

**POLYNOMIAL OPTIMIZATION RELAXATIONS FOR
GENERALIZED SEMI-INFINITE PROGRAMS**

XIAOMENG HU AND JIAWANG NIE

ABSTRACT. This paper studies generalized semi-infinite programs (GSIPs) given by polynomials. We propose a hierarchy of polynomial optimization relaxations to solve them. They are based on Lagrange multiplier expressions and polynomial extensions. Moment-SOS relaxations are applied to solve the polynomial optimization. The convergence of this hierarchy is shown under certain conditions. In particular, the classical semi-infinite programs (SIPs) can be solved as a special case of GSIPs. We also study GSIPs that have convex infinity constraints and show that they can be solved exactly by a single polynomial optimization relaxation. The computational efficiency is demonstrated by extensive numerical results.

1. INTRODUCTION

We consider the generalized semi-infinite program (GSIP):

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} \min & f(x) \\ \text{s.t.} & g(x, u) \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in U(x), \\ & x \in X, \end{cases}$$

where the constraining sets X and $U(x)$ are given as

$$(1.2) \quad X = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \begin{array}{l} c_i(x) = 0 \ (i \in \mathcal{I}_1), \\ c_j(x) \geq 0 \ (j \in \mathcal{J}_1) \end{array} \right\},$$

$$(1.3) \quad U(x) = \left\{ u \in \mathbb{R}^p \mid \begin{array}{l} h_i(x, u) = 0 \ (i \in \mathcal{I}_2), \\ h_j(x, u) \geq 0 \ (j \in \mathcal{J}_2) \end{array} \right\}.$$

The constraining function $g(x, u)$ in (1.1) is the s -dimensional vector

$$g(x, u) := (g_1(x, u), \dots, g_s(x, u)).$$

In this paper, we assume that all functions are given by polynomials, and \mathcal{I}_1 , \mathcal{I}_2 , \mathcal{J}_1 and \mathcal{J}_2 are finite label sets. For each feasible x , the constraint $g(x, u) \geq 0$ is required to hold for *every* point $u \in U(x)$. In particular, for the special case $U(x) = \emptyset$ (the empty set), this constraint automatically holds for all $x \in X$. Throughout the paper, $a \geq b$ means that the entries of $a - b$ are all nonnegative. Generally, $U(x)$ is an infinite set, which makes it challenging to solve the GSIP. The feasible set of (1.1) is denoted as

$$(1.4) \quad \mathcal{F} := \{x \in X : g(x, u) \geq 0 \ \forall u \in U(x)\}.$$

The problem (1.1) is called a semi-infinite program (SIP) if the set $U(x) \equiv U$ is independent of x .

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 90C23, 90C34, 65K05.

Key words and phrases. GSIP, polynomial extension, optimization, relaxation, SIP.

GSIPs have broad applications. One is the centering design problem, which aims to maximize the volume of a parameterized set $U(x)$, such as balls/ellipsoids [6], boxes [2] and gemstones [54], inscribed in a given region [44]. For instance, an ellipsoid can be expressed as

$$U(x) = \{u \in \mathbb{R}^p : (u - a(x))^T P(x)^{-1} (u - a(x)) \leq 1\},$$

where $a(x)$ is a vector parameterizing the center and $P(x)$ is a symmetric positive definite matrix (i.e., $P(x) \succ 0$ for $x \in X$) parameterizing the ellipsoid shape. The maximum ellipsoid design problem is to look for $x \in X$ such that $U(x)$ has maximum volume and $U(x) \subseteq Y$, for a given set $Y \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$. If $Y = \{u : g(u) \geq 0\}$ for a vector function g , this design problem can be formulated as the GSIP (see [44, 45]):

$$(1.5) \quad \begin{cases} \max & \det P(x) \\ \text{s.t.} & g(u) \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in U(x), \\ & x \in X. \end{cases}$$

Other applications include min-max optimization [42, 55], portfolio optimization [26], disjunctive programming [22], the Stackelberg game [44], and dynamical network classification [53]. More applications can be found in [14, 29, 46].

There are various methods for solving SIPs (i.e., $U(x) \equiv U$ is constant). Some methods first approximate U by a finite subset and then solve the resulting approximation optimization problems with finitely many constraints. They subsequently update the approximation until a certain termination criterion is met [22]. When SIPs are given by polynomials, a semidefinite relaxation method is given in [51]. Different methods can be obtained when U is approximated by different schemes. Typical tricks for the approximation are the exchange, discretization and local reduction. We refer to [4, 19, 29, 31] for classical surveys on SIPs.

It is harder to solve GSIPs than SIPs. The methods for SIPs are difficult to be extended to solve GSIPs, when the set $U(x)$ depends on x . To show the difficulty for doing this, suppose \mathcal{F}_0 is an initial approximation for the feasible set \mathcal{F} of (1.1) and solve the relaxation problem

$$(1.6) \quad \begin{cases} \min & f(x) \\ \text{s.t.} & x \in \mathcal{F}_0. \end{cases}$$

Suppose \hat{x} is an optimizer for (1.6). Typically, the point \hat{x} is not a feasible point in \mathcal{F} (otherwise, \hat{x} is a minimizer for the GSIP), i.e., there exists a point $\hat{u} \in U(\hat{x})$ such that $g(\hat{x}, \hat{u}) \not\geq 0$. Such \hat{u} can be obtained by solving the optimization problem about u :

$$(1.7) \quad \begin{cases} \min & \min_{1 \leq j \leq s} g_j(\hat{x}, u) \\ \text{s.t.} & u \in U(\hat{x}). \end{cases}$$

The classical exchange technique (see [19]) is to solve the strengthened relaxation problem

$$(1.8) \quad \begin{cases} \min & f(x) \\ \text{s.t.} & g(x, \hat{u}) \geq 0, x \in \mathcal{F}_0. \end{cases}$$

However, the new optimization (1.8) may not contain any minimizer x^* of (1.1) as a feasible point. This is because $g(x^*, u) \geq 0$ is only required to hold for all $u \in U(x^*)$. But we may not have $g(x^*, \hat{u}) \geq 0$, since it is possible that $\hat{u} \notin U(x^*)$. This phenomenon is shown in Example 3.1. The classical exchange trick may not

solve GSIPs correctly. Other types of computational methods for SIPs experience similar difficulties for solving GSIPs. We refer to [14, 46] for the classical work.

Some methods transform GSIPs into other equivalent problems (see [26] for related work). When the objective f is convex, $g(x, u)$ is linear in x and is quadratic in u , a branch-and-bound method is proposed in [27], which transforms a GSIP into a finite number of convex programs. Under certain assumptions, GSIPs can be transformed to SIPs [46] or some bilevel programs [44]. The GSIP can be converted to min-max optimization [50]. An approach transforming GSIPs into penalty problems with finitely many constraints is given in [13]. In computational practice, these equivalent problems or reformulations are also hard to solve. It is still a big challenge to solve GSIPs.

Contributions. To solve the GSIP (1.1) efficiently and reliably, we propose a hierarchy of polynomial optimization relaxations (P_k) . They have the same objective $f(x)$ but their feasible sets \mathcal{F}_k satisfy the nesting containment

$$\mathcal{F}_0 \supseteq \mathcal{F}_1 \supseteq \cdots \mathcal{F}_k \supseteq \cdots \supseteq \mathcal{F}.$$

The initial relaxation \mathcal{F}_0 can be any set containing \mathcal{F} . At the k th stage, we solve the relaxation problem

$$(P_k): \quad \begin{cases} \min & f(x) \\ \text{s.t.} & x \in \mathcal{F}_k. \end{cases}$$

Suppose \hat{x}_k is a minimizer of (P_k) . If \hat{x}_k is feasible for (1.1), i.e., $g(\hat{x}_k, u) \geq 0$ for all $u \in U(\hat{x}_k)$, then it is an optimizer for the GSIP. If it is not feasible for (1.1), we need to update (P_k) to get the next tighter relaxation (P_{k+1}) .

When \hat{x}_k is not feasible for (1.1), there must exist $\hat{u}_k \in U(\hat{x}_k)$ such that $g_j(\hat{x}_k, \hat{u}_k) < 0$ for some j , i.e., the inequality $g(\hat{x}_k, \hat{u}_k) \geq 0$ is violated. When $U(x)$ depends on x , we cannot simply select the new relaxation set \mathcal{F}_{k+1} as

$$\mathcal{F}_{k+1} = \{x \in \mathcal{F}_k : g(x, \hat{u}_k) \geq 0\}.$$

This is because we may not have $\hat{u}_k \in U(x^*)$ for any minimizer x^* of (1.1). The classical exchange trick does not work for GSIPs. To fix this issue, we look for a polynomial vector function $q_k(x)$ such that

$$q_k(\hat{x}_k) = \hat{u}_k, \quad q_k(x) \in U(x) \quad \forall x \in X.$$

Such q_k is called a polynomial extension at \hat{u}_k . It is important to observe that if such q_k exists, then every feasible point x of (1.1) must satisfy the inequality $g(x, q_k(x)) \geq 0$. Therefore, if x^* is a minimizer of (1.1), then we must have $g(x^*, q_k(x^*)) \geq 0$. Therefore, we can select the new polynomial optimization relaxation (P_{k+1}) as

$$(1.9) \quad \begin{cases} \min & f(x) \\ \text{s.t.} & g(x, q_k(x)) \geq 0, x \in \mathcal{F}_k. \end{cases}$$

Equivalently, the new feasible set \mathcal{F}_{k+1} is updated as

$$\mathcal{F}_{k+1} := \{x \in \mathcal{F}_k : g(x, q_k(x)) \geq 0\}.$$

Continuing to do the above, we can get a hierarchy of polynomial optimization relaxations. This hierarchy gives a method for solving the GSIP. It produces a sequence of points \hat{x}_k , which serve as approximate optimizers for (1.1). It is expected that either \hat{x}_k is a minimizer of (1.1) for some k (this case is called the finite convergence), or an accumulation point of the sequence $\{\hat{x}_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is a minimizer of (1.1) (this case is called the asymptotic convergence). Under certain assumptions,

we can prove that the hierarchy of polynomial optimization relaxations has either finite convergence or asymptotic convergence.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we review some preliminaries about polynomial optimization. In Section 3, we show how to use polynomial extensions to construct the hierarchy of polynomial optimization relaxations. Its convergence is also shown there. In Section 4, we show how to get polynomial extensions. In Section 5, we discuss how to solve GSIPs that have convex infinite constraints. In Section 6, various numerical examples for both GSIPs and SIPs are presented to show the efficiency of the proposed method. Some conclusions and discussions are made in Section 7.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Notation. Let \mathbb{N} (resp., \mathbb{R}) denote the set of nonnegative integers (resp., real numbers). For $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\lceil t \rceil$ denotes the smallest integer greater than or equal to t . For a finite set A , we use $|A|$ to denote its cardinality. The symbol $\mathbb{R}[x] = \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ denotes the ring of polynomials in $x := (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ with real coefficients. For a symmetric matrix W , $W \succeq 0$ (resp., $W \succ 0$) means that W is positive semidefinite (resp., positive definite). For a vector u , $\|u\|$ denotes the standard Euclidean norm. The notation I_n denotes n -dimensional identity matrix, and e denotes the vector of all ones (its length is determined by the operation on it). For an integer $s > 0$, denote the set $[s] := \{1, \dots, s\}$. For a power $\alpha := (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$, we denote the monomial $x^\alpha := x_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots x_n^{\alpha_n}$. The notation

$$\mathbb{N}_d^n := \{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n : \alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n \leq d\}$$

denotes the set of monomial powers with degrees at most d . So, $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_d^n}$ denotes the space of real vectors labeled by $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_d^n$. The notation $\nabla_x f$ stands for the gradient of f in x and $\nabla_u g$ stands for the gradient of g in u .

A polynomial tuple $h = (h_1, \dots, h_m)$ in $\mathbb{R}[x]$ generates the ideal

$$\text{Ideal}(h) := h_1 \cdot \mathbb{R}[x] + \cdots + h_m \cdot \mathbb{R}[x],$$

the smallest ideal containing all h_i . The k th degree truncation of $\text{Ideal}(h)$ is

$$\text{Ideal}(h)_k := h_1 \cdot \mathbb{R}[x]_{k-\deg(h_1)} + \cdots + h_m \cdot \mathbb{R}[x]_{k-\deg(h_m)}.$$

A polynomial $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ is said to be a sum of squares (SOS) polynomial if $\sigma = \sigma_1^2 + \cdots + \sigma_k^2$ for some $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k \in \mathbb{R}[x]$. The symbol $\Sigma[x]$ denotes the set of all SOS polynomials in x . We refer to [20, 33, 34] for related work about SOS polynomials and matrices. The quadratic module for a polynomial tuple $q = (q_1, \dots, q_t)$ is ($q_0 := 1$)

$$\text{QM}[q] := \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^t \sigma_i q_i \mid \sigma_i \in \Sigma[x] \right\}.$$

For a positive integer $k > 0$, the $2k$ th degree truncation of $\text{QM}(q)$ is

$$\text{QM}[q]_{2k} := \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^t \sigma_i q_i \mid \sigma_i \in \Sigma[x], \deg(\sigma_i q_i) \leq 2k \right\}.$$

The sum $\text{Ideal}(p) + \text{QM}(q)$ is said to be archimedean if there exists $b \in \text{Ideal}(p) + \text{QM}(q)$ such that the inequality $b(x) \geq 0$ gives a compact set.

A vector labelled as $y := (y_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_{2d}^n}$ is called a truncated multi-sequences (tms) of degree $2d$. For $y \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_{2d}^n}$, define the operation

$$\langle p, y \rangle := \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_{2d}^n} p_\alpha y_\alpha \quad \text{for } p = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_{2d}^n} p_\alpha x^\alpha.$$

For a given $p \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ with degree $\deg(p) \leq 2d$, let $t := \lceil d - \deg(p)/2 \rceil$. Let $L_p^{(d)}[y]$ denote the symmetric matrix such that

$$\langle p\phi^2, y \rangle = \text{vec}(\phi)^T \cdot L_p^{(d)}[y] \cdot \text{vec}(\phi) \quad \text{for all } \phi \in \mathbb{R}[x]_t.$$

where $\text{vec}(\phi)$ denotes the coefficient vector of ϕ , ordered by the graded alphabetical ordering. In particular, for the case $p = 1$, we get the moment matrix $M_d[y] = L_1^{(d)}[y]$, which is equivalent to the expression

$$M_d[y] := (y_{\alpha+\beta})_{\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}_d^n}.$$

For the polynomial p , let $\mathcal{V}_p^{(2d)}[y]$ denote the vector such that

$$\langle p\phi, y \rangle = (\mathcal{V}_p^{(2d)}[y])^T \text{vec}(\phi).$$

The $\mathcal{V}_p^{(2d)}[y]$ is called the localizing vector of p , generated by y .

2.1. Moment-SOS relaxations. For convenience of description, we consider the standard polynomial optimization problem

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{cases} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} & f(x) \\ \text{s.t.} & p_i(x) = 0 \ (i = 1, \dots, m_1) \\ & p_i(x) \geq 0 \ (i = m_1 + 1, \dots, m_2). \end{cases}$$

The Lasserre type Moment-SOS hierarchy can be applied to solve (2.1). The SOS relaxation is

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{cases} \max & \gamma \\ \text{s.t.} & f - \gamma \in \text{Ideal}[p_1, \dots, p_{m_1}]_{2k} + \text{QM}[p_{m_1+1}, \dots, p_{m_2}]_{2k}. \end{cases}$$

Its dual problem is the moment relaxation

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{cases} \min & \langle f, y \rangle \\ \text{s.t.} & \mathcal{V}_{p_i}^{(2k)}[y] = 0 \ (i = 1, \dots, m_1), \\ & L_{p_i}^{(k)}[y] \succeq 0 \ (i = m_1 + 1, \dots, m_2), \\ & M_k[y] \succeq 0, \\ & y_0 = 1, y \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_{2k}^n}. \end{cases}$$

Suppose y^* is an optimizer of (2.3). Denote the degree

$$d_0 := \max_{i \in [m_2]} \{ \lceil \deg(f)/2 \rceil, \lceil \deg(p_i)/2 \rceil \}.$$

If there exists a degree $t \in [d_0, k]$ such that

$$(2.4) \quad \text{rank} M_{t-d_0}[y^*] = \text{rank} M_t[y^*].$$

then we can extract $r := \text{rank} M_t[y^*]$ minimizers. Generically, flat truncation is a sufficient and necessary condition for extracting optimizers from Moment-SOS relaxations [35]. We refer to [18, 24, 25, 40] for general polynomial optimization theory and methods.

3. POLYNOMIAL OPTIMIZATION RELAXATIONS

This section gives a hierarchy of polynomial optimization relaxations for solving GSIPs. It requires to use polynomial extensions.

3.1. Polynomial extensions. To solve the GSIP (1.1) efficiently and reliably, we relax its infinity constraints into finitely many ones and then subsequently update them to get better relaxation. To achieve this, we need to construct a sequence of polynomial optimization relaxations (P_k) , which have the same objective $f(x)$ and have the feasible sets \mathcal{F}_k satisfying the nesting containment

$$(3.1) \quad \mathcal{F}_0 \supseteq \mathcal{F}_1 \supseteq \cdots \mathcal{F}_k \supseteq \cdots \supseteq \mathcal{F}.$$

The initial \mathcal{F}_0 can be any set containing \mathcal{F} (e.g, $\mathcal{F}_0 = X$). For each $k = 0, 1, \dots$, the GSIP (1.1) is relaxed to

$$(3.2) \quad (P_k) \quad \begin{cases} f_k := \min & f(x) \\ s.t. & x \in \mathcal{F}_k. \end{cases}$$

The minimal value for (P_k) is denoted as f_k . Clearly, the nesting relation (3.1) implies

$$(3.3) \quad f_0 \leq f_1 \leq \cdots f_k \leq \cdots \leq f^*,$$

where f^* denotes the optimal value of (1.1). Suppose \hat{x}_k is a minimizer for (3.2). To check if \hat{x}_k is feasible for (1.1) or not, we need to solve the optimization problems (for $j = 1, \dots, s$),

$$(3.4) \quad (Q_{k,j}) \quad \begin{cases} \hat{g}_k := \min & g_j(\hat{x}_k, u) \\ s.t. & u \in U(\hat{x}_k). \end{cases}$$

The minimal value of $(Q_{k,j})$ is denoted as $\hat{g}_{k,j}$. Note that \hat{x}_k is feasible for (1.1) if and only if $g(\hat{x}_k, u) \geq 0$ for all $u \in U(\hat{x}_k)$. Therefore,

$$\hat{x}_k \text{ is feasible for (1.1)} \Leftrightarrow \hat{g}_{k,j} \geq 0, j = 1, \dots, s.$$

If some $\hat{g}_{k,j} < 0$, then \hat{x}_k is not feasible for (1.1). Denote the label set

$$(3.5) \quad \mathcal{N}_k := \{j \in [s] : \hat{g}_{k,j} < 0\}.$$

Suppose $\hat{u}_{k,j}$ is a minimizer of $(Q_{k,j})$. Using the classical exchange trick, one may select the new set \mathcal{F}_{k+1} as

$$(3.6) \quad \mathcal{F}_{k+1} := \{x \in \mathcal{F}_k : g(x, \hat{u}_{k,j}) \geq 0, j \in \mathcal{N}_k\}.$$

However, the above choice may result in that $x^* \notin \mathcal{F}_{k+1}$ for every optimizer x^* of (1.1). The reason for this is that the constraining set $U(x)$ depends on x . This can be shown in the following example.

Example 3.1. Consider the following GSIP from [32]:

$$\begin{cases} \min & -x_1 \\ s.t. & g := u^5 - 3x_2^2 \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in U(x), \\ & x \in X, \end{cases}$$

where the constraining sets are

$$X = [0, 1]^2, \quad U(x) = \left\{ u \in \mathbb{R}^1 \mid \begin{array}{l} -u \geq 0, u + 2 \geq 0, \\ u^5 + 4x_1^2 + x_2^2 - 1 \geq 0 \end{array} \right\}.$$

The minimizers for (P_0) and (Q_0) are $\hat{x}_0 \approx (1.0000, 0.4350)$ and $\hat{u}_0 \approx -1.2611$ respectively. The true minimizer for this GSIP is $x^* = (0.5000, 0.0000)$. However,

$g(x^*, \hat{u}_0) \approx -3.1892 < 0$. If we let $\mathcal{F}_1 = \{x \in \mathcal{F}_0 : g(x, \hat{u}_0) \geq 0\}$, then $x^* \notin \mathcal{F}_1$ and $\mathcal{F}_1 \not\supseteq \mathcal{F}$. We cannot get the minimizer if \mathcal{F}_1 is selected as in (3.6). More details for solving this GSIP is referred to Example 6.3.

To fix the above issue, we need to introduce the concept of polynomial extension (also see [39]).

Definition 3.2. For a pair (\hat{x}, \hat{u}) with $\hat{x} \in X$ and $\hat{u} \in U(\hat{x})$, a polynomial vector function $q(x)$ is called a polynomial extension of \hat{u} for $U(x)$ if

$$(3.7) \quad q(\hat{x}) = \hat{u}, \quad q(x) \in U(x) \quad \forall x \in X.$$

Recall that \hat{x}_k is a minimizer of (3.2). Consider the case that $\hat{g}_{k,j} < 0$ and $\hat{u}_{k,j}$ is a minimizer of $Q_{k,j}$. Assume $q_{k,j}(x)$ is a polynomial extension of $\hat{u}_{k,j}$ for $U(x)$, i.e.,

$$(3.8) \quad q_{k,j}(\hat{x}_k) = \hat{u}_{k,j}, \quad q_{k,j}(x) \in U(x) \quad \forall x \in X.$$

Observe that $g(x, q_{k,j}(x)) \geq 0$ for every feasible point $x \in \mathcal{F}$. Therefore, the new tighter relaxation \mathcal{F}_{k+1} can be selected as

$$(3.9) \quad \mathcal{F}_{k+1} := \{x \in \mathcal{F}_k : g(x, q_{k,j}(x)) \geq 0, j \in \mathcal{N}_k\}.$$

Continuing to do this, we can get a hierarchy of relaxations \mathcal{F}_k satisfying the nesting relation (3.1).

3.2. The algorithm. Using polynomial extensions in the above, we can get the following algorithm for solving GSIPs.

Algorithm 3.3. For the GSIP (1.1), do the following:

Step 0: Let $k := 0$ and $\mathcal{F}_0 := X$ (or any set $\mathcal{F}_0 \supseteq \mathcal{F}$).

Step 1: Solve the polynomial optimization relaxation (P_k) as in (3.2). If (P_k) is infeasible, output that (1.1) is infeasible and there are no minimizers. If it is feasible and has minimizers, compute a minimizer \hat{x}_k .

Step 2: Check whether or not \hat{x}_k is feasible for (1.1). Solve the optimization problem $(Q_{k,j})$ as in (3.4), for each $j = 1, \dots, s$. If $U(\hat{x}_k) = \emptyset$, then the constraint that $g(\hat{x}_k, u) \geq 0$ for all $u \in U(\hat{x}_k)$ is automatically satisfied. For this case, let $\hat{g}_k := +\infty$. If $U(\hat{x}_k) \neq \emptyset$, compute its optimal value $\hat{g}_{k,j}$ and a minimizer $\hat{u}_{k,j}$ (if any) for $(Q_{k,j})$. Then let $\hat{g}_k := \min_{j \in [s]} \hat{g}_{k,j}$.

Step 3: If $\hat{g}_k \geq 0$, output that \hat{x}_k is a minimizer for (1.1) and stop. If $\hat{g}_k < 0$, construct a polynomial extension $q_{k,j}(x)$ satisfying (3.8) for each $j \in \mathcal{N}_k$, where \mathcal{N}_k is the label set as in (3.5).

Step 4: Update the set \mathcal{F}_{k+1} as in (3.9). Let $k := k + 1$ and go to Step 1.

We would like to remark that Algorithm 3.3 is in the framework of the *conceptual* exchange method of Still's work [47, Algorithm 2]. General nonlinear functions are considered in [47]. There are no efficient methods/packages for computing global minimizers for general nonlinear optimization. Moreover, computing continuous functions satisfying feasible sets given by infinitely many constraints is also difficult. The conceptual exchange method is generally hard to be implemented in computational practice. However, when GSIPs are given by polynomials, the optimization problems $(P)_k$ and $(Q_{k,j})$ can be solved globally (by Moment-SOS relaxations, see section 2.1), and the polynomial extensions can be computed for many frequently

appearing feasible sets (see Section 4). This is our major motivation for studying GSIPs of polynomials.

To check if \hat{x}_k is feasible for (1.1) or not, the optimization problem $(Q_{k,j})$ in (3.4) need to be solved very accurately. We can apply the tight relaxation method in [37] to solve them. In Step 2, if $(Q_{k,j})$ is unbounded below, i.e., $\hat{g}_{k,j} = -\infty$, we can just choose any point $\hat{u}_{k,j}$ such that $g_j(\hat{x}_k, \hat{u}_{k,j}) < 0$. In computational practice, we often select a priori accuracy parameter $\epsilon > 0$ (e.g., $\epsilon = 10^{-6}$), to detect if \hat{x}_k is feasible for (1.1) or not. If $\hat{g}_k \geq -\epsilon$, we can view \hat{x}_k as a feasible point, i.e., it is an accurate minimizer for the GSIP.

The polynomial optimization relaxation (P_k) can be solved by the Lasserre type Moment-SOS relaxations, as described in subsection 2.1. Under the archimedean condition, it has the asymptotic convergence (see [24]). Moreover, under some classical optimality conditions, the finite convergence occurs (see [36]). The convergence can be detected by the flat truncation condition (see [35]).

3.3. Convergence properties. We now study the convergence of Algorithm 3.3. First, if Algorithm 3.3 terminates at a certain loop, the computed solution is a minimizer for the GSIP(1.1).

Theorem 3.4 (Finite convergence). *In Algorithm 3.3, if $\hat{g}_k \geq 0$ at the k th loop, then the minimizer \hat{x}_k for (P_k) is also a minimizer for (1.1).*

Proof. The feasible sets \mathcal{F}_k satisfy the nesting relation (3.1) and the optimal values f_k satisfy (3.3). If $\hat{g}_k \geq 0$ at the k th loop, it means that $g(\hat{x}_k, u) \geq 0$ for all $u \in U(\hat{x}_k)$, i.e., \hat{x}_k is feasible for (1.1). So, $f_k = f(\hat{x}_k) \geq f^*$, hence $f_k = f^*$ and \hat{x}_k is a minimizer for (1.1). \square

Second, we study the asymptotic convergence of Algorithm 3.3. Let x^* be an accumulation point of the sequence $\{\hat{x}_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$. We consider the value function

$$(3.10) \quad v(x) := \min_{j \in [s]} \min_{u \in U(x)} g_j(x, u).$$

People often assume $v(x)$ is continuous at x^* . This can be ensured under certain conditions (see [8, 9, 15, 30]). For convenience of notation, let \hat{u}_k denote the point $\hat{u}_{k,j}$ such that $g_j(\hat{x}_k, \hat{u}_{k,j}) = \hat{g}_k$. We also let $\hat{q}_k(x)$ denote the polynomial extension of \hat{u}_k at the k th loop.

Theorem 3.5 (Asymptotic convergence). *Let $\{\hat{x}_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ be the sequence produced by Algorithm 3.3. Suppose x^* is an accumulation point of this sequence. Assume the following:*

- (i) *In the k th loop, the problems (P_k) and $(Q_{k,j})$ have minimizers \hat{x}_k and $\hat{u}_{k,j}$ respectively;*
- (ii) *Suppose (x^*, u^*) is an accumulation point of $\{(\hat{x}_k, \hat{u}_k)\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ and the value function $v(x)$ as in (3.10) is continuous at x^* ;*
- (iii) *The polynomial extensions $q_{k,j}(x)$ are uniformly continuous at x^* .¹*

Then, we have $v(x^) = 0$ and x^* is a minimizer for the GSIP (1.1).*

¹This means that for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\|q_{k,j}(x) - q_{k,j}(x^*)\| \leq \delta$ for all $\|x - x^*\| < \epsilon$ and for all k, j .

Proof. Since x^* is an accumulation point of the sequence $\{\hat{x}_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$, there exists a subsequence such that $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \hat{x}_{k_l} = x^*$. Since f is a polynomial function, the monotonicity relation (3.3) implies

$$f(x^*) = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} f(\hat{x}_{k_l}) = \lim_{k_l \rightarrow \infty} f_{k_l} \leq f^*.$$

If Algorithm 3.3 does not stop at the k_l th loop, we have

$$v(\hat{x}_{k_l}) < 0.$$

Letting $l \rightarrow \infty$, we get $v(x^*) \leq 0$, since $v(x)$ is continuous at x^* .

Next, we pick an arbitrary $k' \in \mathbb{N}$. For every $k_l > k'$, the feasibility of the polynomial optimization relaxation (P_{k_l}) implies that

$$g(\hat{x}_{k_l}, \hat{q}_{k'}(\hat{x}_{k_l})) \geq 0.$$

Letting $l \rightarrow \infty$, we then get $g(x^*, \hat{q}_{k'}(x^*)) \geq 0$. Since k' can be arbitrary, the above implies that

$$g(x^*, \hat{q}_k(x^*)) \geq 0, \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Since $g_j(\hat{x}_{k_l}, \hat{u}_{k_l}) \geq g_j(\hat{x}_{k_l}, \hat{u}_{k_l, j})$, one can observe that

$$v(\hat{x}_{k_l}) = \min_{j \in [s]} g_j(\hat{x}_{k_l}, \hat{u}_{k_l, j}).$$

Therefore, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} v(x^*) &= v(\hat{x}_{k_l}) + v(x^*) - v(\hat{x}_{k_l}) \\ &\geq \left(\min_{j \in [s]} g_j(\hat{x}_{k_l}, \hat{u}_{k_l}) - \min_{j \in [s]} g_j(\hat{x}^*, \hat{q}_{k_l}(\hat{x}^*)) \right) + \left(v(x^*) - v(\hat{x}_{k_l}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

By the polynomial extension and uniform continuity, we have

$$u^* = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \hat{u}_{k_l} = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \hat{q}_{k_l}(\hat{x}_{k_l}) = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \hat{q}_{k_l}(\hat{x}^*),$$

$$\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \left(\min_{j \in [s]} g_j(\hat{x}_{k_l}, \hat{u}_{k_l}) - \min_{j \in [s]} g_j(\hat{x}^*, \hat{q}_{k_l}(\hat{x}^*)) \right) = 0.$$

Since $v(x)$ is continuous at x^* , the above implies $v(x^*) \geq 0$.

Combining the above, we have $v(x^*) = 0$, so $g(x^*, u) \geq 0$ holds for all $u \in U(x)$. This implies that x^* is feasible for the GSIP (1.1), i.e., $x^* \in \mathcal{F}$. Hence, $f(x^*) \geq f^*$ and we must have $f(x^*) = f^*$. In other words, x^* is a minimizer for the GSIP (1.1). \square

When the sequence $\{\hat{x}_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is bounded, it always has an accumulation point. This is the case if either X is compact or the objective f is coercive, i.e., the sublevel set $\{x \in X : f(x) \leq v\}$ is bounded for each value v . The uniform continuity condition in Theorem 3.5 (iii) can be ensured if the polynomial extension functions $q_{k,j}(x)$ have uniformly bounded degrees and bounded coefficients. In Section 4, we will see that this is the case for many common feasible sets.

4. POLYNOMIAL EXTENSIONS

This section discusses how to compute polynomial extensions. Suppose \hat{x} is an approximate optimizer obtained from solving a polynomial optimization relaxation. We consider the case that \hat{x} is not feasible for the GSIP (1.1), i.e., there exists $\hat{u} \in U(\hat{x})$ such that $g_j(\hat{x}, \hat{u}) < 0$ for some $j \in [s]$. For the special case of SIP, the polynomial function $q(x)$ can be selected to be the constant \hat{u} . In the following, we study how to compute a polynomial function $q(x)$ satisfying (3.7) in Definition 3.2 for more general cases.

First, we look at some common feasible sets for which polynomial extensions can be given explicitly. They are discussed in [39].

Box type constraints. Suppose the infinity constraining set is

$$U(x) = \{u \in \mathbb{R}^p : l(x) \leq u \leq w(x)\},$$

where $l(x) := (l_1(x), \dots, l_p(x))$ and $w(x) := (w_1(x), \dots, w_p(x))$ are given polynomial vectors. Suppose $l(x) \leq w(x)$ on X . For the given pair (\hat{x}, \hat{u}) , with $\hat{u} = (\hat{u}_1, \dots, \hat{u}_p)$, we can choose the polynomial extension $q = (q_1, \dots, q_p)$ as

$$(4.1) \quad q_j(x) = \sigma_j l_j(x) + (1 - \sigma_j) w_j(x), \quad j = 1, \dots, p,$$

where each scalar

$$\sigma_j := (w_j(\hat{x}) - \hat{u}_j) / (w_j(\hat{x}) - l_j(\hat{x})) \in [0, 1].$$

For the case $w_j(\hat{x}) - l_j(\hat{x}) = 0$, we just let $\sigma_j = 0$. Then, for each $j = 1, \dots, p$,

$$q_j(\hat{x}) = \sigma_j l_j(\hat{x}) + (1 - \sigma_j) w_j(\hat{x}) = \hat{u}_j.$$

Clearly, $q(x) \in U(x)$ for all $x \in X$. Such $q(x)$ satisfies (3.7).

Simplex type constraints. Suppose the infinite constraining set is

$$U(x) = \{u \in \mathbb{R}^p : l(x) \leq u, e^T u \leq w(x)\},$$

where $l(x) := (l_1(x), \dots, l_p(x))$ is a polynomial vector and $w(x)$ is a scalar polynomial. Here, e is the vector of all ones. Suppose $w(x) - e^T l(x) \geq 0$ on X . For given (\hat{x}, \hat{u}) , with $\hat{u} = (\hat{u}_1, \dots, \hat{u}_p)$, we can choose the polynomial extension $q = (q_1, \dots, q_p)$ as

$$(4.2) \quad q_j(x) = \mu_j (w(x) - e^T l(x)) + l_j(x), \quad j = 1, \dots, p,$$

where each scalar

$$\mu_j = (\hat{u}_j - l_j(\hat{x})) / (w(\hat{x}) - e^T l(\hat{x})) \geq 0.$$

For the case $w(\hat{x}) - e^T l(\hat{x}) = 0$, one can just let $\mu_j = 0$. Note that $\sum_{i=1}^p \mu_i \leq 1$ and

$$q_j(\hat{x}) = \mu_j \cdot (w(\hat{x}) - e^T l(\hat{x})) + l_j(\hat{x}) = \hat{u}_j.$$

Since $e^T l(x) \leq w(x)$ on X , we have $q(x) \geq l(x)$ and

$$e^T q(x) = e^T l(x) \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^p \mu_j\right) + \left(\sum_{j=1}^p \mu_j\right) w(x) \leq w(x).$$

Therefore, $q(x) \in U(x)$ for all $x \in X$. Such $q(x)$ satisfies (3.7).

Ball type constraints. Suppose the infinite constraining set is

$$U(x) = \{u \in \mathbb{R}^p : l(x) \leq \|u - a(x)\| \leq w(x)\},$$

where $a(x) = (a_1(x), \dots, a_p(x))$ is a polynomial vector and $l(x), w(x)$ are given polynomials such that $0 \leq l(x) \leq w(x)$ on X . We can choose the polynomial extension q such that

$$(4.3) \quad q(x) := a(x) + \tilde{q}(x)v, \quad \tilde{q}(x) = \mu_1 l(x) + \mu_2 w(x)$$

where the scalars μ_1, μ_2 and the vector v are selected such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{u} - a(\hat{x})\| &= \mu_1 l(\hat{x}) + \mu_2 w(\hat{x}), \\ \mu_1 &\geq 0, \mu_2 \geq 0, \mu_1 + \mu_2 = 1, \\ v &= (\hat{u} - a(\hat{x})) / \|\hat{u} - a(\hat{x})\|. \end{aligned}$$

For the case $\hat{u} - a(\hat{x}) = 0$, we just let $v = e/\sqrt{p}$. Since $\tilde{q}(\hat{x}) = \|\hat{u} - a(\hat{x})\|$ and $\|v\| = 1$, one can check that

$$\hat{u} - q(\hat{x}) = (\hat{u} - a(\hat{x})) - (q(\hat{x}) - a(\hat{x})) = (\hat{u} - a(\hat{x})) - \tilde{q}(\hat{x})v = 0,$$

$$\|q(x) - a(x)\| = \|\tilde{q}(x)v\| = |\tilde{q}(x)| \cdot \|v\| = |\tilde{q}(x)|.$$

Since $0 \leq l(x) \leq w(x)$ on X , we have

$$l(x) \leq \|q(x) - a(x)\| \leq w(x).$$

The above $q(x)$ satisfies (3.7).

Beyond the above, we consider the case that the infinity constraining set is given by a parameterized ellipsoid

$$U(x) = \{u \in \mathbb{R}^p : (u - a(x))^T (D(x)^T D(x))^{-1} (u - a(x)) \leq 1\}.$$

Here, $a(x)$ is the center vector, and $D(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ is a polynomial matrix that is nonsingular on X . We can choose the polynomial extension as

$$(4.4) \quad q(x) = a(x) + D(x)^T D(\hat{x})^{-T} (\hat{u} - a(\hat{x})).$$

One can see that

$$q(\hat{x}) = a(\hat{x}) + D(\hat{x})^T D(\hat{x})^{-T} (\hat{u} - a(\hat{x})) = \hat{u}.$$

Moreover, we have $q(x) \in U(x)$ for all x , since

$$\begin{aligned} & (q(x) - a(x))^T (D(x)^T D(x))^{-1} (q(x) - a(x)) \\ &= (\hat{u} - a(\hat{x}))^T D(\hat{x})^{-1} D(\hat{x})^{-T} (\hat{u} - a(\hat{x})) \\ &= (\hat{u} - a(\hat{x}))^T (D(\hat{x})^T D(\hat{x}))^{-1} (\hat{u} - a(\hat{x})) \\ &\leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality is due to that $\hat{u} \in U(\hat{x})$. The $q(x)$ as in (4.4) is a satisfactory polynomial extension.

In the following, we propose a numerical method for obtaining polynomial extensions. Recall that the infinity constraining set $U(x)$ is given by

$$h_i(x, u) = 0 \quad (i \in \mathcal{I}_2), \quad h_i(x, u) \geq 0 \quad (i \in \mathcal{J}_2).$$

When $h_i(x, u)$ is nonlinear in $u = (u_1, \dots, u_p)$, how to obtain polynomial extensions is generally highly challenging. This question is mostly open, to the best of the authors's knowledge. Here, we consider a typical case that all $h_i(x, u)$ are linear in u (but they can be nonlinear in x), i.e.,

$$h_i(x, u) = h_{i,0}(x) + (h_{i,1}(x))^T u,$$

where each $h_{i,1}$ is a p -dimensional polynomial vector. Recall that the constraining set X is given as in (1.2). As required in Definition 3.2 for given (\hat{x}, \hat{u}) , the polynomial extension vector $q = (\phi_1(x), \dots, \phi_p(x))$ can be obtained by solving the following feasibility problem

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{cases} (\phi_1(\hat{x}), \dots, \phi_p(\hat{x})) = \hat{u}, \\ h_i(x, q(x)) \in \text{Ideal}[c_{eq}] \quad \text{for } i \in \mathcal{I}_2, \\ h_i(x, q(x)) \in \text{Ideal}[c_{eq}] + \text{QM}[c_{in}] \quad \text{for } i \in \mathcal{J}_2, \\ \phi_1, \dots, \phi_p \in \mathbb{R}[x]. \end{cases}$$

In the above, $c_{eq} = (c_k)_{k \in \mathcal{I}_1}$ is the tuple of equality constraining polynomials for X and $c_{in} = (c_k)_{k \in \mathcal{J}_1}$ is the tuple of inequality constraining polynomials for X . After choosing priori degrees, (4.5) is a linear convex conic system about coefficients of q . The second constraint implies that $h_i(x, q(x)) = 0$ for all $x \in X$ and $i \in \mathcal{I}_2$, and the third one implies that $h_i(x, q(x)) \geq 0$ for all $x \in X$ and $i \in \mathcal{J}_2$. Therefore, if q satisfies (4.5), then q is a polynomial extension.

Example 4.1. Consider $X, U(x)$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{x} &= (1/2, 1), \quad \hat{u} = (1/3, 2/3), \quad c(x) = (x_2 - x_1, x_1, 2 - x_1 - x_2) \geq 0, \\ h(x, u) &= (x_2 - x_1 u_1 - x_2 u_2, u_1 + x_1 u_2 - x_1 x_2, x_1 + 3u_1 - u_2, u_1 - x_1^2 u_2) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

A polynomial extension $q = (\phi_1, \phi_2)$ satisfying (4.5) is

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_1 &= 0.2705 - 0.4539x_1 - 0.0395x_2 + 0.2690x_1^2 - 0.4113x_1x_2 + 0.0564x_2^2, \\ \phi_2 &= 0.7102 - 0.3609x_1 + 0.1369x_2. \end{aligned}$$

One can check that $q(\hat{x}) = \hat{u}$ and for every $x \in X$,

$$h(x, q(x)) \geq (3.9 \cdot 10^{-10}, 1.0 \cdot 10^{-8}, 0.0151, 0.0072) \geq 0.$$

The system (4.5) is implemented in *Yalmip* [28] and solved by *SeDuMi* [48].

5. CONVEX INFINITY CONSTRAINTS

This section discusses GSIPs that have convex infinity constraints. Such a GSIP can be solved by a single polynomial optimization relaxation.

Recall that $g(x, u) = (g_1(x, u), \dots, g_s(x, u))$ and the infinity set $U(x)$ is given as in (1.3). Suppose each $g_j(x, u)$ is convex in u for each fixed $x \in X$. Assume $U(x)$ is a convex set² such that

$$(5.1) \quad U(x) = \{u \in \mathbb{R}^p : h_1(x, u) \geq 0, \dots, h_m(x, u) \geq 0\},$$

where each $h_i(x, u)$ is concave in u for fixed $x \in X$. For convenience, denote

$$h(x, u) = [h_1(x, u) \quad \dots \quad h_m(x, u)]^T.$$

In this section, the functions $g_j(x, u), h_i(x, u)$ are not necessarily polynomials. They can be rational functions in (x, u) . Under certain constraint qualifications, the infinity constraint can be equivalently expressed through KKT conditions.

Consider the optimization problem in u (for fixed $x \in X$ and $j \in [s]$)

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{cases} \min_u & g_j(x, u) \\ \text{s.t.} & h(x, u) \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

²When $U(x)$ is convex, its equality constraints are typically given by linear equations, which can be dropped by eliminating variables.

Under certain constraint qualification conditions, if z_j is a minimizer of (5.2), there exists the Lagrange multiplier vector $\lambda_j = (\lambda_{j,1}, \dots, \lambda_{j,m})$ such that

$$(5.3) \quad \boxed{\begin{aligned} \nabla_u h(x, z_j) \lambda_j &= \nabla_u g_j(x, z_j), \\ 0 \leq h(x, z_j) \perp \lambda_j &\geq 0. \end{aligned}}$$

In the above, $\nabla_u h(x, z_j) = [\nabla_u h_1(x, z_j) \ \cdots \ \nabla_u h_m(x, z_j)]$ is the gradient of $h(x, u)$ at $u = z_j$, and \perp denotes the perpendicularity relation. Under the convexity assumption, the constraint that $g_j(x, u) \geq 0$ for all $u \in U(x)$ is equivalent to that

$$g_j(x, z_j) \geq 0, \quad z_j \text{ satisfies (5.3).}$$

If the minimum value of (5.2) is achieved at a KKT point for every $x \in X$, the GSIP (1.1) is then equivalent to

$$(5.4) \quad \begin{cases} \min_{\substack{x, z_1, \dots, z_s \\ \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s}} f(x) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad \nabla_u h(x, z_j) \lambda_j = \nabla_u g_j(x, z_j), \\ \quad \quad 0 \leq h(x, z_j) \perp \lambda_j \geq 0, \\ \quad \quad x \in X. \end{cases}$$

The optimization problem (5.4) has new variables $z_1, \dots, z_s, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s$, in addition to the original variable x . Therefore, we get the following theorem.

Theorem 5.1. *Suppose $U(x)$ is given as in (5.1). For each $x \in X$, assume every $g_j(x, u)$ is convex in u and every $h_j(x, u)$ is concave in u . Assume the optimal value of (5.2) is achieved at a KKT point z_j for each $x \in X$. Then, the GSIP (1.1) is equivalent to (5.4).*

Under certain assumptions, Lagrange multipliers λ_j can be eliminated. Denote that (for $j = 1, \dots, m$)

$$(5.5) \quad H(x, u) = \begin{bmatrix} \nabla_u h_1 & \nabla_u h_2 & \cdots & \nabla_u h_m \\ h_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & h_2 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & h_m \end{bmatrix}, \quad \eta_j(x, u) = \begin{bmatrix} \nabla_u g_j \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The KKT system (5.3) implies that

$$H(x, u) \lambda_j = \eta_j(x, u),$$

If there exists a matrix polynomial $T(x, u)$ such that

$$(5.6) \quad T(x, u) H(x, u) = \phi(x, u) \cdot I_m,$$

for a nonzero polynomial $\phi(x, u)$, then

$$\lambda_j = \frac{1}{\phi(x, u)} T(x, u) H(x, u) \lambda_j = \frac{1}{\phi(x, u)} T(x, u) \eta_j(x, u).$$

When $H(x, u)$ is not identically zero, such a matrix polynomial $T(x, u)$ always exists (see [38]). If we denote the rational vector

$$(5.7) \quad p_j(x, u) = \frac{1}{\phi(x, u)} T(x, u) \eta_j(x, u),$$

the Lagrange multiplier can be expressed as $\lambda_j = p_j(u)$. Then, the optimization problems (1.1) and (5.4) are equivalent to

$$(5.8) \quad \begin{cases} \min_{x, z_1, \dots, z_s} & f(x) \\ \text{s.t.} & \nabla_u h(x, z_j) p_j(x, z_j) = \nabla_u g_j(x, z_j), \\ & 0 \leq h(x, z_j) \perp p_j(x, z_j) \geq 0, \\ & x \in X. \end{cases}$$

The optimization problem (5.8) does not have Lagrange multiplier variables. It is about polynomials or rational functions, so it can be solved by Moment-SOS relaxations. We refer to [7, 17] and [38, Section 5] for how to solve rational optimization problems. We also have the following theorem.

Theorem 5.2. *Suppose $U(x)$ is given as in (5.1). For each $x \in X$, assume every $g_j(x, u)$ is convex in u and every $h_j(x, u)$ is concave in u . Assume the optimal value of (5.2) is achieved at a KKT point z_j for each $x \in X$ and the Lagrange multiplier vector $\lambda_j = p_j(z_j)$ for p_j as in (5.7). Then, the GSIP (1.1) is equivalent to the optimization problem (5.8).*

Computational results for GSIPs with convex infinity constraints are shown in Examples 6.8 and 6.9.

6. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

This section reports numerical examples to show how Algorithm 3.3 solve GSIPs. The computations are implemented in MATLAB R2022b on a laptop equipped with a 10th Generation Intel® Core™ i7-10510U processor and 16GB memory. The Moment-SOS relaxations are implemented by the software `Gloptipoly`[17], which calls the software `SeDuMi` [48] for solving the corresponding semidefinite programs.

For the GSIP (1.1), we use x^* and f^* to denote the global minimizer and the global minimum value respectively. The loops in Algorithm 3.3 are labelled by k . In the k th loop, \hat{x}_k denotes the minimizer of (P_k) and f_k denotes the minimum value. Due to numerical errors, we consider \hat{x}_k as an accurate minimizer for (1.1) if all $\hat{g}_{k,j} \geq -\epsilon$, for a positive small value ϵ (say, $\epsilon = 10^{-6}$). The \hat{u}_k denotes the minimizer for (Q_k) and g_k denotes the minimal value for (Q_k) . Thus, the inequality $\hat{g}_k \geq -\epsilon$ serves as the termination criterion. When the algorithm terminates at the k th loop, we output the minimizer $x^* := \hat{x}_k$ for the GSIP and the minimum value $f^* := f_k$. Consumed computational time is denoted as time. All computational results are displayed with 4 decimal digits.

6.1. SIP examples. Since SIPs are special cases of GSIPs, Algorithm 3.3 can be applied to solve SIPs. This subsection reports such examples.

Example 6.1. *Consider the following min-max SIP from [42]:*

$$\begin{cases} \min_{x \in X} \max_{u \in U} & 5x_1^2 + 5x_2^2 - u_1^2 - u_2^2 + x_1(-u_1 + u_2 + 5) + x_2(u_1 - u_2 + 3) \\ \text{s.t.} & \begin{cases} 0.2 - x_1^2 - u_1^2 \\ 0.1 - x_2^2 - u_2^2 \end{cases} \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in U = [-0.2, 0.2]^2, \\ & x \in X = [-100, 100]^2. \end{cases}$$

This min-max semi-infinite problem is equivalent to an SIP problem:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \min_{x \in X} x_3 \\ \text{s.t.} \left[\begin{array}{l} x_3 - 5x_1^2 - 5x_2^2 + u_1^2 + u_2^2 - x_1(-u_1 + u_2 + 5) - x_2(u_1 - u_2 + 3) \\ 0.2 - x_1^2 - u_1^2 \\ 0.1 - x_2^2 - u_2^2 \end{array} \right] \geq 0 \\ \forall u \in U = [-0.2, 0.2]^2, \\ x \in X = [-100, 100]^3. \end{array} \right.$$

This SIP is solved by Algorithm 3.3 with 3 loops. The computational results are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Computational results for Example 6.1

k	(\hat{x}_k, \hat{u}_k)	function values
0	$\hat{x}_0 = (0.0000, 0.0000, -100.0000)$ $\hat{u}_0 = (0.0000, 0.0000)$	$f_0 = -100.0000$ $\hat{g}_0 = -100.0000$
1	$\hat{x}_1 = (-0.4000, -0.2449, -1.6348)$ $\hat{u}_1 = (0.0775, -0.0775)$	$f_1 = -1.6348$ $\hat{g}_1 = -0.0120$
2	$\hat{x}_2 = (-0.4000, -0.2449, -1.6228)$ $\hat{u}_2 = (-0.2000, 0.2000)$	$f_2 = -1.6228$ $\hat{g}_2 = -7.0 \cdot 10^{-9}$
Output: $x^* = \hat{x}_2, f^* = f_2$		time: 1.62s

Example 6.2. Consider the following SIP

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \min (x_1 - x_2)(x_3 - x_4) + (x_1 - x_3)(x_2 - x_4) + x_1x_2 - x_2x_3 + x_3x_4 \\ \text{s.t.} \left[\begin{array}{l} -2x_1x_2u_2u_3 + u_1^2x_4 + x_1u_2 - x_2u_3 + x_3u_1 + x_4 + 1 \\ 2u_1x_2 - u_3x_4 + 2u_2u_3 + 2x_1x_4 - x_2x_3 + 1 \end{array} \right] \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in U, \\ x \in X, \end{array} \right.$$

where the constraining sets are

$$X = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^4 \left| \begin{array}{l} 10 - x^T x \geq 0, 3x_1x_2 - 2x_3^2 + 4x_4 \geq 0 \\ x_1x_2x_3 - 1 \geq 0, -3x_3x_4 + x_2 + 2x_3 \geq 0 \end{array} \right. \right\},$$

$$U = \left\{ u \in \mathbb{R}^3 \left| \begin{array}{l} u_1u_2u_3 - 1 \geq 0, \\ -2u_3^2 + u_1 + u_2 + 3 \geq 0, \\ -u^T u + u_1 + u_3 + 5 \geq 0, \end{array} \right. \right\}.$$

This SIP is solved by Algorithm 3.3 with 2 loops. The computational results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Computational results for Example 6.2

k	(\hat{x}_k, \hat{u}_k)	function values
0	$\hat{x}_0 = (1.2517, -1.3709, -1.3383, 2.1824)$ $\hat{u}_0 = (2.5046, 0.2357, 1.6941)$	$f_0 = -24.9074$ $\hat{g}_0 = -5.1372$
1	$\hat{x}_1 = (1.7887, -0.9005, -1.3106, 2.0669)$ $\hat{u}_1 = (2.5046, 0.2357, 1.6941)$	$f_1 = -23.7793$ $\hat{g}_1 = 3.4 \cdot 10^{-8}$

Output: $x^* = \hat{x}_2, f^* = f_2$ time: 1.22s

6.2. GSIP examples. This subsection reports numerical examples for GSIPs.

Example 6.3. Consider the GSIP from Example 3.1. Make substitution $y := u^5$, then Example 3.1 becomes:

$$\begin{cases} \min & -x_1 \\ \text{s.t.} & y - 3x_2^2 \geq 0 \quad \forall y \in Y(x), \\ & x \in X, \end{cases}$$

where the constraining sets are

$$X = [0, 1]^2, \quad Y(x) = \{y \in \mathbb{R} : -32 \leq y \leq 0, 1 - 4x_1^2 - x_2^2 \leq y\}.$$

For all $x \in X$, we have $1 - 4x_1^2 - x_2^2 \leq -32$. When $1 - 4x_1^2 - x_2^2 > 0$, the set $Y(x)$ is empty. We solve this GSIP in two cases:

Case I: If $x \in X \cap \{1 - 4x_1^2 - x_2^2 \leq 0\}$, then $Y(x) = \{1 - 4x_1^2 - x_2^2 \leq y \leq 0\}$, which is a box constraint. The polynomial extension can be chosen as in (4.1). For this case of the GSIP, Algorithm 3.3 terminates in 2 loops and returns $x^* \approx (0.5000, 0.0000)$, $f^* \approx -0.5000$. The computational results are shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Computational results for Example 6.3

k	(\hat{x}_k, \hat{y}_k)	function values
0	$\hat{x}_0 = (1.0000, 0.3251)$ $\hat{y}_0 = -3.1057$	$f_0 = -1.0000$ $\hat{g}_0 = -3.4229$
1	$\hat{x}_1 = (0.5000, 0.0000)$ $\hat{y}_1 = 0.0000$	$f_1 = -0.5000$ $\hat{g}_1 = -1.3 \cdot 10^{-9}$
Output: $x^* = \hat{x}_1, f^* = f_1, g^* = g_1$		time: 0.68s

Case II: If $x \in X \cap \{1 - 4x_1^2 - x_2^2 > 0\}$, then $Y(x) = \emptyset$ and the GSIP is equivalent to

$$(6.1) \quad \begin{cases} \min & -x_1 \\ \text{s.t.} & x \in X \cap \{1 - 4x_1^2 - x_2^2 > 0\}. \end{cases}$$

When this polynomial optimization is solved, the strict inequality $1 - 4x_1^2 - x_2^2 > 0$ is treated as $1 - 4x_1^2 - x_2^2 \geq 0$. Solving (6.1) gives $\tilde{x} \approx (0.5000, 0.0001)$, $f(\tilde{x}) \approx -0.5000$. The minimizer \tilde{x} is the same as the one for Case I. The constraint $1 - 4x_1^2 - x_2^2 \geq 0$ is active at \tilde{x} . Since $\min_{u \in U(\tilde{x})} g(\tilde{x}, u) \approx -1.1 \cdot 10^{-8}$, the \tilde{x} is feasible for the GSIP (up to numerical errors). By comparison with Case I, \tilde{x} is a global minimizer for the GSIP.

Example 6.4. Consider the following GSIP

$$\begin{cases} \min & x_1^2 x_2 - x_2^2 x_3 - x_1 x_2 x_3 + (x_1 + 1)^2 \\ \text{s.t.} & \begin{bmatrix} x_1^2 u_1 + x_2 u_2^2 - x_3 u_1^2 - x_1 x_3 u_2 + 1 \\ x_1 x_2 u_1 u_2 + x_1 x_3 (u_1 + u_2) - x_3 u_2 - 1 \end{bmatrix} \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in U, \\ & x \in X, \end{cases}$$

where the constraining sets:

$$X = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid \begin{array}{l} 25 - x^T x \geq 0, x_1 - x_2^2 \geq 0, \\ x_3 - x_2 - 1 \geq 0 \end{array} \right\},$$

$$U = \left\{ u \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid \begin{array}{l} 0 \leq u_1 \leq x_1, \\ x_2 \leq u_2 \leq x_3 \end{array} \right\}.$$

For all $x \in X$, we have $0 \leq x_1, x_2 < x_3$, so $U(x)$ is nonempty and has box constraints. The polynomial extension is given in Section 4. However, in the 2nd loop at Algorithm 3.3, the subproblem (P_2) is infeasible, so Example 6.4 is infeasible. The result is shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Computational results for Example 6.4

k	(\hat{x}_k, \hat{u}_k)	function values
0	$\hat{x}_0 = (4.4034, -2.0984, -1.0984)$ $\hat{u}_0 = (0.0000, -2.0984)$	$f_0 = -16.8047$ $\hat{g}_0 = -18.3900$
1	$\hat{x}_1 = (4.4449, -2.1083, 0.8933)$ $\hat{u}_1 = (4.4449, 0.8933)$	$f_1 = -7.6063$ $\hat{g}_1 = -17.8112$
2	Moment relaxation is infeasible	
Output: The GSIP in Example 6.4 is infeasible.		

Example 6.5. Consider the following GSIP

$$\begin{cases} \min & x_1^2 x_2 - x_1 x_2^2 - x_1 x_2 x_3 + x_3 x_4 x_5 + x_3^3 \\ \text{s.t.} & \begin{bmatrix} x_1 u_1 + x_2 x_5 u_5 - x_3 u_2 u_3 - x_4 u_4 - 1 \\ x_1 x_2 u_1 u_2 - x_3 x_4 u_1 - x_5 u_3 u_4 u_5 - 5 \\ u_1 u_2 + x_5 u_3 - (x_1 - u_1)^2 - (x_3 - u_4)^2 - u_5^2 + 1 \end{bmatrix} \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in U(x) \\ & x \in X, \end{cases}$$

where the constraining sets are

$$X = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^5 \mid \begin{array}{l} 25 - x^T x \geq 0, x_1 x_2 - 1 \geq 0, x_3 \geq 0, \\ -x_2 + x_3 x_5 - 3 \geq 0, x_3 x_4 - 2 \geq 0 \end{array} \right\},$$

$$U(x) = \left\{ u \in \mathbb{R}^5 : \|u - (x_1, x_2, 0, 0, 0)\| \leq \sqrt{3} x_3 \right\}.$$

Since $x_3 \geq 0$ for all $x \in X$, the set $U(x)$ has ball constraints, so we can choose the polynomial extension

$$q(x) = \frac{1}{\hat{x}_3} [x_1 \hat{x}_3 + (u_1 - x_1)x_3, x_2 \hat{x}_3 + (u_2 - x_2)x_3, \hat{u}_3 x_3, \hat{u}_4 x_3, \hat{u}_5 x_3].$$

This GSIP is solved by Algorithm 3.3 with 4 loops. The computational results are shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Computational results for Example 6.5

k	(\hat{x}_k, \hat{u}_k)	function values
0	$\hat{x}_0 = (-4.0182, -2.1036, 1.5910, 1.2571, 0.5634)$ $\hat{u}_0 = (-4.2767, 0.6399, 0.0000, 0.0000, 0.0000)$	$f_0 = -24.4776$ $\hat{g}_0 = -19.5772$
1	$\hat{x}_1 = (-3.7475, -2.3203, 0.9845, 2.0314, 0.6903)$ $\hat{u}_1 = (-2.8124, -1.5519, -0.1886, -1.1863, 0.0000)$	$f_1 = -18.6352$ $\hat{g}_1 = -0.3528$
2	$\hat{x}_2 = (-3.7162, -2.3348, 0.9605, 2.0823, 0.6926)$ $\hat{u}_2 = (-2.7811, -1.5813, -0.1876, -1.1358, 0.0000)$	$f_2 = -18.0488$ $\hat{g}_2 = -0.0010$
3	$\hat{x}_3 = (-3.7163, -2.3344, 0.9603, 2.0827, 0.6931)$ $\hat{u}_3 = (-2.7814, -1.5808, -0.1878, -1.1356, 0.0000)$	$f_3 = -18.0471$ $\hat{g}_3 = -1.8 \cdot 10^{-7}$
Output: $x^* = \hat{x}_3, f^* = f_3$		time: 2.01s

Example 6.6. Consider the following GSIP (let $x_0 := 1$):

$$\begin{cases} \min & \sum_{i=0}^3 \prod_{j \neq i} (x_i - x_j) \\ \text{s.t.} & \begin{bmatrix} (x_1 x_2 - u_1)(x_3 - u_2) + x_2 u_1 u_2 + x_1 x_3 + 2 \\ 2x_1 u_1 - x_3 u_1 u_2 + x_2 + 1 \end{bmatrix} \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in U(x), \\ & x \in X, \end{cases}$$

where the constraining sets

$$X = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid \begin{array}{l} x_1 + x_2 - x_3 \geq 0, x_1 - x_2 \geq 0, 1 - x_1 - x_3 \geq 0, \\ 2 - 2x_1 + x_2 \geq 0, 3x_2 + x_3 - 1 \geq 0 \end{array} \right\},$$

$$U(x) = \left\{ u \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid \begin{array}{l} e^T x \geq e^T u, x_1 u_2 - u_1 - x_3 - x_1 x_2 \geq 0, \\ x_1 - u_2 + x_2 u_1 \geq 0, -u_1 \geq 0 \end{array} \right\}.$$

The polynomial extension q is obtained by solving the system (4.5). This GSIP is solved by Algorithm 3.3 with 4 loops. The computational results are shown in Table 6.

Table 6: Computational results for Example 6.6

k	(\hat{x}_k, \hat{u}_k)	function values
0	$\hat{x}_0 = (2.0000, 2.0000, -5.0000)$ $\hat{u}_0 = (-1.0000, 0.0000)$	$f_0 = -288.0000$ $\hat{g}_0 = -33.0000$
1	$\hat{x}_1 = (0.7195, 0.7195, -1.1585)$ $\hat{u}_1 = (-0.8177, 0.1312)$	$f_1 = -7.4436$ $\hat{g}_1 = -0.6331$
2	$\hat{x}_2 = (0.6496, 0.6496, -0.9489)$ $\hat{u}_2 = (-0.8148, 0.1203)$	$f_2 = -4.7405$ $\hat{g}_2 = -0.0025$
3	$\hat{x}_3 = (0.6493, 0.6493, -0.9480)$ $\hat{u}_3 = (-0.8148, 0.1203)$	$f_3 = -4.7306$ $\hat{g}_3 = 2.5 \cdot 10^{-8}$
Output: $x^* = \hat{x}_3, f^* = f_3, g^* = \hat{g}_3$		time: 6.53s

Example 6.7. We show how to find maximum ellipsoid contained inside a region. This can be done by solving the GSIP (1.5). The ellipsoid can be represented as

$$U(x) = \{u \in \mathbb{R}^2 : (u - a)^T P(x)^{-1} (u - a) \leq 1 \}.$$

The center of the ellipsoid is $a = (x_1, x_2)$ and the shape matrix is

$$P(x) = \begin{bmatrix} x_3 & 0 \\ x_4 & x_5 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_3 & x_4 \\ 0 & x_5 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The GSIP for finding the maximum ellipsoid is

$$\begin{cases} \min & -\pi \det \begin{bmatrix} x_3 & x_4 \\ 0 & x_5 \end{bmatrix} \\ \text{s.t.} & g(u) \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in U(x), \\ & x \in X, \end{cases}$$

where $X = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^5 : 100 - x^T x \geq 0, x_3 \geq 0, x_5 \geq 0\}$ and

$$g(u) = (4u_1 + u_2^2 - 4, -u_1 + 2u_2 + 4, 8 - (u_1 - 1)^2 - u_2^2, 3 - u_1 u_2) \geq 0.$$

We select the polynomial extension as in (4.4). After 9 loops, we obtained the optimizer

$$x^* \approx (1.5084, 1.0587, 1.4203, -1.4097, 0.9039).$$

The result is shown in Figure 1. It took around 14 seconds.




FIGURE 1. The shaded area is region the of $g(u) \geq 0$ in Example 6.7. The dotted line is the boundary of the maximum ellipsoid inscribed in the shade.

6.3. GSIPs with convex infinite constraints.

Example 6.8. Consider the following GSIP example from [41]:

$$\begin{cases} \min & x_1^2 + x_2^2 \\ \text{s.t.} & g(x, u) = (x_2 - u_2)^2 - (x_1 - u_1)^2 \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in U(x), \\ & x \in \mathbb{R}^2, \end{cases}$$

where the constraining set is

$$U(x) = \{u \in \mathbb{R} : x_1 - u_1 \geq 0, x_2 - u_2 \geq 0\}.$$

Notice that the constraining function $g(x, u)$ is convex in u , and the set $U(x)$ is convex in u . Since for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, there exists $u = x - e$ such that $h(x, u) \geq 0$, and

$\nabla_u h_1(x, u) = (-1, 0)^T \neq 0$, $\nabla_u h_2(x, u) = (0, -1)^T \neq 0$, then the KKT condition holds for $u \in U(x)$. Solve equation (5.4) with variables x, z, λ , where z served as the parameter u in $g(x, u)$, and λ is the Lagrange multiplier. The results are

$$\begin{aligned} x^* &\approx (6.6 \cdot 10^{-9}, -9.9 \cdot 10^{-8}), z^* \approx (6 \cdot 10^{-9}, -1.7 \cdot 10^{-5}), \\ \lambda^* &= (6.4 \cdot 10^{-10}, 3.4 \cdot 10^{-5}), f(x^*) \approx 1.8 \cdot 10^{-9}, g(x^*, z^*) \approx 2.9 \cdot 10^{-10}. \end{aligned}$$

Example 6.9. Consider the following GSIP example:

$$\begin{cases} \min & -x_1 x_2 + x_1 + 2x_2 \\ \text{s.t.} & g(x, u) = \begin{bmatrix} u_1 + u_2 + \frac{x_2^2}{x_1 + u_1} + \frac{x_1^2}{x_2 + u_2} - 2 \\ x_1 u_2 + \frac{x_2^2 + u_2^2}{1 + u_1} - x_2^2 \end{bmatrix} \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in U(x), \\ & x \in X, \end{cases}$$

where the constraining sets are

$$X = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 4 - x^T x \geq 0, x_1 x_2 \geq \frac{1}{2}, x_1 \geq 0\},$$

$$U(x) = \{u \in \mathbb{R}^2 : u_1 \geq 0, u_2 - x_2 u_1 \geq 0, 2x_1 - x_2 u_1 - u_2 \geq 0\}.$$

The constraining function $g_1(x, u)$, $g_2(x, u)$ are both convex in $u = (u_1, u_2)$ over $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}$, and the set $U(x)$ is convex in u . For any $x \in X$, we have $x > 0$, and $\nabla_u h \neq 0$. Consider point $\hat{u} = (\frac{x_1}{2x_2}, x_1)$, then $h(x, \hat{u}) = (\frac{x_1}{2x_2}, \frac{x_1}{2}, \frac{x_1}{2}) > 0$, so the KKT condition holds for $u \in U(x)$. The matrix polynomial $T(x, u)$ satisfying equation (5.6) is:

$$T(x, u) = \begin{bmatrix} 2x_1 - 2x_2 u_1 & 2x_1 x_2 - 2x_2 u_2 & 2x_2 & 2x_2 & 2x_2 \\ -u_1 & 2x_1 - u_2 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ -u_1 & -u_2 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

for the denominator vector $\phi(x, u) = 2x_1$. Solve the optimization (5.8) with variables x, z_1, z_2 , where z_i served as the parameter u in $g_i(x, u)$, $i = 1, 2$. We get the optimizers and optimal values as

$$\begin{aligned} x^* &\approx (1.1348, 0.4406), z_1^* \approx (9.8 \cdot 10^{-9}, 0.6941), z_2^* \approx (1.9, 2.1) \cdot 10^{-9}, \\ f(x^*) &\approx 1.5160, (g_1(x^*, z_1^*), g_2(x^*, z_2^*)) \approx (4.9, 0.2) \cdot 10^{-7}. \end{aligned}$$

6.4. GSIPs from existing references. This subsection gives two tables of computational results for SIP and GSIP examples from earlier existing references. All of these examples are successfully solved by Algorithm 3.3. The SIP examples are listed in Appendix A and the computational results are reported in Table 7. The GSIP examples are listed in Appendix B and their computational results are reported in Table 8. In these examples, if the constraining set X is not given in the original references, we set it to be $X = [-100, 100]^n$.

Table 7: Computational results for SIPs in Appendix A

Problem	# of loops	(x^*, u^*)	(f^*, g^*, time)
(A.1)	2	$x^* = (-0.7500, -0.6180)$ $u^* = 4.1 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$f^* = 0.1945$ $g^* = -3.9 \cdot 10^{-9}$ time: 0.70s

(A.2)	3	$x^* = (-1.0000, 0.0000, 0.0000)$ $u^* = (0.0, 0.3) \cdot 10^{-5}$	$f^* = 1.0000$ $g^* = -8.2 \cdot 10^{-10}$ time: 0.98s
(A.3)	2	$x^* = (-0.3, 1.7) \cdot 10^{-11}$ $u^* = 5.7 \cdot 10^{-11}$	$f^* = 1.7 \cdot 10^{-11}$ $g^* = 3.1 \cdot 10^{-11}$ time: 0.69s
(A.4)	5	$x^* = (-1.2808, -1.2808)$ $u^* = (-0.9294, -0.2610, -0.2610)$	$f^* = -2.5616$ $g^* = 7.7 \cdot 10^{-10}$ time: 1.29s
(A.5)	11	$x^* = (3.0000, 0.0000, 0.0000$ $\quad -0.0019, 0.0000, 0.0019)$ $u^* = (-0.0298, 0.0086)$	$f^* = -12.0000$ $g^* = -9.4 \cdot 10^{-7}$ time: 3.40s
(A.6)	2	$x^* = (0.7071, 0.7071)$ $u^* = (0.7071, 0.7071)$	$f^* = 0.3431$ $g^* = 1.7 \cdot 10^{-9}$ time: 0.91s
(A.7)	13	$x^* = (0.5000, 0.2501, 0.1226, 0.0798,$ $\quad -0.0299, 0.1297, -0.1026, 0.0502)$ $u^* = 0.1637$	$f^* = 0.6931$ $g^* = -4.1 \cdot 10^{-7}$ time: 2.06s
(A.8)	7	$x^* = (-0.0280, 4.0001, -4.0002, 0.0280)$ $u^* = 0.1502$	$f^* = 0.0280$ $g^* = -2.0 \cdot 10^{-7}$ time: 1.90s
(A.9)	9	$x^* = (1.6953, 0.0000)$ $u^* = (0.7185, 0.0000)$	$f^* = 1.4039$ $g^* = -1.4 \cdot 10^{-7}$ time: 2.52s
(A.10)	2	$x^* = (-0.0001, 0.4999)$ $u^* = 1.0 \cdot 10^{-11}$	$f^* = -0.2500$ $g^* = -1.0 \cdot 10^{-8}$ time: 0.69s

Table 8: Computational results for Appendix B

Problem	# of loops	(x^*, u^*)	(f^*, g^*, time)
(B.1)	2	$x^* = 0.5000$ $u^* = (-0.7500, -0.5000)$	$f^* = 1.7500$ $g^* = 3.1 \cdot 10^{-10}$ time: 0.58s
(B.2)	2	$x^* = (0.9999, 0.9999)$ $u^* = (0.7071, 0.7071, 0.0000)$	$f^* = -0.5000$ $g^* = 2.8 \cdot 10^{-8}$ time: 0.82s
(B.3)	1	$x^* = (0.0000, 1.0000)$ $u^* = 9.0 \cdot 10^{-10}$	$f^* = 5.8284$ $g^* = 9.0 \cdot 10^{-10}$ time: 0.53s

(B.4)	2	$x^* = (0.0000, 0.0000)$ $u^* = -1.1 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$f^* = -1.6 \cdot 10^{-11}$ $g^* = -2.0 \cdot 10^{-11}$ time: 0.43s
(B.5)	3	$x^* = (-0.6180, 0.0000, 0.0000)$ $u^* = (0.6180, 0.0000)$	$f^* = 0.3820$ $g^* = 3.1 \cdot 10^{-9}$ time: 1.09s
(B.6)	2	$x^* = (-0.5000, -0.5000, 0.0000)$ $u^* = 1.4 \cdot 10^{-8}$	$f^* = 0.5000$ $g^* = -3.4 \cdot 10^{-7}$ time: 0.83s
(B.7)	2	$x^* = (-1.0000, 0.0000)$ $x^* = (0.0000, -1.0000)$ $u^* = 9.4 \cdot 10^{-9}$	$f^* = -1.0000$ $g^* = 9.4 \cdot 10^{-9}$ time: 0.88s
(B.8)	3	$x^* = (0.0000, 0.2500, 0.2500)$ $u^* = 1.0000$	$f^* = 3.5680$ $g^* = -2.8 \cdot 10^{-9}$ time: 1.23s
(B.9)	4	$x^* = (-1.0000, -1.0000, 1.0000, -0.1508)$ $u^* = (0.7355, -0.1508)$	$f^* = -1.6985$ $g^* = -4.8 \cdot 10^{-8}$ time: 152.64s
(B.10)	10	$x^* = (2.0125, -0.4997, 2.2164, 0.5003)$ $u^* = (3.6575, -0.1644)$	$f^* = -3.4838$ $g^* = -1.1 \cdot 10^{-7}$ time: 2.86s

7. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

This paper proposes a hierarchy of polynomial optimization relaxations to solve GSIPs. The optimization problems are not assumed to be convex. When the constraining set $U(x)$ depends on x , we use polynomial extensions to construct polynomial optimization relaxations. We have also demonstrated how to get polynomial extensions for various feasible sets. Moment-SOS relaxations are applied to solve the polynomial optimization. The method is given in Algorithm 3.3. Its efficiency is demonstrated by extensive examples. In particular, the SIP can be solved as a special case of the GSIP. An interesting fact is that the finite convergence of Algorithm 3.3 is observed numerically in all our computational examples.

There is much interesting future work to do. For instance, how do we get polynomial extensions for general set $U(x)$? How do we efficiently solve the polynomial relaxation (P_k) when there are a lot of constraints? What are conveniently checkable conditions for Algorithm 3.3 to have finite convergence? These questions are mostly open, to the best of the authors's knowledge.

Acknowledgement The research is partially supported by the NSF grant DMS-2110780.

APPENDIX A. THE SIP EXAMPLES FROM REFERENCES

The SIPs in this appendix are from existing work. Their computational results are shown in Table 7.

Example A.1. *The SIP from [10, 52]:*

$$\begin{cases} \min & \frac{x_1^2}{3} + \frac{x_1}{2} + x_2^2 \\ \text{s.t.} & g(x, u) = -(1 - x_1^2 u^2)^2 + x_1 u^2 + x_2^2 - x_2 \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in U, \\ & U = [0, 1]. \end{cases}$$

Example A.2. *The SIP from [10]*

$$\begin{cases} \min & x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 \\ \text{s.t.} & g(x, u) = -x_1(u_1 + u_2^2 + 1) - x_2(u_1 u_2 - u_2^2) \\ & \quad - x_3(u_1 u_2 + u_2^2 + u_2) - 1 \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in U, \\ & U = [0, 1]^2. \end{cases}$$

Example A.3. *The SIP from [51]*

$$\begin{cases} \min & x_2 \\ \text{s.t.} & g(x, u) = -2x_1^2 u^2 + u^4 - x_1^2 + x_2 \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in U, \\ & U = [-1, 1]. \end{cases}$$

Example A.4. *The SIP from [51]*

$$\begin{cases} \min & x_1 + x_2 \\ \text{s.t.} & G(x) = \begin{bmatrix} 4 - x_1^2 - x_2^2 & x_1 & x_2 \\ x_1 & x_2^2 - x_1 & x_1 x_2 \\ x_2 & x_1 x_2 & x_1^2 - x_2 \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0 \end{cases}$$

For the PSD matrix constraint, we can convert $G(x) \succeq 0$ to the equivalent form $g(x, u) = u^T G(x) u \geq 0$ with $U = \{u \in \mathbb{R}^3 : u^T u = 1\}$.

Example A.5. *The SIP from [26]*

$$\begin{cases} \min & -4x_1 - \frac{2}{3}(x_4 + x_6) \\ \text{s.t.} & g(x, u) = -x_1 - x_2 u_1 - x_3 u_2 - x_4 u_1^2 - x_5 u_1 u_2 - x_6 u_2^2 \\ & \quad + (u_1 - u_2)^2 (u_1 + u_2)^2 + 3 \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in U, \\ & U = [-1, 1]^2. \end{cases}$$

Example A.6. *The SIP from [49]*

$$\begin{cases} \min & (x_1 + x_2 - 2)^2 + (x_1 - x_2)^2 + 30 \min\{0, (x_1 - x_2)\}^2 \\ \text{s.t.} & g(x, u) = x_1 \cos(u) - x_2 \sin(u) + 1 \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in U, \\ & U = [0, \pi]. \end{cases}$$

We introduce a new variable x_3 such that $x_3^2 = (x_1 - x_2)^2$, $x_3 \geq 0$ and let $w_1 = \cos(u)$ and $w_2 = \sin(u)$. Then, this SIP becomes:

$$\begin{cases} \min & (x_1 + x_2 - 2)^2 + (x_1 - x_2)^2 + 30x_3^2 \\ \text{s.t.} & x_1 w_1 - x_2 w_2 + 1 \geq 0 \quad \forall w \in W, \\ & x \in X = [100, 100]^3 \cap \{x_3^2 = (x_1 - x_2)^2, x_3 \geq 0\}, \\ & W = \{w \in \mathbb{R}^2 : w^T w = 1, w_1 \geq 0\}. \end{cases}$$

The minimizer for this equivalent problem is $\tilde{x} \approx (0.7071, 0.7071, 0.0000)$, so the minimizer for Example A.6 is $x^* \approx (0.7071, 0.7071)$.

Example A.7. *The SIP from [3]:*

$$\begin{cases} \min & \sum_{i=1}^8 \frac{x_i}{i} \\ \text{s.t.} & g(x, u) = \sum_{i=1}^8 u^{i-1} x_i - \frac{1}{2-u} \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in U = [0, 1], \\ & x \in X = [-1, 1]^8. \end{cases}$$

We replace $g(x, u) \geq 0$ by its equivalent form $(2-u)g(x, u) \geq 0$.

Example A.8. *The SIP for the Chebyshev approximation problem [12, 52]:*

$$\begin{cases} \min & x_4 \\ \text{s.t.} & \max |\sin(\pi u) - (x_3 u^2 + x_2 u + x_1)| \leq x_4 \quad \forall u \in U, \\ & x \in X = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^4 : -1 \leq x_1 \leq 1, 3 \leq x_2 \leq 5, -5 \leq x_3 \leq -3, -1 \leq x_4 \leq 3\}, \\ & U = [0, 1]. \end{cases}$$

Notice that the constraints are equivalent to $x_4 \pm (\sin(\pi u) - x_3 u^2 - x_2 u - x_1) \geq 0$, which gives a SIP. The function $\sin(\pi u)$ is approximated by its 11th-degree Taylor expansion.

Example A.9. *The SIP for the min-max problem [55]:*

$$\begin{cases} \min_x \max_u & 4(x_1 - 2)^2 - 2u_1^2 + x_1^2 u_1 - u_2^2 + 2x_2^2 u_2 \\ \text{s.t.} & x \in X = [-100, 100]^2, \\ & u \in U = [-5, 5]^2. \end{cases}$$

Introduce a new variable x_3 such that the problem convert to an equivalent SIP problem:

$$\begin{cases} \min & x_3 \\ \text{s.t.} & 4(x_1 - 2)^2 - 2u_1^2 + x_1^2 u_1 - u_2^2 + 2x_2^2 u_2 \leq x_3 \\ & x \in X = [-100, 100]^2, \\ & u \in U = [-5, 5]^2. \end{cases}$$

Example A.10. *The SIP from [5]*

$$\begin{cases} \min & \frac{x_1^2}{3} + \frac{x_1}{2} + x_2^2 - x_2 \\ \text{s.t.} & g(x, u) = \sin(u) - x_1^2 - 2x_1 x_2 u^2 \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in U, \\ & x \in X = [-1000, 1000]^2 \\ & U = [0, 2]. \end{cases}$$

The function $\sin(u)$ is approximated by its 7th-degree Taylor expansion.

APPENDIX B. SOME GSIP EXAMPLES FROM REFERENCES

The GSIPs in this appendix are from existing references. Their computational results are shown in Table 8.

Example B.1. *The GSIP from [1]:*

$$\begin{cases} \min & x^2 + |x| + 1 \\ \text{s.t.} & g(x, u) = x^2 + 2x + u_1 + u_2 \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in U(x), \\ & x \in X = [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}], \\ & U(x) = \{u \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x^2 - 1 \leq u \leq -\frac{3}{4}, x - 1 \leq u_2 \leq -\frac{1}{2}\}. \end{cases}$$

Let $x_1 := x$, then introduce a new variable x_2 such that $x_2 = x_1^2, x_2 \geq 0$. Let $x \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^2 \cap \{x_2 = x_1^2, x_2 \geq 0\}$, then the objective function becomes $x_1 + x_2 + 1$,

and the constraints $x_1^2 - 1 \leq -\frac{3}{4}$, $x_1 - 1 \leq -\frac{1}{2}$ gives $U(x)$ nonempty with box constraints. The polynomial extension is available as for box constraints. The minimizer for this equivalent problem with new variable is $\tilde{x} \approx (0.5000, 0.5000)$, so the minimizer for Example B.1 is $x^* \approx 0.5000$.

Example B.2. The GSIP from [32, 43]:

$$\begin{cases} \min & -0.5x_1^4 + 2x_1x_2 - 2x_1^2 \\ \text{s.t.} & g(x, u) = -x_1^2 + x_1 + x_2 - u_1^2 - u_2^2 \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in U(x), \\ & x \in X = [0, 1]^2, \\ & U(x) = \{u \in \mathbb{R}^3 : 0 \leq u \leq e, x_1 - u^T u \geq 0\}. \end{cases}$$

Make substitution $y_1 := u_1^2, y_2 := u_2^2, y_3 := u_3^2$, then this GSIP becomes

$$\begin{cases} \min & -0.5x_1^4 + 2x_1x_2 - 2x_1^2 \\ \text{s.t.} & -x_1^2 + x_1 + x_2 - y_1 - y_2 \geq 0 \quad \forall y \in Y(x), \\ & x \in X = [0, 1]^2, \\ & Y(x) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^3 : 0 \leq y \leq 1, e^T y \leq x_1\}. \end{cases}$$

For all $x \in X$, we have $0 \leq x_1 \leq 1$, so the constraining set is nonempty and $Y(x) = \{0 \leq y, e^T y \leq x_1\}$, which has simplex constraints. The polynomial extension is available as for simplex constraints. This new problem gives $y^* \approx (0.5000, 0.5000, 0.0000)$, so Example B.2 gives $u^* \approx (0.7071, 0.7071, 0.0000)$.

Example B.3. The GSIP from [11]:

$$\begin{cases} \min & (x_1 + \sqrt{2} + 1)^2 + (x_2 - 1)^2 \\ \text{s.t.} & g(x, u) = u \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in U(x), \\ & x \in X = \mathbb{R}^2, \\ & U(x) = \{u \in \mathbb{R} : x_1 \leq u \leq x_2\}. \end{cases}$$

Clearly, when $x_1 > x_2$, the set $U(x)$ is empty. We solve this GSIP in two cases.

Case I: If $x \in X_1 := X \cap \{x_1 \leq x_2\}$, then $U(x) = \{x_1 \leq u \leq x_2\}$ is a box constraint. The polynomial extension is available as in (4.1). Solving this case of the GSIP by Algorithm 3.3, we get $x^* \approx (0.0000, 0.9999)$, $f^* \approx 5.8284$.

Case II: If $x \in X_2 := X \cap \{x_1 > x_2\}$, then $U(x) = \emptyset$ and this GSIP is equivalent to minimizing $f(x)$ over the set X_2 . The strict inequality $x_1 > x_2$ is treated as $x_1 \geq x_2$. Solving this case of the polynomial optimization, we get the optimal $x^* \approx (0.44, 0.52) \cdot 10^{-13}$, $f^* \approx 6.8284$. The inequality $x_1 \geq x_2$ is active at x^* . Since $\min_{u \in U(x^*)} g(x^*, u) = 4.1 \cdot 10^{-14}$, this point x^* is feasible for the GSIP, but it is not optimal when compared with Case I.

Example B.4. The GSIP from [21]:

$$\begin{cases} \min & x_2 \\ \text{s.t.} & g(x, u) = u^3 - x_2 \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in U(x), \\ & x \in X = \mathbb{R}^2, \\ & U(x) = \{u \in \mathbb{R} : u \leq 0, -x_1^2 + 2x_2 - u^3 \leq 0\}. \end{cases}$$

Introduce the new variable x_3 such that $x_3^3 = -x_1^2 + 2x_2$, and add this constraint to constraining set X . Compare x_3 with 0. When $x_3 \leq 0$, then $U(x) = \{x_3 \leq u \leq 0\}$ is a box constraint. When $x_3 > 0$, the set $U(x)$ is empty. We solve the GSIP in two cases.

Case I: If $x \in X_1 := X \cap \{x_3 \leq 0, x_3^3 = -x_1^2 + 2x_2\}$, then $U(x)$ is a nonempty box constraint. The polynomial extension is available as in (4.1). Use Algorithm 3.3 to solve this case of the GSIP, we get $x^* \approx (0.0000, 0.0000, -0.0037)$, $f^* \approx -1.0 \cdot 10^{-7}$. So the minimizer for Example B.4 is $x^* \approx (0.0000, 0.0000)$.

Case II: If $x \in X_2 := X \cap \{x_3 > 0, x_3^3 = -x_1^2 + 2x_2\}$, then $U(x) = \emptyset$. The GSIP is the equivalent to minimize $f(x)$ over the set X_2 . The strict inequality $x_3 > 0$ is treated as $x_3 \geq 0$. Solving this case polynomial optimization, we get $x^* \approx (0.00, 0.00, 0.13) \cdot 10^{-3}$, $f^* \approx 1.8 \cdot 10^{-11}$. The inequality $x_3 \geq 0$ is active at x^* numerically. Since $\min_{u \in U(x^*)} g(x^*, u) = -1.3 \cdot 10^{-11}$, we can view this x^* as a feasible for the original GSIP. The obtained minimizer is the same result as for Case I.

Example B.5. The GSIP from [32]:

$$\begin{cases} \min & x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 \\ \text{s.t.} & g(x, u) = -x_1(u_1 + u_2^2 + 1) - x_2(u_1 u_2 - u_2^2) - x_3(u_1 u_2 + u_2^2 + u_2) - 1 \geq 0 \\ & \forall u \in U(x) := \{u \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 0 \leq u \leq 1, x_1^2 \leq u_1^2\}, \\ & x \in X = [-1, 0]^3. \end{cases}$$

Since $x \in X = [-1, 0]^3$, then the set $U(x)$ is equivalent to the box type constraint $\{-x_1 \leq u_1 \leq 1, 0 \leq u_2 \leq 1\}$. The polynomial extension is available as for the box case.

Example B.6. The GSIP from [32]:

$$\begin{cases} \min & x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 \\ \text{s.t.} & g(x, u) = 2 \sin(4u) - x_1 - x_2 \exp(x_3 u) - \exp(x_2 u) \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in U(x), \\ & x \in X = [-5, 5]^3, \\ & U(x) = \{u \in \mathbb{R} : 0 \leq u \leq 1, x_2 + 1 - 2u \geq 0\}. \end{cases}$$

Replace $\sin(4u)$ with its 5th-degree Taylor expansion, and replace $\exp(x_i u)$ with its 4th-degree Taylor expansion. The set $U(x)$ is empty when $\frac{1}{2}(x_2 + 1) > 1$. Comparing $\frac{1}{2}(x_2 + 1)$ with 0 and 1 respectively, we solve this GSIP in three cases.

Case I: If $x \in X_1 := X \cap \{-1 \leq x_2 \leq 1\}$, then $U(x) = \{0 \leq u \leq \frac{1}{2}(x_2 + 1)\}$ is a box constraint. Solving this case of the GSIP with Algorithm 3.3, we get $x^* \approx (-0.5000, -0.5000, 0.0000)$, $f^* \approx 0.5000$.

Case II: If $x \in X_2 := X \cap \{x_2 > 1\}$, then $U(x) = [0, 1]$ is a constant set and the GSIP reduces to an SIP. The constraint $x_2 > 1$ is treated as $x_2 \geq 1$ in the polynomial optimization. Solving this case by Algorithm 3.3, we get $x^* \approx (-2.0000, 1.0000, -0.1821)$, $f^* \approx 5.0332$. It is not optimal when compared with Case I.

Case III: If $x \in X_3 := X \cap \{x_2 < -1\}$, then $U(x) = \emptyset$ and the GSIP is reduced to minimizing $f(x)$ over the set X_3 . The constraint $x_2 < -1$ is treated as $x_2 \leq -1$. Solving this polynomial optimization gives $x^* \approx (0.0000, -1.0000, 0.0000)$, $f^* \approx 1.0000$. Since $\min_{u \in U(x^*)} g(x^*, u) = -6.4 \cdot 10^{-11}$, this point x^* is feasible for the original GSIP. But it is not optimal when compared with Case I.

Example B.7. *The GSIP from [32]:*

$$\begin{cases} \min & x_1 + x_2 \\ \text{s.t.} & g(x, u) = u \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in U(x), \\ & x \in X = [-1, 1]^3, \\ & U(x) = \{u \in \mathbb{R} : -1 \leq u \leq 1, x_1 \leq u, x_2 \leq u\}. \end{cases}$$

Introduce the new variable x_3 such that $x_3^2 = (x_1 - x_2)^2, x_3 \geq 0$. The set X is changed to $X \cap \{x_3^2 = (x_1 - x_2)^2, x_3 \geq 0\}$ and $U(x)$ is then equivalently given by the box constraint $\frac{1}{2}(x_1 + x_2 + x_3) \leq u \leq 1$. Applying Algorithm 3.3 for the new set, we get two optimizers $(0.0000, -1.0000, 1.0000)$ and $(-1.0000, 0.0000, 1.0000)$, s which correspond to minimizers $(0.0000, -1.0000)$ and $(-1.0000, 0.0000)$ for the original GSIP.

Example B.8. *Consider the following GSIP from [26, 32]*

$$\begin{cases} \min & \exp(x_1) + \exp(x_2) + \exp(x_3) \\ \text{s.t.} & g(x, u) = x_1 + x_2 u + x_3 u^2 - \frac{1}{1+u^2} \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in U(x), \\ & x \in X = [-1, 1]^3, \\ & U(x) = \{u \in \mathbb{R} : 0 \leq u \leq 1, 2(x_2 + x_3) \leq u\}. \end{cases}$$

We replace $\exp(x_i)$ by its 4th-degree Taylor expansion and replace $g(x, u) \geq 0$ by its equivalent form $(1 + u^2)g(x, u) \geq 0$. Comparing $2(x_2 + x_3)$ with 0 and 1, we solve this GSIP in three cases.

Case I: If $x \in X_1 := X \cap \{0 \leq x_2 + x_3 \leq \frac{1}{2}\}$, then $U(x) = \{2(x_2 + x_3) \leq u \leq 1\}$ is a box constraint. Applying Algorithm 3.3 for the set X_1 , we get $x^* \approx (0.0000, 0.2500, 0.2500)$, $f^* \approx 3.5680$.

Case II: If $x \in X_2 := X \cap \{x_2 + x_3 < 0\}$, then $U(x) = [0, 1]$ and the GSIP reduces to an SIP. Applying Algorithm 3.3 for the set X_2 , we get

$$x^* \approx (1.0000, -0.0001, -0.4999), f^* \approx 4.3151.$$

Since $\min_{u \in U(x^*)} g(x^*, u) = -1.37 \cdot 10^{-8}$, this point x^* is feasible for the original GSIP.

It is not optimal when compared with Case I.

Case III: If $x \in X_3 := X \cap \{x_2 + x_3 > \frac{1}{2}\}$, then $U(x) = \emptyset$ and the GSIP is equivalent to minimizer $f(x)$ over the set X_3 . The constraint $x_2 + x_3 > \frac{1}{2}$ is treated as $x_2 + x_3 \geq \frac{1}{2}$. Solving this case polynomial optimization, we get $x^* \approx (-1.0000, 0.2500, 0.2500)$ and $f^* \approx 2.9430$. Since $\min_{u \in U(x^*)} g(x^*, u) = -2.0000 < 0$, this point x^* is not feasible for the GSIP.

Example B.9. *The GSIP from [16]:*

$$\begin{cases} \min & -(x_3 - x_1)(x_4 - x_2) \\ \text{s.t.} & g(x, u) = \cos(u_1) \sin(u_2) - \frac{u_1}{u_2^2 + 1} - \sum_{i=1}^2 \alpha_i u_i (1 - u_i) \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in U(x), \\ & x \in X, \end{cases}$$

where $\alpha_1 = 1.841, \alpha_2 = 6.841$. The constraining sets are:

$$\begin{aligned} X &= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^4 : u + e \geq 0, e - u \geq 0, x_1 \leq x_3, x_2 \leq x_4\}, \\ U(x) &= \{u \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x_1 \leq u_1 \leq x_3, x_2 \leq u_2 \leq x_4\}. \end{aligned}$$

We approximate $\cos(u_1)$ and $\sin(u_2)$ by their 4th-degree Taylor expansions, and replace $g(x, u) \geq 0$ by its equivalent form $(u_2^2 + 1)g(x, u) \geq 0$. For all $x \in X$,

we have $x_1 \leq x_3$, $x_2 \leq x_4$, so the constraining set is nonempty and has box case constraint. The polynomial extension is available as for the box type constraint.

Example B.10. The GSIP from [45]:

$$\begin{cases} \min & -\pi x_3 x_4 \\ \text{s.t.} & \begin{bmatrix} u_1 + u_2^2 \\ 3 - u_1 - 4u_2 \\ u_2 + 1 \end{bmatrix} \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in U(x), \\ & x \in X, \end{cases}$$

where the constraining sets

$$X = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^4 : 100 - x^T x \geq 0, x_3 \geq 0, x_4 \geq 0\},$$

$$U(x) = \left\{ u \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid \frac{(u_1 - x_1)^2}{x_3^2} + \frac{(u_2 - x_2)^2}{x_4^2} \leq 1 \right\}.$$

The polynomial extension is available as for the ellipsoidal type constraint.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aboussoror, A., Adly, S. & Salim, S.: An extended conjugate duality for generalized semi-infinite programming problems via a convex decomposition. *Optimization*. **69**, 1635-1654 (2020)
- [2] Bemporad, A., Filippi, C., Torrisi, F.: Inner and outer approximations of polytopes using boxes. *Comput. Geom.* **27**, 151-178 (2004)
- [3] Betrò, B.: An accelerated central cutting plane algorithm for linear semi-infinite programming. *Math. Program.* **101**, 479-495 (2004)
- [4] Bhattacharjee, B., Green, W., Barton, P.: Interval methods for semi-infinite programs. *Comput. Optim. Appl.* **30**, 63-93 (2005)
- [5] Bhattacharjee, B., Lemonidis, P., Green, W., Barton, P.: Global solution of semi-infinite programs. *Math. Program.* **103**, 283-307 (2005)
- [6] Boyd, S., Vandenberghe, L.: Convex optimization. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge(2004)
- [7] Bugarin, F., Henrion, D., Lasserre, J.B.: Minimizing the sum of many rational functions. *Math. Prog. Comp.* **8**, 83-111 (2016).
- [8] Clarke, F., Ledyaev, Y., Stern, R., Wolenski, P.: Nonsmooth Analysis and Control Theory Nonlinear Analysis. *Grad. Texts In Math.* **178** (1998)
- [9] Clarke, F. Optimization and nonsmooth analysis. (Society for Industrial,1990)
- [10] Coope, I., Watson, G.: A projected Lagrangian algorithm for semi-infinite programming. *Math. Programming.* **32**, 337-356 (1985)
- [11] Diehl, M., Houska, B., Stein, O., Steueremann, P.: A lifting method for generalized semi-infinite programs based on lower level Wolfe duality. *Comput. Optim. Appl.* **54**, 189-210 (2013)
- [12] Floudas, C., Stein, O.: The adaptive convexification algorithm: a feasible point method for semi-infinite programming. *SIAM J. Optim.* **18**, 1187-1208 (2007)
- [13] Geletu, A., Hoffmann, A.: A conceptual method for solving generalized semi-infinite programming problems via global optimization by exact discontinuous penalization. *European J. Oper. Res.* **157**, 3-15 (2004)
- [14] Guerra Vázquez, F., Rückmann, J., Stein, O., Still, G.: Generalized semi-infinite programming: a tutorial. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* **217**, 394-419 (2008)
- [15] Guo, L., Lin, G., Ye, J., Zhang, J.: Sensitivity analysis of the value function for parametric mathematical programs with equilibrium constraints. *SIAM J. Optim.* **24**, 1206-1237 (2014)
- [16] Harwood, S., Barton, P.: Lower level duality and the global solution of generalized semi-infinite programs. *Optimization*. **65**, 1129-1149 (2016)
- [17] Henrion, D., Lasserre, J., Löfberg, J.: GloptiPoly 3: moments, optimization and semidefinite programming. *Optim. Methods Softw.* **24**, 761-779 (2009)
- [18] Henrion, D., Korda, M., J.B. Lasserre, J.B.: The Moment-SOS Hierarchy, World Scientific, Singapore, 2020.

- [19] Hettich, R., Kortanek, K.: Semi-infinite programming: theory, methods, and applications. *SIAM Rev.* **35**, 380-429 (1993)
- [20] Hillar, C., Nie, J.: An elementary and constructive solution to Hilbert's 17th problem for matrices, *Proceedings of the AMS*. **136** (1), 73–76, 2008.
- [21] Jongen, H., Rückmann, J., Stein, O.: Generalized semi-infinite optimization: a first order optimality condition and examples. *Math. Programming.* **83**, 145-158 (1998)
- [22] Kirst, P.: Disjunctive Aspects in Generalized Semi-infinite Programming. (Karlsruher Institut für Technologie (KIT),2019)
- [23] Kirst, P., Stein, O.: Solving disjunctive optimization problems by generalized semi-infinite optimization techniques. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* **169**, 1079-1109 (2016)
- [24] Lasserre, J.: Global optimization with polynomials and the problem of moments. *SIAM J. Optim.* **11**, 796-817(2001)
- [25] Laurent, M.: Sums of squares, moment matrices and optimization over polynomials, *Emerging Applications of Algebraic Geometry of IMA Volumes in Mathematics and its Applications*, vol. 149, pp. 157–270, Springer, 2009.
- [26] Lemonidis, P.: Global optimization algorithms for semi-infinite and generalized semi-infinite programs. (MIT Ph. D. thesis, 2008)
- [27] Levitin, E., Tichatschke, R.: A branch-and-bound approach for solving a class of generalized semi-infinite programming problems. *J. Global Optim.* **13**, 299-315 (1998)
- [28] Lofberg, J.: YALMIP: A toolbox for modeling and optimization in MATLAB. *2004 IEEE International Conference On Robotics And Automation (IEEE Cat. No. 04CH37508)*. pp. 284–289 (2004)
- [29] Lopez, M., Qi, L., Wu, S.: Preface [Special issue: semi-infinite programming (SIP)]. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* **217**, 299-300 (2008)
- [30] Lucet, Y., Ye, J.: Erratum: Sensitivity analysis of the value function for optimization problems with variational inequality constraints. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **41**, 1315-1319 (2002)
- [31] Mitsos, A.: Global optimization of semi-infinite programs via restriction of the right-hand side. *Optimization*. **60**, 1291-1308 (2011)
- [32] Mitsos, A., Tsoukalas, A.: Global optimization of generalized semi-infinite programs via restriction of the right hand side. *J. Global Optim.* **61**, 1-17 (2015)
- [33] Nie, J.: Polynomial matrix inequality and semidefinite representation, *Mathematics of Operations Research*. **36** (3), 398–415, 2011.
- [34] Nie, J.: Sum of squares methods for minimizing polynomial forms over spheres and hyper-surfaces, *Front. Math. China*. **7** (2), 321–346, 2012.
- [35] Nie, J.: Certifying convergence of Lasserre's hierarchy via flat truncation. *Math. Program.* **142**, 485-510 (2013)
- [36] Nie, J.: An exact Jacobian SDP relaxation for polynomial optimization. *Math. Program.* **137**, 225-255 (2013)
- [37] Nie, J.: Tight relaxations for polynomial optimization and Lagrange multiplier expressions. *Mathematical Programming*. **178** pp. 1-37 (2019)
- [38] Nie, J., Tang, X., Zhong, S.: Rational generalized Nash equilibrium problems. *SIAM J. Optim.*, to appear.
- [39] Nie, J., Wang, L., Ye, J., Zhong, S.: A Lagrange multiplier expression method for bilevel polynomial optimization. *SIAM Journal On Optimization*. **31**, 2368-2395 (2021)
- [40] Nie, J.: *Moment and Polynomial Optimization*, SIAM, to appear.
- [41] Özturan, A.: Solving generalized semi-infinite programming problems with a trust region method. *Acta Phys. Polon. A*. **128** (2015)
- [42] Pang, L., Wu, Q., Wang, J., Wu, Q.: A discretization algorithm for nonsmooth convex semi-infinite programming problems based on bundle methods. *Comput. Optim. Appl.* **76**, 125-153 (2020)
- [43] Rückmann, J., Shapiro, A.: Second-order optimality conditions in generalized semi-infinite programming. *Set-Valued Anal.* **9** pp. 169-186 (2001)
- [44] Stein, O.: Bi-level strategies in semi-infinite programming. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, MA,(2003)
- [45] Stein, O., Still, G.: Solving semi-infinite optimization problems with interior point techniques. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **42**, 769-788 (2003)

- [46] Still, G.: Generalized semi-infinite programming: Theory and methods. *European J. Oper. Res.* **119**, 301-313 (1999)
- [47] Still, G.: Generalized semi-infinite programming: numerical aspects. *Optimization*. **49**, 223-242 (2001)
- [48] Sturm, J.: Using SeDuMi 1.02, a MATLAB toolbox for optimization over symmetric cones. *Optim. Methods Softw.* **11/12** pp. 625-653 (1999)
- [49] Teo, K., Yang, X., Jennings, L.: Computational discretization algorithms for functional inequality constrained optimization. *Ann. Oper. Res.* **98** pp. 215-234 (2000)
- [50] Tsoukalas, A., Rustem, B., Pistikopoulos, E.: A global optimization algorithm for generalized semi-infinite, continuous minimax with coupled constraints and bi-level problems. *J. Global Optim.* **44**, 235-250 (2009)
- [51] Wang, L., Guo, F.: Semidefinite relaxations for semi-infinite polynomial programming. *Comput. Optim. Appl.* **58**, 133-159 (2014)
- [52] Wang, S., Yuan, Y.: Feasible method for semi-infinite programs. *SIAM J. Optim.* **25**, 2537-2560 (2015)
- [53] Weber, G., Tezel, A.: On generalized semi-infinite optimization of genetic networks. *TOP*. **15**, 65-77 (2007)
- [54] Winterfeld, A.: Application of general semi-infinite programming to lapidary cutting problems. *European J. Oper. Res.* **191**, 838-854 (2008)
- [55] Žaković, S., Rustem, B.: Semi-infinite programming and applications to minimax problems. *Ann. Oper. Res.* **124** pp. 81-110 (2003)

XIAOMENG HU AND JIAWANG NIE, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SAN DIEGO, 9500 GILMAN DRIVE, LA JOLLA, CA 92093, USA.

Email address: x8hu@ucsd.edu, njw@math.ucsd.edu