## EE464 Positivstellensatz

## Basic Semialgebraic Sets

The basic (closed) semialgebraic set defined by polynomials $f_{1}, \ldots, f_{m}$ is

$$
\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n} \mid f_{i}(x) \geq 0 \text { for all } i=1, \ldots, m\right\}
$$

## Examples

- The nonnegative orthant in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$
- The cone of positive semidefinite matrices
- Feasible set of an SDP; polyhedra and spectrahedra


## Properties

- If $S_{1}, S_{2}$ are basic closed semialgebraic sets, then so is $S_{1} \cap S_{2}$; i.e., the class is closed under intersection
- Not closed under union or projection


## Semialgebraic Sets

Given the basic semialgebraic sets, we may generate other sets by set theoretic operations; unions, intersections and complements.

A set generated by a finite sequence of these operations on basic semialgebraic sets is called a semialgebraic set.

Some examples:

- The set

$$
S=\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n} \mid f(x) * 0\right\}
$$

is semialgebraic, where $*$ denotes $<, \leq,=, \neq$.

- In particular every real variety is semialgebraic.
- We can also generate the semialgebraic sets via Boolean logical operations applied to polynomial equations and inequalities


## Semialgebraic Sets

Every semialgebraic set may be represented as either

- an intersection of unions

$$
S=\bigcap_{i=1}^{m} \bigcup_{j=1}^{p_{i}}\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n} \mid \operatorname{sign} f_{i j}(x)=a_{i j}\right\} \text { where } a_{i j} \in\{-1,0,1\}
$$

- a finite union of sets of the form

$$
\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n} \mid f_{i}(x)>0, h_{j}(x)=0 \text { for all } i=1, \ldots, m, j=1, \ldots, p\right\}
$$

- in $\mathbb{R}$, a finite union of points and open intervals

Every closed semialgebraic set is a finite union of basic closed semialgebraic sets; i.e., sets of the form

$$
\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n} \mid f_{i}(x) \geq 0 \text { for all } i=1, \ldots, m\right\}
$$

## Tarski-Seidenberg and Quantifier Elimination

Tarski-Seidenberg theorem: if $S \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+p}$ is semialgebraic, then so are

- $\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n} \mid \exists y \in \mathbb{R}^{p}(x, y) \in S\right\} \quad$ (closure under projection)
- $\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n} \mid \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^{p}(x, y) \in S\right\} \quad$ (complements and projections)
i.e., quantifiers do not add any expressive power

Cylindrical algebraic decomposition (CAD) may be used to compute the semialgebraic set resulting from quantifier elimination

## Feasibility of Semialgebraic Sets

Suppose $S$ is a semialgebraic set; we'd like to solve the feasibility problem

Is $S$ non-empty?

More specifically, suppose we have a semialgebraic set represented by polynomial inequalities and equations

$$
S=\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n} \mid f_{i}(x) \geq 0, h_{j}(x)=0 \text { for all } i=1, \ldots, m, j=1, \ldots, p\right\}
$$

- Important, non-trivial result: the feasibility problem is decidable.
- But NP-hard (even for a single polynomial, as we have seen)
- We would like to certify infeasibility


## Certificates So Far

- The Nullstellensatz: a necessary and sufficient condition for feasibility of complex varieties

$$
\left\{x \in \mathbb{C}^{n} \mid h_{i}(x)=0 \forall i\right\}=\emptyset \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad-1 \in \operatorname{ideal}\left\{h_{1}, \ldots, h_{m}\right\}
$$

- Valid inequalities: a sufficient condition for infeasibility of real basic semialgebraic sets

$$
\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n} \mid f_{i}(x) \geq 0 \forall i\right\}=\emptyset \quad \Longleftarrow-1 \in \operatorname{cone}\left\{f_{1}, \ldots, f_{m}\right\}
$$

- Linear Programming: necessary and sufficient conditions via duality for real linear equations and inequalities


## Certificates So Far

| Degree $\backslash$ Field | Complex | Real |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Linear | Range/Kernel <br> Linear Algebra | Farkas Lemma <br> Linear Programming |
| Polynomial | Nullstellensatz <br> Bounded degree: LP <br> Groebner bases | ???? |

We'd like a method to construct certificates for

- polynomial equations
- over the real field


## Real Fields and Inequalities

If we can test feasibility of real equations then we can also test feasibility of real inequalities and inequations, because

- inequalities: there exists $x \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(x) \geq 0$ if and only if

$$
\text { there exists }(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{2} \text { such that } f(x)=y^{2}
$$

- strict inequalities: there exists $x$ such that $f(x)>0$ if and only if

$$
\text { there exists }(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{2} \text { such that } y^{2} f(x)=1
$$

- inequations: there exists $x$ such that $f(x) \neq 0$ if and only if

$$
\text { there exists }(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{2} \text { such that } y f(x)=1
$$

The underlying theory for real polynomials called real algebraic geometry

## Real Varieties

The real variety defined by polynomials $h_{1}, \ldots, h_{m} \in \mathbb{R}\left[x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right]$ is

$$
\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}\left\{h_{1}, \ldots, h_{m}\right\}=\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n} \mid h_{i}(x)=0 \text { for all } i=1, \ldots, m\right\}
$$

We'd like to solve the feasibility problem; is $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}\left\{h_{1}, \ldots, h_{m}\right\} \neq \emptyset$ ?

We know

- Every polynomial in ideal $\left\{h_{1}, \ldots, h_{m}\right\}$ vanishes on the feasible set.
- The (complex) Nullstellensatz:

$$
-1 \in \operatorname{ideal}\left\{h_{1}, \ldots, h_{m}\right\} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}\left\{h_{1}, \ldots, h_{m}\right\}=\emptyset
$$

- But this condition is not necessary over the reals


## The Real Nullstellensatz

Recall $\Sigma$ is the cone of polynomials representable as sums of squares.

Suppose $h_{1}, \ldots, h_{m} \in \mathbb{R}\left[x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right]$.

$$
-1 \in \Sigma+\operatorname{ideal}\left\{h_{1}, \ldots, h_{m}\right\} \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}\left\{h_{1}, \ldots, h_{m}\right\}=\emptyset
$$

Equivalently, there is no $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ such that

$$
h_{i}(x)=0 \quad \text { for all } i=1, \ldots, m
$$

if and only if there exists $t_{1}, \ldots, t_{m} \in \mathbb{R}\left[x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right]$ and $s \in \Sigma$ such that

$$
-1=s+t_{1} h_{1}+\cdots+t_{m} h_{m}
$$

## Example

Suppose $h(x)=x^{2}+1$. Then clearly $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}\{h\}=\emptyset$

We saw earlier that the complex Nullstellensatz cannot be used to prove emptyness of $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}\{h\}$

But we have

$$
-1=s+t h
$$

with

$$
s(x)=x^{2} \quad \text { and } \quad t(x)=-1
$$

and so the real Nullstellensatz implies $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}\{h\}=\emptyset$.

The polynomial equation $-1=s+$ th gives a certificate of infeasibility.

## The Positivstellensatz

We now turn to feasibility for basic semialgebraic sets, with primal problem

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Does there exist } x \in \mathbb{R}^{n} \text { such that } \\
f_{i}(x) \geq 0 & \text { for all } i=1, \ldots, m \\
h_{j}(x)=0 & \text { for all } j=1, \ldots, p
\end{array}
$$

Call the feasible set $S$; recall

- every polynomial in cone $\left\{f_{1}, \ldots, f_{m}\right\}$ is nonnegative on $S$
- every polynomial in ideal $\left\{h_{1}, \ldots, h_{p}\right\}$ is zero on $S$

The Positivstellensatz (Stengle 1974)

$$
S=\emptyset \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad-1 \in \operatorname{cone}\left\{f_{1}, \ldots, f_{m}\right\}+\operatorname{ideal}\left\{h_{1}, \ldots, h_{m}\right\}
$$

## Example

Consider the feasibility problem
$S=\left\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{2} \mid f(x, y) \geq 0, h(x, y)=0\right\}$
where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f(x, y)=x-y^{2}+3 \\
& h(x, y)=y+x^{2}+2
\end{aligned}
$$

By the P -satz, the primal is infeasible if and only if there exist polynomials $s_{1}, s_{2} \in$ $\Sigma$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}[x, y]$ such that

$$
-1=s_{1}+s_{2} f+t h
$$

A certificate is given by

$$
s_{1}=\frac{1}{3}+2\left(y+\frac{3}{2}\right)^{2}+6\left(x-\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}, \quad s_{2}=2, \quad t=-6 .
$$

## Explicit Formulation of the Positivstellensatz

The primal problem is

Does there exist $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_{i}(x) \geq 0 & \text { for all } i=1, \ldots, m \\
h_{j}(x)=0 & \text { for all } j=1, \ldots, p
\end{aligned}
$$

The dual problem is

Do there exist $t_{i} \in \mathbb{R}\left[x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right]$ and $s_{i}, r_{i j}, \ldots \in \Sigma$ such that

$$
-1=\sum_{i} h_{i} t_{i}+s_{0}+\sum_{i} s_{i} f_{i}+\sum_{i \neq j} r_{i j} f_{i} f_{j}+\cdots
$$

These are strong alternatives

## Testing the Positivstellensatz

Do there exist $t_{i} \in \mathbb{R}\left[x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right]$ and $s_{i}, r_{i j}, \ldots \in \Sigma$ such that

$$
-1=\sum_{i} t_{i} h_{i}+s_{0}+\sum_{i} s_{i} f_{i}+\sum_{i \neq j} r_{i j} f_{i} f_{j}+\cdots
$$

- This is a convex feasibility problem in $t_{i}, s_{i}, r_{i j}, \ldots$
- To solve it, we need to choose a subset of the cone to search; i.e., the maximum degree of the above polynomial; then the problem is a semidefinite program
- This gives a hierarchy of syntactically verifiable certificates
- The validity of a certificate may be easily checked; e.g., linear algebra, random sampling
- Unless NP=co-NP, the certificates cannot always be polynomially sized.


## Example: Farkas Lemma

The primal problem; does there exist $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ such that

$$
A x+b \geq 0 \quad C x+d=0
$$

Let $f_{i}(x)=a_{i}^{T} x+b_{i}, h_{i}(x)=c_{i}^{T} x+d_{i}$. Then this system is infeasible if and only if

$$
-1 \in \operatorname{cone}\left\{f_{1}, \ldots, f_{m}\right\}+\operatorname{ideal}\left\{h_{1}, \ldots, h_{p}\right\}
$$

Searching over linear combinations, the primal is infeasible if there exist $\lambda \geq 0$ and $\mu$ such that

$$
\lambda^{T}(A x+b)+\mu^{T}(C x+d)=-1
$$

Equating coefficients, this is equivalent to

$$
\lambda^{T} A+\mu^{T} C=0 \quad \lambda^{T} b+\mu^{T} d=-1 \quad \lambda \geq 0
$$

## Hierarchy of Certificates

- Interesting connections with logic, proof systems, etc.
- Failure to prove infeasibility (may) provide points in the set.
- Tons of applications:
optimization, copositivity, dynamical systems, quantum mechanics...


## General Scheme



## Special Cases

Many known methods can be interpreted as fragments of P-satz refutations.

- LP duality: linear inequalities, constant multipliers.
- S-procedure: quadratic inequalities, constant multipliers
- Standard SDP relaxations for QP.
- The linear representations approach for functions $f$ strictly positive on the set defined by $f_{i}(x) \geq 0$.

$$
f(x)=s_{0}+s_{1} f_{1}+\cdots+s_{n} f_{n}, \quad s_{i} \in \Sigma
$$

## Converse Results

- Losslessness: when can we restrict a priori the class of certificates?
- Some cases are known; e.g., additional conditions such as linearity, perfect graphs, compactness, finite dimensionality, etc, can ensure specific a priori properties.


## Example: Boolean Minimization

$$
\begin{aligned}
x^{T} Q x & \leq \gamma \\
x_{i}^{2}-1 & =0
\end{aligned}
$$

A P-satz refutation holds if there is $S \succeq 0$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{n}, \varepsilon>0$ such that

$$
-\varepsilon=x^{T} S x+\gamma-x^{T} Q x+\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i}\left(x_{i}^{2}-1\right)
$$

which holds if and only if there exists a diagonal $\Lambda$ such that $Q \succeq \Lambda, \gamma=$ trace $\Lambda-\varepsilon$.

The corresponding optimization problem is

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { maximize } & \operatorname{trace} \Lambda \\
\text { subject to } & Q \succeq \Lambda \\
& \Lambda \text { is diagonal }
\end{array}
$$

## Example: S-Procedure

The primal problem; does there exist $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
x^{T} F_{1} x & \geq 0 \\
x^{T} F_{2} x & \geq 0 \\
x^{T} x & =1
\end{aligned}
$$

We have a P-satz refutation if there exists $\lambda_{1}, \lambda_{2} \geq 0, \mu \in \mathbb{R}$ and $S \succeq 0$ such that

$$
-1=x^{T} S x+\lambda_{1} x^{T} F_{1} x+\lambda_{2} x^{T} F_{2} x+\mu\left(1-x^{T} x\right)
$$

which holds if and only if there exist $\lambda_{1}, \lambda_{2} \geq 0$ such that

$$
\lambda_{1} F_{1}+\lambda_{2} F_{2} \leq-I
$$

Subject to an additional mild constraint qualification, this condition is also necessary for infeasibility.

## Exploiting Structure

What algebraic properties of the polynomial system yield efficient computation?

- Sparseness: few nonzero coefficients.
- Newton polytopes techniques
- Complexity does not depend on the degree
- Symmetries: invariance under a transformation group
- Frequent in practice. Enabling factor in applications.
- Can reflect underlying physical symmetries, or modelling choices.
- SOS on invariant rings
- Representation theory and invariant-theoretic techniques.
- Ideal structure: Equality constraints.
- SOS on quotient rings
- Compute in the coordinate ring. Quotient bases (Groebner)


## Example: Structured Singular Value

- Structured singular value $\mu$ and related problems: provides better upper bounds.
- $\mu$ is a measure of robustness: how big can a structured perturbation be, without losing stability.
- A standard semidefinite relaxation: the $\mu$ upper bound.
- Morton and Doyle's counterexample with four scalar blocks.
- Exact value: approx. 0.8723
- Standard $\mu$ upper bound: 1
- New bound: 0.895


## Example: Matrix Copositivity

A matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is copositive if

$$
x^{T} M x \geq 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}, x_{i} \geq 0 .
$$

- The set of copositive matrices is a convex closed cone, but...
- Checking copositivity is coNP-complete
- Very important in QP. Characterization of local solutions.
- The P-satz gives a family of computable SDP conditions, via:

$$
\left(x^{T} x\right)^{d}\left(x^{T} M x\right)=s_{0}+\sum_{i} s_{i} x_{i}+\sum_{j k} s_{j k} x_{j} x_{k}+\cdots
$$

## Example: Geometric Inequalities

Ono's inequality: For an acute triangle,

$$
(4 K)^{6} \geq 27 \cdot\left(a^{2}+b^{2}-c^{2}\right)^{2} \cdot\left(b^{2}+c^{2}-a^{2}\right)^{2} \cdot\left(c^{2}+a^{2}-b^{2}\right)^{2}
$$

where $K$ and $a, b, c$ are the area and lengths of the edges.
The inequality is true if:

$$
\left.\left.\begin{array}{l}
t_{1}:=a^{2}+b^{2}-c^{2} \\
t_{2} \\
t_{3}:=b^{2}+c^{2}-a^{2} \\
c^{2}+a^{2}-b^{2} \\
\geq
\end{array}\right\} 00\right\}(4 K)^{6} \geq 27 \cdot t_{1}^{2} \cdot t_{2}^{2} \cdot t_{3}^{2}
$$

A simple proof: define
$s(x, y, z)=\left(x^{4}+x^{2} y^{2}-2 y^{4}-2 x^{2} z^{2}+y^{2} z^{2}+z^{4}\right)^{2}+15 \cdot(x-z)^{2}(x+z)^{2}\left(z^{2}+x^{2}-y^{2}\right)^{2}$.
We have then

$$
(4 K)^{6}-27 \cdot t_{1}^{2} \cdot t_{2}^{2} \cdot t_{3}^{2}=s(a, b, c) \cdot t_{1} \cdot t_{2}+s(c, a, b) \cdot t_{1} \cdot t_{3}+s(b, c, a) \cdot t_{2} \cdot t_{3}
$$

therefore proving the inequality.

