

A Numerical Algorithm for Zero Counting. II: Randomization and Condition

Felipe Cucker *

Dept. of Mathematics
City University of Hong Kong
HONG KONG

e-mail: macucker@cityu.edu.hk

Gregorio Malajovich[‡]

Depto. de Matemática Aplicada
Univ. Federal do Rio de Janeiro
BRASIL

e-mail: gregorio@ufrj.br

Teresa Krick [†]

Departamento de Matemática
Univ. de Buenos Aires & CONICET
ARGENTINA

e-mail: krick@dm.uba.ar

Mario Wschebor

Centro de Matemática
Universidad de la República
URUGUAY

e-mail: wschebor@cmat.edu.uy

Abstract. In a recent paper [9] we analyzed a numerical algorithm for computing the number of real zeros of a polynomial system. The analysis relied on a condition number $\kappa(f)$ for the input system f . In this paper we continue this analysis by looking at $\kappa(f)$ as a random variable derived from imposing a probability measure on the space of polynomial systems. We give bounds for both the tail $\mathbb{P}\{\kappa(f) > a\}$ and the expected value $\mathbb{E}(\log \kappa(f))$.

1 Introduction

1.1 Context

Condition numbers were introduced in the late 1940's by von Neumann and Goldstine [33] and Turing [32] with the aim of understanding the loss of precision in the solution of linear systems of equations using digital computers. With time they were similarly used for other problems. And they got new applications as well. Notably, they were used to bound convergence rates in iterative algorithms, a paradigm of this being the analysis of the conjugate gradient method [31, Theorem 38.5]. For both purposes (accuracy and complexity analyses), however, condition numbers have as a drawback the fact that they are not known a priori. It would seem that to know the condition number of a given data one needs to solve the problem at hand on this data.

A solution pioneered by John von Neumann and collaborators (see [16, §2.1] and references therein) and reintroduced by Steve Smale [28, 29] is to assume a probability measure

*Partially supported by City University SRG grant 7002106.

[†]Partially supported by grants ANPCyT 33671/05 and UBACyT X113/2008-2010.

[‡]Partially supported by CNPq grants 470031/2007-7, 303565/2007-1, and by FAPERJ.

on the space of data and to study the condition number at data a , $\text{cond}(a)$, as a random variable. This approach yields bounds on accuracy or complexity for random data and has been pursued in several contexts: systems of linear equations [14, 15], polyhedral conic systems [6, 8, 11, 18, 30], linear programs [7], complex polynomial systems [24], [20], ...

In [9] a finite-precision algorithm was proposed to count the number of real zeros of a (square) real polynomial system. Both its complexity and the machine precision needed to ensure a correct answer were bounded by expressions involving a condition number $\kappa(f)$ of the input system f . The goal of the present paper is to add further understanding to this algorithm analysis by giving bounds (with respect to a given probability measure in the space of data, to be specified in §1.2 below) for both the tail $\mathbb{P}\{\kappa(f) > a\}$ and the expected value $\mathbb{E}(\log \kappa(f))$.

1.2 Basic definitions and main result

For $d \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote by \mathcal{H}_d the subspace of $\mathbb{R}[x_0, \dots, x_n]$ of homogeneous polynomials of degree d and, for $\mathbf{d} := (d_1, \dots, d_n)$, we set $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{d}} := \mathcal{H}_{d_1} \times \dots \times \mathcal{H}_{d_n}$. We endow $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{d}}$ with the Weyl norm which is defined, for $f \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{d}}$, $f = \sum_{|j|=d} a_j x^j$, by

$$\|f\|_W^2 = \sum_{|j|=d} \frac{a_j^2}{\binom{d}{j}}$$

where $x = (x_0, \dots, x_n)$, $j = (j_0, \dots, j_n)$, $|j| := j_0 + \dots + j_n$, $x^j = x_0^{j_0} \dots x_n^{j_n}$ and $\binom{d}{j} := \frac{d!}{j_0! \dots j_n!}$. We then endow $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{d}}$ with the norm given by

$$\|f\| := \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|f_i\|_W.$$

For $f = (f_1, \dots, f_n) \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{d}}$, as in [9], we define the following condition number

$$\kappa(f) = \max_{x \in S^n} \min \left\{ \mu_{\text{norm}}(f, x), \frac{\|f\|}{\|f(x)\|_{\infty}} \right\}$$

with

$$\mu_{\text{norm}}(f, x) = \sqrt{n} \|f\| \|D_x(f)^{-1} M\|.$$

Here

- $D_x(f) = Df(x)|_{T_x S^n}$ is the derivative of f along the unit sphere $S^n \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ at the point x , a linear operator from the tangent space $T_x(S^n)$ to \mathbb{R}^n ,
- $M := \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{d_1} & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \sqrt{d_n} \end{bmatrix}$ is the scaling $n \times n$ diagonal matrix with diagonal entries the square roots of the degrees $d_i = \deg(f_i)$,
- the norm $\|D_x(f)^{-1} M\|$ is the spectral norm, i.e., the operator norm $\max\{\|D_x(f)^{-1} M y\|_2; y \in S^n, y \perp x\}$ with respect to $\|\cdot\|_2$,
- $\|f(x)\|_{\infty} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |f_i(x)|$ denotes as usual the infinity norm.

We next impose the probability measure on $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{d}}$ defined by Eric Kostlan [19] and Shub-Smale [24]. This measure assumes the coefficients of the polynomials $f_i = \sum_{|j|=d_i} a_j^{(i)} x^j$ are independent, Gaussian, centered random variables, with variances

$$\text{Var}(a_j^{(i)}) = \binom{d_i}{j}.$$

For this distribution, and for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, $1 \leq i, i \leq n$, covariances are given by (see Lemma 3.2 below)

$$\mathbb{E}(f_i(x)f_k(y)) = \delta_{ik}\langle x, y \rangle^{d_i}$$

where δ_{ik} is the Kronecker symbol.

This probability law is invariant under the action of the orthogonal group and permits to perform the computations below, which appear to be much more complicated under other distributions sharing this invariance property.

To state our main results a number of quantities will be useful. Firstly, we define

$$D := \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} d_i, \quad m_d := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d_i, \quad v_d := \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d_i(d_i - 1).$$

We may assume here that $d_i \geq 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ since otherwise we could restrict to a system with less equations and unknowns. Therefore $2 \leq m_d \leq D$ and, it is easy to see, $v_d \leq 2D(m_d - 1)$. We will also use

$$N_n := \dim \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{d}} = \sum_{i=1}^n \binom{n + d_i}{n} \quad \text{and} \quad L_d := C_d e^{K_d^2/2},$$

where

$$K_d := \max \left\{ \left(\frac{D}{2(m_d - 1)} \right)^{1/2}, \left(\frac{v_d}{2m_d - 1} \right)^{1/2} \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad C_d := \frac{D^{1/2n}(2m_d - 1)}{(\prod_{i=1}^n d_i)^{1/2n}}.$$

We observe that $N_n \leq n^{D+2}$ and that $K_d \leq D^{1/2}$ since both terms in the max expression are thus bounded. Moreover, $C_d \leq \frac{2D-1}{2^{1/4}}$ and therefore $L_d \leq \frac{2D-1}{2^{1/4}} e^{D/2}$.

We are now ready to state our main result.

Theorem 1.1. *Let the random system f satisfy the conditions of the Shub-Smale model and assume $n \geq 2$. Then,*

(i) *For $a > 2\sqrt{2n}$ one has*

$$\mathbb{P}(\kappa(f) > a) \leq 19 N_n^{1/2} L_d^n \frac{\sqrt{2n} (1 + \ln(a/\sqrt{2n}))^{1/2}}{a} = \mathcal{O}(e^{Dn}) \frac{\sqrt{\ln a}}{a},$$

(ii)

$$\mathbb{E}(\ln \kappa(f)) \leq 38 + 10 \ln N_n + 20 n \ln L_d = \mathcal{O}(Dn).$$

For (i), an exponential bound in Dn is essentially the best that could be expected, in view of [4, Th.1 p.256].

The proof of this theorem is given in the next two sections. Section 3 contains a certain number of auxiliary results we need. They are separated from the main body of the proof, which is in Section 2, with the aim of isolating (and in this way highlighting) the basic ideas.


1.3 Relations with previous work

Probably the most successful combination of algorithmics, conditioning, and probability occurs in the study of complex polynomial systems (a setting similar to ours but with the coefficients of the polynomials now drawn from \mathbb{C} and considering projective complex zeros). This study spans an impressive collection of papers, which began with [23, 24, 25, 27, 26] and continued on [2] and [22, 3]. The final outcome of these efforts is a randomized algorithm producing an approximate zero of the input system in expected time which is polynomial in the size of the system. The expectation is with respect to *both* the random choices in the algorithm and a probability measure on the input data.

The condition number of a system f in this setting is defined to be

$$\mu_{\text{norm}}(f) := \max_{\zeta \in S_{\mathbb{C}}^n | f(\zeta) = 0} \mu_{\text{norm}}(f, \zeta). \quad (1)$$

Here $\mu_{\text{norm}}(f, \zeta)$ is roughly the quantity we defined above. Over the reals, the right-hand side in (1) may not be well-defined since the zero set of f may be empty. If one restricts attention to the subset $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{d}} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{d}}$ of those systems having at least a real zero one may define a measure $\mu_{\text{worst}}(f)$ as in (1) (but maximizing over the set of real zeros). This has been done in [5] where bounds for the tail and the expected value of $\mu_{\text{worst}}(f)$ are given. These bounds are very satisfying (for instance, the tail $\mathbb{P}(\mu_{\text{worst}} > a)$ is bounded by an expression in a^{-2} , a fact ensuring the finiteness of $\mathbb{E}(\mu_{\text{worst}}(f))$). The measure $\mu_{\text{worst}}(f)$, however, is hardly a condition number for the problem of real zeros counting, not even restricted to the subset $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{d}}$. To understand why, consider a polynomial as in the left-hand side of the figure below.



For this polynomial one has $\mu_{\text{worst}} = \infty$.

An upward small perturbation (as in the right-hand side) yields a low value of μ_{worst} . This value admits a finite limit when such perturbations are small enough ! The measure $\mu_{\text{worst}}(f)$ appears to be insensitive to the closeness to ill-posedness. This runs contrary to the notion of conditioning [13, 17, 21, 34].

A condition number $\mu^*(f)$ for the feasibility problem of real systems (which, obviously, needs to be defined on all of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{d}}$) was given in [10] by taking

$$\mu^*(f) = \begin{cases} \min_{\zeta \in S^n | f(\zeta) = 0} \mu_{\text{norm}}(f, \zeta) & \text{if } f \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{d}} \\ \max_{x \in S^n} \frac{\|f\|}{\|f(x)\|} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

As of today, there is no probabilistic analysis for it. The results and ideas in [5] could probably be used to carry out such analysis.

2 Proof of Theorem 1.1

For our purposes, it is convenient to consider the following quantity $\tilde{\kappa}(f)$ instead of $\kappa(f)$:

$$\tilde{\kappa}(f) = \frac{\|f\|_W}{\left(\min_{x \in S^n} \{\|D_x(f)^{-1}M\|^{-2} + \|f(x)\|_2^2\}\right)^{1/2}}$$

where $\|f\|_W^2 := \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|f_i\|_W^2$ is the Weyl norm of the system and $\|f(x)\|^2 := \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} f_i(x)^2$ denotes the usual Euclidean norm.

Although $\tilde{\kappa}(f)$ is not necessary always ≥ 1 , the quantities $\kappa(f)$ and $\tilde{\kappa}(f)$ are strongly related as shown in next result.

Lemma 2.1.

$$\frac{\tilde{\kappa}(f)}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \kappa(f) \leq \sqrt{2n} \tilde{\kappa}(f).$$

PROOF. For fixed $x \in S^n$ we set $L_x := \|D_x(f)^{-1}M\|^{-2} + \|f(x)\|_2^2$.

Therefore $L_x \geq \|D_x(f)^{-1}M\|^{-2}$ and $L_x \geq \|f(x)\|_2^2 \geq \|f(x)\|_\infty^2$, i.e.

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{L_x}} \leq \|D_x(f)^{-1}M\| \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{L_x}} \leq \frac{1}{\|f(x)\|_\infty}.$$

Since $\|f\|_W \leq \sqrt{n} \|f\|$, this implies that for any $x \in S^n$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\|f\|_W}{\sqrt{L_x}} &\leq \sqrt{n} \min \left\{ \|f\| \|D_x(f)^{-1}M\|, \frac{\|f\|}{\|f(x)\|_\infty} \right\} \\ &\leq \sqrt{n} \min \left\{ \sqrt{n} \|f\| \|D_x(f)^{-1}M\|, \frac{\|f\|}{\|f(x)\|_\infty} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\kappa}(f) &= \frac{\|f\|_W}{\min_{x \in S^n} \sqrt{L_x}} = \max_{x \in S^n} \frac{\|f\|_W}{\sqrt{L_x}} \\ &\leq \sqrt{n} \max_{x \in S^n} \min \left\{ \sqrt{n} \|f\| \|D_x(f)^{-1}M\|, \frac{\|f\|}{\|f(x)\|_\infty} \right\} = \sqrt{n} \kappa(f). \end{aligned}$$

On the other side, since for any $x \in S^n$,

$$\min \left\{ \frac{1}{\|D_x(f)^{-1}M\|^{-2}}, \frac{1}{\|f(x)\|_2^2} \right\} \leq \frac{2}{\|D_x(f)^{-1}M\|^{-2} + \|f(x)\|_2^2},$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} \min \left\{ \sqrt{n} \|f\| \|D_x(f)^{-1}M\|, \frac{\|f\|}{\|f(x)\|_\infty} \right\} &\leq \min \left\{ \sqrt{n} \|f\| \|D_x(f)^{-1}M\|, \sqrt{n} \frac{\|f\|}{\|f(x)\|_2} \right\} \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{2n} \|f\|}{\sqrt{L_x}}. \end{aligned}$$

This finally implies

$$\kappa(f) = \max_{x \in S^n} \min \left\{ \sqrt{n} \|f\| \|D_x(f)^{-1}M\|, \frac{\|f\|}{\|f(x)\|_\infty} \right\} \leq \frac{\sqrt{2n} \|f\|}{\min_{x \in S^n} \sqrt{L_x}} = \sqrt{2n} \tilde{\kappa}(f). \quad \square$$

We will therefore obtain Theorem 1.1 as a direct consequence of the following result.

Theorem 2.2. *Let the random system f satisfy the conditions of the Shub-Smale model and assume $n \geq 2$. Then,*

(i) *For $a > 2$ one has*

$$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\kappa}(f) > a) \leq 19 N_n^{1/2} L_d^n \frac{(1 + \ln a)^{1/2}}{a}$$

(ii)

$$\mathbb{E}(\ln^+ \tilde{\kappa}(f)) \leq 38 + 10 \ln N_n + 20 n \ln L_d,$$

where as usual, for real y , $y^+ = \max\{y, 0\}$.

This is because $\mathbb{P}(\kappa(f) > a) \leq \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\kappa}(f) > a/\sqrt{2n})$, since $\kappa(f) > a \Rightarrow \sqrt{2n} \tilde{\kappa}(f) \geq \kappa(f) > a$.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. The proof relies on the so-called Rice Formula for the expectation of the number of local minima of a real-valued random field. This is described precisely in Step 2 below. Previously, in Step 1, we use large deviations to reduce our problem to one where such a formula would apply. Steps 3, 4, and 5 estimate the different expressions occurring in Rice formula. Finally, Step 6 wraps up all these estimates to yield the upper bound for the density and Step 7 derives from it the bounds claimed in the statement of Theorem 1.1.

During the rest of the proof, we set $\underline{L} = \underline{L}(f) := \min_{x \in S^n} \{\|D_x(f)^{-1}M\|^{-2} + \|f(x)\|_2^2\}$ so that $\tilde{\kappa}(f) = \|f\|_W / \sqrt{\underline{L}}$. We observe that

$$\|D_x(f)^{-1}M\|^{-1} = \sigma_{\min}(M^{-1}D_x(f)) = \min\{\|M^{-1}D_x(f)y\| : y \in S^n, y \perp x\},$$

(where σ_{\min} denotes the minimum singular value), and therefore

$$\underline{L} = \min\{\|M^{-1}D_x(f)y\|^2 + \|f(x)\|_2^2 : x, y \in S^n, y \perp x\}$$

is the minimum of the random field $\{L(x, y) : (x, y) \in V\}$ where

$$\begin{aligned} L(x, y) &:= \|M^{-1}D_x(f)y\|^2 + \|f(x)\|_2^2, \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{d_i} \left(\sum_{j,k=0}^n \partial_j f_i(x) \partial_k f_i(x) y_j y_k \right) + \sum_{i=1}^n f_i^2(x); \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

$$\text{and } V := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : \|x\| = \|y\| = 1, \langle x, y \rangle = 0\}.$$

Here $y = (y_0, \dots, y_n)$ and, for $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $0 \leq j \leq n$, $\partial_j f_i(x)$ denotes the partial derivative of f_i with respect to x_j at the point x .

Step 1. Our first step consists in replacing the Weyl norm in the numerator of $\tilde{\kappa}(f)$ by a non-random constant, at the cost of adding a small probability, which will be controlled using large deviations.

Let $a > 1$ and $\eta := \ln a > 0$. We have

$$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\kappa}(f) > a) = \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\underline{L}}{\|f\|_W^2} < \frac{1}{a^2}\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\underline{L} < \frac{1}{a^2}(1 + \eta)N_n\right) + \mathbb{P}(\|f\|_W^2 \geq (1 + \eta)N_n).$$

Using Lemma 3.1 of Section 3 we may bound $\mathbb{P}(\|f\|_W^2 \geq (1 + \eta)N_n)$ to obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\kappa}(f) > a) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\underline{L} < \frac{1}{a^2}(1 + \eta)N_n\right) + \exp\left(-\frac{N_n}{2}(\eta - \ln(\eta + 1))\right). \quad (3)$$

The second term in the right-hand side of (3) can be easily estimated. We therefore turn our attention to the first. Given $\alpha > 0$, we want to compute an upper bound for

$$\mathbb{P}(\underline{L} < \alpha).$$

Step 2. Our second step consists in giving a bound for the density function $p_{\underline{L}}(u)$ of the random variable \underline{L} , i.e. such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\underline{L} < \alpha) = \int_0^\alpha p_{\underline{L}}(u) du$$

since \underline{L} is non-negative.

We recall that the quantity \underline{L} is the minimum of the random field $\{L(x, y) : (x, y) \in V\}$, for L and V defined in (2).

Notice that V is the Stiefel manifold $S(2, n + 1)$, a compact \mathcal{C}^∞ -differentiable manifold of dimension $2n - 1$, embedded in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$.

The orthogonal group of \mathbb{R}^{n+1} acts on V by means of $(x, y) \rightsquigarrow (Ux, Uy)$ for U an orthogonal transformation of \mathbb{R}^{n+1} .

At a generic point (x, y) of the manifold V , the normal space $N_{(x,y)}(V)$ has dimension $(2n + 2) - (2n - 1) = 3$, and is generated by the orthonormal set $\left\{(x, 0), (0, y), \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(y, x)\right\}$. Therefore, if $\{z_2, \dots, z_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is such that $\{x, y, z_2, \dots, z_n\}$ is an orthonormal basis of \mathbb{R}^{n+1} , the set

$$\mathcal{B}_{T_{(x,y)}} := \left\{(z_2, 0), \dots, (z_n, 0), (0, z_2), \dots, (0, z_n), \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(y, -x)\right\} \quad (4)$$

is an orthonormal basis of the tangent space $T_{(x,y)}(V)$.

We denote by $\sigma_V(d(x, y))$ the geometric measure on V (i.e. the measure induced by the Riemannian distance on V), which is invariant under the action of the orthogonal group. It is not hard to compute (see for example [1, Lemma 13.5]) the total measure

$$\sigma_V(V) = \sqrt{2}\sigma_n\sigma_{n-1}, \quad (5)$$

where $\sigma_n = \frac{2\pi^{(n+1)/2}}{\Gamma((n+1)/2)}$ is the total n th dimensional measure of the unit sphere S^n .

For $\alpha > 0$, denote by $m_\alpha(L, V)$ the number of local minima of the random function L on the set V , having value smaller than α . Clearly:

$$\mathbb{P}(\underline{L} < \alpha) = \mathbb{P}(m_\alpha(L, V) \geq 1) \leq \mathbb{E}(m_\alpha(L, V)). \quad (6)$$

Under certain general conditions, the right-hand side of (6) can be written using the following integral formula (Chapter 6 of [1], formula (6.18)):

$$\mathbb{E}(m_\alpha(L, V)) = \int_0^\alpha du \int_V \mathbb{E} \left(|\det(\tilde{L}''(x, y))| \cdot \chi_{\{\tilde{L}''(x, y) \succ 0\}} / L(x, y) = u, \tilde{L}'(x, y) = 0 \right) \times p_{L(x, y), \tilde{L}'(x, y)}(u, 0) \sigma_V(d(x, y)). \quad (7)$$

Here \tilde{L} is the restriction of L to V , and the first two derivatives \tilde{L}', \tilde{L}'' are taken along this manifold, χ_A means indicator function of the set A , \succ positive definite, $p_{L(x, y), \tilde{L}'(x, y)}$ is the joint density in $\mathbb{R}^1 \times T_{(x, y)}(V) \cong \mathbb{R}^1 \times \mathbb{R}^{2n-1}$ of the pair of random variables $(L(x, y), \tilde{L}'(x, y))$. The question of the independence of this formula with respect to the choice of the parametrizations of the manifold V is also considered in the above mentioned reference.

Whenever formula (7) holds true, it follows that the distribution of the random variable \underline{L} has a density satisfying inequality:

$$p_{\underline{L}}(u) \leq \int_V \mathbb{E} \left(|\det(\tilde{L}''(x, y))| \cdot \chi_{\{\tilde{L}''(x, y) \succ 0\}} / L(x, y) = u, \tilde{L}'(x, y) = 0 \right) \times p_{L(x, y), \tilde{L}'(x, y)}(u, 0) \sigma_V(d(x, y)). \quad (8)$$

However, if one computes the ingredients in the integrand of the right-hand side of (7), it turns out that the value of the density is $+\infty$ and the conditional expectation vanishes. So, the formula is meaningless in this form.

To overcome this difficulty we proceed as follows:

Let $S_{x, y} = \text{span}(z_2, \dots, z_n) \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be the orthogonal complement of $\text{span}(x, y) \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and $\pi_{x, y} : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow S_{x, y}$ the orthogonal projection. For $(x, y) \in V$, we introduce a new random vector $\zeta_{x, y}$ defined as

$$\zeta_{x, y} := ((\pi_{x, y}(f'_i(x)), \partial_{yy} f_i(x)), 1 \leq i \leq n) \in (S_{x, y} \times \mathbb{R})^n \cong \mathbb{R}^{2n}, \quad (9)$$

where for $1 \leq i \leq n$, $f'_i(x)$ is the free derivative (the gradient) of f_i at x , the first $(n-1)$ coordinates are given by the coordinates of the projection of $f'_i(x)$ onto $S_{x, y}$ in the orthonormal basis $\{z_2, \dots, z_n\}$ and the n th one is the second derivative in the direction y at x .

Instead of (7) we write the formula

$$\mathbb{E}(m_\alpha(L, V)) = \int_0^\alpha du \int_V \int_{(S_{x, y} \times \mathbb{R})^n} \mathbb{E} \left(|\det(\tilde{L}''(x, y))| \cdot \chi_{\{\tilde{L}''(x, y) \succ 0\}} / L(x, y) = u, \tilde{L}'(x, y) = 0, \zeta_{x, y} = z \right) \times p_{L(x, y), \tilde{L}'(x, y), \zeta_{x, y}}(u, 0, z) dz \sigma_V(d(x, y)). \quad (10)$$

Formally, formula (7) is obtained from (10) by integrating in z .

To prove the validity of (10) one could follow exactly the proof of formula (6.18) of [1], if the random field $\{L(x, y) : (x, y) \in V\}$ were Gaussian. This is not our case.

However, it is in fact a simple function of a Gaussian field, namely it is a quadratic form in the coordinates of f and its first derivatives as shown in formula (2). It is easy to show that formula (10) holds true for non-Gaussian random fields as it is done for the general Rice formulas in Chapter 6, Section 1.4. of [1]. This requires to prove: 1) the existence and regularity of the density $p_{L(x,y), \tilde{L}'(x,y), \zeta_{x,y}}(u, 0, z)$ and 2) with probability 1, 0 is a regular value of $\tilde{L}'(x, y)$.

1) is contained below in the present proof (see Step 4). As for 2), once the regularity of this density will be established, it follows in the same way as Proposition 6.5, part (a) of [1].

So, instead of (8) we get the inequality:

$$p_{\underline{L}}(u) \leq \int_V \int_{(S_{x,y} \times \mathbb{R})^n} \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \det(\tilde{L}''(x, y)) \right| \cdot \chi_{\{\tilde{L}''(x,y) > 0\}} / L(x, y) = u, \tilde{L}'(x, y) = 0, \zeta_{x,y} = z \right) \times p_{L(x,y), \tilde{L}'(x,y), \zeta_{x,y}}(u, 0, z) dz \sigma_V(d(x, y)). \quad (11)$$

Step 3. For the rest of the proof we fix the following orthonormal basis \mathcal{B}_T (given by (4)) of the tangent space $T := T_{e_0, e_1}$:

$$\mathcal{B}_T = \left\{ (e_2, 0), \dots, (e_n, 0), (0, e_2), \dots, (0, e_n), \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(e_1, -e_0) \right\}. \quad (12)$$

Notation. To simplify notations, from now on we write f_i (resp. $\partial_k f_i$ and $\partial_{k\ell} f_i$, $0 \leq k, \ell \leq n$) for $f_i(e_0)$ (resp. $\partial_k f_i(e_0) = \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_k}(e_0)$, $\partial_{k\ell} f_i(e_0) = \frac{\partial^2 f_i}{\partial x_k \partial x_\ell}(e_0)$, $0 \leq k, \ell \leq n$). In the same spirit we write L and L' for $L(e_0, e_1)$ and $L'(e_0, e_1)$, and \tilde{L} , \tilde{L}' and \tilde{L}'' for $\tilde{L}(e_0, e_1)$, $\tilde{L}'(e_0, e_1)$ and $\tilde{L}''(e_0, e_1)$. Finally we write ζ for $\zeta(e_0, e_1)$ and S for S_{e_0, e_1} .

Using these notations, and the invariance of the inner integral and the measure σ_V under the action of the orthogonal group, we rewrite (11) as

$$p_{\underline{L}}(u) \leq \sigma_V(V) \int_{(S \times \mathbb{R})^n} \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \det(\tilde{L}'') \right| \cdot \chi_{\{\tilde{L}'' > 0\}} / L = u, \tilde{L}' = 0, \zeta = z \right) \cdot p_{L, \tilde{L}', \zeta}(u, 0, z) dz. \quad (13)$$

Here, according to the definition of $L(x, y)$ in (2) we have that

$$L := L(e_0, e_1) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{d_i} (\partial_1 f_i)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^n f_i^2, \quad (14)$$

and, from Definition (9),

$$\zeta := \zeta_{e_0, e_1} = ((\partial_2 f_i, \dots, \partial_n f_i, \partial_{11} f_i), 1 \leq i \leq n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2}. \quad (15)$$

We also set $[\tilde{L}']_{\mathcal{B}_T} := (\xi_2, \dots, \xi_n, \eta_2, \dots, \eta_n, \varrho)$ for the coordinates of the derivative $\tilde{L}'(e_0, e_1)$ of $\tilde{L}(x, y)$ along the manifold V at (e_0, e_1) in the basis \mathcal{B}_T .

Using that the (free) partial derivatives of L at (e_0, e_1) are given (look at the Definition of $L(x, y)$ in (2)) by the following formulas

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial L}{\partial x_k}(e_0, e_1) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{2}{d_i} (\partial_{k1} f_i) (\partial_1 f_i) + \sum_{i=1}^n 2f_i (\partial_k f_i) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq k \leq n \\ \frac{\partial L}{\partial y_\ell}(e_0, e_1) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{2}{d_i} (\partial_1 f_i) (\partial_\ell f_i) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq \ell \leq n,\end{aligned}\tag{16}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_j &= \langle L'(e_0, e_1), (e_j, 0) \rangle = 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{d_i} (\partial_{1j} f_i) (\partial_1 f_i) + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n f_i (\partial_j f_i), \quad 2 \leq j \leq n, \\ \eta_j &= \langle L'(e_0, e_1), (0, e_j) \rangle = 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{d_i} (\partial_1 f_i) (\partial_j f_i), \quad 2 \leq j \leq n, \\ \varrho &= \langle L'(e_0, e_1), 2^{-1/2}(e_1, -e_0) \rangle \\ &= \sqrt{2} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{d_i} (\partial_1 f_i) (\partial_{11} f_i) + \sum_{i=1}^n f_i (\partial_1 f_i) \right] - \sqrt{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{d_i} (\partial_0 f_i) (\partial_1 f_i) \\ &= \sqrt{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{d_i} (\partial_1 f_i) (\partial_{11} f_i).\end{aligned}\tag{17}$$

Here, $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the usual inner product in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and the last equality in (17) follows from the equalities $\partial_0 f_i = d_i f_i$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$) which are easily verified.

Step 4. In this step we focus on the term $p_{L, \tilde{L}', \zeta}(u, 0, z)$ of (13). To this aim we factor this density as

$$p_{L, \tilde{L}', \zeta}(u, 0, z) = q_{L, \tilde{L}' / \zeta = z}(u, 0) \cdot p_\zeta(z)\tag{18}$$

where $q_{L, \tilde{L}' / \zeta = z}(u, 0)$ denotes conditional density.

We study the two terms in the right-hand side of (18).

Computation of $p_\zeta(z)$. Lemma 3.2 of Section 3 shows that the n^2 coordinates of ζ are independent Gaussian centered random variables satisfying, for $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $2 \leq k \leq n$, that $\text{Var}(\partial_k f_i) = d_i$ and $\text{Var}(\partial_{11} f_i) = 2d_i(d_i - 1)$.

Although we are not going to use the exact expression in the sequel, we can immediately deduce for $z = ((z_{i2}, \dots, z_{in}, z_{i11}), 1 \leq i \leq n)$ that

$$p_\zeta(z) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{n^2/2}} \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^n d_i^{(n-1)/2} \prod_{i=1}^n (2d_i(d_i - 1))^{1/2}} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{j=2}^n \frac{z_{ij}^2}{d_i} + \frac{z_{i11}^2}{2d_i(d_i - 1)} \right) \right).$$

Computation of $q_{L, \tilde{L}'/\zeta=z}(0)$. We factor it as

$$q_{L, \tilde{L}'/\zeta=z}(u, 0) = q_{L/\tilde{L}'=0, \zeta=z}(u) \cdot q_{\tilde{L}'/\zeta=z}(0).$$

Remembering that $[\tilde{L}']_{\mathcal{B}_T} := (\xi_2, \dots, \xi_n, \eta_2, \dots, \eta_n, \varrho)$, we can write $q_{\tilde{L}'/\zeta=z}(0)$ as

$$q_{\tilde{L}'/\zeta=z}(0) = q_{(\xi_2, \dots, \xi_n)/(\eta_2, \dots, \eta_n, \varrho)=0, \zeta=z}(0) \cdot q_{(\eta_2, \dots, \eta_n, \varrho)/\zeta=z}(0).$$

We first compute $q_{(\eta_2, \dots, \eta_n, \varrho)/\zeta=z}(0)$. The condition $\zeta = z$ says that for $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $2 \leq j \leq n$, $\partial_j f_i = z_{ij}$ and $\partial_{11} f_i = z_{i11}$. Therefore, from Identities (17), we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} \eta_2 \\ \vdots \\ \eta_n \\ \varrho \end{pmatrix} = A(z) \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial_1 f_1}{\sqrt{d_1}} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{\partial_1 f_n}{\sqrt{d_n}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{where} \quad A(z) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{2}{\sqrt{d_1}} z_{12} & \cdots & \frac{2}{\sqrt{d_n}} z_{n2} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \frac{2}{\sqrt{d_1}} z_{1n} & \cdots & \frac{2}{\sqrt{d_n}} z_{nn} \\ \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{d_1}} z_{111} & \cdots & \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{d_n}} z_{n11} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$$

is non-singular for almost every $z \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2}$. By Lemma 3.2, $\partial_1 f_i / \sqrt{d_i}$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, are independent standard normal random variables that are independent from ζ . Applying the change of variables formula, we get

$$q_{(\eta_2, \dots, \eta_n, \varrho)/\zeta=z}(0) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{n/2}} \frac{1}{|\det A(z)|}.$$

Now we compute $q_{(\xi_2, \dots, \xi_n)/(\eta_2, \dots, \eta_n, \varrho)=0, \zeta=z}(0)$. Since $A(z)$ is non-singular for almost every z , the condition $\eta_2 = \dots = \eta_n = \varrho = 0$ implies $\partial_1 f_i = 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Therefore, from Identities (17) and since $\zeta = z$, we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} \xi_2 \\ \vdots \\ \xi_n \end{pmatrix} = 2B(z) \begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ \vdots \\ f_n \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{where} \quad B(z) = \begin{pmatrix} z_{12} & \cdots & z_{n2} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ z_{1n} & \cdots & z_{nn} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-1) \times n}.$$

Again, the f_i , $1 \leq i \leq n$, are independent standard normal variables independent from $(\eta_2, \dots, \eta_n, \varrho, \zeta)$ and thus

$$q_{(\xi_2, \dots, \xi_n)/(\eta_2, \dots, \eta_n, \varrho)=0, \zeta=z}(0) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{(n-1)/2}} \frac{1}{2^{n-1} (\det(B(z)B(z)^t))^{1/2}},$$

where $B(z)^t$ denotes the transpose of the matrix $B(z)$.

We therefore obtain

$$\begin{aligned} q_{\tilde{L}'/\zeta=z}(0) &= q_{(\xi_2, \dots, \xi_n)/(\eta_2, \dots, \eta_n, \varrho)=0, \zeta=z}(0) \cdot q_{(\eta_2, \dots, \eta_n, \varrho)/\zeta=z}(0) \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{n-\frac{1}{2}} 2^{n-1} |\det A(z)| (\det(B(z)B(z)^t))^{1/2}}. \end{aligned}$$

We now compute $q_{L/\tilde{L}'=0, \zeta=z}(u)$. The conditions $\tilde{L}' = 0$ and $\zeta = z$ imply that $\partial_1 f_i = 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Plugging this into (14) we get

$$L = \sum_{i=1}^n f_i^2.$$

Moreover the same conditions also imply that $\sum_{i=1}^n f_i z_{ij} = 0$, $2 \leq j \leq n$, which indicates that the vector (f_1, \dots, f_n) of independent standard normal variables is orthogonal to the $(n-1)$ -dimensional subspace S spanned by the $n-1$ vectors (z_{1j}, \dots, z_{nj}) , $2 \leq j \leq n$. Thus $f_1^2 + \dots + f_n^2$ equals the square of the distance of (f_1, \dots, f_n) to S . Since the property of being a vector of independent standard normal variables is independent of the choice of the orthonormal basis, writing (f_1, \dots, f_n) in a basis obtained completing $n-1$ vectors of S , we conclude that $f_1^2 + \dots + f_n^2$ equals the square of the last coordinate, i.e. has the χ_1^2 -distribution. So, for $u > 0$,

$$q_{L/\tilde{L}'=0, \zeta=z}(u) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi u}} e^{-u/2}.$$

We therefore obtain

$$\begin{aligned} q_{L, \tilde{L}'/\zeta=z}(u, 0) &= q_{L/\tilde{L}'=0, \zeta=z}(u) \cdot q_{\tilde{L}'/\zeta=z}(0) \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n 2^{n-1} |\det A(z)| (\det(B(z)B(z)^t))^{1/2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{u}} e^{-u/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Step 5. In this step we focus on the conditional expectation

$$\mathbb{E} \left(|\det(\tilde{L}'')| \cdot \chi_{\{\tilde{L}'' > 0\}} / L = u, \tilde{L}' = 0, \zeta = z \right)$$

in the integrand of (13).

Let M be the symmetric block-matrix $\mathbb{R}^{(2n-1) \times (2n-1)}$ of the linear operator $\tilde{L}'' := \tilde{L}''(e_0, e_1)$ in the fixed orthonormal basis \mathcal{B}_T under the conditions $L = u$, $\tilde{L}' = 0$ and $\xi = z$. These conditions imply that, for almost every z , one has $\partial_1 f_i = 0$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$), $\sum_{i=1}^n f_i z_{ij} = 0$ ($2 \leq j \leq n$) and $\sum_{i=1}^n f_i^2 = u$.

The conditions

$$\sum_i f_i^2 = u, \quad \sum_{i=1}^n f_i z_{ij} = 0, \quad 2 \leq j \leq n,$$

represent a system of n equations and n unknowns, which has exactly two solutions $f^* = (f_1^*, \dots, f_n^*)$ and $-f^*$ for almost every z and $u > 0$, since the solutions of the $n-1$ last equations are, for almost every z , a line and therefore, for $u > 0$, this gives exactly the two stated solutions for the first equation. Moreover the symmetry of the Gaussian distribution implies that the coordinates of the matrix $|\det(\tilde{L}'')|$ do not change under the stated conditions when replacing f_1, \dots, f_n by either one of them.

Thanks to the formulas of Corollary 3.4 of Section 3, we get

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} M_{\sigma\sigma} & M_{\sigma\tau} & M_{\sigma\theta} \\ M_{\tau\sigma} & M_{\tau\tau} & M_{\tau\theta} \\ M_{\theta\sigma} & M_{\theta\tau} & M_{\theta\theta} \end{pmatrix}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
(M_{\sigma\sigma})_{jj} &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{d_i} (\partial_{1j} f_i)^2 + z_{ij}^2 + f_i^* (\partial_{jj} f_i) - d_i f_i^{*2} \right) \quad \text{for } 2 \leq j \leq n, \\
(M_{\sigma\sigma})_{jk} &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{d_i} (\partial_{1j} f_i) (\partial_{1k} f_i) + z_{ij} z_{ik} + f_i^* (\partial_{jk} f_i) \right) \quad \text{for } 2 \leq j \neq k \leq n, \\
(M_{\sigma\tau})_{jk} &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{d_i} (\partial_{1j} f_i) z_{ik} \quad \text{for } 2 \leq j, k \leq n, \\
(M_{\sigma\theta})_{j1} &= \sqrt{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{d_i} (\partial_{1j} f_i) z_{i11} \quad \text{for } 2 \leq j \leq n, \\
(M_{\tau\tau})_{jk} &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{d_i} z_{ij} z_{ik} \quad \text{for } 2 \leq j, k \leq n, \\
(M_{\tau\theta})_{j1} &= \sqrt{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{d_i} z_{i11} z_{ij} \quad \text{for } 2 \leq j \leq n, \\
M_{\theta\theta} &= \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{d_i} z_{i11}^2 - f_i^* z_{i11} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

(Here we skipped the details of the computations, let us just note that we also use that $\partial_0 f_i = d_i f_i$.)

Since the only random variables that appear in these coefficients are $\partial_{jk} f_i$, $1 \leq k \leq n$, $2 \leq j \leq n$, which by Lemma 3.2 are independent from \tilde{L} and ζ , we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\left| \det(\tilde{L}'') \right| \cdot \chi_{\{\tilde{L}'' > 0\}} / L = u, \tilde{L}' = 0, \zeta = z \right) = \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \det(M) \right| \cdot \chi_{\{M > 0\}} \right). \quad (20)$$

This is the expectation we are going to bound, in terms of u and z .

We denote by M_0 the following $n \times n$ sub-block of M (which does not have random variables in it),

$$M_0 = \begin{pmatrix} M_{\tau\tau} & M_{\tau\theta} \\ M_{\theta\tau} & M_{\theta\theta} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}.$$

Whenever the event $\{M > 0\}$ occurs, it is elementary to show that $M_{\sigma\sigma} > 0$, $M_0 > 0$ and the inequality

$$0 < \det(M) \leq \det(M_{\sigma\sigma}) \det(M_0)$$

holds true (in particular the determinant of a positive definite matrix is bounded by the product of its diagonal elements, which are all positive). Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\left| \det(M) \right| \cdot \chi_{\{M > 0\}} \right) \leq \mathbb{E} \left(\det(M_{\sigma\sigma}) \chi_{\{M_{\sigma\sigma} > 0\}} \right) \det(M_0) \chi_{\{M_0 > 0\}}, \quad (21)$$

where we assume $M_{\sigma\sigma}$ and M_0 are positive definite. Here we used the fact that $M_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. Applying again 3.2 and the fact that $\partial_{1j} f_i$ and $\partial_{1k} f_i$ are independent for $j \neq k$ we obtain

the inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(\det(M_{\sigma\sigma})) &\leq 2^{n-1} \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j=2}^n \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{d_i} (\partial_{1j} f_i)^2 + z_{ij}^2 + |f_i^* (\partial_{jj} f_i)| \right) \right) \\
&\leq 2^{n-1} \prod_{j=2}^n \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{d_i} (\partial_{1j} f_i)^2 + z_{ij}^2 \right) + u^{1/2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (\partial_{jj} f_i)^2 \right)^{1/2} \right) \quad (22) \\
&\leq 2^{n-1} \prod_{j=2}^n \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (d_i - 1 + z_{ij}^2) + u^{1/2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n 2d_i(d_i - 1) \right)^{1/2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Now we bound $\det(M_0)$. For that purpose, we introduce some additional notations. For $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $2 \leq j \leq n$ we write

$$\tilde{z}_{ij} = 2z_{ij}/\sqrt{d_i}, \quad \tilde{z}_{i11} = 2z_{i11}/\sqrt{d_i}, \quad \tilde{f}_i = \sqrt{d_i} f_i^*,$$

and

$$\tilde{z}_j = (\tilde{z}_{1j}, \dots, \tilde{z}_{nj}), \quad \tilde{z}_{11} = (\tilde{z}_{111}, \dots, \tilde{z}_{n11}), \quad \tilde{f} = (\tilde{f}_1, \dots, \tilde{f}_n).$$

With these notations, we can rewrite M_0 as

$$M_0 = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \langle \tilde{z}_j, \tilde{z}_k \rangle_{2 \leq j, k \leq n} & w^t \\ w & \frac{1}{4} \langle \tilde{z}_{11}, \tilde{z}_{11} \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \langle \tilde{f}, \tilde{z}_{11} \rangle \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$w = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4} (\langle \tilde{z}_2, \tilde{z}_{11} \rangle, \dots, \langle \tilde{z}_n, \tilde{z}_{11} \rangle).$$

We can also rewrite the matrix $A(z)$ of Step 4 by rows as

$$A(z) = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{z}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{z}_n \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \tilde{z}_{11} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{B}(z) \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \tilde{z}_{11} \end{pmatrix},$$

where we introduce the matrix $\widehat{B}(z)$ to denote the first $(n-1)$ rows of $A(z)$. Computing $\det(M_0)$ by splitting the last column of M_0 we get

$$\det(M_0) = \frac{1}{2^n} \left((\det(A(z)))^2 - \langle \tilde{f}, \tilde{z}_{11} \rangle \det(\widehat{B}(z) \widehat{B}(z)^t) \right).$$

On the other hand, $|\det(A(z))|$ is the n -volume of the parallelotope generated in \mathbb{R}^n by the rows of $A(z)$, that is

$$\begin{aligned}
|\det(A(z))| &= \text{Vol} \left(\left\{ \sum_{j=2}^n \lambda_j \tilde{z}_j + \lambda_{11} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \tilde{z}_{11} : 0 \leq \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n, \lambda_{11} \leq 1 \right\} \right) \\
&= \text{dist} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \tilde{z}_{11}, \tilde{S} \right) \det(\widehat{B}(z) \widehat{B}(z)^t)^{1/2},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{S} := \text{span}(\tilde{z}_2, \dots, \tilde{z}_n) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is the hyperplane spanned by the the first $n - 1$ rows of $A(z)$ (i.e. the rows of $\hat{B}(z)$). This is clear since the volume is the product of the distance from the last row of $A(z)$ to \tilde{S} with the volume of the parallelepiped generated by its first $n - 1$ rows, i.e. $\det(\hat{B}(z)\hat{B}(z)^t)^{1/2}$.

Now, we recall that (f_1^*, \dots, f_n^*) satisfies the conditions $\sum_{i=1}^n f_i^* z_{ij} = 0$, $2 \leq j \leq n$, which implies

$$\langle \tilde{f}, \tilde{z}_j \rangle = 2 \sum_{i=1}^n f_i^* z_{ij} = 0, \quad 2 \leq j \leq n.$$

This means that \tilde{f} is orthogonal to \tilde{S} so that

$$\text{dist} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \tilde{z}_{11}, \tilde{S} \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left| \left\langle \frac{\tilde{f}}{\|\tilde{f}\|}, \tilde{z}_{11} \right\rangle \right|.$$

Therefore we get

$$|\det(A(z))| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left| \left\langle \frac{\tilde{f}}{\|\tilde{f}\|}, \tilde{z}_{11} \right\rangle \right| \det(\hat{B}(z)\hat{B}(z)^t)^{1/2}, \quad (23)$$

$$\det(M_0) = \frac{1}{2^n} \left(\frac{1}{2} \left\langle \frac{\tilde{f}}{\|\tilde{f}\|}, \tilde{z}_{11} \right\rangle^2 - \langle \tilde{f}, \tilde{z}_{11} \rangle \right) \det(\hat{B}(z)\hat{B}(z)^t). \quad (24)$$

Plugging (21), (22) and (24) into (20) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(|\det(\tilde{L}'')| \cdot \chi_{\{\tilde{L}'' > 0\}} / L = u, \tilde{L}' = 0, \zeta = z) &= \mathbb{E}(|\det(M)| \cdot \chi_{\{M > 0\}}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \prod_{j=2}^n \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (d_i - 1 + z_{ij}^2) + u^{1/2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n 2d_i(d_i - 1) \right)^{1/2} \right) \\ &\quad \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2} \left\langle \frac{\tilde{f}}{\|\tilde{f}\|}, \tilde{z}_{11} \right\rangle^2 + \left| \langle \tilde{f}, \tilde{z}_{11} \rangle \right| \right) \det(\hat{B}(z)\hat{B}(z)^t). \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Step 6. We now put together the calculations of Steps 4 and 5 to compute an upper bound

for $p_{\underline{L}}(u)$. To this aim we plug (5), (25), (18), (19) and (23) into (13) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
p_{\underline{L}}(u) &\leq \sigma_V(V) \int_{(S \times \mathbb{R})^n} \mathbb{E} \left(|\det(\tilde{L}'')| \cdot \chi_{\{\tilde{L}'' > 0\}} / L = u, \tilde{L}' = 0, \zeta = z \right) \cdot q_{L, \tilde{L}' / \zeta = z}(u, 0) \cdot p_{\zeta}(z) dz \\
&\leq \sqrt{2} \frac{2\pi^{n/2}}{\Gamma(n/2)} \frac{2\pi^{(n+1)/2}}{\Gamma((n+1)/2)} \int_{(S \times \mathbb{R})^n} \frac{1}{2} \prod_{j=2}^n \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (d_i - 1 + z_{ij}^2) + u^{1/2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n 2d_i(d_i - 1) \right)^{1/2} \right) \\
&\quad \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2} \left\langle \frac{\tilde{f}}{\|\tilde{f}\|}, \tilde{z}_{11} \right\rangle^2 + \left| \langle \tilde{f}, \tilde{z}_{11} \rangle \right| \right) \det(\widehat{B}(z)\widehat{B}(z)^t) \\
&\quad \cdot \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n 2^{n-1} |\det A(z)| (\det(B(z)B(z)^t))^{1/2}} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{u}} e^{-u/2} \cdot p_{\zeta}(z) dz \\
&\leq \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2^{2n-3} \Gamma(n/2) \Gamma((n+1)/2)} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{u}} e^{-u/2} \int_{(S \times \mathbb{R})^n} \prod_{j=2}^n \left(\sum_{i=1}^n z_{ij}^2 + n(m_d - 1) + (nv_d u)^{1/2} \right) \\
&\quad \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2} \|\tilde{z}_{11}\| + \|\tilde{f}\| \right) \cdot \left(\frac{\det(\widehat{B}(z)\widehat{B}(z)^t)}{\det(B(z)B(z)^t)} \right)^{1/2} \cdot p_{\zeta}(z) dz
\end{aligned}$$

where we recall that $m_d := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d_i$ and $v_d := \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d_i(d_i - 1)$.

We can bound the quotient

$$\frac{\det(\widehat{B}(z)\widehat{B}(z)^t)}{\det(B(z)B(z)^t)}$$

in the following way. According to the definitions of the matrices $B(z)$ and $\widehat{B}(z)$ we have

$$\widehat{B}(z) = B(z)H,$$

where H is the $n \times n$ diagonal matrix

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{2}{\sqrt{d_1}} & & & \\ & \ddots & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \frac{2}{\sqrt{d_n}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Now denote by $B_k(z)$ (resp. $\widehat{B}_k(z)$) the matrix obtained by deleting the k th column of $B(z)$ (resp. $\widehat{B}(z)$), and by H_k the matrix obtained by deleting the k th row and column of H . Therefore, using Binet-Cauchy's formula for the determinant of the square product of two non-square matrices, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\det(\widehat{B}(z)\widehat{B}(z)^t) &= \sum_{k=1}^n \det(\widehat{B}_k(z)) \det(\widehat{B}_k(z)^t) = \sum_{k=1}^n \det(B_k(z)H_k) \det(H_k^t B_k(z)^t) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^n \det(H_k)^2 \det(B_k(z)) \det(B_k(z)^t) \\
&\leq \frac{2^{2n-2} D}{\prod_i d_i} \sum_{k=1}^n \det(B_k(z)) \det(B_k(z)^t) = \frac{2^{2n-2} D}{\prod_i d_i} \det(B(z)B(z)^t).
\end{aligned}$$

Here we recall $D := \max_i d_i$ and we used the fact that $\det(H_k)^2 = \prod_{i \neq k} \frac{4}{d_i} \leq \frac{2^{2n-2} D}{\prod_i d_i}$.

Using these bounds in the bound for $p_{\underline{L}}(u)$ at the beginning of this step, we get

$$p_{\underline{L}}(u) \leq \frac{(\pi D)^{1/2}}{2^{n-2} \Gamma(n/2) \Gamma((n+1)/2) (\prod_{i=1}^n d_i)^{1/2}} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{u}} e^{-u/2} \cdot \int_{(S \times \mathbb{R})^n} \left(\frac{1}{2} \|\tilde{z}_{11}\| + \|\tilde{f}\| \right) \cdot \prod_{j=2}^n \left(\sum_{i=1}^n z_{ij}^2 + n(m_d - 1) + (nv_d u)^{1/2} \right) \cdot p_{\zeta}(z) dz.$$

We observe that the integral can be expressed as the expectation of the corresponding function of the vector of random variables $\zeta := \zeta_{e_0, e_1}$, which in turn can be easily computed since (as we already noted) the components of ζ are centered Gaussian independent random variables, with known variances. We recall that $\tilde{z}_{11} = 2(z_{i11}/\sqrt{d_i})_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ and $\tilde{f} = (\sqrt{d_i} f_i^*)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ where $\sum f_i^{*2} = u$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{(S \times \mathbb{R})^n} \left(\frac{1}{2} \|\tilde{z}_{11}\| + \|\tilde{f}\| \right) \cdot \prod_{j=2}^n \left(\sum_{i=1}^n z_{ij}^2 + n(m_d - 1) + (nv_d u)^{1/2} \right) \cdot p_{\zeta}(z) dz \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{d_i} (\partial_{11} f_i)^2 \right)^{1/2} + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n d_i (f_i^*)^2 \right)^{1/2} \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. \prod_{j=2}^n \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (\partial_j f_i)^2 + n(m_d - 1) + (nv_d u)^{1/2} \right) \right) \\ &\leq \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{d_i} \mathbb{E}((\partial_{11} f_i)^2) \right)^{1/2} + (Du)^{1/2} \right) \\ & \quad \prod_{j=2}^n \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}((\partial_j f_i)^2) + n(m_d - 1) + (nv_d u)^{1/2} \right) \\ &= \left((2n(m_d - 1))^{1/2} + (Du)^{1/2} \right) \left(n(2m_d - 1) + (nv_d u)^{1/2} \right)^{n-1} \\ &\leq n^{n-1/2} (2(m_d - 1))^{1/2} \left(1 + \left(\frac{D}{2(m_d - 1)} \frac{u}{n} \right)^{1/2} \right) (2m_d - 1)^{(n-1)/2} \\ & \quad \left((2m_d - 1)^{1/2} + \left(\frac{v_d}{2(m_d - 1)} \frac{u}{n} \right)^{1/2} \right)^{n-1} \\ &\leq 2^{n/2} n^{n-1/2} (m_d - 1/2)^n \exp \left(\left(\frac{D}{2(m_d - 1)} \frac{u}{n} \right)^{1/2} + (n-1) \left(\frac{v_d}{2(m_d - 1)} \frac{u}{n} \right)^{1/2} \right) \\ &\leq 2^{n/2} n^{n-1/2} (m_d - 1/2)^n \exp(nK_d(u/n)^{1/2}) \\ &= 2^{n/2} n^{n-1/2} (m_d - 1/2)^n \exp(K_d(nu)^{1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

where, we recall,

$$K_d := K_{d,n} = \max \left\{ \left(\frac{D}{2(m_d - 1)} \right)^{1/2}, \left(\frac{v_d}{2m_d - 1} \right)^{1/2} \right\}.$$

Now, for $n \geq 3$ we use the standard lower bound

$$\Gamma(x) \geq (x-1)^{x-1} e^{x-1} \sqrt{2\pi(x-1)} \quad \text{for } x > 1,$$

and the fact that

$$2^{n/2} n^{n-1/2} \leq 2^{3n} (n/2 - 1)^{n/2-1} ((n+1)/2 - 1)^{(n+1)/2-1} \sqrt{n/2 - 1} \sqrt{(n+1)/2 - 1}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\underline{L}}(u) &\leq \frac{2^{2n+1} D^{1/2} (m_d - 1/2)^n}{\sqrt{\pi} e^{n-2} (\prod_{i=1}^n d_i)^{1/2}} \exp\left(K_d(nu)^{1/2}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{u}} e^{-u/2} \\ &\leq \frac{2e^2}{\sqrt{\pi}} D^{1/2} \left(\frac{4}{e}\right)^n \frac{(m_d - 1/2)^n}{(\prod_{i=1}^n d_i)^{1/2}} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{u}} e^{K_d \sqrt{nu} - u/2} \\ &\leq 9 C_d^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{u}} e^{K_d \sqrt{nu} - u/2}. \end{aligned}$$

where, we also recall,

$$C_d := \frac{D^{1/2n} (2m_d - 1)}{(\prod_{i=1}^n d_i)^{1/2n}}.$$

(We observe that $C_d \geq 1$ due to the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality.)

It is easy to verify, since $\Gamma(1) = 1$ and $\Gamma(3/2) = \sqrt{\pi}/2$, that the same bound holds for $n = 2$.

Step 7. We finally complete the proof of Theorem 2.2.

(i) For $\alpha > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\underline{L} < \alpha) &= \int_0^\alpha p_{\underline{L}}(u) du \\ &\leq 9 C_d^n \int_0^\alpha \frac{1}{\sqrt{u}} e^{K_d \sqrt{nu} - u/2} du = 9 C_d^n e^{nK_d^2/2} \int_{-K_d \sqrt{n}}^{\sqrt{\alpha} - K_d \sqrt{n}} 2 e^{-y^2/2} dy \\ &\leq 9 L_d^n \int_{-K_d \sqrt{n}}^{\sqrt{\alpha} - K_d \sqrt{n}} 2 dy = 18 L_d^n \sqrt{\alpha} \end{aligned}$$

after performing the change of variables $y = \sqrt{u} - K_d \sqrt{n}$ and setting

$$L_d := C_d e^{K_d^2/2}.$$

Let us go back to the starting inequality (3). For $a > 2$, $\eta := \ln a$ and $\alpha := \frac{1}{a^2}(1 + \ln a)N_n$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\kappa}(f) > a) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\underline{L} < \frac{1}{a^2}(1 + \ln a)N_n\right) + \exp\left(-\frac{N_n}{2}(\ln a - \ln(\ln a + 1))\right) \\ &\leq 18 L_d^n \frac{1}{a} ((1 + \ln a)N_n)^{1/2} + \frac{1}{a} \\ &\leq 19 N_n^{1/2} L_d^n \frac{(1 + \ln a)^{1/2}}{a}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that the second term in the right-hand side of the first row is bounded by $1/a$ (use $a > 2$ and the simple inequality $N_n \geq 6$).

This proves Part (i).

(ii) This part is a straightforward consequence of part (i). Indeed, if $x_n > \ln 2$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\ln^+ \tilde{\kappa}(f)) &= \int_0^{+\infty} \mathbb{P}(\ln \tilde{\kappa}(f) > x) dx \leq x_n + \int_{x_n}^{+\infty} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\kappa}(f) > e^x) dx \\ &\leq x_n + 19 N_n^{1/2} L_d^n \int_{x_n}^{+\infty} (1+x)e^{-x} dx = x_n + 19 N_n^{1/2} L_d^n (2 + x_n)e^{-x_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $x_n = \ln(N_n^{1/2} L_d^n)$, the result follows:

$$\mathbb{E}(\ln^+ \tilde{\kappa}(f)) \leq \ln(N_n^{1/2} L_d^n) + 19 \frac{N_n^{1/2} L_d^n (2 + \ln(N_n^{1/2} L_d^n))}{N_n^{1/2} L_d^n} = 38 + 10 \ln N_n + 20 n \ln L_d.$$

□

3 Auxiliary lemmas

Lemma 3.1. *Set*

$$N_n := \dim \mathcal{H}_d = \sum_{i=1}^n \binom{n + d_i}{n}$$

Then, for $\eta > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\|f\|_W^2 \geq (1 + \eta)N_n\right) \leq e^{-\frac{N_n}{2}[\eta - \ln(\eta + 1)]}.$$

PROOF. According to the definition of the Weyl norm,

$$\|f\|_W^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{|j|=d_i} \xi_{i,j}^2 \tag{26}$$

where, due to the distribution, the random variables

$$\xi_{i,j} = \frac{a_j^{(i)}}{\binom{d_i}{j}^{1/2}}$$

are independent identically distributed (i.i.d.) standard normal.

It is easy to see that the number of terms in the sum (26) is equal to N_n , so that

$$\mathbb{P}(\|f\|_W^2 \geq (1 + \eta)N_n) = \mathbb{P}((\xi_1^2 - 1) + \dots + (\xi_{N_n}^2 - 1) \geq \eta N_n) = \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{X_1 + \dots + X_{N_n}}{N_n} \geq \eta\right)$$

where X_1, \dots, X_{N_n} are i.i.d. random variables having the distribution of $\xi^2 - 1$, ξ a normal standard random variable.

The logarithmic moment generating function of $\xi^2 - 1$ is

$$\Lambda(\lambda) = \ln \mathbb{E}\{e^{\lambda(\xi^2 - 1)}\} = \begin{cases} -\lambda - \frac{1}{2} \ln(1 - 2\lambda) & \text{if } \lambda < \frac{1}{2} \\ +\infty & \text{if } \lambda \geq \frac{1}{2} \end{cases}$$

and its Fenchel-Legendre transform

$$\Lambda^*(x) = \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} (\lambda x - \Lambda(\lambda)) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}(x - \ln(x + 1)) & \text{if } x > -1 \\ +\infty & \text{if } x \leq -1. \end{cases}$$

A basic result on large deviations [12, Ch. 2] states that, for any integer m and any $x > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{X_1 + \dots + X_m}{m} \geq x\right) \leq \exp(-m\Lambda^*(x)).$$

This implies the statement. \square

The next lemma contains the ingredients to compute the distributions and conditional expectations needed for the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $f \in \mathbb{R}[X_0, \dots, X_n]$ be an homogeneous random polynomial of degree d . Assume that f satisfies the Shub-Smale model for the probability law of the coefficients, that is, the coefficients of the polynomial $f = \sum_{|j|=d} a_j X^j$ are independent, Gaussian, centered random variables with variances*

$$\text{Var}(a_j) = \binom{d}{j}.$$

Then

- For $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, the covariances satisfy

$$\mathbb{E}(f(x)f(y)) = \langle x, y \rangle^d \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1},$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the usual inner product in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} .

Moreover, if $e_0 := (1, 0, \dots, 0)$ is the first vector of the canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^{n+1} and we write f (resp. $\partial_k f$ and $\partial_{k\ell} f$, $0 \leq k, \ell \leq n$) for $f(e_0)$ (resp. $\partial_k f(e_0) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_k}(e_0)$, $\partial_{k\ell} f(e_0) = \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_k \partial x_\ell}(e_0)$, $0 \leq k, \ell \leq n$), we get the following covariances:

- $\mathbb{E}(f \partial_k f) = \delta_{k0} d$ for $0 \leq k \leq n$.
- $\mathbb{E}((\partial_k f)(\partial_{k'} f)) = \delta_{kk'} [d + \delta_{k0} d(d - 1)]$ for $0 \leq k, k' \leq n$.
- $\mathbb{E}(f(\partial_{k\ell} f)) = \delta_{k\ell} \delta_{k0} d(d - 1)$ for $0 \leq k, \ell \leq n$.

- $\mathbb{E}((\partial_{k\ell}f)(\partial_{k'}f)) = d(d-1)[(d-2)\delta_{\ell 0}\delta_{k0}\delta_{k'0} + \delta_{k0}\delta_{k'\ell} + \delta_{\ell 0}\delta_{kk'}]$ for $0 \leq k, k', \ell \leq n$.
- $\mathbb{E}((\partial_{k\ell}f)(\partial_{k'\ell'}f)) = d(d-1)\left\{(d-2)(d-3)\delta_{k0}\delta_{\ell 0}\delta_{k'0}\delta_{\ell'0} + (d-2)[\delta_{k0}\delta_{k'0}\delta_{\ell\ell'} + \delta_{k'0}\delta_{\ell 0}\delta_{k\ell'} + \delta_{k0}\delta_{\ell'0}\delta_{k'\ell} + \delta_{\ell 0}\delta_{\ell'0}\delta_{kk'}] + \delta_{kk'}\delta_{\ell\ell'} + \delta_{k\ell'}\delta_{k'\ell}\right\}$ for $0 \leq k, k', \ell, \ell' \leq n$.

PROOF. For the first item, from the fact that $\mathbb{E}(a_j a_{j'}) = \mathbb{E}(a_j)\mathbb{E}(a_{j'}) = 0$ for $j \neq j'$ (by the independence of the a_j), we have

$$\mathbb{E}(f(x)f(y)) = \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{j,j'} a_j a_{j'} x^j y^{j'}\right) = \sum_j \mathbb{E}((a_j)^2) x^j y^j = \sum_j \binom{d}{j} x^j y^j = \langle x, y \rangle^d.$$

For the following items, we observe that we can differentiate under the expectation sign the function $(x, y) \mapsto \mathbb{E}(f(x)f(y)) = \langle x, y \rangle^d$, e.g.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(f(x)\partial_k f(y)) &= \frac{\partial(\langle x, y \rangle^d)}{\partial y_k}(x, y) = dx_k \langle x, y \rangle^{d-1} \\ \mathbb{E}(\partial_k f(x)\partial_{k'} f(y)) &= \partial_{kk'}^2(\langle x, y \rangle^d) = \delta_{kk'} d \langle x, y \rangle^{d-1} + d(d-1)x_{k'} y_k \langle x, y \rangle^{d-2}. \end{aligned}$$

This gives the covariances when specializing $x = y = e_0$. \square

Our next lemma deals with the analytic description of the geometry of the manifold V . We define the function

$$\begin{aligned} \psi : \quad B(0; \delta) \subset \mathbb{R}^{2n-1} &\quad \rightarrow \quad \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \\ (\sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_n, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_n, \theta) &\quad \mapsto \quad \left(\frac{C}{\|C\|_{n+1}}, \frac{D}{\|D\|_{n+1}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $B(0; \delta) \subset \mathbb{R}^{2n-1}$ is the open ball centered at the origin and radius δ sufficiently small, $\|\cdot\|_{n+1}$ is the Euclidean norm in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} and where the definition of C and D is given in several steps by the following:

- We set $\sigma_1 := (1 - \sigma_2^2 - \dots - \sigma_n^2)^{1/2}$, $\tau_1 := (1 - \tau_2^2 - \dots - \tau_n^2)^{1/2}$,
 $a(\sigma, \tau) := -\left(\sum_{j=2}^n \sigma_j \tau_j\right) / (\sigma_1 + \tau_1)$, $n(\sigma, \tau) := \sqrt{1 + a^2(\sigma, \tau)}$.
- $A := \frac{1}{n(\sigma, \tau)} \left(\sigma_1 e_0 + \sum_{j=2}^n \sigma_j e_j + a(\sigma, \tau) e_1 \right)$, and
 $B := \frac{1}{n(\sigma, \tau)} \left(\tau_1 e_1 + \sum_{j=2}^n \tau_j e_j + a(\sigma, \tau) e_0 \right)$.
- $C := \cos(\theta/\sqrt{2})A + \sin(\theta/\sqrt{2})\sigma_1 e_1$, and $D := \cos(\theta/\sqrt{2})B - \sin(\theta/\sqrt{2})\tau_1 e_0$.

Lemma 3.3. [Geometry of V]

1. ψ is a parametrization of a neighborhood of the point (e_0, e_1) in the manifold V with $\psi(0) = (e_0, e_1)$.
2. For $2 \leq j \leq n$,

$$\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \sigma_j}(0) = (e_j, 0), \quad \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \tau_j}(0) = (0, e_j) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \theta}(0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(e_1, -e_0).$$

Therefore the orthonormal basis \mathcal{B}_T (defined in (12)) of the tangent space of V at the point (e_0, e_1) satisfies

$$\mathcal{B}_T = \left(\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial\sigma_2}(0), \dots, \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial\sigma_n}(0), \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial\tau_2}(0), \dots, \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial\tau_n}(0), \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial\theta}(0) \right).$$

3. The curvatures are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2\psi}{\partial\sigma_j^2}(0) &= (-e_0, 0); \quad \frac{\partial^2\psi}{\partial\tau_j^2}(0) = (0, -e_1); \quad \frac{\partial^2\psi}{\partial\sigma_j\partial\tau_j}(0) = -\frac{1}{2}(e_1, e_0) \quad \text{for } 2 \leq j \leq n, \\ \frac{\partial^2\psi}{\partial\sigma_j\partial\sigma_k}(0) &= \frac{\partial^2\psi}{\partial\tau_j\partial\tau_k}(0) = \frac{\partial^2\psi}{\partial\sigma_j\partial\tau_k}(0) = (0, 0) \quad \text{for } 2 \leq j \neq k \leq n, \\ \frac{\partial^2\psi}{\partial\theta^2}(0) &= -\frac{1}{2}(e_0, e_1); \quad \frac{\partial^2\psi}{\partial\sigma_j\partial\theta}(0) = \frac{\partial^2\psi}{\partial\tau_j\partial\theta}(0) = (0, 0) \quad \text{for } 2 \leq j \leq n. \end{aligned}$$

PROOF. If δ is small enough, ψ is well defined and is \mathcal{C}^∞ . It is easy to check that $\langle C, D \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} = 0$, so that $\psi(\sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_n, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_n, \theta) \in V$.

A routine calculation of first derivatives allows to check (2) and also implies that if δ is small enough, ψ is a diffeomorphism from $B(0, \delta)$ onto its image. The computation of second order derivatives is also immediate. \square

Corollary 3.4. *Let us set $L' := L'(e_0, e_1)$ and $L'' := L''(e_0, e_1)$ for the free first order and second order derivatives of L at (e_0, e_1) . Following the notations introduced in the previous Lemma, the following symmetric matrix M is the matrix of the linear operator $\tilde{L}''(e_0, e_1)$ in the orthonormal basis \mathcal{B}_T of the tangent space $T_{(e_0, e_1)}(V)$,*

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} M_{\sigma\sigma} & M_{\sigma\tau} & M_{\sigma\theta} \\ M_{\tau\sigma} & M_{\tau\tau} & M_{\tau\theta} \\ M_{\theta\sigma} & M_{\theta\tau} & M_{\theta\theta} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(2n-1) \times (2n-1)}$$

where for $2 \leq j, k \leq n$,

$$\begin{aligned} (M_{\sigma\sigma})_{jk} = (M_{\sigma\sigma})_{kj} &= \frac{\partial^2(L \circ \psi)}{\partial\sigma_j\partial\sigma_k} = \left\langle L'' \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial\sigma_j}(0), \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial\sigma_k}(0) \right\rangle + \left\langle L', \frac{\partial^2\psi}{\partial\sigma_j\partial\sigma_k}(0) \right\rangle \\ &= \begin{cases} \langle L''(e_j, 0), (e_j, 0) \rangle - \langle L', (e_0, 0) \rangle & \text{for } j = k \\ \langle L''(e_j, 0), (e_k, 0) \rangle & \text{for } j \neq k \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial x_j^2} - \frac{\partial L}{\partial x_0} & \text{for } j = k \\ \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial x_j \partial x_k} & \text{for } j \neq k \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} (M_{\sigma\tau})_{jk} = (M_{\tau\sigma})_{kj} &= \frac{\partial^2(L \circ \psi)}{\partial\sigma_j\partial\tau_k} = \left\langle L'' \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial\sigma_j}(0), \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial\tau_k}(0) \right\rangle + \left\langle L', \frac{\partial^2\psi}{\partial\sigma_j\partial\tau_k}(0) \right\rangle \\ &= \begin{cases} \langle L''(e_j, 0), (0, e_j) \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \langle L', (e_1, e_0) \rangle & \text{for } j = k \\ \langle L''(e_j, 0), (0, e_k) \rangle & \text{for } j \neq k \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial x_j \partial y_j} - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial x_1} + \frac{\partial L}{\partial y_0} \right) & \text{for } j = k \\ \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial x_j \partial y_k} & \text{for } j \neq k \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(M_{\tau\tau})_{jk} = (M_{\tau\tau})_{kj} &= \frac{\partial^2(L \circ \psi)}{\partial\tau_j\partial\tau_k} = \left\langle L'' \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial\tau_j}(0), \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial\tau_k}(0) \right\rangle + \left\langle L', \frac{\partial^2\psi}{\partial\tau_j\partial\tau_k}(0) \right\rangle \\
&= \begin{cases} \langle L''(0, e_j), (0, e_j) \rangle - \langle L', (0, e_1) \rangle & \text{for } j = k \\ \langle L''(0, e_j), (0, e_k) \rangle & \text{for } j \neq k \end{cases} \\
&= \begin{cases} \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial y_j^2} - \frac{\partial L}{\partial y_1} & \text{for } j = k \\ \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial y_j \partial y_k} & \text{for } j \neq k \end{cases},
\end{aligned}$$

for $2 \leq j \leq n$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(M_{\sigma\theta})_{j1} = (M_{\theta\sigma})_{1j} &= \frac{\partial^2(L \circ \psi)}{\partial\sigma_j\partial\theta} = \left\langle L'' \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial\sigma_j}(0), \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial\theta}(0) \right\rangle + \left\langle L', \frac{\partial^2\psi}{\partial\sigma_j\partial\theta}(0) \right\rangle \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \langle L''(e_j, 0), (e_1, -e_0) \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial x_j \partial x_1} - \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial x_j \partial y_0} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(M_{\tau\theta})_{j1} = (M_{\theta\tau})_{1j} &= \frac{\partial^2(L \circ \psi)}{\partial\tau_j\partial\theta} = \left\langle L'' \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial\tau_j}(0), \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial\theta}(0) \right\rangle + \left\langle L', \frac{\partial^2\psi}{\partial\tau_j\partial\theta}(0) \right\rangle \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \langle L''(0, e_j), (e_1, -e_0) \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial y_j \partial x_1} - \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial y_j \partial y_0} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

and finally

$$\begin{aligned}
M_{\theta\theta} &= \frac{\partial^2(L \circ \psi)}{\partial\theta^2} = \left\langle L'' \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial\theta}(0), \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial\theta}(0) \right\rangle + \left\langle L', \frac{\partial^2\psi}{\partial\theta^2}(0) \right\rangle \\
&= \frac{1}{2} (\langle L''(e_1, -e_0), (e_1, -e_0) \rangle - \langle L', (e_0, e_1) \rangle) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial x_1^2} - 2 \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial x_1 \partial y_0} + \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial y_0^2} - \frac{\partial L}{\partial x_0} - \frac{\partial L}{\partial y_1} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

References

- [1] J.-M. Azaïs and M. Wschebor. *Level sets and extrema of random processes and fields*. John Wiley and Sons. Forthcoming.
- [2] C. Beltrán and L.M. Pardo. On Smale's 17 problem: a probabilistic positive solution. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 8:1–43, 2008.
- [3] C. Beltrán and M. Shub. Complexity of Bézout's theorem VII: distance estimates in the condition metric. To appear at *Found. Comput. Math.*
- [4] L. Blum, F. Cucker, M. Shub, and S. Smale. *Complexity and Real Computation*. Springer-Verlag, 1998.
- [5] C.E. Borges and L.M. Pardo. On the probability distribution of data at points in real complete intersection varieties. *J. Compl.*, 24:492–523, 2008.
- [6] D. Cheung and F. Cucker. Probabilistic analysis of condition numbers for linear programming. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 114:55–67, 2002.

- [7] D. Cheung and F. Cucker. Solving linear programs with finite precision: I. Condition numbers and random programs. *Math. Program.*, 99:175–196, 2004.
- [8] D. Cheung, F. Cucker, and R. Hauser. Tail decay and moment estimates of a condition number for random linear conic systems. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 15:1237–1261, 2005.
- [9] F. Cucker, T. Krick, G. Malajovich, and M. Wschebor. A numerical algorithm for zero counting. I: Complexity and accuracy. *J. Compl.*, 24:582–605, 2008.
- [10] F. Cucker and S. Smale. Complexity estimates depending on condition and round-off error. *Journal of the ACM*, 46:113–184, 1999.
- [11] F. Cucker and M. Wschebor. On the expected condition number of linear programming problems. *Numer. Math.*, 94:419–478, 2003.
- [12] A. Dembo and O. Zeitouni. *Large Deviations Techniques and Applications*. Springer-Verlag, 2 edition, 1998.
- [13] J. Demmel. On condition numbers and the distance to the nearest ill-posed problem. *Numer. Math.*, 51:251–289, 1987.
- [14] J. Demmel. The probability that a numerical analysis problem is difficult. *Math. Comp.*, 50:449–480, 1988.
- [15] A. Edelman. Eigenvalues and condition numbers of random matrices. *SIAM J. of Matrix Anal. and Applic.*, 9:543–556, 1988.
- [16] A. Edelman. *Eigenvalues and Condition Numbers of Random Matrices*. Ph. D. Thesis, M.I.T., 1989.
- [17] R.M. Freund and J.R. Vera. Some characterizations and properties of the “distance to ill-posedness” and the condition measure of a conic linear system. *Math. Program.*, 86:225–260, 1999.
- [18] R. Hauser and T. Müller. Conditioning of random conic systems under a general family of input distributions. To appear at *Found. Comput. Math.*
- [19] E. Kostlan. Random polynomials and the statistical fundamental theorem of algebra. Unpublished, 1987.
- [20] G. Malajovich and J. M. Rojas. High probability analysis of the condition number of sparse polynomial systems. *Theoret. Comp. Sci.*, 315:524–555, 2004.
- [21] S. Rump. Ill-conditioned matrices are componentwise near to singularity. *SIAM Review*, 41:102–112, 1999.
- [22] M. Shub. Complexity of Bézout’s theorem VI: geodesics in the condition (number) metric. To appear at *Found. Comput. Math.*
- [23] M. Shub and S. Smale. Complexity of Bézout’s theorem I: geometric aspects. *Journal of the Amer. Math. Soc.*, 6:459–501, 1993.
- [24] M. Shub and S. Smale. Complexity of Bézout’s theorem II: volumes and probabilities. In F. Eyssette and A. Galligo, editors, *Computational Algebraic Geometry*, volume 109 of *Progress in Mathematics*, pages 267–285. Birkhäuser, 1993.
- [25] M. Shub and S. Smale. Complexity of Bézout’s theorem III: condition number and packing. *Journal of Complexity*, 9:4–14, 1993.
- [26] M. Shub and S. Smale. Complexity of Bézout’s theorem V: polynomial time. *Theoret. Comp. Sci.*, 133:141–164, 1994.
- [27] M. Shub and S. Smale. Complexity of Bézout’s theorem IV: probability of success; extensions. *SIAM J. of Numer. Anal.*, 33:128–148, 1996.
- [28] S. Smale. On the efficiency of algorithms of analysis. *Bulletin of the Amer. Math. Soc.*, 13:87–121, 1985.

- [29] S. Smale. Complexity theory and numerical analysis. In A. Iserles, editor, *Acta Numerica*, pages 523–551. Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- [30] M.J. Todd, L. Tunçel, and Y. Ye. Characterizations, bounds and probabilistic analysis of two complexity measures for linear programming problems. *Math. Program.*, 90:59–69, 2001.
- [31] L.N. Trefethen and D. Bau III. *Numerical Linear Algebra*. SIAM, 1997.
- [32] A.M. Turing. Rounding-off errors in matrix processes. *Quart. J. Mech. Appl. Math.*, 1:287–308, 1948.
- [33] J. von Neumann and H.H. Goldstine. Numerical inverting matrices of high order. *Bulletin of the Amer. Math. Soc.*, 53:1021–1099, 1947.
- [34] J. Wilkinson. Note on matrices with a very ill-conditioned eigenproblem. *Numer. Math.*, 19:176–178, 1972.