

PLMES AND DISJUNCTIVE DECOMPOSITIONS FOR BILEVEL OPTIMIZATION

JIAWANG NIE, JANE J. YE, AND SUHAN ZHONG

ABSTRACT. This paper studies bilevel polynomial optimization in which lower level constraining functions depend linearly on lower level variables. We show that such a bilevel program can be reformulated as a disjunctive program using partial Lagrange multiplier expressions (PLMEs). An advantage of this approach is that branch problems of the disjunctive program are easier to solve. In particular, since the PLME can be easily obtained, these branch problems can be efficiently solved by polynomial optimization techniques. Solving each branch problem either returns infeasibility or gives a candidate local or global optimizer for the original bilevel optimization. We give necessary and sufficient conditions for these candidates to be global optimizers, and sufficient conditions for the local optimality. Numerical experiments are also presented to show the efficiency of the method.

1. INTRODUCTION

A typical bilevel optimization problem (BOP) is in the form

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n, y \in \mathbb{R}^p} & F(x, y) \\ \text{s.t.} & h_i(x, y) = 0 \ (i \in \mathcal{E}_1), \\ & h_i(x, y) \geq 0 \ (i \in \mathcal{I}_1), \\ & y \in S(x), \end{cases}$$

where $S(x)$ is the set of global optimizer(s) of the lower level problem

$$(P_x) \quad \begin{cases} \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^p} & f(x, z) \\ \text{s.t.} & g_j(x, z) = 0 \ (j \in \mathcal{E}_2), \\ & g_j(x, z) \geq 0 \ (j \in \mathcal{I}_2). \end{cases}$$

Here $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{I}_2$ are finite (or empty) index sets. We call problem (1.1) a bilevel polynomial optimization problem (BPOP) if all F, f, h_i, g_j are polynomials. The functions F and h_i are called the upper level objective function and constraining functions respectively, while f and g_j are the lower level objective function and constraining functions respectively.

For convenience, denote the feasible set of the lower level problem (P_x) as

$$Z(x) := \left\{ z \in \mathbb{R}^p \mid \begin{array}{l} g_j(x, z) = 0 \ (j \in \mathcal{E}_2), \\ g_j(x, z) \geq 0 \ (j \in \mathcal{I}_2) \end{array} \right\},$$

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 90C23, 65K05, 90C33.

Key words and phrases. PLME, disjunctive decomposition, bilevel optimization, Lagrange multiplier, feasible extension.

the set containing both the upper and the lower level constraints as

$$\mathcal{U} := \left\{ (x, y) \mid \begin{array}{l} h_i(x, y) = 0 \ (i \in \mathcal{E}_1), \ g_j(x, y) = 0 \ (j \in \mathcal{E}_2) \\ h_i(x, y) \geq 0 \ (i \in \mathcal{I}_1), \ g_j(x, y) \geq 0 \ (j \in \mathcal{I}_2) \end{array} \right\},$$

and the feasible set of (1.1) as

$$\mathcal{F} := \{(x, y) \in \mathcal{U} : y \in S(x)\}.$$

Throughout the paper we assume that the solution set $S(x)$ is nonempty for all feasible x satisfying $(x, y) \in \mathcal{U}$ for some y .

Bilevel optimization originated from economics as Stackelberg games [40, 57]. It has been successfully applied to many application areas, and more recently to data science and machine learning (see e.g., [18, 20, 30, 64]). We refer to the monographs [5, 12, 15, 55], the surveys [11, 16] and the references within for more applications and the recent advances in related topics.

To study a bilevel optimization problem, one usually transform it into a single-level optimization problem. However, the equivalent single-level program is still very challenging to solve, since the usual constraint qualifications always fail at every point of the feasible region, and implicit functions like the value function may be needed in the reformulation of the bilevel program ([37, 63]). Despite these difficulties, there are still tremendous developments on constraint qualifications and optimality conditions for bilevel optimization, see as in [2, 16, 29, 39, 62] and the references within.

It is notoriously hard to design an efficient and reliable algorithm to solve bilevel optimization problems. Even when all defining functions are linear, the computational complexity is already NP-hard [7]. In most early works in the literature, bilevel programs are tackled by replacing the lower level program with its first order optimality condition. When the lower level constraints include inequality constraints, the transformed problem becomes a so-called mathematical program with equilibrium constraints (MPEC) [38, 53]. But this approach is only reliably applicable if the lower level problem is smooth and convex. Moreover, when the lower level multipliers are not unique, the resulting optimization usually has different local optimizers from the original ones [13, 33]. In recent years, some numerical algorithms for bilevel programs that are not reformulated as MPECs are proposed in [20, 33, 37, 41, 51, 60, 61, 64].

In this paper, we mainly focus on solving bilevel polynomial optimization whose lower level constraining functions are linear in lower level variables. Polynomial optimization has been extensively studied [31, 32, 34, 46, 50]. A single level polynomial optimization problem can be solved globally by the Lasserre type Moment-SOS relaxations. Recently, these techniques have been used to design numerical algorithms for globally solving BPOPs in [28, 48, 49].

1.1. Lagrange multiplier expression approach. The bilevel program (1.1) can be rewritten as the following single-level optimization problem:

$$\begin{cases} \min_{(x, y) \in \mathcal{U}} & F(x, y) \\ \text{s.t.} & f(x, z) - f(x, y) \geq 0 \quad \forall z \in Z(x). \end{cases}$$

Suppose the lower level problem satisfies a constraint qualification. Then every $(x, y) \in \mathcal{F}$ satisfies the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions:

$$(1.2) \quad \exists \lambda \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \begin{cases} \nabla_z f(x, y) - \nabla_z g(x, y)^T \lambda = 0, \\ 0 \leq g_j(x, y) \perp \lambda_j \geq 0 \quad (j \in \mathcal{I}_2), \end{cases}$$

where \perp denotes the perpendicular relation, and the λ_j 's are Lagrange multipliers. Following the KKT system (1.2), we denote the set of KKT points

$$\mathcal{K} := \left\{ (x, y) \in \mathcal{U} \mid \exists \lambda \text{ s.t.} \quad \begin{cases} \nabla_z f(x, y) - \nabla_z g(x, y)^T \lambda = 0, \\ 0 \leq g_j(x, y) \perp \lambda_j \geq 0 \quad (j \in \mathcal{I}_2) \end{cases} \right\}.$$

Suppose there is a tuple of rational functions $\lambda(x, y)$ such that $(x, y, \lambda(x, y))$ satisfies (1.2) for every KKT point $(x, y) \in \mathcal{K}$. Then the strategy recently proposed in [49] can be used to design an algorithm as follows. Since under a constraint qualification $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{K}$, (1.1) can be reformulated as

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{cases} \min_{(x, y) \in \mathcal{F}} & F(x, y) \\ \text{s.t.} & \nabla_z f(x, y) - \nabla_z g(x, y)^T \lambda(x, y) = 0, \\ & 0 \leq g_j(x, y) \perp \lambda_j(x, y) \geq 0 \quad (j \in \mathcal{I}_2), \end{cases}$$

where $\lambda(x, y)$ is called a *Lagrange multiplier expression* (LME). Replacing \mathcal{F} by the larger set \mathcal{U} , (1.3) is relaxed to the following optimization problem:

$$(1.4) \quad \begin{cases} \min_{(x, y) \in \mathcal{U}} & F(x, y) \\ \text{s.t.} & \nabla_z f(x, y) - \nabla_z g(x, y)^T \lambda(x, y) = 0, \\ & 0 \leq g_j(x, y) \perp \lambda_j(x, y) \geq 0 \quad (j \in \mathcal{I}_2). \end{cases}$$

Since problem (1.4) is a one-level rational optimization problem, it can be solved globally with Moment-SOS relaxations. Suppose (\hat{x}, \hat{y}) is the global minimizer of problem (1.4). If $\hat{y} \in S(\hat{x})$, then it is also the global optimizer of (1.1). Otherwise, one can find $\hat{z} \in Z(\hat{x})$ such that $f(\hat{x}, \hat{z}) < f(\hat{x}, \hat{y})$. Assume there is a vector-valued function $q(x, y)$ such that

$$(1.5) \quad q(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) = \hat{z}, \quad \text{and} \quad q(x, y) \in Z(x) \quad \forall (x, y) \in \mathcal{K}.$$

Then we can get a tighter relaxation of (1.4) by adding the extra constraint

$$f(x, y) - f(x, q(x, y)) \geq 0.$$

Since (\hat{x}, \hat{y}) does not satisfy the above constraint, the updated relaxation must have a different global optimizer. Assuming q in (1.5) always exists in computation, we can repeat this process for infinite times. It is expected that computed candidate solutions converge to the global optimizer of (1.1). This approach was applied to solve BPOPs and general Nash equilibrium problems in recent work [47, 49]. However, there are still some related problems that are not fully solved, both in theory and in computation. For instance, the rational tuple $\lambda(x, y)$ typically has very complicated expressions when the lower level problem has a relatively large number of constraints, i.e., $m := |\mathcal{E}_2 \cup \mathcal{I}_2| \gg p$. How to find more convenient expressions of $\lambda(x, y)$? In addition, the existence of q in (1.5) is usually unclear for general polynomial constraints, or even for general linear constraints. How to efficiently detect its existence and further compute its expression? These issues are addressed in this paper.

1.2. Disjunctive decomposition. Disjunctive programming approach was introduced by Balas [3] to represent mixed integer programming problems. By the disjunctive programming approach, the original optimization problem is formulated equivalently as an optimization problem in which a subset of constraints is expressed through disjunctions (sets of constraints of which at least one must be true). The advantage of the disjunctive programming approach is that one may solve the original problem by solving some branches of the original problem, and these branches are typically much easier to solve than the original problem.

We can represent the bilevel program as a disjunctive program. Let

$$t := \max \{ \text{rank } \nabla_z g(x, y) : (x, y) \in \mathcal{U} \}.$$

For convenience of notation, we write the label set as

$$\mathcal{E}_2 \cup \mathcal{I}_2 = [m] := \{1, \dots, m\}.$$

Because $\nabla_z g(x, y)$ has m rows and p columns, it is clear that $t \leq \min\{m, p\}$. We denote the set of all subsets of $[m]$ with cardinality t by

$$\mathcal{P}_m^t := \{J \subseteq [m] : |J| = t\}.$$

For each KKT point $(x, y) \in \mathcal{K}$, by Carathéodory's Theorem (see e.g., [1, Lemma 1]), since the number of linearly independent gradient vectors $\nabla_z g_j(x, y)$ is not larger than t , one can find an index set $J \in \mathcal{P}_m^t$ and a multiplier λ such that

$$(1.6) \quad \begin{cases} \nabla_z f(x, y) - \nabla_z g(x, y)^T \lambda = 0, \lambda_j = 0 \ (j \notin J), \\ 0 \leq g_j(x, y) \perp \lambda_j(x, y) \geq 0 \ (j \in \mathcal{I}_2 \cap J). \end{cases}$$

Denote the subset of the KKT points corresponding to the set J as

$$\mathcal{K}_J := \{(x, y) \in \mathcal{U} : \exists \lambda \text{ satisfying (1.6)}\}.$$

Then it is easy to see that

$$\mathcal{K} = \bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{P}_m^t} \mathcal{K}_J.$$

Hence \mathcal{K} is a disjunctive set and \mathcal{K}_J is a piece of \mathcal{K} . Since $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{K}$, the bilevel program (1.1) can be reformulated equivalently as follows:

$$(1.7) \quad (DP) : \begin{cases} \min & F(x, y) \\ \text{s.t.} & (x, y) \in \bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{P}_m^t} \mathcal{K}_J, \quad y \in S(x). \end{cases}$$

We remark that in the original paper of Balas and most related work (see e.g. [36] for the survey), each piece of the disjunctive set in a disjunctive program is a convex polyhedral set. While in [35, 54], the pieces can be non-polyhedral and even nonconvex. In this article, we simply call the above problem a disjunctive program even the piece \mathcal{K}_J is in general not a convex polyhedral set. For any given $J \in \mathcal{P}_m^t$, we call the following problem a branch problem of (DP) corresponding to J :

$$(B_J) : \begin{cases} \min & F(x, y) \\ \text{s.t.} & (x, y) \in \mathcal{K}_J, \quad y \in S(x). \end{cases}$$

How do we solve the problem (DP)? If we can solve each branch problem (B_J) for all $J \in \mathcal{P}_m^t$, then obviously the minimal value of (B_J) among all $J \in \mathcal{P}_m^t$ will be the minimal value of the original problem (DP). Moreover, we can use the active set for the inequality constraints to obtain local optimality of the problem (DP) by checking the optimality of all adjacent pieces. Is a branch problem (B_J) easier to solve than the original problem (DP)? The answer is positive since the gradient

vectors in (B_J) has t rows, and t is less than m . In particular, if we assume that the lower level constraint functions are linear in the lower level variables, i.e.,

$$(1.8) \quad g_j(x, z) = a_j(x)^T z - b_j(x), \quad \text{for } j \in \mathcal{E}_2 \cup \mathcal{I}_2,$$

then it is much easier to find a simpler Lagrange multiplier expression. Hence the Lagrange multiplier expression approach proposed in [49] can be used to solve each branch (B_J) .

Contributions. Our main contributions are as follows.

- We propose the disjunctive program reformulation as in (1.7) to solve bilevel programs. We remark that our disjunctive program is not enumerating active sets for the lower level optimization. This is because some constraints for the label set J may still be inactive. To the best of our knowledge, this novel approach has never been used to solve bilevel optimization before.
- We propose to solve BPOPs with linear lower level constraints as in (1.8) by the disjunctive decomposition approach combined with the Lagrange multiplier expression approach.
- We give convenient sufficient conditions to verify the local optimality, and sufficient and necessary conditions for verifying global optimality of BPOPs.

Notation. The following notation is used throughout the paper. The symbol \mathbb{N} (resp., \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{R}_+) denotes the set of nonnegative integers (resp., real numbers, nonnegative real numbers). The \mathbb{R}^n denotes the n -dimensional Euclidean space and the \mathbb{R}_+^n denotes the nonnegative orthant of \mathbb{R}^n . For an integer $n > 0$, $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$. For $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $(t)_+ := \max\{t, 0\}$. For a function f , ∇f denotes its total gradient and $\nabla_z f$ denotes its partial gradient with respect to z . For a vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\|u\|$ denotes the standard Euclidean norm. The $e := (1, \dots, 1)^T$ denotes the vector of all ones and each e_i denotes the unit vector of all zeros but the i th entry being one. The symbol $0_{n_1 \times n_2}$ denotes the zero matrix of dimension $n_1 \times n_2$, where the subscript may be ignored if the dimension is clear. A symmetric matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is said to be positive semidefinite or psd if $x^T A x \geq 0$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, denoted as $A \succeq 0$. For a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and a scalar $\rho > 0$, we denote the closed ball centred at x with radius ρ by $B_\rho(x)$. For a tuple of functions or real numbers $a = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$, we denote $a_{i:j} := (a_i, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_j)$ for every $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$. For a matrix A , we use $\|A\|_F$ to denote its Frobenius norm, and use $A_{i_1, \dots, i_r}^{j_1, \dots, j_r}$ to denote the $r \times r$ submatrix of A with rows i_1, \dots, i_r and columns j_1, \dots, j_r .

The rest of paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce partial Lagrange multiplier expressions and decomposed KKT system. In Section 3, we propose the disjunctive decomposition of BPOPs. In Section 4, we propose semidefinite algorithms to solve BPOPs. The constructions of feasible extensions, as a key component of the algorithms, are studied in Section 5. The numerical examples are presented in Section 6.

2. PLMES AND THE KKT SYSTEM

We assume all functions in (1.1) are polynomials and the lower level optimization has only linear constraints, i.e., (1.8) holds. For convenience, denote

$$A_{\text{eq}}(x) := (a_j(x)^T)_{j \in \mathcal{E}_2}, \quad A_{\text{in}}(x) := (a_j(x)^T)_{j \in \mathcal{I}_2}, \quad A(x) := \begin{bmatrix} A_{\text{eq}}(x) \\ A_{\text{in}}(x) \end{bmatrix}.$$

$$b_{\text{eq}}(x) := (b_j(x))_{j \in \mathcal{E}_2}, \quad b_{\text{in}}(x) := (b_j(x))_{j \in \mathcal{I}_2}.$$

The lower level optimization then reads as

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{cases} \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^p} & f(x, z) \\ \text{s.t.} & A_{\text{eq}}(x)z = b_{\text{eq}}(x), \\ & A_{\text{in}}(x)z \geq b_{\text{in}}(x). \end{cases}$$

Its Lagrange multiplier vector is labelled as

$$\lambda_{\text{eq}} := (\lambda_j)_{j \in \mathcal{E}_2}, \quad \lambda_{\text{in}} := (\lambda_j)_{j \in \mathcal{I}_2}, \quad \lambda := (\lambda_j)_{j \in \mathcal{E}_2 \cup \mathcal{I}_2}.$$

Consider the set of KKT points

$$\mathcal{K} := \left\{ (x, y) \in \mathcal{U} \mid \begin{array}{l} \exists \lambda \text{ s.t. } \nabla_z f(x, y) - A(x)^T \lambda = 0, \\ 0 \leq (A_{\text{in}}(x))^T y - b_{\text{in}}(x) \perp \lambda_{\text{in}} \geq 0 \end{array} \right\}.$$

Since the constraining functions are affine, KKT conditions always hold for the lower level optimization and hence $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{K}$.

We would like to remark that rational LMEs $\lambda(x, y)$ always exist. This is shown in [47, 49]. However, the rational LMEs may be complicated, especially when there are more constraints than the number of decision variables. We see the following example.

Example 2.1. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Consider the lower level optimization problem

$$\begin{cases} \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^2} & x(z_1 - z_2) \\ \text{s.t.} & -5z_1 - 4z_2 \geq 4x - 12, \\ & 5z_1 - 4z_2 \geq 4 - 4x, \\ & 4z_1 - 5z_2 \geq 4x - 4, \\ & -4z_1 - 5z_2 \geq 4x + 4. \end{cases}$$

The matrix A does not have full row rank. By using the procedures as in [49], we can find the following rational LMEs:

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{5x(y_1 - y_2)(4x + 4 - 4y_1 - 5y_2)}{(32x - 24)(9y_2 - 36x + 28)}, \quad \lambda_2 = 9\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 + 9\lambda_4, \\ \lambda_3 = \frac{4(x - \lambda_4)(5y_1 - 4y_2 + 4x - 4)}{(41y_2 + 164x - 164)}, \quad \lambda_4 = \frac{x(y_2 - y_1)(12 - 5y_1 - 4y_2 - 4x)}{(10x - 8)(9y_2 - 36x + 28)}.$$

Interestingly, LMEs can be simplified if we know some Lagrange multipliers are zeros in advance. For the above optimization, the decision variable z has length 2 but there are 4 linear inequality constraints. For the optimizer, there always exists a Lagrange multiplier vector whose two entries are zeros. For instance, for the case that $\lambda_3 = \lambda_4 = 0$, the KKT system can be simplified as

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} x + 5\lambda_1 - 5\lambda_2 = 0, \\ -x + 4\lambda_1 + 4\lambda_2 = 0, \\ \lambda_3 = 0, \quad \lambda_4 = 0, \end{array} \right\} \Rightarrow \lambda = \frac{1}{40} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ 9x \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

In the above, the right hand side LME has only linear polynomials, which is much simpler than the previous one.

2.1. Partial Lagrange multiplier expressions. Example 2.1 motivates us to consider partial Lagrange multiplier expressions. Recall that $[m] = \mathcal{E}_2 \cup \mathcal{I}_2$ and

$$t := \max\{\text{rank } A(x) : (x, y) \in \mathcal{U}\}.$$

In particular, if $A(x) \equiv A$ is a constant matrix, then $t = \text{rank } A$.

For a subset $J = \{j_1, \dots, j_t\} \subseteq [m]$, let $A_J(x)$ denote the submatrix of $A(x)$ with rows labeled in J , i.e.,

$$A_J(x)^T = [a_{j_1}(x) \quad a_{j_2}(x) \quad \cdots \quad a_{j_t}(x)].$$

Also denote the subvector of the Lagrange multiplier

$$\lambda_J = [\lambda_{j_1} \quad \cdots \quad \lambda_{j_t}]^T.$$

We consider the Lagrange multiplier λ such that $\lambda_j = 0$ for $j \notin J$.

Definition 2.2. For a subset $J = \{j_1, \dots, j_t\}$, a function

$$\psi(x, y) = (\psi_{j_1}(x, y), \dots, \psi_{j_t}(x, y))$$

is called a partial Lagrange multiplier expression (PLME) for (2.1) if $A_J(x)^T \psi = \nabla_z f(x, y)$ for all $(x, y) \in \mathcal{K}_J$. For such a case, we write $\lambda_{j_i}(x, y) := \psi_{j_i}(x, y)$ and $\lambda_J(x, y) := \psi(x, y)$.

The function ψ satisfying Definition 2.2 always exists, as shown in [47, 49]. In particular, when $p = t$ and $A_J(x)$ is invertible, we directly have

$$(2.2) \quad \lambda_J(x, y) = A_J(x)^{-T} \nabla_z f(x, y).$$

Example 2.3. In Example 2.1, the KKT equation is

$$\underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} -5 & 5 & 4 & -4 \\ -4 & -4 & -5 & -5 \end{bmatrix}}_{A^T} \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 \\ \lambda_2 \\ \lambda_3 \\ \lambda_4 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} x \\ -x \end{bmatrix}}_{\nabla_z f}.$$

We have $m = 4$ and $p = t = 2$. By (2.2), for $J \in \mathcal{P}_4^2$, the PLMEs are

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\{1,2\}}(x, y) &= \frac{(x, 9x)}{40}, & \lambda_{\{1,3\}}(x, y) &= \frac{(-x, 9x)}{41}, \\ \lambda_{\{1,4\}}(x, y) &= (-x, x), & \lambda_{\{2,3\}}(x, y) &= \frac{(x, x)}{9}, \\ \lambda_{\{2,4\}}(x, y) &= \frac{(x, 9x)}{41}, & \lambda_{\{3,4\}}(x, y) &= \frac{(9x, -x)}{40}. \end{aligned}$$

Compared with Example 2.1, these PLMEs are much more computationally efficient than the original LMEs.

Note that as shown in the following example, when $A_J(x)$ is singular at some point x , the denominator of $\lambda_J(x, y)$ as in (2.2) may achieve the zero value at x .

Example 2.4. For $x \in \mathbb{R}$, consider the lower level optimization problem

$$\begin{cases} \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^2} & (1-x)z_1 + xz_2 \\ \text{s.t.} & xz_1 - z_2 = 0, \\ & z_2 - x = 0, \\ & z_1 + z_2 - x \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

For fixed x , this is a linear program in z , so the KKT system is necessary and sufficient for optimality, i.e., $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{F}$. Note $p = t = 2$. For $J = \{1, 2\}$, we have the PLME:

$$\lambda_{\{1,2\}}(x, y) = \left(\underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} x & -1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}}_{A_{\{1,2\}}} \right)^{-T} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 1-x \\ x \end{bmatrix}}_{\nabla_z f} = \frac{1}{x} \begin{bmatrix} 1-x \\ 1-x+x^2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The denominator of $\lambda_{\{1,2\}}(x, y)$ is equal to zero at the KKT point $(x, y) = (0, 0, 0)$. However, we can handle this issue by cancelling the denominator:

$$x [\nabla_z f(x, y) - A_{\{1,2\}}(x)^T \lambda_{\{1,2\}}(x, y)] = 0.$$

Then the origin $(x, y) = (0, 0, 0)$ is a solution to the above.

It is convenient to get PLMEs. We assume the PLME as in Definition 2.2 is given as follows.

Assumption 2.5. *In Definition 2.2 with $J = \{j_1, \dots, j_t\}$, there exist nonzero polynomials $d_{j_1}(x, y), \dots, d_{j_t}(x, y)$ which are nonnegative on \mathcal{K} , and there exist polynomials $\phi_{j_1}(x, y), \dots, \phi_{j_t}(x, y)$ such that*

$$(2.3) \quad \lambda_{j_i}(x, y) d_{j_i}(x, y) = \phi_{j_i}(x, y), \quad i = 1, \dots, t.$$

2.2. Decomposition of the KKT system. Let $D_J(x, y)$ denote the least common multiple of $d_{j_1}(x, y), \dots, d_{j_t}(x, y)$ in (2.3). For the PLME $\lambda_J(x, y)$, we denote the set

$$(2.4) \quad \mathcal{W}_J := \left\{ (x, y) \in \mathcal{U} \left| \begin{array}{l} D_J(x, y) (\nabla_z f(x, y) - A_J(x)^T \lambda_J(x, y)) = 0, \\ 0 \leq (a_j(x)^T y - b_j(x)) \perp \lambda_j(x, y) d_j(x, y) \geq 0 \\ \text{for each } j \in J \cap \mathcal{I}_2 \end{array} \right. \right\}.$$

Clearly, $\mathcal{K}_J \subseteq \mathcal{W}_J$. If each $d_{j_i}(x, y)$ is positive on \mathcal{U} , then $\mathcal{W}_J = \mathcal{K}_J$. The KKT set \mathcal{K} can be expressed through \mathcal{W}_J as follows.

Theorem 2.6. *Suppose Assumption 2.5 holds for all $J \in \mathcal{P}_m^t$. Then*

$$(2.5) \quad \mathcal{K} \subseteq \bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{P}_m^t} \mathcal{W}_J,$$

and if each $d_{j_i}(x, y)$ is positive on \mathcal{U} , then

$$(2.6) \quad \mathcal{K} = \bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{P}_m^t} \mathcal{W}_J.$$

Moreover, if $\text{rank } A(x) \equiv t$ on \mathcal{U} and each $d_{j_i}(x, y) > 0$ on \mathcal{U} , then

$$(2.7) \quad \mathcal{K} = \bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{P}_m^+} \mathcal{W}_J,$$

where $\mathcal{P}_m^+ := \{J \in \mathcal{P}_m^t : \text{rank } A_J(u) = t \text{ for some } (u, v) \in \mathcal{U}\}$.

Proof. Under Assumption 2.5, we know $\mathcal{K}_J \subseteq \mathcal{W}_J$. By Carathéodory's Theorem, every point in \mathcal{K} is contained in \mathcal{K}_J for some $J \in \mathcal{P}_m^t$, so the inclusion (2.5) holds. When each $d_{j_i}(x, y)$ is positive on \mathcal{U} , we have $\mathcal{W}_J = \mathcal{K}_J$ so the inclusion in (2.5) becomes the equality (2.6).

Next, suppose that the $\text{rank } A(x) = t$ for all $(x, y) \in \mathcal{U}$ and each $d_{j_i}(x, y)$ is positive on \mathcal{U} . Then (2.6) holds. So \mathcal{K} contains the right hand side union in (2.7).

Hence it suffices to show that \mathcal{K} is contained in the right hand side union. Choose an arbitrary pair $(u, v) \in \mathcal{K}$. Denote the active label set

$$I := I(u, v) = \{j \in \mathcal{E}_2 \cup \mathcal{I}_2 : a_j(u)^T v - b_j(u) = 0\}.$$

Let $r := \text{rank } A_I(u)$, then $r \leq t$. Since $(u, v) \in \mathcal{K}$, there exists a Lagrange multiplier vector $\lambda = (\lambda_j)_{j \in I}$ such that

$$\nabla_z f(u, v) = A_I(u)^T \lambda, \quad \lambda_j \geq 0 (j \in I \cap \mathcal{I}_2).$$

By Carathéodory's Theorem, there exist a subset $J_0 \subseteq I$ with cardinality r and a Lagrange multiplier vector $\mu = (\mu_j)_{j \in J_0}$ such that

$$\nabla_z f(u, v) = A_{J_0}(u)^T \mu, \quad \mu_j \geq 0 (j \in J_0 \cap \mathcal{I}_2), \quad \text{rank } A_{J_0}(u) = r.$$

Since $r \leq t$ and $\text{rank } A(u) = t$, we can enlarge J_0 to a bigger set $J \in \mathcal{P}_m^t$ such that $\text{rank } A_J(u) = t$. If we let $\mu_j = 0$ for $j \in J \setminus J_0$, then

$$\nabla_z f(u, v) = A_J(u)^T \mu, \quad \mu_j \geq 0 (j \in J \cap \mathcal{I}_2).$$

This means that \mathcal{K} is contained in the right hand side union, so the equality (2.7) holds under the given assumptions. \square

Theorem 2.6 implies the following.

Corollary 2.7. *Assume $A(x) \equiv A$ is constant and has the rank t , then*

$$\mathcal{K} = \bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{P}_m^+} \mathcal{W}_J,$$

where $\mathcal{P}_m^+ := \{J \in \mathcal{P}_m^t : \text{rank } A_J = t\}$.

The decomposition in Theorem 2.6 is illustrated in the following example.

Example 2.8. Consider the BPOP

$$(2.8) \quad \begin{cases} \min_{x, y \in \mathbb{R}} & (x - 1.5)^2 + y^2 \\ \text{s.t.} & x \geq 0, 2y + 1 \geq 0, \quad y \in S(x), \end{cases}$$

where $S(x)$ is the set of optimizer(s) for

$$\begin{cases} \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}} & (z - x)^2 \\ \text{s.t.} & (z + 1, 1 - z, 4 - 2x - z, 3x - 1 - z) \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

Because the lower level optimization problem has a convex objective and linear constraints, the feasible set $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{K}$ for (2.8). In addition, each $\mathcal{K}_{\{j\}} = \mathcal{W}_{\{j\}}$ since A is a constant matrix. By solving the lower level problem, we get the expression of \mathcal{K} as follows.

$$\begin{array}{l} x \in \quad \underline{[\frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{2}], [\frac{1}{2}, 1], [1, \frac{3}{2}], [\frac{2}{3}, \frac{9}{4}]}; \\ y = \quad \underline{3x - 1, \quad x, \quad 1, \quad 4 - 2x.} \end{array}$$

On the other hand, by (2.2), one can easily determine that

$$\lambda_{\{1\}}(x, y) = 2(y - x), \quad \lambda_{\{j\}}(x, y) = -2(y - x) \text{ for } j = 2, 3, 4.$$

In Figure 1, we plot these KKT sets. It is obvious that $\mathcal{K} = \bigcup_{j=1}^4 \mathcal{K}_{\{j\}}$.




FIGURE 1. The PLME decomposition for the KKT set of Example 2.8

3. THE DISJUNCTIVE DECOMPOSITION

This section gives the disjunctive decomposition of the BPOP (1.1) with the lower level optimization as in (2.1).

For a given subset $J \in \mathcal{P}_m^t$, consider the branch problem

$$(3.1) \quad (P_J) : \begin{cases} \min & F(x, y) \\ \text{s.t.} & (x, y) \in \mathcal{W}_J, \quad y \in S(x). \end{cases}$$

We denote by ϑ_J the optimal value of (P_J) , and by \mathcal{F}_J its feasible region. Under Assumption 2.5, by (2.5), the BPOP (1.1) can be reformulated equivalently as the following disjunctive program

$$(DP) : \begin{cases} \min & F(x, y) \\ \text{s.t.} & (x, y) \in \bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{P}_m^t} \mathcal{W}_J, \quad y \in S(x), \end{cases}$$

which is also equivalent to (1.7). Problem (P_J) is a branch of the disjunctive program (DP) . To solve BPOPs using disjunctive programming approach has obvious computational advantages. First, rational LMEs for \mathcal{W}_J are easier to find and they usually have much simpler expressions than the ones for \mathcal{K} . This can be observed from the comparison between Examples 2.1 and 2.3. Second, by solving some branches (P_J) , we may obtain local or even global optimizers for the original BPOPs. We now explain the second advantages. For $(x, y) \in \mathcal{U}$, denote the active set

$$\mathcal{A}(x, y) := \{j \in [m] : a_j(x)^T y = b_j(x)\}.$$

We summarize following results on optimality verification.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose Assumption 2.5 holds for each $J \in \mathcal{P}_m^t$. Let (u_J, v_J) be an optimal solution of (P_J) . Then (u_J, v_J) is a local minimizer of (1.1) if one of the following conditions hold:*

- (i) $J \supseteq \mathcal{A}(u_J, v_J)$;
- (ii) $F(u_J, v_J) \leq \vartheta_{J'}$ holds for every $J' \in \mathcal{P}_m^t$ such that $J' \subseteq \mathcal{A}(u_J, v_J)$.

In addition, (u_J, v_J) is a global minimizer of (1.1) if and only if $F(u_J, v_J) \leq \vartheta_{J'}$ for all $J' \in \mathcal{P}_m^t$.

Proof. Let $(u, v) \in \mathcal{U}$. Then $a_j(u)^T v > b_j(u)$ for all $j \in [m], j \notin \mathcal{A}(u, v)$. Since each a_j, b_j are polynomials, by continuity there exists $\rho > 0$ such that for each $j \in [m], j \notin \mathcal{A}(u, v)$, i.e., $a_j(x)^T y > b_j(x)$, $\forall (x, y) \in B_\rho(u, v)$. Let $(x, y) \in \mathcal{K} \cap B_\rho(u, v)$ and $\lambda^{x,y}$ be a corresponding Lagrange multiplier. Then by the complementary slackness condition, $\lambda_j^{x,y} = 0$ for $j \notin \mathcal{A}(u, v)$. This implies that if $J \supseteq \mathcal{A}(u, v)$, then $\lambda_j^{x,y} = 0$ for $j \notin J$. By Assumption 2.5, the above implies

$$\mathcal{K} \cap B_\rho(u, v) \subseteq \mathcal{K}_J \cap B_\rho(u, v) \subseteq \mathcal{W}_J \cap B_\rho(u, v)$$

for every J satisfying $J \supseteq \mathcal{A}(u, v)$.

(i) Suppose $J \supseteq \mathcal{A}(u_J, v_J)$. Then from the above analysis, there exists $\rho > 0$ such that $\mathcal{F} \cap B_\rho(u_J, v_J) = \mathcal{F}_J \cap B_\rho(u_J, v_J)$. Hence we have

$$F(u_J, v_J) = \vartheta_J := \min_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{F}_J} F(x, y) = \min_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{F} \cap B_\rho(u_J, v_J)} F(x, y).$$

Since $(u_J, v_J) \in \mathcal{F}_J \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, it follows from the above that (u_J, v_J) is a local minimizer of problem (1.1).

(ii) Suppose $\vartheta_{J'} \geq F(u_J, v_J)$ for every $\mathcal{A}(u_J, v_J) \supseteq J' \in \mathcal{P}_m^t$. From the analysis before (i), there exists $\rho > 0$ such that for all $(x, y) \in \mathcal{K} \cap B_\rho(u_J, v_J)$, the corresponding multiplier $\lambda^{x,y}$ satisfies $\lambda_j^{x,y} = 0$ if $j \notin \mathcal{A}(u_J, v_J)$. Further by Carathéodory's Theorem and Assumption 2.5, for every $(x, y) \in \mathcal{K} \cap B_\rho(u_J, v_J)$, there exists $J' \subseteq \mathcal{A}(u_J, v_J)$ such that $(x, y) \in \mathcal{K}_{J'} \subseteq \mathcal{W}_{J'}$. Hence

$$\mathcal{F} \cap B_\rho(u_J, v_J) = \bigcup_{J' \subseteq \mathcal{A}(u_J, v_J)} \mathcal{F}_{J'} \cap B_\rho(u_J, v_J).$$

So it holds that

$$F(u_J, v_J) \leq \min_{J' \subseteq \mathcal{A}(u_J, v_J)} \vartheta_{J'} = \min_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{F} \cap B_\rho(u_J, v_J)} F(x, y).$$

The last equality holds since the feasible region of (DP) is the union of all feasible regions of P_J for all $J \in \mathcal{P}_m^t$. Since $(u_J, v_J) \in \mathcal{F}_J \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, it follows that it is a local minimizer of (1.1).

By the equivalence of problems (1.1) and the disjunctive program (DP), it is clear that (u_J, v_J) is a global minimizer of (1.1) if and only if $F(u_J, v_J) = \min_{J' \in \mathcal{P}_m^t} \vartheta_{J'}$ and hence the last assertion holds. \square

For the BPOP (1.1), solving branch problems as in (3.1) gives candidate local minimizers. Their local optimality may be verified by Theorem 3.1. Here is such an example.

Example 3.2. Consider the BPOP given as in (2.8). It has the lower level objective f and constraining tuple g :

$$\begin{aligned} f(x, z) &= (z - x)^2, \\ g(x, z) &= (z + 1, 1 - z, 4 - 2x - z, 3x - 1 - z). \end{aligned}$$

We find explicit expressions of $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{K}$ and each $\mathcal{F}_J = \mathcal{K}_J = \mathcal{W}_J$ in Example 2.8. Then we solve (3.1) accurately with all results reported in Table 1. The optimal value and solution of (P_J) are denoted by ϑ_J , (u_J, v_J) respectively. By Theorem 3.1,

TABLE 1. Optimizers for decomposed BPOPs of (2.8)

J	ϑ_J	(u_J, v_J)	$g(u_J, v_J)$	$\mathcal{A}(u_J, v_J)$
{1}	1.125	(0.75, 0.75)	(1.75, 0.25, 1.75, 0.5)	\emptyset
{2}	1	(1.5, 1)	(2.5, 0, 0, 2.5)	{2, 3}
{3}	0.2	(1.9, 0.2)	(1.2, 0.8, 0, 4.5)	{3}
{4}	1.125	(0.75, 0.75)	(1.75, 0.25, 1.75, 0.5)	\emptyset

we find the global optimizer (1.9, 0.2) and a local minimizer (0.75, 0.75) of (2.8). The point (1.5, 1) for the case $J = \{2\}$ is not a local optimizer. This is consistent with our graphic results shown as in Figure 2.




FIGURE 2. For Example 3.2, the solid line is the feasible set \mathcal{F} , the dotted curves are contour level curves of F , the box denotes the global minimizer and the star denotes the local minimizer.

3.1. Local optimality of BPOPs. We would like to remark that Theorem 3.1 does not give a full characterization for local optimizers. However, local optimality can be verified by solving branch problems with an additional small ball constraint. For given $J \in \mathcal{P}_m^t$, $(\hat{u}, \hat{v}) \in \mathcal{F}$ and a small radius $\rho > 0$, consider the new branch optimization problem

$$(3.2) \quad (Q_J) : \begin{cases} \min & F(x, y) - F(\hat{u}, \hat{v}) \\ \text{s.t.} & (x, y) \in \mathcal{W}_J \cap B_\rho(\hat{u}, \hat{v}). \end{cases}$$

We can also verify whether or not (\hat{u}, \hat{v}) is a local minimizer of (1.1) as follows. Select a small scalar $\rho > 0$. By Theorem 2.6, if each (Q_J) is either infeasible or has a nonnegative optimal value, then (\hat{u}, \hat{v}) must be a local minimizer of (1.1). Indeed, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 3.3. *Under Assumption 2.5, suppose φ_J is the optimal value of (Q_J) for $J \in \mathcal{P}_m^t$. Then (\hat{u}, \hat{v}) is a local minimizer of (1.1) if $\varphi_J \geq 0$ and $J \supseteq \mathcal{A}(\hat{u}, \hat{v})$ or $\varphi_{J'} \geq 0$ for all $J' \in \mathcal{P}_m^t$ satisfying $J' \subseteq \mathcal{A}(\hat{u}, \hat{v})$.*

Proof. By assumption, $(\hat{u}, \hat{v}) \in \mathcal{F}$ and a small $\rho > 0$ are given. For every $J \in \mathcal{P}_m^t$, it holds that $\mathcal{F}_J \cap B_\rho(\hat{u}, \hat{v}) \subseteq \mathcal{W}_J \cap B_\rho(\hat{u}, \hat{v})$.

(i) Suppose $J \supseteq \mathcal{A}(\hat{u}, \hat{v})$. By arguments of Theorem 3.1 (i), there exists $\rho' \in (0, \rho)$ such that $\mathcal{F} \cap B_{\rho'}(\hat{u}, \hat{v}) = \mathcal{F}_J \cap B_{\rho'}(\hat{u}, \hat{v}) \subseteq \mathcal{W}_J \cap B_{\rho'}(\hat{u}, \hat{v})$. Hence we have

$$\min_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{F} \cap B_{\rho'}(\hat{u}, \hat{v})} F(x, y) \geq \min_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{W}_J \cap B_{\rho'}(\hat{u}, \hat{v})} F(x, y) := F(\hat{u}, \hat{v}) + \varphi_J.$$

If $\varphi_J \geq 0$, then the above implies $F(\hat{u}, \hat{v}) \leq F(x, y)$ for all $(x, y) \in \mathcal{F} \cap B_{\rho'}(\hat{u}, \hat{v})$, so (\hat{u}, \hat{v}) is a local minimizer of (1.1).

(ii) Suppose $\varphi_{J'} \geq 0$ for all $J' \in \mathcal{P}_m^t$ satisfying $J' \subseteq \mathcal{A}(\hat{u}, \hat{v})$. By arguments of Theorem 3.1 (ii), there exists $\rho' \in (0, \rho)$ such that

$$\mathcal{F} \cap B_{\rho'}(\hat{u}, \hat{v}) = \bigcup_{J' \subseteq \mathcal{A}(\hat{u}, \hat{v})} \mathcal{F}_{J'} \cap B_{\rho'}(\hat{u}, \hat{v}) \subseteq \bigcup_{J' \subseteq \mathcal{A}(\hat{u}, \hat{v})} \mathcal{W}_{J'} \cap B_{\rho'}(\hat{u}, \hat{v}).$$

Since φ_J is the optimal value of (Q_J) , we have

$$\min_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{F} \cap B_{\rho'}(\hat{u}, \hat{v})} F(x, y) \geq F(\hat{u}, \hat{v}) + \min_{J' \subseteq \mathcal{A}(\hat{u}, \hat{v})} \varphi_{J'}.$$

It follows that (\hat{u}, \hat{v}) is a minimizer of (1.1). \square

We remark that (3.2) is equivalent to a polynomial optimization problem, which can be solved globally with Moment-SOS relaxations. In computational practice, the scalar $\rho > 0$ can be chosen for small values like 0.1, 0.05 etc. It is hard to get a theoretical estimate for such ρ .

4. THE PLME-DISJUNCTIVE ALGORITHM

In this section, we give an algorithm for solving the BPOP (1.1). It is based on the partial Lagrange multiplier expression and the disjunctive decomposition of the KKT system. We solve (1.1) as a set of branch problems as in (3.1).

The following is our main algorithm for solving the BPOP (1.1).

Algorithm 4.1. For the BPOP (1.1) with the lower level optimization as in (2.1), do the following:

- Step 0 Let $t = \max\{\text{rank } A(x) : (x, y) \in \mathcal{U}\}$. For each $J \in \mathcal{P}_m^t$, find the PLME as in (2.3) and formulate the set \mathcal{W}_J as in (2.4).
- Step 1 For each $J \in \mathcal{P}_m^t$, solve the branch problem (3.1). Compute its optimal value ϑ_J and optimizer (u_J, v_J) , if they exist.
- Step 2 For each (u_J, v_J) , compute the active set $\mathcal{A}(u_J, v_J)$. Verify if it is a local minimizer or not. Output all verified local minimizers.
- Step 3 Compare optimal values for all branch problems and select the best one among them. Output the minimum value and the corresponding optimizer as the global optimal value and minimizer of (1.1).

In Step 1, the branch problem (3.1) can be solved by Algorithm 4.3 in the next subsection. In Step 2, the local optimality of (u_J, v_J) can be verified by Theorem 3.1 or solving (3.2).

4.1. Solving branch problems. We discuss how to solve the branch problem (3.1). This problem is still hard. We need to make the following assumption.

Assumption 4.2. For given $(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \in \mathcal{U}$ and $\hat{z} \in S(\hat{x})$, there exists a rational function $q = (q_1, \dots, q_p)$ such that

$$(4.1) \quad q(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) = \hat{z} \quad \text{and} \quad q(x, y) \in Z(x) \forall (x, y) \in \mathcal{K}.$$

The above q is called a *feasible extension* of (\hat{x}, \hat{y}) at \hat{z} . They can be used to exclude infeasible points obtained from relaxations. Under Assumption 4.2, consider the inequality constraint

$$(4.2) \quad f(x, q(x, y)) - f(x, y) \geq 0.$$

If $\hat{y} \notin S(\hat{x})$, then (4.2) is violated at (\hat{x}, \hat{y}) because

$$f(\hat{x}, q(\hat{x}, \hat{y})) = f(\hat{x}, \hat{z}) = \inf_{z \in Z(\hat{x})} f(\hat{x}, z) < f(\hat{x}, \hat{y}).$$

However, every feasible point of (1.1) must satisfy (4.2). So, we can use feasible extensions and (4.2) to exclude infeasible points. Feasible extensions can be obtained for many optimization problems. We refer to Section 5 for how to do that. Under Assumptions 2.5 and 4.2, the following is the algorithm for solving (3.1).

Algorithm 4.3. For the branch problem (3.1), let $\mathcal{Q}_0 := \emptyset, k := 0$. Do the following:

Step 1 Solve the optimization

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{cases} \min & F(x, y) \\ \text{s.t.} & f(x, q(x, y)) - f(x, y) \geq 0, \forall q \in \mathcal{Q}_k, \\ & (x, y) \in \mathcal{W}_J. \end{cases}$$

If it is infeasible, stop and output that (3.1) is infeasible. Otherwise, solve it for an optimizer $(x^{(k)}, y^{(k)})$ and go to the Step 2.

Step 2 Verify if $y^{(k)} \in S(x^{(k)})$ or not by solving the optimization

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{cases} \eta_k := \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^p} & f(x^{(k)}, z) - f(x^{(k)}, y^{(k)}) \\ \text{s.t.} & z \in Z(x^{(k)}). \end{cases}$$

If $\eta_k \geq 0$, stop and output $(x^{(k)}, y^{(k)})$ as the optimizer of (3.1). Otherwise, solve it for an optimizer $z^{(k)}$ and go to Step 3.

Step 3 Compute a feasible extension $q^{(k)}$ such that

$$(4.5) \quad q^{(k)}(x^{(k)}, y^{(k)}) = z^{(k)}, \quad q^{(k)}(x, y) \in Z(x) \forall (x, y) \in \mathcal{K}.$$

Update $\mathcal{Q}_{k+1} := \mathcal{Q}_k \cup \{q^{(k)}\}, k := k + 1$, and go to Step 1.

We remark that each optimization in Algorithm 4.3 is (or equivalent to) polynomial optimization, thus can be solved globally by Moment-SOS relaxations. Take (4.4) for instance. Let ρ_l denote the optimal value of its l th relaxation. For a fixed k , $\rho_l \rightarrow \eta_k$ as $l \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, $\rho_l = \eta_k$ when l is big enough if (4.4) is given by generic polynomials. The finite convergence can be conveniently checked by the *flat truncation condition* (see [45]). Once the condition is met, the optimizer $z^{(k)}$ can be computed with Schur decompositions (see [24]). We refer to [19, 26, 31, 32, 34, 43, 44, 50] for related work about polynomial optimization.

In the algorithm, we always have $y^{(k)} \in Z(x^{(k)})$ since $(x^{(k)}, y^{(k)}) \in \mathcal{W}_J \subseteq \mathcal{U}$. In Step 2, $\eta_k \geq 0$ if and only if $y^{(k)}$ is a global optimizer of (4.4). If $\eta_k < 0$, then any

optimizer of (4.4) will make $f(x^{(k)}, z^{(k)}) - f(x^{(k)}, y^{(k)}) < 0$. For the special case that f is convex in z , Step 2 may be skipped depending on the rational expression of \mathcal{W}_J . The related result is summarized in Proposition 4.4.

In Step 3, the feasible extension $q^{(k)}$ must satisfy

$$q^{(k)}(x^{(k)}, y^{(k)}) = z^{(k)}, \quad q(x, y) \in Z(x) \quad \forall (x, y) \in \mathcal{K}.$$

For each $y^{(k)}$ that does not optimize (4.4), the inequality constraint in (4.3) prevents the corresponding $(x^{(k)}, y^{(k)})$ to be feasible in future loops. But the same constraint is satisfied at every feasible point of (3.1), so (4.3) is always a relaxation for (3.1) for all k .

4.2. Convergence property. For the case of convex lower level optimization, Algorithm 4.1 terminates at the initial loop.

Proposition 4.4. *For given $J \in \mathcal{P}_m^t$, suppose Assumption 2.5 holds and $D_J(x, y) > 0$ for each $(x, y) \in \mathcal{U}$. Assume $f(x, z)$ is convex in z for every given x . Then (4.3) is equivalent to (3.1) at $k = 0$ and Algorithm 4.3 terminates at the initial loop.*

Proof. For every given x , the lower level optimization problem has a convex function and linear constraints, so every KKT point is equivalent to an optimizer, i.e., $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{F}$. Suppose $D_J(x, y) > 0$ for each $(x, y) \in \mathcal{U}$, then every point in \mathcal{W}_J satisfies KKT conditions. It implies that (3.1) and (4.3) are equivalent at the loop $k = 0$, since $\mathcal{W}_J = \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{W}_J$. So Algorithm 4.3 must terminate at the initial loop. \square

Next, we study the asymptotic convergence of Algorithm 4.3. Denote the value function of the lower level problem

$$(4.6) \quad \omega(x) := \inf_{z \in Z(x)} f(x, z).$$

According to [21, Definition 3.13], we say that the *restricted inf-compactness* (RIC) condition holds around \bar{x} if $\omega(\bar{x})$ is finite and there exists a compact set Ω , a positive number ϵ_0 such that $S(x) \cap \Omega \neq \emptyset$ for all $x \in B_{\epsilon_0}(\bar{x})$ satisfying $\omega(x) < \omega(\bar{x}) + \epsilon_0$. The RIC condition is very weak. It holds if $Z(x)$ is uniformly compact around \bar{x} , or $f(\bar{x}, \cdot)$ satisfies the growth condition or the lower level objective $f(x, z)$ is weakly coercive in z with respect to $Z(x)$ around \bar{x} ; see [48] for details. It turns out that for our problem, the value function is always continuous under the RIC condition.

Lemma 4.5. *For the lower level optimization (2.1), suppose RIC condition holds at \bar{x} and the smallest singular value of the matrix $A(x)$ is nonzero for all x sufficiently close to \bar{x} . Then the value function $\omega(x)$ is continuous at \bar{x} .*

Proof. Under the RIC condition, by [23, Proposition 3.1], $\omega(x)$ is continuous at \bar{x} if there exists $\bar{y} \in S(\bar{x})$ such that

$$(4.7) \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \bar{x}} \text{dist}(\bar{y}, Z(x)) = 0,$$

where $\text{dist}(\bar{y}, Z(x))$ is the minimum length of $\|\bar{y} - y\| \quad \forall y \in Z(x)$. Let $\bar{y} \in S(\bar{x})$. By Hoffman's Lemma and its proof in [27], for each x , unless $A(x)$ is the constant zero matrix, there is a positive number κ_x such that the error bound holds:

$$(4.8) \quad \text{dist}(\bar{y}, Z(x)) \leq \kappa_x \left(\|A_{\text{eq}}(x)\bar{y} - b_{\text{eq}}(x)\| + \|(b_{\text{in}}(x) - A_{\text{in}}(x)\bar{y})_+\| \right),$$

and the constant

$$\kappa_x := \frac{(\sum_{1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_r \leq p} \|C(A_{i_1, \dots, i_r}^{j_1, \dots, j_r}(x))\|_F^2)^{1/2}}{(\sum_{1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_r \leq p} (\det A_{i_1, \dots, i_r}^{j_1, \dots, j_r}(x))^2)^{1/2}}.$$

where r is the rank of the matrix $A(x)$, $(z)_+$ denotes the vector whose i th entry being $(z_i)_+$, and $C(\cdot)$ denotes the cofactor matrix of a square matrix. Every element of the matrix $A(x)$ is a polynomial function, hence it is continuous as long as the denominators are nonzero. One can see that κ_x is bounded above when $x \rightarrow \bar{x}$. Then taking limits in (4.8), we obtain (4.7) and hence the continuity is proved. \square

Let $\{q^{(k)}\}_{k=0}^\infty, q^{(k)} : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ be a sequence of vector-valued continuous functions in (x, y) . We say $\{q^{(k)}\}$ is *uniformly continuous* at a given point (\hat{x}, \hat{y}) if for every $\rho > 0$, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\|q^{(k)}(x, y) - q^{(k)}(\hat{x}, \hat{y})\| \leq \epsilon, \quad \forall (x, y) \in B_\rho(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

For the special case that $\{q^{(k)}\}$ is a polynomial sequence. A sufficient condition for the uniform continuity is that $\{q^{(k)}\}$ has uniformly bounded degrees and coefficients. There are explicit feasible extensions with such properties when the lower level optimization has single bound, boxed or simplex constraints; see as in Section 5.

Theorem 4.6. *For a given $J \in \mathcal{P}_m^t$, suppose Assumption 2.5 holds, and $q^{(k)}$ in (4.5) exists for each $(x^{(k)}, y^{(k)}, z^{(k)})$ produced in Algorithm 4.3. Then any accumulation point of $(x^{(k)}, y^{(k)})$ is a global optimizer of (3.1) if $\omega(x)$ is continuous and $\{q^{(k)}\}$ is uniformly continuous at this point.*

Proof. Let (\hat{x}, \hat{y}) denote any accumulation point of $(x^{(k)}, y^{(k)})$. Then $(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \in \mathcal{W}_J$, and up to selection of a subsequence, we can generally assume $(x^{(k)}, y^{(k)}) \rightarrow (\hat{x}, \hat{y})$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Let ϑ_J denote the optimal value of (3.1). Since F is a polynomial and each (4.3) is a relaxation of (3.1), we have

$$F(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} F(x^{(k)}, y^{(k)}) \leq \vartheta_J.$$

Then (\hat{x}, \hat{y}) is the global optimizer of (3.1) if $\hat{y} \in S(\hat{x})$, or equivalently, $\omega(\hat{x}) \geq f(\hat{x}, \hat{y})$. For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we can always write

$$(4.9) \quad \omega(\hat{x}) - f(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) = \underbrace{\left(\omega(\hat{x}) - f(\hat{x}, q^{(k)}(\hat{x}, \hat{y})) \right)}_{S_1} + \underbrace{\left(f(\hat{x}, q^{(k)}(\hat{x}, \hat{y})) - f(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \right)}_{S_2}.$$

The $(x^{(k)}, y^{(k)})$ must be feasible for all (4.3) with $s \leq k$. That is,

$$f(x^{(k)}, q^{(s)}(x^{(k)}, y^{(k)})) - f(x^{(k)}, y^{(k)}) \geq 0, \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{N}, s \leq k.$$

Let $k \rightarrow \infty$, the above implies that in (4.9), we have

$$S_2 \geq 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \omega(\hat{x}) - f(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \geq S_1.$$

Assume $\omega(x)$ is continuous at \hat{x} and $\{q^{(k)}\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is uniformly continuous at (\hat{x}, \hat{y}) . By (4.5), we have $\omega(x^{(k)}) = f(x^{(k)}, q^{(k)}(x^{(k)}, y^{(k)}))$. Then when $k \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \left(\omega(\hat{x}) - \omega(x^{(k)}) \right) + \left(\omega(x^{(k)}) - f(\hat{x}, q^{(k)}(\hat{x}, \hat{y})) \right) \\ &= \left(\omega(\hat{x}) - \omega(x^{(k)}) \right) + \left(f(x^{(k)}, q^{(k)}(x^{(k)}, y^{(k)})) - f(\hat{x}, q^{(k)}(\hat{x}, \hat{y})) \right) \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

The (4.9) holds for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, so $\omega(\hat{x}) - f(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \geq 0$. Therefore, (\hat{x}, \hat{y}) is feasible for (3.1), thus it is a global optimizer of (3.1). \square

5. FEASIBLE EXTENSIONS FOR LINEAR CONSTRAINTS

In this section, we discuss how to construct feasible extensions when the lower level optimization is in the form (2.1), of which all constraints are linear in z .

First, we review some frequently appearing constraints such that the feasible extensions can be obtained with explicit formula (see [49]). For the BPOP (1.1) and for a given pair $(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \in \mathcal{U}$ and $\hat{z} \in S(\hat{x})$, we look for a polynomial or rational function $q = (q_1, \dots, q_p)$ satisfying (4.1).

Example 5.1. The feasible extension q can be given explicitly for the following cases.

- *Single bound:* If z is univariate and $Z(x)$ is given by $z \geq b(x)$ or $z \leq b(x)$, then

$$q(x, y) = b(x) + (\hat{z} - b(\hat{x})).$$

- *Boxed constraints:* If $Z(x)$ is given by the box constraint $b(x) \leq z \leq c(x)$ with $b = (b_1, \dots, b_p)$, $c = (c_1, \dots, c_p)$, then $q = (q_1, \dots, q_p)$ can be given as

$$(5.1) \quad q_i(x, y) = \begin{cases} b_i(x), & \text{if } b_i(\hat{x}) = c_i(\hat{x}), \\ \frac{(c_i(\hat{x}) - \hat{z}_i)b_i(x) + (\hat{z}_i - b_i(\hat{x}))c_i(x)}{c_i(\hat{x}) - b_i(\hat{x})}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, p$.

- *Simplex constraints:* If $Z(x)$ is given by $b(x) \leq z$ and $e^T z \leq b_0(x)$, then q can be given as

$$q(x, y) = \begin{cases} b(x), & \text{if } b_0(\hat{x}) = e^T b(\hat{x}); \\ b(x) + \frac{(b_0(x) - e^T b(x))(\hat{z} - b(\hat{x}))}{b_0(\hat{x}) - e^T b(\hat{x})}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We remark that feasible extensions in Example 5.1 can be generalized by using coordinate changes. For instance, suppose $Z(x)$ is given by

$$b(x) \leq B(x)z \leq c(x)$$

and $B(x)$ is a square matrix polynomial that is nonsingular on \mathcal{U} . For given $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \in \mathcal{U}$ and $\tilde{z} \in S(\tilde{x})$, let $\hat{x} = \tilde{x}$, $\hat{y} = B(\tilde{x})\tilde{y}$, and $\hat{z} = B(\tilde{x})\tilde{z}$. Then a feasible extension at \tilde{z} of (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) is

$$\hat{q}(x, y) = B(x)^{-1}q(x, y),$$

where $q = (q_1, \dots, q_p)$ is given as in (5.1).

Next, we introduce an efficient method to compute feasible extensions for more general cases. Without loss of generality, we may assume there are no linear equality constraints in (2.1), i.e., $\mathcal{E}_2 = \emptyset$, since they can be removed by eliminating variables. In applications, a frequently appearing class of lower level constraints has the form

$$Z(x) = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^p : Az \geq b(x)\},$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$ is a constant matrix and $b(x)$ is a polynomial vector function.

First, we consider the case that $b(x) = b_0 + Bx$ is a linear vector function. Furthermore, we assume the upper level optimization has linear constraints like

$$h(x, y) = h_0 + H_1x + H_2y \geq 0,$$

for a constant vector h_0 and two constant matrices H_1, H_2 . We look for the feasible extension function in the form

$$q(x, y) = w_0 + W_1x + W_2y.$$

Clearly, $q(x, y) \in Z(x)$ for all $(x, y) \in \mathcal{U}$ if it satisfies the polynomial identity

$$A(w_0 + W_1x + W_2y) - b(x) = \xi + Y_1h(x, y) + Y_2(Ay - b(x)),$$

for a nonnegative vector $\xi \geq 0$ and two nonnegative matrices $Y_1 \geq 0, Y_2 \geq 0$. Thus, the feasible extension function q can be obtained by solving the linear program:

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{cases} w_0 + W_1\hat{x} + W_2\hat{y} = \hat{z}, \\ Aw_0 - b_0 = \xi + Y_1h_0 - Y_2b_0, \\ AW_1 = Y_1H_1 - Y_2B, \\ AW_2 = Y_1H_2 + Y_2A, \\ \xi \geq 0, \quad Y_1 \geq 0, \quad Y_2 \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

Example 5.2. Consider the BPOP in Example A.1, where $x \in \mathbb{R}^2, y \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and

$$\begin{aligned} h &= (2 - e^T x, x_1, x_2), \\ g &= (-z_1 + z_2 + 2x_1 - 2.5, -z_2 - x_1 + 3x_2 + 2, z_1, z_2). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\hat{x} = (1, 1), \hat{y} = (3.5, 4), \hat{z} = (0, 4)$. We look for a linear feasible extension by solving (5.2). A feasible solution for (5.2) is given by

$$w_0 = 0_{2 \times 1}, \quad W_1 = 0_{2 \times 2}, \quad \xi = 0_{4 \times 1}, \quad Y_1 = 0_{4 \times 3},$$

$$W_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad Y_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

This gives the linear feasible extension $q(x, y) = (0, y_2)$.

Second, we consider the case that $b(x)$ is a quadratic vector function. We also assume the upper level optimization has only quadratic constraints, i.e., each $h = (h_i)_{i \in \mathcal{E}_1 \cup \mathcal{I}_1}$ is a quadratic polynomial vector in (x, y) . We look for a quadratic feasible extension $q(x, y) = (q_1(x, y), \dots, q_p(x, y))$ such that

$$q_i(x, y) = (x \diamond y)^T W_i(x \diamond y) \quad \text{where} \quad x \diamond y := \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ x \\ y \end{bmatrix}.$$

One can verify that $q(x, y) \in Z(x)$ for all $(x, y) \in \mathcal{U}$ if it satisfies the polynomial system

$$(5.3) \quad \begin{cases} q(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) = \hat{z}, \\ a_i^T q(x, y) - b_i(x) = (x \diamond y)^T Y_i(x \diamond y) + \nu_i^T h(x, y) + \theta_i^T (Ay - b(x)), \\ \nu_i = (\nu_{i,j})_{j \in \mathcal{E}_1 \cup \mathcal{I}_1}, \nu_{i,j} \geq 0 (j \in \mathcal{I}_1), \\ Y_i \succeq 0, \theta_i \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, p. \end{cases}$$

The above is a semidefinite program.

Example 5.3. Consider the BPOP in Example A.9, where $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^2, y \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and

$$\begin{aligned} h &= (4 - x_1^2 - 2x_2, x_1, x_2), \\ g &= (-2z_1 + z_2 + x_1^2 - 2x_1 + x_2^2 + 3, 3z_1 - 4z_2 + x_2 - 4, z_1, z_2). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\hat{x} = (1, 1)$, $\hat{y} = (1.5, 0)$, $\hat{z} = (1.8, 0.6)$. We look for a quadratic feasible extension by solving (5.3). A feasible solution for (5.3) is given by

$$W_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1.6 & -0.8 & 0.1 & 0 & 0 \\ -0.8 & 0.8 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0.1 & 0 & 0.8 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad W_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.2 & -0.6 & 0.2 & 0 & 0 \\ -0.6 & 0.6 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0.2 & 0 & 0.6 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\theta_1 = \theta_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \theta_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.8 \\ 0.2 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \theta_4 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.6 \\ 0.4 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad Y_1 = Y_2 = 0_{5 \times 5}, \quad \nu_1 = \nu_2 = 0_{3 \times 1}.$$

This gives the following quadratic feasible extension function

$$q(x, y) = \begin{bmatrix} 0.8x_1^2 - 1.6x_1 + 0.2x_2 + 0.8x_2^2 + 1.6 \\ 0.6x_1^2 - 1.2x_1 + 0.4x_2 + 0.6x_2^2 + 0.2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

For more general constraints, it is typically a challenge to get feasible extensions. The problem is mostly open, to the best of our knowledge. This is an interesting question for future work.

6. NUMERICAL EXAMPLES

In this section, we give numerical experiments of solving BPOPs with Algorithms 4.1 and 4.3. In computations, each optimization problem is solved globally by Moment-SOS relaxations with MATLAB software `GloptiPoly 3` [25] and `SeDuMi` [58]. We implement algorithms using MATLAB R2018a, in a Laptop with CPU 8th Generation Intel® Core™ i5-8250U and RAM 16 GB. In the following, we report all numerical results with four digits. For convenience of expression, the computational results are reported with four digits. In each optimization problem, the lower level constraints are ordered from left to right, and from top to bottom. The CPU time of running Algorithm 4.3 is given with the unit “second”. For a candidate solution $(u, v) \in \mathcal{U}$, its active set $\mathcal{A}(x, y)$ is computed within a small tolerance, i.e., $\mathcal{E}_2 \cup \{i \in \mathcal{I}_2 : a_i(u)^T v - b_i(u) \leq 10^{-4}\}$.

Example 6.1. [8] Consider the BPOP

$$\begin{cases} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^4, y \in \mathbb{R}^2} & 0.5(\|x - e\|^2 + \|y\|^2) \\ s.t. & y \in S(x), \end{cases}$$

where $S(x)$ is the set of global optimizer(s) of

$$\begin{cases} \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^2} & 0.5\|z\|^2 - x_1 z_1 - x_2 z_2 \\ s.t. & z_1 + 1 - x_1 \geq 0, \quad z_1 + x_1 - 1 \geq 0, \\ & 1.5 - x_1 - z_1 \geq 0, \quad z_2 + 1 - x_2 \geq 0, \\ & z_2 + x_2 - 1 \geq 0, \quad 3 - z_2 - x_2 \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

Apply Algorithm 4.1 to solve this problem. It took 0.14 – 0.42 second to solve each branch problem with Algorithm 4.3. When $J = \{2, 5\}$, we solved for

$$\vartheta_J = 0.5000, \quad u_J = (0.5000, 0.5000, 1.0000, 1.0000), \\ v_J = (0.5000, 0.5000).$$

Since $\mathcal{A}(u_J, v_J) = \{2, 5\}$, the (u_J, v_J) is a local optimizer. Up to comparison of all branches, we got the global optimal value and optimizer

$$F_{\min} = 0.3125, \quad x^* = (1.2500, 0.5000, 1.0000, 1.0000), \\ y^* = (0.2500, 0.5000).$$

They were obtained from the branch problem (P_J) with $J = \{3, 5\}$.

Example 6.2. [14, Example 3.1] Consider the BPOP

$$\begin{cases} \min_{x, y \in \mathbb{R}^3} & (x_1 - 0.5)^2 + (x_2 - 0.5)^2 + x_3^2 - 3y_1 - 3y_2 - 6y_3 \\ s.t. & y \in S(x), \end{cases}$$

where $S(x)$ is the set of global optimizer(s) of

$$\begin{cases} \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^3} & x^T z \\ s.t. & 2 - e^T z \geq 0, \quad z_1 - z_2 \geq 0, \\ & z_1 \geq 0, \quad z_2 \geq 0, \quad z_3 \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

Apply Algorithm 4.1 to solve this problem. It took 0.07 – 0.46 second to solve each branch problem with Algorithm 4.3. Up to comparison of all branches, we got the global optimal value and optimizer

$$F_{\min} = -12.0000, \quad x^* = (0.5000, 0.5000, 0.0000), \\ y^* = (0.0000, 0.0000, 2.0000).$$

They were obtained from the branch problem (P_J) with $J = \{1, 2, 4\}$.

Example 6.3. [56, TP6] Consider the BPOP

$$\begin{cases} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}, y \in \mathbb{R}^2} & (x - 1)^2 + 2y_1 - 2x \\ s.t. & x \geq 0, \quad y \in S(x), \end{cases}$$

where $S(x)$ is the set of global optimizer(s) of

$$\begin{cases} \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^2} & (2z_1 - 4)^2 + (2z_2 - 1)^2 + xz_1 \\ s.t. & 12 - 5z_1 - 4z_2 - 4x \geq 0, \\ & 5z_1 - 4z_2 + 4x - 4 \geq 0, \\ & 4z_1 - 5z_2 - 4x + 4 \geq 0, \\ & 4x + 4 - 4z_1 - 5z_2 \geq 0, \\ & z_1 \geq 0, \quad z_2 \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

Apply Algorithm 4.1 to solve this problem. It took 0.32 – 0.81 second to solve each branch problem with Algorithm 4.3. Up to comparison of all branches, we got the global optimal value and optimizer

$$F_{\min} = -1.2099, \quad x^* = 1.8889, \quad y^* = (0.8889, 0.0000).$$

They were obtained from the branch problem (P_J) with $J = \{1, 6\}$.

Example 6.4. [52, Example 3.1] Consider the BPOP

$$\begin{cases} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}, y \in \mathbb{R}^2} & 0.5(y_1 - 3)^2 + 0.5(y_2 - 4)^2 \\ s.t. & x \geq 0, \quad y \in S(x), \end{cases}$$

where $S(x)$ is the set of global optimizer(s) of

$$\begin{cases} \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^2} & 0.5(1 + 0.2x)z_1^2 + 0.5(1 + 0.1x)z_2^2 - (3 + 1.38x)z_1 - xz_2 \\ \text{s.t.} & (0.333 - 0.1x)z_1 - z_2 + 2 - 0.1x \geq 0, \\ & 2 - 0.1x - z_1 + (0.333 + 0.1x)z_2 \geq 0, \\ & z_1 \geq 0, \quad z_2 \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

Apply Algorithm 4.1 to solve this problem. It took us 0.34 – 0.45 second to solve each branch problem with Algorithm 4.3. When $J = \{1, 2\}$, we solved for

$$\vartheta_J = 1.6221, \quad u_J = 1.9901, \quad v_J = (2.9709, 2.1991).$$

Since $\mathcal{A}(u_J, v_J) = \{1, 2\}$, the (u_J, v_J) is a local optimizer. Up to comparison of all branches, we got the global optimal value and optimizer

$$F_{\min} = 1.5641, \quad x^* = 1.9111, \quad y^* = (2.9784, 2.2315).$$

They were obtained from the branch problem (P_J) with $J = \{2, 3\}$.

Example 6.5. [22, Example 3.4] Consider the BPOP

$$\begin{cases} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2, y \in \mathbb{R}^3} & -8x_1 - 4x_2 + y_1 - 40y_2 - 4y_3 \\ \text{s.t.} & 0 \leq x \leq 2e, \quad y \in S(x), \end{cases}$$

where $S(x)$ is the set of global optimizer(s) of

$$\begin{cases} \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^3} & (1 + x_1 + x_2 + 2z_1 - z_2 + z_3)(6 + 2x_1 + z_1 + z_2 - 3z_3)^{-1} \\ \text{s.t.} & z_1 \geq 0, \quad z_2 \geq 0, \quad z_3 \geq 0, \\ & 2 - z_1 \geq 0, \quad 2 - z_2 \geq 0, \quad 2 - z_3 \geq 0, \\ & z_1 - z_2 - z_3 + 1 \geq 0, \\ & z_1 - 2z_2 + 0.5z_3 - (1 - 2x_1) \geq 0, \\ & -2z_1 + z_2 + 0.5z_3 + (1 - 2x_2) \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

Apply Algorithm 4.1 to solve this BPOP. It took 0.31 – 0.64 second to solve each branch problem with Algorithm 4.3. When $J = \{2, 8, 9\}$, we solved for

$$\vartheta_J = -19.0000, \quad u_J = (1.5000, 0.0000), \quad v_J = (1.0000, 0.0000, 2.0000).$$

The $\mathcal{A}(u_J, v_J) = \{2, 7, 8, 9\}$. Since other branch problems for $J \in \mathcal{P}_9^3$ and $J \subseteq \mathcal{A}(u_J, v_J)$ are infeasible, the (u_J, v_J) is a local optimizer. Up to comparison of all branches, we got the global optimal value and optimizer

$$F_{\min} = -29.2000, \quad x^* = (0.0000, 0.9000), \quad y^* = (0.0000, 0.6000, 0.40000).$$

They were obtained from the branch problem (P_J) with $J = \{1, 8, 9\}$.

Example 6.6. Consider the BPOP

$$\begin{cases} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2, y \in \mathbb{R}^3} & (1 - x_2 + 2y_2)(2 + x_1 - y_1 + y_3) \\ \text{s.t.} & 4 - \|x\|^2 - \|y\|^2 \geq 0, \\ & \|x\|^2 - 1 \geq 0, \quad x \geq 0 \\ & y \in S(x), \end{cases}$$

where $S(x)$ is the set of global optimizer(s) of

$$\begin{cases} \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^3} & (z_1 + 2z_2 - x_1 z_3)^2 + x_1 z_1 + x_2 z_2 \\ \text{s.t.} & z_1 - z_2 - z_3 + 1 \geq 0, \\ & z_1 - 2z_2 + 0.5z_3 - (2x_1 - 1) \geq 0, \\ & -2z_1 + z_2 + 0.5z_3 - (2x_2 - 1) \geq 0, \\ & z_1 \geq 0, \quad z_2 \geq 0, \quad z_3 \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

Apply Algorithm 4.1 to solve this problem. It took us 0.34 – 0.45 second to solve each branch problem with Algorithm 4.3. When $J = \{2, 3, 4\}$, we solved for

$$\vartheta_J = 1.4191, \quad u_J = (0.6414, 0.7672), \quad v_J = (0.0000, 0.0839, 0.9011).$$

Since $\mathcal{A}(u_J, v_J) = \{2, 3, 4\}$, the (u_J, v_J) is a local optimizer. Up to comparison of all branches, we got the global optimal value and optimizer

$$F_{\min} = 0.9375, \quad x^* = (0.7500, 0.7500), \quad y^* = (0.0000, 0.0000, 1.0000).$$

They were obtained from the branch problem (P_J) with $J = \{1, 2, 3\}$.

Example 6.7. Consider the BPOP

$$\begin{cases} \min_{x, y \in \mathbb{R}^4} & x_1^2(y_3^2 - 1) + x_4^2(y_1^2 - 2) - x_2 x_4 + x_1 x_3 \\ \text{s.t.} & 1 \leq e^T x \leq 4, \quad 2x_1 x_2 - y_1^2 - 2y_2^2 \geq 0, \\ & x_1 - y_1 \geq 0, \quad x_2 - y_2 \geq 0, \quad 2 - x_1 - x_2 \geq 0, \\ & 2 - x_3^2 - x_4^2 \geq 0, \quad y \in S(x), \end{cases}$$

where $S(x)$ is the set of global optimizer(s) of

$$\begin{cases} \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^4} & x_1 z_1^2 - z_2 + x_3(z_3 - 1)^2 + x_4(z_4 + 1)^2 \\ \text{s.t.} & z_1 - z_2 - x_2 \geq 0, \quad x_1 - z_1 + z_2 \geq 0, \\ & z_1 + z_2 + x_1 + x_2 \geq 0, \\ & 4x_1 - 2x_2 - z_1 - z_2 \geq 0, \\ & z_3 \geq 0, \quad z_4 \geq 0, \quad 3 - z_3 - z_4 \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

Apply Algorithm 4.1 to solve this problem. It took 1.29 – 109.03 seconds to solve each branch problem with Algorithm 4.3. When $J = \{1, 3, 5, 7\}$ and $\{1, 4, 5, 7\}$, we solved for the same results

$$\vartheta_J = -6.8995, \quad u_J = (1.0000, 1.0000, 0.3660, -1.3660), \\ v_J = (0.5000, -0.5000, 0.0000, 3.0000).$$

Since $\mathcal{A}(u_J, v_J) = \{1, 2, 5, 7\}$ for both J , and that $\nabla_z g_1, \nabla_z g_2$ are linearly dependent, the (u_J, v_J) is a local minimizer. It is worth noting that when $J = \{1, 3, 5, 6\}$, Algorithm 4.3 terminated at the loop $k = 1$. We list the detailed computational process below.

Loop $k = 0$:

$$x^{(0)} = (1.8660, 0.1340, -0.4839, 1.3289),$$

$$y^{(0)} = (0.2679, 0.1340, 0.0000, 0.0000).$$

$$\eta_0 = -1.4516 < 0, \text{ solve for optimizer } z^{(0)} = (0.2679, 0.1340, 3.0000, 0.0000),$$

$$\text{Construct feasible extension } q^{(0)} = (y_1, y_2, 3, 0).$$

Loop $k = 1$:

$$x^{(1)} = (1.8660, 0.1340, 0.0000, 1.4142),$$

$$y^{(1)} = (0.2679, -0.1340, 0.0000, 0.0000).$$

$$\eta_1 = -5.6365 \cdot 10^{-8} \text{ is close to zero, so stop.}$$

Up to comparison, we found the computed candidate is the global optimizer.

$$F_{\min} = -7.3385, \quad x^* = (1.8660, 0.1340, 0.0000, 1.14142), \\ y^* = (0.2679, -0.1340, 0.0000, 0.0000).$$

Example 6.8. Consider the general bilevel optimization

$$\begin{cases} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^4, y \in \mathbb{R}^2} & \|x - e\|^2 + \|y + e\|^2 \\ s.t. & x \geq 0, \quad y_1 + 1 \geq 0, \quad y_2 \geq 0, \\ & 4 - e^T x - e^T y \geq 0, \quad y \in S(x), \end{cases}$$

where $S(x)$ is the set of global optimizer(s) of

$$\begin{cases} \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^2} & (x_3 - z_1 - 1)(x_4 - z_2 + 1) - \|z\|^2, \\ s.t. & z_1 - x_1 + 1 \geq 0, \quad z_1 + z_2 + x_1 - 1 \geq 0, \\ & 1.5 - z_1 - x_1 \geq 0, \quad -1 + x_2 - z_2 \geq 0, \\ & 3 - x_1 - z_1 - z_2 \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

Apply Algorithm 4.1 to solve this problem. It took 0.78–2.02 seconds to solve each branch problem. It is worth noting that when $J = \{3, 4\}$, Algorithm 4.3 terminated at the loop $k = 2$. We list the detailed computational process below.

Loop k = 0 :	
$x^{(0)} = (1.2500, 1.0000, 0.7500, 0.7500),$	$y^{(0)} = (0.2500, 0.0000).$
$\eta_0 = -1.5000 < 0,$ solve for optimizer	$z^{(0)} = (0.2500, 1.5000),$
Construct feasible extension	$q^{(0)} = (0.25, 2.75 - x_1).$
Loop k = 1 :	
$x^{(1)} = (0.9337, 1.0000, 0.0000, 1.4356),$	$y^{(1)} = (0.5663, 0.0000).$
$\eta_1 = -0.6997 < 0,$ solve for optimizer	$z^{(1)} = (-0.0663, 2.1326),$
Construct feasible extension	$q^{(1)} = (x_1 - 1, 4 - 2x_1).$
Loop k = 2 :	Infeasible.

Up to comparison of all branches, we got the global optimal value and optimizer

$$F_{\min} = 9.2083, \quad x^* = (1.2500, 0.3336, 0.3332, 0.3332), \\ y^* = (0.2500, 1.5000).$$

They were obtained from the branch problem (P_J) with $J = \{1, 5\}$.

6.1. Some examples from references. We use our PLME-disjunctive Algorithm 4.1 to solve some bilevel optimization problems from existing references. These problems are given explicitly in the appendix Section A, each with a given citation name. We report our numerical results in Table 2. The F_{\min} and (x^*, y^*) denote the computed optimal value and solution respectively.

7. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we propose a disjunctive decomposition approach for solving bilevel optimization problems. For bilevel polynomial optimization which only has linear lower level constraints, we use partial Lagrange multiplier expression to build the disjunctive decomposition of the KKT system, and solve it as a set of branch problems. These branch problems typically have simpler expressions and are much easier to solve than the original BPOP. They are equivalent to polynomial optimization problems, which can be solved efficiently with Moment-SOS relaxations. Under the existence of feasible extensions, each branch is either infeasible or has a global

Problem	F_{\min}	x^*	y^*
Bard2	$-6.6000 \cdot 10^3$	(7.9154, 4.3722, 11.0849, 16.6273)	(2.2864, 10.0012, 27.7122, 0.0000)
B-F2	-3.2500	(2.0000, 0.0000)	(1.5000, 0.0000)
C-V3	0.3125	(0.1308, 0.0520, 0.1022, 0.0674)	(0.0251, 0.0500)
C-W	-13.0000	5.0000	(4.0000, 2.0000)
F-E	0.0000	(0.0000, 0.0000)	(-10.0000, -10.0000)
M-Q2	0.6389	(0.6111, 0.3889)	(0.0000, 0.0000, 1.8333)
N-W-Y-Z55	-24.6491	(0.0000, 0.0000, 0.3204, 1.9742)	(0.0000, 0.0000, 0.00000, 3.0000)
N-W-Y-Z56	-0.4575	(1.0000, 1.0000, 1.6458, 1.3542)	(2.0000, 2.0000, 1.3542, 1.6458)
S-M-D3	-18.6787	(0.0000, 2.0000)	(1.8750, 0.9062)
W-W-L	7.5000	(0.5000, 0.5000)	(0.0000, 0.0000, 0.0000)
BIPA1	-7.0000	(7.0000, 5.3150, 6.8699)	(0.0000, 0.0000, 1.0000, 0.00000, 0.00000, 0.0000, 0.0000, 0.0000)
BIPA4	-4.0000	(2.5000, -1.0000)	(0.0000, 1.0000, 1.0000, 0.0000)
BIPA5	-2.0000	1.0000	(0.0000, 1.0000, 1.0000, 0.0000)

TABLE 2. Numerical results for BPOPs from existing references

optimizer, for which we give convenient necessary and sufficient conditions for the global optimality, and sufficient conditions for the local optimality of the original problem. Our approach performs very efficiently in numerical experiments.

Acknowledgement The first author is partially supported by the NSF grant DMS-2110780, and the second author is partially supported by NSERC.

APPENDIX A. APPENDIX

Example A.1 (Bard2 [4]).

$$\begin{cases} \min_{x,y \in \mathbb{R}^4} & -(200 - y_1 - y_3)(y_1 + y_3) - (160 - y_2 - y_4)(y_2 + y_4) \\ \text{s.t.} & x_1 \leq 10, x_2 \leq 5, x_3 \leq 15, x_4 \leq 20, \\ & e^T x \leq 40, x \geq 0, \quad y \in S(x), \end{cases}$$

where $S(x)$ is the set of global optimizer(s) of

$$\begin{cases} \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^4} & (z_1 - 4)^2 + (z_2 - 13)^2 + (z_3 - 35)^2 + (z_4 - 2)^2 \\ \text{s.t.} & x_1 - 0.4z_1 - 0.7z_2 \geq 0, \quad x_2 - 0.6z_1 - 0.3z_2 \geq 0, \\ & x_3 - 0.4z_3 - 0.7z_4 \geq 0, \quad x_4 - 0.6z_3 - 0.3z_4 \geq 0, \\ & z \geq 0, \quad z_1 \leq 20, \quad z_2 \leq 20, \quad z_3 \leq 40, \quad z_4 \leq 40. \end{cases}$$

Example A.2 (B-F2 [6]).

$$\begin{cases} \min_{x,y \in \mathbb{R}^2} & -2x_1 + x_2 + 0.5y_1 \\ \text{s.t.} & e^T x \leq 2, x \geq 0, \quad y \in S(x), \end{cases}$$

where $S(x)$ is the set of global optimizer(s) of

$$\begin{cases} \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^2} & x_1 + x_2 - 4z_1 + z_2 \\ \text{s.t.} & 2x_1 - z_1 + z_2 - 2.5 \geq 0, \\ & 2 - x_1 + 3x_2 - z_2 \geq 0, \\ & z_1 \geq 0, \quad z_2 \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

Example A.3 (C-Vc [8]).

$$\begin{cases} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^4, y \in \mathbb{R}^2} & \frac{1}{2}x^T Ax + \frac{1}{2}y^T By + a^T x + 2 \\ \text{s.t.} & y \in S(x), \end{cases}$$

where $S(x)$ is the set of optimizer(s) of

$$\begin{cases} \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^2} & 12z^T Bz + x^T Cz \\ \text{s.t.} & Dy \geq Ex + d, \end{cases}$$

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 197.2 & 32.4 & -129.6 & -43.2 \\ 32.4 & 110.8 & -43.2 & -14.4 \\ -129.6 & -43.2 & 302.8 & -32.4 \\ -43.2 & -14.4 & -32.4 & 389.2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 100 & 0 \\ 0 & 100 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$a = \begin{bmatrix} -8.56 \\ -9.52 \\ -9.92 \\ -16.64 \end{bmatrix}, \quad C = \begin{bmatrix} -132.4 & -10.8 \\ -10.8 & -103.6 \\ -43.2 & 14.4 \\ 14.4 & 4.8 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$D = \begin{bmatrix} 10 & 0 \\ 0 & 10 \\ -10 & 0 \\ 0 & -10 \\ 10 & 0 \\ 0 & 10 \end{bmatrix}, \quad E = \begin{bmatrix} 13.24 & 1.08 & -4.32 & -1.44 \\ 1.08 & 10.36 & -1.44 & -0.48 \\ 13.24 & 1.08 & -4.32 & -1.44 \\ 1.08 & 10.36 & -1.44 & -0.48 \\ -13.24 & -1.08 & 4.32 & 1.44 \\ -1.08 & -10.36 & 1.44 & 0.48 \end{bmatrix}, \quad d = \begin{bmatrix} -1 \\ -1 \\ -1.5 \\ -3 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Example A.4 (C-W [9]).

$$\begin{cases} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^1, y \in \mathbb{R}^2} & -x - 3y_1 + 2y_2 \\ \text{s.t.} & 0 \leq x \leq 8, \quad y \in S(x), \end{cases}$$

where $S(x)$ is the set of global optimizer(s) of

$$\begin{cases} \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^2} & -z_1 \\ \text{s.t.} & 0 \leq z_1 \leq 4, \\ & 2x - z_1 - 4z_2 + 16 \geq 0, \\ & 48 - 8x - 3z_1 + 2z_2 \geq 0, \\ & 2x - z_1 + 3z_2 - 12 \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

Example A.5 (F-E [17]).

$$\begin{cases} \min_{x,y \in \mathbb{R}^2} & 2x_1 + 2x_2 - 3y_1 - 3y_2 - 60 \\ \text{s.t.} & 0 \leq x \leq 50e, \quad y \in S(x), \end{cases}$$

where $S(x)$ is the set of global optimizer(s) of

$$\begin{cases} \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^2} & (z_1 - x_1 + 20)^2 + (z_2 - x_2 + 20)^2 \\ \text{s.t.} & 40 - e^T x - z_1 + 2z_2 \geq 0, \\ & x_1 - 2z_1 - 10 \geq 0, \\ & x_2 - 2z_2 - 10 \geq 0, \\ & -10e \leq z \leq 20e. \end{cases}$$

Example A.6 (M-Q2 [42]).

$$\begin{cases} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2, y \in \mathbb{R}^3} & y_1^2 + y_3^2 - y_1 y_3 - 4y_2 - 7x_1 + 4x_2 \\ \text{s.t.} & e^T x \leq 1, x \geq 0, \quad y \in S(x), \end{cases}$$

where $S(x)$ is the set of global optimizer(s) of

$$\begin{cases} \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^3} & z_1^2 + \frac{1}{2}z_2^2 + \frac{1}{2}z_3^2 + z_1 z_2 + (1 - 3x_1)z_1 + (1 + x_2)z_2 \\ \text{s.t.} & 2x_2 - x_1 - 2 - 2z_1 - z_2 + z_3 \geq 0, \quad z \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

Example A.7 (N-W-Y-Z55 [49]).

$$\begin{cases} \min_{x, y \in \mathbb{R}^4} & (x_1 y_3)^2 - 2x_3 x_4 + 1.2x_1 x_3 - x_4^2 (y_3 + 2y_4) \\ \text{s.t.} & 1 \leq e^T x \leq 8, \quad 4x_1 x_2 - y_1^2 - y_2^2 \geq 0, \\ & x_1 \geq y_1, \quad x_2 \geq y_2, \quad 4 - x_1 - x_2 \geq 0, \\ & 4 - x_3^2 - x_4^2 \geq 0, \quad y \in S(x), \end{cases}$$

where $S(x)$ is the set of global optimizer(s) of

$$\begin{cases} \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^4} & x_1 z_1^2 + x_2 z_2^2 + x_3 z_3 - x_4 z_4 \\ \text{s.t.} & x_1 - z_1 + z_2 \geq 0, \\ & z_1 - z_2 - x_2 \geq 0, \\ & 4x_1 - 2x_2 - z_1 - z_2 \geq 0, \\ & z_1 + z_2 + x_1 + x_2 \geq 0, \\ & 3 - z_3 - z_4 \geq 0, \quad z_3 \geq 0, \quad z_4 \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

Example A.8 (N-W-Y-Z56 [49]).

$$\begin{cases} \min_{x, y \in \mathbb{R}^4} & y_1 x_1^2 + y_2 x_2^2 - y_3 x_3 - y_4 x_4 \\ \text{s.t.} & x_1 \geq 1, \quad x_2 \geq 1, \quad x_1 + x_2 \leq 4, \\ & x_3 \geq 1, \quad x_4 \leq 4, \quad 2x_4 - (x_3)^2 \leq 0, \\ & \|x\|^2 \leq 8, \quad y \in S(x), \end{cases}$$

where $S(x)$ is the set of global optimizer(s) of

$$\begin{cases} \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^4} & -z_1 z_2 + z_3 + z_4 \\ \text{s.t.} & 4x_1 x_2 - x_1 z_1 - x_2 z_2 \geq 0, \\ & 3 - z_3 - z_4 \geq 0, \quad z_1 \geq 0, \\ & z_2 \geq 0, \quad z_3 \geq x_4, \quad z_4 \geq x_3. \end{cases}$$

Example A.9 (S-M-D3 [56]).

$$\begin{cases} \min_{x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2} & -x_1^2 - 3x_2^2 - 4y_1 + y_2^2 \\ \text{s.t.} & 4 - x_1^2 - 2x_2 \geq 0, \\ & x \geq 0, \quad y \in S(x), \end{cases}$$

where $S(x)$ is the set of global optimizer(s) of

$$\begin{cases} \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^2} & 2x_1^2 + z_1^2 - 5z_2 \\ \text{s.t.} & x_1^2 - 2x_1 + x_2^2 + 3 - 2z_1 + z_2 \geq 0, \\ & x_2 - 4 + 3z_1 - 4z_2 \geq 0, \quad z \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

Example A.10 (W-W-L [59]).

$$\begin{cases} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2, y \in \mathbb{R}^3} & (1 + x_1 - x_2 + 2y_2)(8 - x_1 - 2y_1 + y_2 + 5y_3) \\ \text{s.t.} & x \geq 0, \quad y \in S(x), \end{cases}$$

where $S(x)$ is the set of global optimizer(s) of

$$\begin{cases} \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^3} & 2z_1 - z_2 + z_3 \\ \text{s.t.} & z \geq 0, \quad 1 + z_1 - z_2 - z_3 \geq 0, \\ & 1 - 2x_1 + z_1 - 2z_2 + 0.5z_3 \geq 0, \\ & 1 - 2x_2 - 2z_1 + z_2 + 0.5z_3 \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

Example A.11 (BIPA1 [10]).

$$\begin{cases} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^3, y \in \mathbb{R}^8} & -x_1y_3 - x_2y_4 - x_3y_8 \\ \text{s.t.} & x \geq 0, \quad y \in S(x), \end{cases}$$

where $S(x)$ is the set of global optimizer(s) of

$$\begin{cases} \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^8} & 2z_1 + 6z_2 + (5 + x_1)z_3 + x_2z_4 + 4z_5 + 2z_6 + 6z_7 + x_3z_8 \\ \text{s.t.} & z_1 + z_2 + z_3 = 1, \quad z_1 - z_4 - z_5 = 0, \\ & z_2 + z_4 = z_6 + z_7, \quad z_2 + z_4 = z_6 + z_7, \\ & z_3 + z_7 + z_8 = 1, \quad z \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

Example A.12 (BIPA4 [10]).

$$\begin{cases} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2, y \in \mathbb{R}^4} & -(y_2 + y_3)x_1 - y_3x_2 \\ \text{s.t.} & y \in S(x), \end{cases}$$

where $S(x)$ is the set of global optimizer(s) of

$$\begin{cases} \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^4} & 8z_1 + (3 + 2x_1)z_2 + (3 + 2x_1 + 2x_2)z_3 + 6z_4 \\ \text{s.t.} & z_1 + z_2 = 1, \quad z_3 + z_4 = 1, \quad z \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

Example A.13 (BIPA5 [10]).

$$\begin{cases} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}, y \in \mathbb{R}^4} & -(y_2 + y_3)x \\ \text{s.t.} & y \in S(x), \end{cases}$$

where $S(x)$ is the set of global optimizer(s) of

$$\begin{cases} \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^4} & 8z_1 + (3 + 2x)z_2 + (4 + 2x)z_3 + 6z_4 \\ \text{s.t.} & z_1 + z_2 = 1, \quad z_3 + z_4 = 1, \quad z \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Andreani, G. Haeser, M. L. Schuverdt and P. J. S. Silva, A relaxed constant positive linear dependence constraint qualification and applications, *Math. Program.*, 135 (2012), 255-273.
- [2] K. Bai and J. J. Ye, Directional necessary optimality conditions for bilevel programs, *Math. Oper. Res.*, 47 (2022), 1169-1191.
- [3] E. Balas, A Disjunctive programming and a hierarchy of relaxations for discrete optimization problems, *SIAM J. Algebraic Discrete Methods*, 6 (1985), 466-486.
- [4] J. F. Bard, Convex two-level optimization, *Math. Program.*, 40 (1988), 15–27.
- [5] J. F. Bard, *Practical Bilevel Optimization: Algorithms and Applications*, Vol. 30. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [6] J. F. Bard and J. E. Falk, An explicit solution to the multi-level programming problem, *Comput. Oper. Res.*, 9 (1982), 77-100.
- [7] O. Ben-Ayed and C. E. Blair, Computational difficulties of bilevel linear programming, *Oper. Res.*, 38 (1990), 556-560.
- [8] P. H. Calamai and L. N. Vicente, Generating quadratic bilevel programming test problems, *ACM Trans. Math. Softw.*, 20 (1994), 103-119.
- [9] P. A. Clark and A. W. Westerberg, Bilevel programming for steady-state chemical process design—I. Fundamentals and algorithms, *Computers Chem. Eng.*, 14 (1990), 87-97.
- [10] B. Colson, BIPA (Bilevel Programming with Approximation Methods): Software guide and test problems, Technical report, 2002.
- [11] B. Colson, P. Marcotte and G. Savard, An overview of bilevel optimization, *Ann. Oper. Res.*, 153 (2007), 235-256.
- [12] S. Dempe, *Bilevel Optimization: Theory, Algorithms and Applications*, TU Bergakademie Freiberg, Fakultät für Mathematik und Informatik, 2018.
- [13] S. Dempe and J. Dutta, Is bilevel programming a special case of a mathematical program with complementarity constraints?, *Math. Program.*, 131 (2012), 37–48.
- [14] S. Dempe and S. Lohse, Dependence of bilevel programming on irrelevant data, *Dekan der Fak. für Mathematik und Informatik*, 2011.
- [15] S. Dempe, V. Kalashnikov, G. Pérez-Valdés and N. Kalashnykova, *Bilevel Programming Problems*, Energy Systems, Springer, Berlin, 2015.
- [16] S. Dempe and A. Zemkoho, *Bilevel Optimization: Advances and Next Challenges*, Springer Optimization and its Applications. Vol. 161. Springer Cham, 2020.
- [17] C. A. Floudas, et al., *Handbook of Test Problems in Local and Global Optimization*, Vol. 33. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [18] L. Franceschi, P. Frasconi, S. Salzo, R. Grazzi and M. Pontil, Bilevel programming for hyperparameter optimization, *Inter. Conf. Mach. Learning*, 1563-1572, 2018.
- [19] C. Hillar and J. Nie, An elementary and constructive solution to Hilbert’s 17th problem for matrices, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 136 (2008), 73-76.
- [20] L. Gao, J. J. Ye, H. Yin, S. Zeng and J. Zhang, Value function based difference-of-convex algorithm for bilevel hyperparameter selection problems, *Inter. Conf. Mach. Learning*, 162 (2022), 7164-7182.
- [21] L. Guo, G. Lin, J.J. Ye and J. Zhang, Sensitivity analysis of the value function for parametric mathematical programs with equilibrium constraints, *SIAM J. Optim.*, 24 (2014), 1206-1237.
- [22] Z. H. Gumus and C. A. Floudas, Global optimization of nonlinear bilevel programming problems, *J. Global Optim.*, 20 (2001), 1–31.
- [23] L. Guo, J.J. Ye and J. Zhang, Sensitivity analysis of the maximal value function with applications in nonconvex minimax programs, *Math. Oper. Res.*, in press 2023.
- [24] D. Henrion and J. Lasserre, *Detecting global optimality and extracting solutions in GloptiPoly*, In: Henrion, D., Garulli, A. (eds) *Positive Polynomials in Control*, 293–310, Lecture Notes in Control and Inform. Sci., 312, Springer, Berlin, 2005.
- [25] D. Henrion, J. Lasserre, and J. Löfberg, Gloptipoly 3: moments, optimization and semidefinite programming, *Optim. Meth. Softw.*, 24 (2009), 761-779.
- [26] D. Henrion, M. Korda, and J.B. Lasserre, *The Moment-SOS Hierarchy*, World Scientific, Singapore, 2020.
- [27] A. J. Hoffman, On approximate solutions of linear inequalities, *J. Research Nat. Bur. Standards*, 49 (1952), 263-265.

- [28] V. Jeyakumar, J. Lasserre, G. Li and T. Pham, Convergent semidefinite programming relaxations for global bilevel polynomial optimization problems, *SIAM J. Optim.*, 26 (2016), 753-780.
- [29] R. Ke, W. Yao, J.J. Ye and J. Zhang, Generic property of the partial calmness condition for bilevel programming problems, *SIAM J. Optim.*, 32 (2022), 604-634.
- [30] G. Kunapuli, K. Bennett, J. Hu and J-S. Pang, Classification model selection via bilevel programming, *Optim. Meth. Softw.*, 23 (2008), 475-489.
- [31] J. Lasserre, Global optimization with polynomials and the problem of moments, *SIAM J. Optim.*, 11 (2000), 796-817.
- [32] J. Lasserre, *Moments, Positive Polynomials and Their Applications*, Vol. 1, World Scientific, 2009.
- [33] L. Lampariello, S. Sagratella, Numerically tractable optimistic bilevel problems, *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, 76 (2020), 277-303.
- [34] M. Laurent, *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.
- [35] S. Lee, I. E. Grossmann, New algorithms for nonlinear generalized disjunctive programming, *Computers Chem. Eng.*, 24 (2000), 2125-2141.
- [36] Y. C. Liang and J. Ye, Optimality conditions and exact penalty for mathematical programs with switching constraints, *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, 190 (2021), 1-31.
- [37] G. Lin, M. Xu and J. Ye, On solving simple bilevel programs with a nonconvex lower level program, *Math. Program.*, 144 (2014), 277-305.
- [38] Z. Luo, J. Pang and D. Ralph, *Mathematical Programs with Equilibrium Constraints*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1996.
- [39] X. Ma, W. Yao, J.J. Ye and J. Zhang, Combined approach with second-order optimality conditions for bilevel programming problems, *Journal of Convex Analysis*, in press.
- [40] J. Mirrlees, The theory of moral hazard and unobservable behaviour: part I, *Rev. Eco. Stud.*, 66 (1999), 3-22.
- [41] A. Mitsos, P. Lemonidis and P.I. Barton, Global solution of bilevel programs with a nonconvex inner program, *J. Global Optim.*, 42 (2008), 475-513.
- [42] L. D. Muu and N. V. Quy, A global optimization method for solving convex quadratic bilevel programming problems, *J. Global Optim.*, 26 (2003), 199-219.
- [43] J. Nie, Polynomial matrix inequality and semidefinite representation, *Math. Oper. Res.* 36 (2011), 398-415.
- [44] J. Nie, Sum of squares methods for minimizing polynomial forms over spheres and hypersurfaces, *Fron. Math. China*, 7 (2012), 321-346.
- [45] J. Nie, Certifying convergence of Lasserre's hierarchy via flat truncation, *Math. Program.* 142 (2013), 485-510.
- [46] J. Nie, Optimality conditions and finite convergence of Lasserre's hierarchy, *Math. Program.*, 146 (2014), 97-121.
- [47] J. Nie, X. Tang and S. Zhong, Rational generalized Nash equilibrium problems, *Preprint*, 2021.
- [48] J. Nie, L. Wang and J.J. Ye, Bilevel polynomial programs and semidefinite relaxation methods, *SIAM J. Optim.*, 27 (2017), 1728-1757.
- [49] J. Nie, L. Wang, J. Ye and S. Zhong, A Lagrange multiplier expression method for bilevel polynomial optimization, *SIAM J. Optim.*, 31 (2021), 2368-2395.
- [50] J. Nie, *Moment and Polynomial Optimization*, SIAM, submitted, 2023.
- [51] J. V. Outrata, On the numerical solution of a class of Stackelberg problems, *Z. Oper. Res.*, 34 (1990), 255-277.
- [52] J. V. Outrata, Necessary optimality conditions for Stackelberg problems, *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, 76 (1993), 305-320.
- [53] J. V. Outrata, M. Kocvara, and J. Zowe, *Nonsmooth Approach to Optimization Problems with Equilibrium Constraints: Theory, Applications and Numerical Results*, Kluwer Academic, Boston, 1998.
- [54] R. Raman, I. E. Grossmann, Modelling and computational techniques for logic based integer programming, *Computers and Chem. Eng.*, 18 (1994), 563-578.
- [55] K. Shimizu, Y. Ishizuka and J. Bard, *Nondifferentiable and Two-level Mathematical Programming*, Kluwer Academic, 1997.

- [56] A. Sinha, P. Malo, and K. Deb, An improved bilevel evolutionary algorithm based on quadratic approximations, *In Evolutionary Computation (CEC)*, 2014 IEEE Congress, pp. 1870-1877, 2014.
- [57] H. Von Stackelberg, *Market structure and equilibrium*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2010.
- [58] J. Sturm, Using SeDuMi 1.02, a MATLAB toolbox for optimization over symmetric cones, *Optim. Meth. Softw.*, 11 (1999), 625-653.
- [59] Z. P. Wan, G. M. Wang and Y. B. Lv, A dual-relax penalty function approach for solving nonlinear bilevel programming with linear lower level problem, *Acta Math. Sci.*, 31 (2011), 652-660.
- [60] M. Xu and J. J. Ye, A smoothing augmented Lagrangian method for solving simple bilevel programs, *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, 59 (2014), 353-377.
- [61] M. Xu, J. J. Ye and L. Zhang, A smoothing SQP method for solving degenerate nonsmooth constrained optimization problems with applications to bilevel programs, *SIAM J. Optim.*, 25 (2015), 1388-1410.
- [62] J. J. Ye, Constraint qualifications and optimality conditions in bilevel optimization, *Bilevel Optimization*. Springer, Cham, 2020, 227-251.
- [63] J.J. Ye and D. L. Zhu, Optimality conditions for bilevel programming problems, *Optim.*, 33 (1995), 9-27.
- [64] J. J. Ye, X. Yuan, S. Zeng and J. Zhang, Difference of convex algorithms for bilevel programs with applications in hyperparameter selection, *Math. Program.*, 198 (2023), 1583-1616.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SAN DIEGO, 9500 GILMAN DRIVE,
LA JOLLA, CA, USA, 92093.

Email address: njw@math.ucsd.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA, VICTORIA, B.C.,
CANADA, V8W 2Y2.

Email address: janeye@uvic.ca

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY, 400 BIZZELL ST, COLLEGE STATION,
TX, USA, 77843.

Email address: suzhong@tamu.edu