

CONVERGENCE RATES OF S.O.S HIERARCHIES FOR POLYNOMIAL SEMIDEFINITE PROGRAMS

HOANG ANH TRAN, KIM-CHUAN TOH

Key words. Polynomial Optimization , Convergence Rates , Approximation theory , Real Algebraic Geometry

AMS subject classifications. 90C22, 90C26, 41A10, 41A50,

Abstract.

We introduce a S.O.S hierarchy of lower bounds for a polynomial optimization problem whose constraint is expressed as a matrix polynomial semidefinite condition. Our approach involves utilizing a penalty function framework to directly address the matrix-based constraint, making it applicable to both discrete and continuous polynomial optimization problems. We investigate the convergence rates of these bounds in both problem types. The proposed method yields a variation of Putinar's theorem tailored for positive polynomials within a compact semidefinite set, defined by a matrix polynomial semidefinite constraint. More specifically, we derive novel insights into the convergence rates and degree of additional terms in the representation within this modified version of Putinar's theorem, based on the Jackson's theorem and a version of Lojasiewicz inequality.

1. Introduction.

1.1. Polynomial Optimization Problems. This paper studies how to solve a polynomial optimization problem with a matrix polynomial semidefinite constraint of the following form:

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{aligned} f^* &= \min f(x) \\ \text{such that } x &\in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ and } G(x) \succeq 0 \end{aligned}$$

where $f \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ is a polynomial of degree d , and $G(x) = (g_{ij}(x))_{m \times m} \in \mathbb{SR}[x]^m$ (which consists of $m \times m$ symmetric matrix of polynomials) with each $g_{ij}(x) \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ of degree at most d . Denote its eigenvalues in non-increasing order by the functions $\lambda_1(x) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_m(x)$. Then, the set of feasible solution, given by

$$(1.2) \quad \mathcal{X} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : G(x) \succeq 0\} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \lambda_m(x) \geq 0\},$$

is a basic semi-algebraic set which we will elaborate later. The function of smallest eigenvalue of $G(x)$ cannot represent \mathcal{X} as a semi-algebraic set since it is not a polynomial. Specially, classical polynomial optimization occurs when $G(x)$ is diagonal with polynomials $g_{ii}(x)$, making \mathcal{X} a semi-algebraic set defined by polynomial inequalities $g_{ii} \geq 0$. Problem (1.1) extends this by specifying the domain via a semidefinite constraint. To show \mathcal{X} as a semi-algebraic set with polynomial inequalities, Descartes's rule of signs can be used, explicitly describing \mathcal{X} by m scalar polynomial inequalities $g_i(x)$ that are the coefficient polynomials of $G(x)$'s characteristic polynomial, as shown in [6]

$$\det(tI_m - G(x)) = t^m + \sum_{i=1}^m (-1)^i g_i(x) t^{m-i}.$$

The constraint $G(x) \succeq 0$ is equivalent to that all the roots of its characteristic polynomial are non-negative. Therefore, the condition is possibly deduced from the coefficient polynomials $g_i(x)$'s by using a generalization of Descartes's rule of signs, see in [6] and [9]. Based on Descartes's rule, the set \mathcal{X} admits the form of a basic

semi-algebraic set as

$$\mathcal{X} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : g_i(x) \geq 0 \forall i = 1, \dots, m\}.$$

However, the defining polynomials have significantly larger degrees than $G(x)$, making computation challenging. Consequently, transforming (1.1) into a classical polynomial optimization problem and using established methods becomes prohibitively expensive. Additionally, the hierarchy depends on how the domain is defined by polynomial or matrix inequalities, affecting SDP relaxations' performance (see Example A.1).

The primary goal of this paper is to construct an S.O.S hierarchy for (1.1) and analyzes convergence rates for 2 types of polynomial optimization with semidefinite constraint: 1) discrete cases when domain is a subset of binary hypercube, and 2) continuous cases when domain is a subset of simple sets (i.e sphere, unit ball, etc).

The methodology involves leveraging Approximation Theory to construct penalty functions, which is used in recent works such as [1], [17], [20] and [16]. While the penalty-function approach studied in [8] only established convergence, and the degree of the proposed penalty functions is generally large, these penalty functions reinstates the simplicity of the feasible set, for which the convergence rate is well-studied. In our current work, we make progress in these two issues, as we shall elaborate in the next subsection.

1.2. A SDP-approach via S.O.S hierarchies. In this section, we present a generalization of Lasserre's hierarchies for semidefinite constraints, which is proposed by Hol and Scherer in [7] based on an extension of Putinar's theorem. We use common terms and definitions as in the book [12].

THEOREM 1.1. *Let the constraint qualification hold: there exist an S.O.S polynomial σ and an S.O.S matrix $R(x)$ (i.e a matrix of the form $T(x)T(x)^T$ for some rectangular matrix polynomial $T(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times s}[x]$) and an integer N such that*

$$N - \|x\|_2^2 = \sigma(x) + \langle R(x), G(x) \rangle.$$

Then every positive polynomial f on the domain \mathcal{X} is in the quadratic module $Q(\mathcal{X})$ defined by

$$Q(\mathcal{X}) := \{\sigma(x) + \langle R(x), G(x) \rangle : \sigma \text{ is an S.O.S polynomial, } R \text{ is an S.O.S matrix}\}.$$

Remark 1.2. The constraint qualification is not stringent and can be equivalently expressed as follows: there exist an S.O.S matrix $R(x)$ and an S.O.S polynomial $\sigma(x)$ such that

$$\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sigma(x) + \langle R(x), G(x) \rangle \leq 0\} \text{ is compact.}$$

As a result, the theorem induces the following S.O.S hierarchy for the problem (1.1):

$$\begin{aligned} f_i &= \max t \\ \text{s.t } f(x) - t &= \sigma(x) + \langle R(x), G(x) \rangle \\ \text{deg}(\sigma) &\leq 2i, \text{ deg}(\langle R(x), G(x) \rangle) \leq 2i. \end{aligned}$$

This S.O.S hierarchy $\{f_i\}$ forms an increasing sequence which is upper bounded by f^* , i.e, $f_1 \leq \dots \leq f_i \leq f_{i+1} \leq \dots \leq f^*$. On the other hand, the following moment hierarchy

$$\begin{aligned} f^{(i)} &= \inf \int_{\mathcal{X}} f(x)v(x)d\mu(x) \\ \text{s.t } v(x) &= \sigma(x) + \langle R(x), G(x) \rangle \\ \text{deg}(\sigma) &\leq 2i, \text{ deg}(\langle R(x), G(x) \rangle) \leq 2i, \end{aligned}$$

generates a decreasing sequence that is lower bounded by f^* , i.e. $f^{(1)} \geq \dots \geq f^{(i)} \geq f^{(i+1)} \geq \dots \geq f^*$. The convergence of these two hierarchies to the optimal value f^* were proved in [7] and [8]. However, the convergence rate analysis remains unexplored. Moreover, the degrees of the polynomials involved in each relaxation level could be unnecessarily large. Thus the purpose of this work is to (i) reduce the size of the semidefinite program at each level and (ii) analyze the convergence rate after integrating several modifications.

1.3. Related works. In this section, we recall the Lasserre's hierarchy for polynomial optimization problems over basic semi-algebraic sets and the corresponding convergence analysis. Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a compact semi-algebraic set of the form

$$(1.3) \quad X := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : g_j(x) \geq 0 \ (1 \leq j \leq m)\},$$

where $g_j \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ is a polynomial for all $1 \leq j \leq m$, and consider the problem

$$(1.4) \quad f^* := \min_{x \in X} f(x) = \max\{t \in \mathbb{R} : f - t \in \mathcal{P}_+(X)\},$$

where $\mathcal{P}_+(X)$ denotes the set of non-negative polynomials over X , and $\mathcal{P}(X)$ denotes the set of polynomials over X . This equivalence is based on the certificates of positivity for polynomials on compact semi-algebraic sets by sums of squares. In [11] and [13], Lasserre proposed several hierarchies to approximate the optimal value of (1.4) by semidefinite programs (SDP) of increasing sizes. These SDP relaxation is strictly related to Putinar's Positivstellensatz for Archimedean semi-algebraic sets and Schmüdgen's Positivstellensatz for compact semi-algebraic sets, respectively, see [12].

DEFINITION 1.3. *We state the following definitions separately for semi-algebraic sets defined by polynomial constraints and semidefinite constraints.*

- A polynomial $p(x) \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ is a sum-of-squares if it can be written as $p = \sum_{i=1}^k p_i^2$ for some polynomials $p_i \in \mathbb{R}[x]$. The set of S.O.S polynomials is denoted by $\Sigma[x] \subset \mathbb{R}[x]$.
- For each semi-algebraic set X defined in (1.3), the quadratic module $\mathcal{Q}(X)$ is

$$\mathcal{Q}(X) := \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^m \sigma_i g_i : \sigma_i \in \Sigma[x] \right\} \quad (g_0 := 1).$$

- In extension, if a semi-algebraic set \mathcal{X} is defined by semidefinite constraints as in (1.2), the quadratic module is defined by

$$\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X}) := \{\sigma(x) + \langle R(x), G(x) \rangle : \sigma \in \Sigma[x] \text{ and } R(x) \text{ is an S.O.S matrix}\}.$$

- The preordering set is defined by

$$\mathcal{T}(X) := \left\{ \sum_{J \subset [m]} \sigma_J g_J : \sigma_J \in \Sigma[x] \right\} \quad (g_J := \prod_{j \in J} g_j).$$

It is clear from the definitions that

$$\Sigma[x] \subseteq \mathcal{Q}(X) \subseteq \mathcal{T}(X) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_+(X).$$

Lasserre observes that relaxing the set of non-negative polynomials by quadratic module and preordering, followed by truncation based on the degree, establishes the following hierarchies of lower bounds on the global minimum f^* of f over X :

$$(1.5) \quad \text{lb}(f, \mathcal{Q}(X))_r := \max\{t \in \mathbb{R} : f - t \in \mathcal{Q}(X)_{2r}\}$$

$$(1.6) \quad \text{lb}(f, \mathcal{T}(X))_r := \max\{t \in \mathbb{R} : f - t \in \mathcal{T}(X)_{2r}\}.$$

By truncation of the degree, we mean the subsets $\mathcal{Q}(X)_{2r}$ and $\mathcal{T}(X)_{2r}$ of $\mathcal{Q}(X)$ and $\mathcal{T}(X)$, respectively, consisting of polynomials of degree at most $2r$. The convergence of these hierarchies under suitable condition on the set X are direct consequences of Putinar's Positivstellensatz and Schmüdgen's Positivstellensatz, respectively.

The convergence analysis on the hierarchies of lower bounds over special domains were intensively studied over the last decade. We highlight here some of the main results: the paper [17] proved the convergence rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/\log(r)^c)$ for Putinar-type bounds, where the constant c depends on the general Archimedean semi-algebraic X . Recently, the paper [1] improved the rate to $\mathcal{O}(1/r^c)$ (for some other constant c) also for Archimedean domains with several improvements using the same technique. In the paper [22], the authors specified the rate for binary hypercube as follows.

THEOREM 1.4 (Convergence rate of S.O.S hierarchy on $\mathbb{B}^n = \{0, 1\}^n$). *Let $f \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ of degree $d \geq n$. Consider $r \in \mathbb{N}$, let ξ_r^n be the least root of the degree r Krawtchouk polynomial with parameter n , and denote the minimal value of f over \mathbb{B}^n by f^* . Then if $(r+1)/n \leq 1/2$ and $d(d+1) \cdot \xi_{r+1}^n \leq 1/2$, we have:*

$$\frac{f^* - \text{lb}(f, \mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{B}^n))_r}{\|f\|_\infty} \leq 2C_d \cdot \xi_{r+1}^n/n.$$

Here $C_d > 0$ is a constant depending only on d , and $\|f\|_\infty := \max_{x \in \{0, 1\}^n} |f(x)|$. For $t \in [0, 1/2]$, define the function

$$\varphi(t) = 1/2 - \sqrt{t(1-t)}.$$

Then for some universal constant $c > 0$, ξ_r^n satisfies

$$\xi_r^n/n \leq \varphi(r/n) + c(r/n)^{-1/6} \cdot n^{-2/3}.$$

Moreover, the bounds $\text{lb}(f, \mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{B}^n))_r$ have finite convergence, i.e the exact optimal value is obtained after finite steps of the hierarchy for any $r \geq n$, according to [10] and [14]. Later on, the paper [19] showed that the bound $\text{lb}(f, \mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{B}^n))_r$ is exact for $2r \geq n + d - 2$ when the polynomial f only has monomials of even degree. For other discrete polynomial optimization problem, specially finite abelian groups, the Fourier transform induced the convergence rate studied in [5]. The work [21] studies the convergence rates of $\mathcal{O}(1/r^2)$ for the n -dimensional unit ball and the standard simplex, the same rate is also proved for the hyper-sphere in [15].

THEOREM 1.5. *Let $X = B^n = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|x\|_2^2 \leq 1\}$ be the n -dimensional unit ball and let $f \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ be a polynomial of degree d . Then for any $r \geq 2nd$, the lower bound $\text{lb}(f, \mathcal{Q}(B^n))_r$ for the minimal value f^* of f over B^n satisfies:*

$$f^* - \text{lb}(f, \mathcal{Q}(B^n))_r \leq \frac{C_B(n, d)}{r^2} \cdot (f_{\max} - f^*).$$

Here, f_{\max} is the maximal value of f over B^n , and $C_B(n, d)$ is a constant depending only on n and d . In addition, this constant depends polynomially on n (for fixed d) and polynomially on d (for fixed n).

Methodology. We present a methodology to approximate the optimal value over subsets of simple sets like the binary hypercube and n -dimensional ball, defined by matrix inequality. This approach is broadly applicable to all compact sets defined by semidefinite conditions. The optimization problems we consider admit the form

$$(1.7) \quad \begin{aligned} f^* &= \min f(x) \\ \text{such that } x &\in \mathcal{X} = \{x \in \mathcal{C}, G(x) \succeq 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here \mathcal{C} is a simple domain with well-known convergence rate for the S.O.S hierarchy of lower bounds on \mathcal{C} . In this paper, \mathcal{C} is the binary hypercube for the discrete case, and \mathcal{C} is the n -dimensional ball for the continuous case. We make a simple observation that: If the optimal value f^* over \mathcal{X} coincides with the optimal value of the objective function f over \mathcal{C} , then the problem (1.7) is equivalent to the optimization problem:

$$f^* = \min \{f(x) \mid x \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

This can be solved efficiently by Lasserre's S.O.S hierarchy of lower bounds.

However in general, the optimal value f^* is larger than the optimal value of f over \mathcal{C} . Then the strategy is to raise the value of f outside \mathcal{X} without changing the value of f on \mathcal{X} by using a penalty function. In other words, the problem (1.7) is equivalent to a new optimization problem of the form:

$$(1.8) \quad f^* = \min \{f(x) + P(x) \mid x \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

The function $P(x)$ here represents the penalty function satisfying: $P(x)$ is sufficiently large outside the set \mathcal{X} , but equals to 0 on \mathcal{X} . Noticeably, There are no such polynomial, whence $P(x)$ is not a polynomial. However, as the goal is to approximate, we can perturb f by a polynomial that is relatively small on \mathcal{X} and sufficient large outside \mathcal{X} . To achieve that, we apply the approximation of univariate continuous function by Chebyshev polynomials with the error bounded by Jackson's theorem.

For the continuous case, we consider a sequence of small neighborhoods $\{V_\delta\}$ of \mathcal{X} satisfying the condition that $\max_{x \in V_\delta} \text{dist}(x, \mathcal{X}) \rightarrow 0$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. For each $\delta > 0$, the construction of the penalty function $P_\delta(x)$ lifts up the value of f outside V_δ , but slightly perturb the value of f on \mathcal{X} . The "middle area", which is $V_\delta - \mathcal{X}$, allows us to modify the penalty function as smoothly as possible, which according to Jackson's theorem, the smoother a function is, the smaller is the error given by an approximation polynomial. However, the degree of the penalty function P_δ tends to infinity as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. To resolve this obstacle, we use the Lipschitz constant of f over \mathcal{C} and the Łojasiewicz exponent to show the connection between δ and the degree of the penalty function.

Organization of the paper.

- We first introduce a method employing penalty functions to construct a hierarchy for binary polynomial optimization problems (BPOP) in Section 2, and the corresponding convergence rate is studied in Theorem 2.13.
- Section 3 tackles continuous problem with the convergence rate in Theorem 3.1
- Finally, we introduce a bound on the degree of the terms comprising the Sum of Squares (S.O.S) representation of a positive polynomial over a domain defined by a matrix inequality. This bound is elucidated in Theorem 4.4.

2. Discrete Polynomial Optimization Problems with semidefinite constraints.

2.1. Binary Polynomial Optimization Problem . Let consider the problem of minimizing a polynomial $f \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ of degree $d \leq n$ over a subset of the n -dimensional binary hypercube $\mathbb{B}^n = \{0, 1\}^n$ (which is the simple domain \mathcal{C} mentioned previously), satisfying the semidefinite constraint $G(x) \succeq 0$ and $G(x) \in \mathbb{S}\mathbb{R}^m[x]$ is of degree l , i.e.,

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{aligned} f^* &= \min f(x) \\ \text{such that } x &\in \mathcal{X} := \{x \in \mathbb{B}^n : G(x) \succeq 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that when considering the objective polynomial over any subset of \mathbb{B}^n , it suffices to replace it by its image in the quotient ring $\mathbb{R}[x]/\langle x_1 - x_1^2, \dots, x_n - x_n^2 \rangle$, in which every polynomial is of degree at most n . Hence, we only need to consider the case where the degree of f is at most n .

Following the described strategy, we need to extend the feasible set into \mathbb{B}^n by constructing a penalty function $P(x)$ such that the new objective function $F(x) := f(x) + P(x)$ is similar to the function $f(x)$ over \mathcal{X} , and sufficient large over $\mathbb{B}^n - \mathcal{X}$. In [8], Kojima proposed the following indicator function:

$$\phi(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{X} \\ \infty & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{B}^n - \mathcal{X}. \end{cases}$$

Clearly, the function ϕ is not a polynomial but it gives a precise description on the behavior the penalty function $P(x)$ must possess as follows: the penalty function P is close to zero over \mathcal{X} , and for the points in $\mathbb{B}^n - \mathcal{X}$, the value of the penalty function P is large enough so that all minimizers of the function $f + P$ over \mathbb{B}^n belong to \mathcal{X} , for which we can use Theorem 1.4 for the new objective function $f + P$. The construction of the penalty function is later shown in Section 2.3. Once we have a sequence of such polynomial penalty function $P_r(x)$, the following hierarchy estimate the optimal value f^* :

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{aligned} f_r &= \max t \\ \text{such that } f(x) + P_r(x) - t &\in \Sigma[x]_{2r}. \end{aligned}$$

LEMMA 2.1. *Let d, r be integers such that $(r+1)/n \leq 1/2$ and $d(d+1) \cdot \xi_{r+1}^n \leq 1/2$ as in Theorem 1.4. Let $P_r(x)$ be a polynomial of degree $d(r)$ satisfying $d(r)(d(r)+1) \cdot \xi_{r+1}^n \leq 1/2$. Let $M_f := \max_{x \in \mathbb{B}^n} |f(x)|$, and define*

$$\varepsilon(P_r) := \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |P_r(x)|, \quad M(P_r) := \max_{x \in \mathbb{B}^n} |P_r|.$$

We assume that $\min_{x \in \mathbb{B}^n - \mathcal{X}} P_r$ is large enough so that the polynomial $f(x) + P_r(x)$ has all its minimizers in \mathcal{X} . Then the bound is obtained as

$$-\varepsilon(P_r) \leq f^* - f_r \leq 2C_{D(r)}(M_f + M(P_r)) \cdot \xi_{r+1}^n/n + \varepsilon(P_r),$$

where $D(r) = \deg(f + P_r(x))$, and the optimal values f^ and f_r are defined as in (2.1) and (2.2) respectively.*

Proof. Let us denote the function $F_r(x) = f(x) + P_r(x)$ of degree $D(r)$, which satisfies the inequality

$$D(r) \leq \max\{d, d(r)\}.$$

The conditions $d(d+1) \cdot \xi_{r+1}^n \leq 1/2$ and $d(r)(d(r)+1) \cdot \xi_{r+1}^n \leq 1/2$ indicate that

$$D(r)(D(r)+1) \cdot \xi_{r+1}^n \leq 1/2.$$

Let denote $F_r^* := \min_{\mathbb{B}^n} F_r(x)$. According to Theorem 1.4, f_r is a lower bound of F_r^* satisfying the inequality

$$0 \leq F_r^* - f_r \leq 2C_{D(r)} \|F_r\|_{\mathbb{B}^n} \cdot \xi_{r+1}^n / n.$$

Here, $\|F_r\|_{\mathbb{B}^n} := \max_{x \in \mathbb{B}^n} |F_r(x)| \leq M_f + M(P_r)$. Note that by assumption, all minimizers of F_r over \mathbb{B}^n is in \mathcal{X} . Let \bar{x} be a minimizer of F_r over \mathbb{B}^n . Then $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ and $F_r(\bar{x}) = F_r^*$. We have that

$$f^* - F_r(\bar{x}) = f^* - f(\bar{x}) - P_r(\bar{x}) \leq -P_r(\bar{x}) \leq \varepsilon(P_r).$$

Therefore, we get

$$f^* - f_r = f^* - F_r(\bar{x}) + F_r(\bar{x}) - f_r \leq 2C_{D(r)}(M_f + M(P_r)) \cdot \xi_{r+1}^n + \varepsilon(P_r).$$

On the other hand, from (2.2), we get $F_r(x) - f_r \geq 0, \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let x^* be a minimizer of f over \mathcal{X} . Then

$$f^* - f_r = f^* - F_r(x^*) + F_r(x^*) - f_r \geq f^* - F_r(x^*) = f(x^*) - f(x^*) - P_r(x^*).$$

Thus $f^* - f_r \geq -P_r(x^*) \geq -\varepsilon(P_r)$. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 2.1 approximates f^* with the error depending on the following factors: the degree of the penalty function (usually larger than the degree of f), the maximal absolute value of the penalty function P_r over \mathbb{B}^n , and the maximal absolute value of P_r over \mathcal{X} . To ensure the convergence, Theorem 1.1 provides an idea using the inner product of symmetric matrices and the matrix $G(x)$ itself. The next section explores a larger framework where discreteness is present but the set is not necessarily in a binary hypercube.

2.2. Simple representations of \mathcal{X} . We show that any discrete set defined by a semidefinite constraint can be represented by a single polynomial inequality, and this polynomial belongs to the quadratic module defined by the semidefinite constraint. Let \mathcal{D} be a bounded discrete subset of \mathbb{R}^n , and $G(x) \in \mathbb{S}\mathbb{R}^m[x]$ is defined as above. Without loss of generality, we can normalize $G(x)$ such that for any $x \in \mathcal{D}$, the absolute value of all eigenvalues of $G(x)$ is at most 1. We aim to use a simpler form to represent the feasible set

$$\mathcal{X} = \{x \in \mathcal{D} : G(x) \succeq 0\}.$$

PROPOSITION 2.2. *Let \mathcal{X} be defined as above. Then there is a polynomial $g(x) \in \mathbb{R}[x]$, which represent \mathcal{X} as follows:*

$$\mathcal{X} = \{x \in \mathcal{D} : g(x) \geq 0\}$$

Proof. Recall the function $\lambda_m(x)$, which maps x to the smallest eigenvalue of the matrix $G(x)$. This function is well-defined because $G(x)$ is symmetric. Consider the interpolation polynomial $g(x)$ that maps the finite set of points $x \in \mathcal{D}$ to the smallest eigenvalue $\lambda_m(x)$. Then, $g|_{\mathcal{D}} = \lambda_m|_{\mathcal{D}}$ directly implies that $\mathcal{X} = \{x \in \mathcal{D} : g(x) \geq 0\}$. \square

It is observed that the proof is non-constructive, and identifying a finite set of points for interpolation is not feasible. Additionally, the degree of $g(x)$ may be exceedingly high as a result of the interpolation process. Nonetheless, because of the discreteness and the normalization, there exists a negative number $0 > \lambda := \max_{x \in \mathcal{D}-\mathcal{X}} \lambda_m(x) \geq -1$, which is used to represent \mathcal{X} in the following theorem.

THEOREM 2.3. *There exists a non-negative univariate polynomial $h(t) \in \mathbb{R}[t]$ over the interval $[-1, 1]$, which represents the set \mathcal{X} as*

$$\mathcal{X} = \{x \in \mathcal{D} : \langle h(G(x)), G(x) \rangle \geq 0\}.$$

Proof. For any univariate polynomial $h(t)$, we can rewrite $\langle h(G(x)), G(x) \rangle$ by the eigenvalue functions $\lambda_i(x)$, $1 \leq i \leq m$, of $G(x)$ as follows:

$$\langle h(G(x)), G(x) \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^m h(\lambda_i(x))\lambda_i(x).$$

It is clear that for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $G(x) \succeq 0$ implies that $\lambda_i(x) \geq 0$. Therefore, it induces the following containment for any non-negative univariate polynomial $h(t)$ over $[-1, 1]$:

$$\mathcal{X} \subset \{x \in \mathcal{D} : \langle h(G(x)), G(x) \rangle \geq 0\}.$$

To obtain the converse containment, we observe that for any $t \in [-1, \lambda]$, the function $h(t)$ needs to be relatively larger than the value of $h(t)$ over the interval $[0, 1]$. Consequently, one notices that the behavior of $h(t)$ is possibly similar to an affine piece-wise function $a(t)$ defined as follows:

$$a(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t \in [0, 1] \\ -m/\lambda & \text{if } t \in [-1, \lambda] \\ 1 - \left(1 + \frac{m}{\lambda}\right) \cdot \frac{t}{\lambda} & \text{if } t \in [\lambda, 0]. \end{cases}$$

Given a positive $\epsilon > 0$, the Stone-Weierstrass theorem (see [18]) ensures that there exists a polynomial $h(t)$ such that $\|h - a\|_{[-1, 1]} \leq \epsilon$. Let $\epsilon < 1/2$. Consequently, $h(t)$ is a non-negative polynomial over $[-1, 1]$, and for any $t \in [0, 1]$, $0 < h(t) < 1$. Moreover, for any $t \in [-1, \lambda]$, $h(t) \geq \frac{-m}{\lambda} - \frac{1}{2} > 0$. Then for any $x \in \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{X}$, we obtain the inequality

$$\langle h(G(x)), G(x) \rangle = h(\lambda_m(x))\lambda_m(x) + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} h(\lambda_i(x))\lambda_i(x) \leq \left(\frac{-m}{\lambda} - \frac{1}{2}\right)\lambda + m - 1 < 0.$$

This completes the proof. \square

Furthermore, the Fekete, Markov–Lukacz theorem in [3] provides another representation of \mathcal{X} in the following corollary.

COROLLARY 2.4. *There exist two S.O.S univariate polynomials $h_1(t)$ and $h_2(t)$ such that*

$$\mathcal{X} = \{x \in \mathcal{D} : \langle h_1(G(x)), G(x) \rangle + \langle h_2(G(x)), (I_m - G(x)^2)G(x) \rangle \geq 0\}.$$

Proof. By the Fekete, Markov–Lukacz theorem in [3], we can express the nonnegative polynomial $h(t)$ over the interval $[-1, 1]$ as follows. Let the degree of h be d . Then there exists S.O.S univariate polynomials $h_1(t)$ of degree $2\lceil d/2 \rceil$ and $h_2(t)$ of degree $2\lceil d/2 \rceil - 2$ such that

$$h(t) = h_1(t) + (1 - t^2)h_2(t).$$

From here, the required result follows. \square

The following section provides a construction for polynomials h, h_1 and h_2 . This construction plays a central role in the technique of representing \mathcal{X} and it is the main idea of this paper.

2.3. Approximation of penalty function. We observe that the penalty function we need to construct is induced by a univariate polynomial $p(t)$ over $[-1, 1]$ as follows: there exists a negative number λ in the open interval $(-1, 0)$ such that $p(t)$ is close to 0 over the interval $[0, 1]$, and close to a positive scalar N over the interval $[-1, \lambda]$. The "middle area" in this case is the middle interval $[\lambda, 0]$, in which we aim to construct a concatenation polynomial $c(t)$ over the interval $[\lambda, 0]$ to produce a differentiable function up to a given order k . Once we have high-order derivatives, the error of the polynomial approximation up to a certain degree is strictly bounded by Jackson's theorem.

LEMMA 2.5. *Let k be a given positive integer, and N be a positive scalar. We assume that there exists a concatenation polynomial $c(t)$ satisfying the following conditions:*

- $c(0) = 0$ and $c(\lambda) = N$,
- $c(t) \geq 0$ over $[\lambda, 0]$,
- For any $1 \leq i \leq k$, $c^{(i)}(0) = c^{(i)}(\lambda) = 0$.

Then the interval-wise polynomial

$$q(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } t \in [0, 1] \\ N & \text{if } t \in [-1, \lambda] \\ c(t) & \text{if } t \in [\lambda, 0] \end{cases}$$

is k times differentiable. In addition, its k -th derivative is bounded over $[-1, 1]$.

Proof. Because the function $q(t)$ is an interval-wise polynomial, so the one-sided derivatives of any order exists, and the given conditions make the function differentiable up to the order k . Furthermore, the bound of its k -th derivative follows from properties of polynomials. This completes the proof. \square

We next give a detailed construction of the concatenation polynomial based on a given integer k . By scaling, we consider the subproblem: Given an integer k , construct a polynomial such that

- $c(0) = 0$ and $c(1) = 1$,
- $c(t) \geq 0$ over $t \in [0, 1]$,
- For any $1 \leq i \leq k$, $c^{(i)}(0) = c^{(i)}(1) = 0$.

A simple observation is that the polynomial behaves similarly at the point 0 and 1, then the following proposition utilizes symmetry to reduce the conditions of the concatenation function.

PROPOSITION 2.6. *Let the polynomial $c(t) = t + (2t - 1)T(t(1 - t))$, where $T(t)$ is a univariate polynomial with 0 constant coefficient. Given the condition that $c^{(i)}(0) = 0 \forall 1 \leq i \leq k$, then $c(0) = 0$, $c(1) = 1$ and $c^{(i)}(1) = 0 \forall 1 \leq i \leq k$.*

Proof. Since $c(t) = t + (2t - 1)T(t(1 - t))$ and the constant coefficient of the polynomial $T(t)$ is 0, it is clear that $c(0) = 0$ and $c(1) = 1$. Moreover, the following equality holds true for any real number $t \in [0, 1]$:

$$c(t) + c(1 - t) = t + 1 - t + (2t - 1)T(t(1 - t)) + (1 - 2t)T((1 - t)t) = 1.$$

Therefore, by the chain rule, for any $1 \leq i \leq k$, we obtain that

$$\frac{d^i c}{dt^i}(t) + (-1)^i \frac{d^i c}{dt^i}(1 - t) = \frac{d^i 1}{dt^i}(t) = 0$$

Then $\frac{d^i c}{dt^i}(0) = 0$ also implies that $\frac{d^i c}{dt^i}(1) = 0$. \square

Because the graph of the polynomial $c(t) = t + (2t - 1)T(t(1 - t))$ is now symmetric about the point $(1/2, 1/2)$, so we concentrate on the interval $[0, 1/2]$. The next proposition gives us the details in the construction of the polynomial $T(t)$.

PROPOSITION 2.7. *Let $T(t)$ be a holomorphic function at the point $t = 0$ satisfying that $t + (2t - 1)T(t(1 - t))$ has all derivatives vanishing at the point $t = 0$. Then the function $t + (2t - 1)T(t(1 - t)) = 0$.*

Proof. Since the function $t + (2t - 1)T(t(1 - t))$ is also holomorphic at the point $t = 0$, the proposition is derived directly from the Analytic Continuation Theorem in Complex Analysis, see [23]. \square

The above proposition shows that $T(t(1 - t))$ is the power series of the holomorphic function $\frac{t}{1 - 2t}$ in the variable $u = t(1 - t) \Leftrightarrow t = \frac{1}{2} - \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} - u} \forall t \in [0, 1/2]$. Then we have

$$\frac{t}{1 - 2t} = \frac{t(1 - t)}{(1 - 2t)(1 - t)} = \frac{2u}{1 - 4u + \sqrt{1 - 4u}} = T(u) \quad \forall u \in [0, 1/4].$$

PROPOSITION 2.8. *Let $T(u) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i u^i$. Then all the coefficients $\{a_i\}$ are non-negative.*

Proof. Notice that $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i u^{i-1}$ is the Taylor expansion of the function $S(u) := \frac{2}{1 - 4u + \sqrt{1 - 4u}}$ at the point $u = 0$. Note also that the function $S(u)$ is the com-

position of the two functions $\frac{t}{1 - 2t}$ and $t = \frac{1}{2} - \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} - u}$. One observes that these two functions are absolutely monotonic, i.e., all derivatives over $[0, 1/2]$ and $[0, 1/4]$, respectively are non-negative, so is its composition. Hence, $a_i \geq 0$ for all $i \geq 1$. \square

PROPOSITION 2.9. *Let $T_k(u) = \sum_{i=1}^k a_i u^i$ be the polynomial of order up to k truncated from the Taylor series of $T(u)$. Then it induces a polynomial of order at most $2k + 1$ defined as*

$$c_k(t) = t + (2t - 1)T_k(t(1 - t)),$$

which satisfies the following properties


- a) $c_k(0) = 0$, $c_k(1) = 1$ and for any $1 \leq i \leq k$, $c_k^{(i)}(0) = 0$, $c_k(t) + c_k(1 - t) = 1 \forall t \in [0, 1]$,
- b) $0 \leq c_k(t) \leq 1$.

Proof. Clearly $T_k(u)$ has a root at $u = 0$. Then $T_k(t(1 - t))$ has the roots $t = 0, t = 1$, which implies that $c_k(0) = 0$, $c_k(1) = 1$. In addition, the series $c_k(t) + (2t - 1)(T(t(1 - t)) - T_k(t(1 - t))) = 0$ over a neighborhood of 0, and $T(t(1 - t)) - T_k(t(1 - t))$ has its coefficients up to k equal to 0. Thus, we obtain that for $1 \leq i \leq k$, $c_k^{(i)}(0) = 0$ as we desired for part (a). Moreover, it is easy to verify that $c_k(t) + c_k(1 - t) = 1 \forall t \in [0, 1]$. Because all the coefficients of $T(u)$ are non-negative, then for any $t \in [0, 1/2]$, the sequence $\{c_k(t)\}$ monotonically decreases to $t + (2t - 1)\frac{t}{1 - 2t} = 0$. Hence, for any $t \in [0, 1/2]$, $c_k(t) \in [0, 1/2]$, and $c_k(1 - t) \in [1/2, 1]$. This completes the proof. \square


Remark 2.10. This construction gives us a sequence of polynomials $c_k(t)$ over $[0, 1]$ satisfying all the desired conditions. Let us consider the first few such polynomials, which are given as follows:

- $c_0(t) = t$,
- $c_1(t) = t + (2t - 1)t(1 - t) = t + (2t - 1)u$,
- $c_2(t) = t + (2t - 1)t(1 - t) + 3(2t - 1)t^2(1 - t)^2 = t + (2t - 1)(u + 3u^2)$,
- $c_3(t) = t + (2t - 1)t(1 - t) + 3(2t - 1)t^2(1 - t)^2 + 10(2t - 1)t^3(1 - t)^3 = t + (2t - 1)(u + 3u^2 + 10u^3)$,
- $c_4(t) = t + (2t - 1)t(1 - t) + 3(2t - 1)t^2(1 - t)^2 + 10(2t - 1)t^3(1 - t)^3 + 35(2t - 1)t^4(1 - t)^4 = t + (2t - 1)(u + 3u^2 + 10u^3 + 35u^4)$.

Figure (1) illustrate how the function c_k concatenates the constant functions at the ends of interval $[0, 1]$ to make the piесе-wise polynomial function as smooth as possible.



(a) The polynomial $c_0(t)$ over $[0, 1]$



(b) The polynomial $c_4(t)$ over $[0, 1]$

Fig. 1: Comparison of $c_0(t)$ and $c_4(t)$ over $[0, 1]$ in terms of their smoothness at the end points of the interval.

Given a negative number $\lambda \in [-1, 0)$ and a positive number N , rescaling induces a new sequence of polynomial $\{c_k(\lambda, N)(t)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ defined by

$$c_k(\lambda, N)(t) = Nc_k(t/\lambda), \quad t \in [\lambda, 0],$$

and we obtain a new sequence of interval-wise polynomials as follows:

$$q_k(\lambda, N)(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } t \in [0, 1] \\ N & \text{if } t \in [-1, \lambda] \\ c_k(\lambda, N)(t) & \text{if } t \in [\lambda, 0]. \end{cases}$$

Then the following conditions are satisfied based on the construction:

- $q_k(\lambda, N)(t)$ is non-negative over $[-1, 1]$,
- $q_k(\lambda, N)(t)$ is k times continuously differentiable,
- $q_k(\lambda, N)(t)$ has its k -th derivative absolutely continuous with bounded variation $N \cdot M_k \cdot |\lambda|^{-k}$, where $M_k := \max_{t \in [0, 1]} c_k^{(k)}(t)$, which is a constant depending only on k .

These three conditions follow straightforwardly from the calculations based on the above construction of $q_k(\lambda, N)(t)$. We next review the versions of Jackson's theorem in [24] and [2] to approximate the function $q_k(\lambda, N)(t)$ by polynomials with specific degrees.

THEOREM 2.11 (Chebyshev approximation). *For an integer d , let $h : [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function such that its derivatives through $h^{(k-1)}$ are absolutely continuous on*

$[-1, 1]$ and its k -th derivative $h^{(k)}$ is of bounded variation V . Then its Chebyshev approximation p_v of degree $v > k$ satisfies:

$$\|h - p_v\|_{[-1,1]} \leq \frac{4V}{\pi k(v-k)^k}.$$

COROLLARY 2.12. Let $p_k^{[v]}(\lambda, N)(t)$ be the best non-negative polynomial approximation with degree at most v of the piecewise polynomial $q_k(\lambda, N)(t)$. Then the following inequality holds:

$$0 \leq p_k^{[v]}(\lambda, N)(t) - q_k(\lambda, N)(t) \leq \frac{8N \cdot M_k \cdot |\lambda|^{-k}}{\pi k(v-k)^k} \quad \forall t \in [-1, 1].$$

In addition, the theorem of Fekete, Markov–Lukacz implies the existence of S.O.S polynomials h_1 and h_2 of degree at most v and $v-2$, respectively, such that

$$p_k^{[v]}(\lambda, N)(t) = h_1(t) + (1-t^2)h_2(t).$$

Proof. Suppose $q_k(\lambda, N)(t)$ has $q_k^{[v]}(\lambda, N)(t)$ as the best polynomial approximation of degree at most v . Then direct calculations show that

$$\|q_k(\lambda, N)(t) - q_k^{[v]}(\lambda, N)(t)\|_{[-1,1]} \leq \frac{4N \cdot M_k \cdot |\lambda|^{-k}}{\pi k(v-k)^k}.$$

Consider the polynomial

$$p_k^{[v]}(\lambda, N)(t) := q_k^{[v]}(\lambda, N)(t) + \frac{4N \cdot M_k \cdot |\lambda|^{-k}}{\pi k(v-k)^k} \geq q_k(\lambda, N)(t) \geq 0 \quad \forall t \in [-1, 1].$$

Then, it is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq p_k^{[v]}(\lambda, N)(t) - q_k(\lambda, N)(t) &= q_k^{[v]}(\lambda, N)(t) - q_k(\lambda, N)(t) + \frac{4N \cdot M_k \cdot |\lambda|^{-k}}{\pi k(v-k)^k} \\ &\leq \frac{8N \cdot M_k \cdot |\lambda|^{-k}}{\pi k(v-k)^k}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

2.4. A Hierarchy for Binary Polynomial Optimization Problem. We propose a hierarchy of lower bounds of problem 2.1 as follows: for any positive integer r , define:

$$\begin{aligned} f_r &= \max \alpha \\ \text{such that } f(x) - \alpha &= \sigma_0(x) + \langle \sigma_1(G(x)), G(x) \rangle + \langle \sigma_2(G(x)), (I_m - G(x)^2)G(x) \rangle \\ \sigma_0 &\in \Sigma[x]_r, \sigma_1(t) \in \Sigma[t]_r \text{ and } \sigma_2(t) \in \Sigma[t]_{r-1}, \\ (2.3) \quad \langle \sigma_1(G(x)), G(x) \rangle &\in \mathbb{R}[x]_{2r}, \langle \sigma_2(G(x)), (I_m - G(x)^2)G(x) \rangle \in \mathbb{R}[x]_{2r}. \end{aligned}$$

We recall the convention of the notation: $\Sigma[x]_r$ denotes the set of S.O.S polynomials in the variable $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ of degree at most $2r$, while $\Sigma[t]_r$ denotes the set of S.O.S univariate polynomials of degree at most $2r$. The matrix polynomial $G(x)$ is assumed to be normalized in the sense that all its eigenvalues are of absolute values at most 1 over $x \in \mathbb{B}^n$. The next theorem captures the convergence and error of the proposed hierarchy for the BPOP (2.1) with semidefinite constraints.

THEOREM 2.13. Consider $f \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ of degree $d \geq n$. Let $r \in \mathbb{N}$, and ξ_r^n be the least root of the degree r Krawtchouk polynomial with parameter n . If $(r+1)/n \leq 1/2$ and $d(d+1) \cdot \xi_{r+1}^n \leq 1/2$, then for any integer v such that $(vl+l)(vl+l+2)\xi_{r+1}^n \leq 1/2$, $vl+l \leq 2r$ and integer $k \leq v$, the following inequality holds:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq f^* - f_r \\ &\leq 2 \left(M_f \left(\frac{-2m}{\lambda} + 1 \right) + \frac{16m \cdot M_f \cdot M_k \cdot |\lambda|^{-k-1}}{\pi k (v-k)^k} \right) \cdot \max\{C_d, C_{vl+l}\} \cdot \xi_{r+1}^n / n \\ &\quad + \frac{16m \cdot M_f \cdot M_k \cdot |\lambda|^{-k-1}}{\pi k (v-k)^k} \end{aligned}$$

where f_r is defined in (2.3), $M_f = \max_{x \in \mathbb{B}^n} |f(x)|$, and M_k depending only on k is the constant defined as in Corollary 2.12.

Proof. It is clear from the normalization assumption of $G(x)$ that for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $G(x)$ and $I_m - G(x)^2$ are positive semidefinite matrices. Hence

$$\sigma_0(x) + \langle \sigma_1(G(x)), G(x) \rangle + \langle \sigma_2(G(x)), (I_m - G(x)^2)G(x) \rangle \geq 0,$$

which implies that $f^* - f_r \geq 0$.

For any positive integers k and v satisfying the conditions stated in the theorem, we consider the penalty function

$$P_r^{[v]}(x) = - \left\langle p_k^{[v]} \left(\lambda, \frac{-2M_f}{\lambda} \right) (G(x)), G(x) \right\rangle = - \sum_{i=1}^m p_k^{[v]} \left(\lambda, \frac{-2M_f}{\lambda} \right) (\lambda_i(x)) \cdot \lambda_i(x),$$

where the polynomial $p_k^{[v]}$ is defined in Corollary 2.12. Then we consider the two new objective functions define by

$$F_r(x) = f(x) + P_r^{[v]}(x), \quad \bar{F}_r(x) = f(x) - \left\langle q_k \left(\lambda, \frac{-2M_f}{\lambda} \right) (G(x)), G(x) \right\rangle.$$

Note that $P_r^{[v]}(x)$ is a polynomial, whereas $\left\langle q_k \left(\lambda, \frac{-2M_f}{\lambda} \right) (G(x)), G(x) \right\rangle$ is not, and this distinction is significant in evaluating $P_r^{[v]}(x)$. With the penalty function established, we refer back to Lemma 2.1 to bound the error based on the maximal norms of $P_r^{[v]}(x)$ over \mathcal{X} and the unit ball \mathbb{B}^n . Specifically, we must identify three factors of the penalty function that influence the error: its degree, its maximal absolute value over \mathbb{B}^n , and the maximal absolute value over \mathcal{X} . Afterward, we apply Theorem 1.4 to $F_r(x)$ to obtain the bound.

Degree of $P_r^{[v]}(x)$: By definition, the degree of $P_r^{[v]}(x)$ is upper bounded by $vl+l$. Hence, the degree of $F_r(x)$ is at most $\max\{d, vl+l\}$.

The maximal value of $|F_r(x)|$ over \mathbb{B}^n : We recall Corollary 2.12, for any $t \in [-1, 1]$, the following inequality holds:

$$0 \leq p_k^{[v]} \left(\lambda, \frac{-2M_f}{\lambda} \right) (t) - q_k \left(\lambda, \frac{-2M_f}{\lambda} \right) (t) \leq \frac{16M_f \cdot M_k \cdot |\lambda|^{-k-1}}{\pi k (v-k)^k}.$$

Hence, for any $x \in \mathbb{B}^n$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} (2.4) \quad &0 \leq \left\langle p_k^{[v]} \left(\lambda, \frac{-2M_f}{\lambda} \right) (G(x)), G(x) \right\rangle - \left\langle q_k \left(\lambda, \frac{-2M_f}{\lambda} \right) (G(x)), G(x) \right\rangle \\ &\leq \frac{16m \cdot M_f \cdot M_k \cdot |\lambda|^{-k-1}}{\pi k (v-k)^k} =: \beta_r. \end{aligned}$$

As a result, we have

$$(2.5) \quad \|F_r(x) - \bar{F}_r(x)\|_{\mathbb{B}^n} \leq \beta_r.$$

One observes that the function $-\langle q_k(\lambda, \frac{-2M_f}{\lambda})(G(x)), G(x) \rangle$ equals to 0 for $x \in \mathcal{X}$. On the other hand, for any $x \in \mathbb{B}^n - \mathcal{X}$, the following inequality holds:

$$2M_f \leq -\langle q_k\left(\lambda, \frac{-2M_f}{\lambda}\right)(G(x)), G(x) \rangle \leq \frac{-2mM_f}{\lambda}.$$

Therefore, the minimal value of $\bar{F}_r(x)$ over \mathbb{B}^n is exactly f^* and all its minimizers are exactly those of $f(x)$ in \mathcal{X} . Moreover, the maximal norm of $\bar{F}_r(x)$ over \mathbb{B}^n is upper bounded by $M_f(\frac{-2m}{\lambda} + 1)$. The inequality (2.5) shows that

$$\|F_r\|_{\mathbb{B}^n} := \max_{x \in \mathbb{B}^n} |F_r(x)| \leq M_f\left(\frac{-2m}{\lambda} + 1\right) + \beta_r.$$

The maximal value of $|P_r^{[v]}(x)|$ over \mathcal{X} : Note that $-\langle q_k(\lambda, \frac{-2M_f}{\lambda})(G(x)), G(x) \rangle$ equals to 0 for $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Thus the inequality (2.4) implies that

$$\max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |P_r^{[v]}(x)| \leq \beta_r$$

Now, we have all the ingredients to apply Lemma 2.1 to evaluate the error. Let F_r^* be the minimal value of the polynomial $F_r(x)$ over \mathbb{B}^n , and it is attained at $x_r^* \in \mathbb{B}^n$. Then we claim that the inequality (2.5) and the fact that f^* is also the minimal value of \bar{F}_r over \mathbb{B}^n implies that

$$(2.6) \quad |F_r^* - f^*| \leq \beta_r.$$

We proceed to prove the above inequality as follows. First, let $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ be a minimizer of \bar{F}_r over \mathbb{B}^n . Then we have that $f^* = \bar{F}_r(\bar{x})$ and $F_r^* - f^* \leq F_r(\bar{x}) - \bar{F}_r(\bar{x}) \leq \beta_r$. On the other hand, we have that $F_r - f^* = F_r(x_r^*) - \bar{F}_r(x_r^*) + (\bar{F}_r(x_r^*) - \bar{F}_r(\bar{x})) \geq F_r(x_r^*) - \bar{F}_r(x_r^*) \geq -\beta_r$. This completes the proof of the inequality (2.6).

For integer v such that $(v+1)l((v+1)l+1)\xi_{r+1}^n \leq 1/2$, the degree of $F_r(x)$ satisfies the degree condition of Theorem 1.4. Then, we can apply Theorem 1.4 to obtain

$$F_r^* - \text{lb}(F_r, \mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{B}^n))_r \leq 2\|F_r\|_{\mathbb{B}^n} \max\{C_d, C_{vl+l}\} \cdot \xi_{r+1}^n/n.$$

Using (2.6), we get

$$f^* - \text{lb}(F_r, \mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{B}^n))_r \leq 2\|F_r\|_{\mathbb{B}^n} \max\{C_d, C_{vl+l}\} \cdot \xi_{r+1}^n/n + \beta_r.$$

In addition, for any α such that $F_r(x) - \alpha$ is an S.O.S polynomial $\sigma_0(x)$, we obtain that

$$f(x) - \alpha = \sigma_0(x) + \left\langle p_k^{[v]}\left(\lambda, \frac{-2M_f}{\lambda}\right)(G(x)), G(x) \right\rangle$$

and $p_k^{[v]}$ is a non-negative polynomial over $[-1, 1]$. Then due to the theorem of Fekete, Markov-Lukacz, $\left\langle p_k^{[v]}\left(\lambda, \frac{-2M_f}{\lambda}\right)(G(x)), G(x) \right\rangle$ takes the form

$$\langle \sigma_1(G(x)), G(x) \rangle + \langle \sigma_2(G(x)), (I_m - G(x)^2)G(x) \rangle.$$

Therefore, we have the following equality for some S.O.S polynomials $\sigma_0(x) \in \Sigma[x]_r$, $\sigma_1(t) \in \Sigma[t]_r$, $\sigma_2(t) \in \Sigma[t]_{r-1}$:

$$f(x) - f_r = \sigma_0(x) + \langle \sigma_1(G(x)), G(x) \rangle + \langle \sigma_2(G(x)), (I_m - G(x)^2)G(x) \rangle.$$

This shows that $\text{lb}(F_r, \mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{B}^n))_r \leq f_r \leq f^*$. In conclusion, we obtain the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq f^* - f_r \leq f^* - \text{lb}(F_r, \mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{B}^n))_r \\ &\leq 2 \left(M_f \left(\frac{-2m}{\lambda} + 1 \right) + \beta_r \right) \cdot \max\{C_d, C_{vl+l}\} \cdot \xi_{r+1}^n/n + \beta_r. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

3. Continuous Polynomial Optimization Problems with semidefinite constraints. In this part, we employ a similar approach to the one outlined in Section 2 to transform a polynomial optimization problem over a subset of the n -dimensional unit ball B^n into an optimization problem over B^n , with several adjustments aimed at resolving the issue introduced by the difference between the discrete set \mathbb{B}^n and the continuous set B^n :

$$\begin{aligned} f^* &= \min f(x) \\ &\text{such that } x \in \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : G(x) \succeq 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Assuming that the above feasible set is compact, without loss of generality, we can assume that it is contained in the unit ball B^n , and $G(x)$ is normalized in the sense that for all $x \in B^n$, all eigenvalues of $G(x)$ are in the interval $[-1, 1]$. Then the problem now becomes:

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} f^* &= \min f(x) \\ &\text{such that } x \in \mathcal{X} := \{x \in B^n : G(x) \succeq 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

We next propose a hierarchy to solve this problem, which is similar to the hierarchy (2.3):

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} f_r &= \max \alpha \\ &\text{such that } f(x) - \alpha = \sigma_0(x) + \sigma_1(x)(1 - \|x\|^2) \\ &\quad + \langle \sigma_2(G(x)), G(x) \rangle + \langle \sigma_3(G(x)), (I_m - G(x)^2)G(x) \rangle, \\ &\sigma_0 \in \Sigma[x]_r, \sigma_1 \in \Sigma[x]_{r-1}, \\ &\langle \sigma_2(G(x)), G(x) \rangle \in \mathbb{R}[x]_{2r}, \langle \sigma_3(G(x)), (I_m - G(x)^2)G(x) \rangle \in \mathbb{R}[x]_{2r}. \end{aligned}$$

We have the following convergence result for the above hierarchy.

THEOREM 3.1. *The sequence $\{f_r\}$ increases to the optimal value f^* with the rate $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{r^c}\right)$, where c is a constant depending only on the domain \mathcal{X} .*

Before proving this theorem, we observe the main difference between the continuous case and the discrete case. One easily notices the absence of the negative number λ in this case. In other words, in the discrete case, we transform the multivariate polynomials into univariate polynomials for better evaluation, and make use of the middle interval $[\lambda, 0]$ to make the penalty function smoother. However, that middle area does not exist in the continuous case. To resolve this obstacle, we consider a

sequence of neighborhoods $\{V(\delta)\}$ of \mathcal{X} , and take the border area $V(\delta) - \mathcal{X}$ as the middle area to smoothen the penalty function. As a consequence, we generally cannot lift up the value of f in that middle area by a sufficiently large quantity. Thus the new objective function can possibly have its minimizer belonging to that area, and consequently, the minimizer can be outside the domain \mathcal{X} . That is when we need to use a version of the Lojasiewicz inequality for a semi-algebraic set defined by a semidefinite constraint, which is stated below, to evaluate the error.

THEOREM 3.2 (Theorem 4.1 in [4]). *Let $G(x)$ be a symmetric matrix polynomial over \mathbb{R}^n of size $m \times m$ and degree l . Then for any compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ depending on \mathcal{X} such that*

$$d(x, \mathcal{X}) \leq C \max\{0, -\lambda_m(x)\}^L \quad \forall x \in K.$$

Here, $L \leq \mathcal{R}(2n + m(n + 1), l + 3)^{-1}$, and $\mathcal{R}(n, d) = d(3d - 3)^{n-1}$ if $d \geq 2$, and $\mathcal{R}(n, d) = 1$ if $d = 1$.

We next construct a sequence of neighborhoods of \mathcal{X} as follows: For any $\delta > 0$, the neighborhood $V(\delta)$ is defined as

$$V(\delta) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : G(x) + \delta I_m \succeq 0\} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \lambda_m(x) \geq -\delta\}.$$

Clearly, $V(\delta)$ contains \mathcal{X} , and the Lojasiewicz inequality implies that for any $x \in V(\delta)$, the distance to the set \mathcal{X} is bounded as

$$\max_{x \in V(\delta)} \text{dist}(x, \mathcal{X}) \leq C \cdot \delta^L.$$

Here C is a constant depending on \mathcal{X} and L is the Lojasiewicz exponent defined as in Theorem 3.2. We now have all the ingredients to prove Theorem 3.1.

Proof. Proof of Theorem 3.1.

Convergence of the hierarchy: We first prove the convergence of the hierarchy. Let $M_f := \max_{x \in B^n} |f(x)|$, and L_f be the Lipschitz constant of f over B^n . Let $\delta \in (0, 1)$, for which $-\delta$ plays the role of the number λ in the discrete case. For any positive integers k and v , we consider the penalty function

$$P_r^{[v]}(x) = -\left\langle p_k^{[v]} \left(-\delta, \frac{2M_f}{\delta} \right) (G(x)), G(x) \right\rangle = -\sum_{i=1}^m p_k^{[v]} \left(-\delta, \frac{2M_f}{\delta} \right) (\lambda_i(x)) \cdot \lambda_i(x).$$

We consider the two new objective functions

$$F_r(x) = f(x) + P_r^{[v]}(x), \quad \bar{F}_r(x) = f(x) - \left\langle q_k \left(-\delta, \frac{2M_f}{\delta} \right) (G(x)), G(x) \right\rangle.$$

We still have $\bar{F}_r|_{\mathcal{X}} = f|_{\mathcal{X}}$, and for any $x \notin V(\delta)$, which implies that $\lambda_m(x) < -\delta$, we have

$$\bar{F}_r(x) \geq 2M_f - M_f = M_f \geq f^*.$$

Now for $x \in V(\delta) - \mathcal{X}$, we bound \bar{F}_r by the Lipschitz constant and the Lojasiewicz inequality. For those i such that $\lambda_i(x) \geq 0$, we have $q_k \left(-\delta, \frac{2M_f}{\delta} \right) (\lambda_i(x)) = 0$. And for those i such that $\lambda_i(x) < 0$, we have $q_k \left(-\delta, \frac{2M_f}{\delta} \right) (\lambda_i(x)) \lambda_i(x) < 0$. Then, we obtain

that for $x \in V(\delta) - \mathcal{X}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{F}_r(x) - f^* &= f(x) - f^* - \sum_{i:\lambda_i(x)<0} q_k\left(-\delta, \frac{2M_f}{\delta}\right)(\lambda_i(x))\lambda_i(x) \\ &\geq f(x) - f(P_{\mathcal{X}}(x)) + f(P_{\mathcal{X}}(x)) - f^* \\ &\geq f(P_{\mathcal{X}}(x)) - f^* - |f(x) - f(P_{\mathcal{X}}(x))| \\ &\geq -L_f C \delta^L.\end{aligned}$$

Here $P_{\mathcal{X}}(x)$ is the closest point in \mathcal{X} to x , which is well-defined because of the compactness of \mathcal{X} . Let $\bar{F}_r^* := \min_{x \in B^n} \bar{F}_r(x)$ and it is attained at $\bar{x}_r \in V(\delta)$. The equality $\bar{F}_r|_{\mathcal{X}} = f|_{\mathcal{X}}$ implies that $f^* \geq \bar{F}_r^*$. Thus, together with what we have obtained above, we get

$$0 \geq \bar{F}_r^* - f^* \geq -L_f C \delta^L.$$

By the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 2.13, for any positive integer r , f_r defined in (3.2) satisfies $f_r \leq f^*$, and as r tends to ∞ , the function $\bar{F}_r(x)$ is approximated by the polynomial $F_r(x)$. By Putinar's Positivstellensatz, the minimal value of $F_r(x)$ over the unit ball B^n can be calculated by the S.O.S hierarchy of lower bounds. Hence, we obtain that

$$f^* \geq \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} f_r \geq \bar{F}_r^*.$$

Thus,

$$0 \leq f^* - \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} f_r \leq L_f C \delta^L \quad \forall \delta > 0.$$

Let δ tends to 0, we obtain the convergence of the hierarchy.

Convergence rate of the hierarchy: The proof employs the following strategy: we first construct a suitable penalty function, then apply the same method as in Lemma 2.1 with a minor modification. The three main factors, namely, the degree the penalty function, the maximal values of $|P_r^{[v]}(x)|$ over the domains B^n and \mathcal{X} , also need to be investigated. Then, instead of applying Theorem 1.4, we use Theorem 1.5 to obtain the error bound.

The degree of $P_r^{[v]}(x)$: By definition, the degree of $P_r^{[v]}(x)$ is $vl + l$, hence

$$\deg(F_r(x)) \leq \max\{vl + l, d\}.$$

The maximal value of $|P_r^{[v]}(x)|$ over B^n : We recall Corollary, 2.12 for any $x \in B^n$, we have the following inequality.

$$\begin{aligned}0 &\leq \left\langle p_k^{[v]}\left(-\delta, \frac{2M_f}{\delta}\right)(G(x)), G(x) \right\rangle - \left\langle q_k\left(-\delta, \frac{2M_f}{\delta}\right)(G(x)), G(x) \right\rangle \\ &\leq \beta_r := \frac{16M_f \cdot M_k \cdot \delta^{-k-1}}{\pi k(v-k)^k}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we can evaluate the difference between $F_r(x)$ and $\bar{F}_r(x)$ as:

$$(3.3) \quad \|F_r(x) - \bar{F}_r(x)\|_{B^n} \leq \beta_r.$$

For any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $\lambda_i(x) \in [0, 1] \forall i \in [m]$. Thus $q_k\left(-\delta, \frac{2M_f}{\delta}\right)(\lambda_i(x)) = 0$ for all $i \in [m]$, which implies that $\bar{F}_r(x) = f(x) \forall x \in \mathcal{X}$. Hence $|\bar{F}_r(x)| \leq M_f \forall x \in \mathcal{X}$. On the other

hand, for any $x \in B^n - \mathcal{X}$, by the definition of $q_k\left(-\delta, \frac{2M_f}{\delta}\right)$, we have

$$|\bar{F}_r(x)| \leq |f(x)| + \sum_{i=1}^m \left| q_k\left(-\delta, \frac{2M_f}{\delta}\right)(\lambda_i(x))\lambda_i(x) \right| \leq M_f \left(\frac{2m}{\delta} + 1 \right).$$

Combining with inequality (3.3), we get

$$\|F_r(x)\|_{B^n} \leq M_f \left(\frac{2m}{\delta} + 1 \right) + \beta_r.$$

The maximal value of $|P_r^{[v]}(x)|$ over \mathcal{X} : Since $\bar{F}_r(x) = f(x) \forall x \in \mathcal{X}$, inequality (3.3) shows that

$$0 \leq f(x) - F_r(x) \leq \beta_r \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X}.$$

We now apply Theorem 1.5 to the polynomial $F_r(x)$ over the unit ball B^n . Let v be an integer such that $r \geq 2n \max\{vl + l, d\}$. Then, the condition $r \geq 2n \deg(F_r)$ is satisfied. Theorem 1.5 implies the following inequality:

$$0 \leq F_r^* - \text{lb}(F_r, \mathcal{Q}(B^n))_r \leq 2 \left(M_f \left(\frac{2m}{\delta} + 1 \right) + \beta_r \right) \frac{C_{n, \max\{d, vl+l\}}}{r^2},$$

where $F_r^* = F_r(x_r^*)$ denotes the minimum value of $F_r(x)$ over B^n and it is attained at $x_r^* \in B^n$. Moreover, there exist S.O.S polynomials $\sigma_0(x) \in \Sigma[x]_r$ and $\sigma_1(x) \in \Sigma[x]_{r-1}$ such that

$$F_r(x) - \text{lb}(F_r, \mathcal{Q}(B^n))_r = \sigma_0(x) + \sigma_1(x)(1 - \|x\|_2^2).$$

By Corollary 2.12, $\left\langle p_k^{[v]}\left(-\delta, \frac{2M_f}{\delta}\right)(G(x)), G(x) \right\rangle$ takes the form

$$\langle \sigma_2(G(x)), G(x) \rangle + \langle \sigma_3(G(x)), (I - G(x)^2)G(x) \rangle,$$

where $\sigma_2(t)$ and $\sigma_3(t)$ are univariate S.O.S polynomials satisfying that the degrees of the polynomials $\langle \sigma_2(G(x)), G(x) \rangle$ and $\langle \sigma_3(G(x)), (I - G(x)^2)G(x) \rangle$ are at most $2r$. Hence, we obtain that $\text{lb}(F_r, \mathcal{Q}(B^n))_r \leq f_r \leq f^*$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq f^* - f_r \leq f^* - \text{lb}(F_r, \mathcal{Q}(B^n))_r \\ &\leq f^* - \bar{F}_r(\bar{x}_r) + \bar{F}_r(\bar{x}_r) - \bar{F}_r(x_r^*) + \bar{F}_r(x_r^*) - F_r(x_r^*) + F_r(x_r^*) - \text{lb}(F_r, \mathcal{Q}(B^n))_r \\ (3.4) \quad &\leq L_f C \delta^L + \beta_r + 2 \left(M_f \left(\frac{2m}{\delta} + 1 \right) + \beta_r \right) \frac{C_{n, \max\{d, vl+l\}}}{r^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that in the above, we have used the fact that \bar{x}_r is a minimizer of \bar{F}_r over B^n to get the inequality: $\bar{F}_r(\bar{x}_r) - \bar{F}_r(x_r^*) \leq 0$.

We next simplify the inequality (3.4).

- For a fixed n , the constant $C_{n,d}$ is a polynomial in d , thus the constant $C_{n, \max\{d, vl+l\}}$ is a polynomial in v . Therefore, if we choose $\delta = v^{-1/2}$, then the last term in (3.4) is simplified to

$$2 \left(M_f \left(\frac{2m}{\delta} + 1 \right) + \frac{16m \cdot M_f \cdot M_k \cdot \delta^{-k-1}}{\pi k (v-k)^k} \right) \frac{C_{n, \max\{d, vl+l\}}}{r^2} \leq C_1 \cdot \frac{v^D}{r^2}$$

for some integer D and a positive constant C_1 .

- For the second last term, we evaluate similarly

$$\frac{16m \cdot M_f \cdot M_k \cdot \delta^{-k-1}}{\pi k(v-k)^k} \leq C_2(k) \cdot \frac{v^{k/2-1/2}}{v^k} = C_2(k) \cdot v^{-k/2+1/2}$$

for some constant $C_2(k)$ depending only on k since M_k is a constant depending only on k .

- Lastly, we consider

$$L_f C \delta^L = L_f C v^{-L/2}.$$

As a result, we obtain

$$f^* - f_r \leq C_1 \cdot \frac{v^D}{r^2} + C_2(k) \cdot v^{-k/2+1/2} + CL_f v^{-L/2}.$$

Let us choose $v = r^e$. Then the inequality becomes

$$f^* - f_r \leq C_1 \cdot r^{De-2} + C_2(k) \cdot r^{-ke/2+e/2} + CL_f r^{-Le/2}. \quad \square$$

Finally, let $e = 1/D$ and choose k large enough, then we obtain the rate $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{r^c}\right)$, where $c = \min\{1, L/2D\}$ as desired.

Remark 3.3. Upon closer examination, it becomes evident that the unit ball can be effectively replaced by other geometrically well-defined sets, such as the hypersphere and standard simplex. Intriguingly, these alternative sets exhibit the same convergence rate within the S.O.S hierarchy of lower bounds. As a result, various hierarchies of lower bounds are alternatively constructible with the same convergence rate as in Theorem (3.1). However, the simplicity in defining the unit ball is a key factor in our approach. Specifically, it requires only a single polynomial of degree 2 for its definition. This characteristic has a notable impact on the proposed S.O.S hierarchy discussed in our paper. The minimal complexity in defining the unit ball translates to a practical advantage in our hierarchy, as it necessitates the fewest number of polynomials in each iteration of the optimization process. This streamlined approach not only simplifies the computational aspects but also underscores the efficiency and feasibility of our proposed S.O.S hierarchy for matrix polynomial optimization problems.

4. A version of the Putinar's Positivstellensatz. This section focuses on using an identical framework as in the last section to develop another version of Putinar's Positivstellensatz for semi-algebraic set defined by semidefinite constraints. This effort aims to yield outcomes analogous to those obtained in the papers [17], [20] and [1], sharing similarities in both methods and outcomes. Schweighofer and Nie have demonstrated efficient adaptations of Schmüdgen and Putinar's Positivstellensatz, providing degree constraints for the representation within truncated preorderings and quadratic modules. The proofs of the key theorems, namely Theorem 4.4, follow the same structure as in the previous section. Consequently, we defer them to Appendices B. Our primary focus lies on comparing the new bound with the established ones, as explored in the papers cited in [1].

THEOREM 4.1. [20] For all $\mathbf{g} = \{g_1, \dots, g_m\} \subset \mathbb{R}[x]$ defining $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{g}) = \mathcal{S} \subset (-1, 1)^n$, where

$$\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{g}) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : g_i(x) \leq 0 \ \forall i = 1, \dots, m\},$$

there exists a constant $c > 0$ (depending on \mathbf{g} and n) such that, if $f \in \mathbb{R}[x]_d$ is strictly positive on \mathcal{S} with minimum $f^* = \min_{x \in \mathcal{S}} f(x) > 0$, then we have $f \in \mathcal{T}(\mathbf{g})_l$ if

$$l \geq cd^2 \left(1 + \left(d^2 n^d \frac{\|f\|}{f^*} \right)^c \right),$$

where $\|f\|$ is the max-norm of the coefficients of f w.r.t the weighted monomial basis $\{\frac{|\alpha|!}{\alpha_1! \dots \alpha_n!} x^\alpha : |\alpha| \leq d\}$.

THEOREM 4.2. [17] For all $\mathbf{g} = \{g_1, \dots, g_m\} \subset \mathbb{R}[x]$ defining an Archimedean quadratic module $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{g})$ and $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{g}) = \mathcal{S} \subset (-1, 1)^n$, where

$$\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{g}) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : g_i(x) \leq 0 \ \forall i = 1, \dots, m\},$$

there exists a constant $c > 0$ (depending on \mathbf{g} and n) such that, if $f \in \mathbb{R}[x]_d$ is strictly positive on \mathcal{S} with minimum $f^* = \min_{x \in \mathcal{S}} f(x) > 0$, then we have $f \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{g})_l$ if

$$l \leq \exp \left(\left(d^2 n^d \frac{\|f\|}{f^*} \right)^c \right).$$

Lastly, Baldi proved a bound involving the Lojasiewicz inequality using the penalty function approach, which is stated as follows.

THEOREM 4.3. [1] Suppose $n \geq 2$ and $\{g_1, \dots, g_m\} \subset \mathbb{R}[x]$ satisfy the normalization assumption:

- $1 - \|x\|_2^2 \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{g})$,
- $\|g_i\| \leq 1/2 \ \forall i = 1, \dots, m$.

Let $\mathcal{S} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : g_i(x) \leq 0 \ \forall i = 1, \dots, m\}$. Suppose $f \in \mathbb{R}[x]_d$ satisfies that $f^* = \min_{x \in \mathcal{S}} f(x) > 0$. Let C, L be the Lojasiewicz coefficient and exponent given by Theorem 3.2. Then $f \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{g})_l$ if

$$l \geq \mathcal{O}(n^3 2^{5n/L} m^n C^{2n/L} d^{3.5n/L} E_f^{-2.5n/L}) = \gamma(n, \mathbf{g}) d^{3.5n/L} E_f^{-2.5n/L},$$

where $\gamma(n, \mathbf{g}) \geq 1$ depends only on n and \mathbf{g} . In the above, $E_f = f^*/\|f\|$ is a measure of how close is f to have a zero on \mathcal{S} .

Next, we establish an alternative version of these theorems wherein the domain is characterized by a matrix polynomial semidefinite inequality rather than polynomial inequalities.

THEOREM 4.4. Let $G(x)$ be a symmetric matrix polynomial of degree l , and assume that $\max_{x \in [-1, 1]^n} \|G(x)\|_2 \leq 1$ and $f(x)$ is a positive polynomial over $\mathcal{X} = \{x \in [-1, 1]^n : G(x) \succeq 0\}$. Denote the minimal value of f over \mathcal{X} by f^* , and $\max_{[-1, 1]^n} |f(x)| = M_f$. Let $E_f = f^*/M_f$. Then $f(x)$ admits a representation

$$f(x) = \sigma_1(x) + \sigma_2(x)(1 - \|x\|_2^2) + \langle h(G(x)), G(x) \rangle$$

where $\sigma_1(x)$ and σ_2 are S.O.S polynomials, and $h(t)$ is a non-negative univariate polynomial over the interval $[-1, 1]$. In addition, for any fixed integer k , the bound on the degrees are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \deg(\sigma_1(x)), \deg(\sigma_2(x)(1 - \|x\|_2^2)) \\ &= \mathcal{O} \left(n \sqrt{mn^3 l^{n+2} (4CL_f)^{2(n+2)/Lk+1/L} E_f^{(-2/L-1)(n+2)/k-1/L-1}} \right), \\ & \deg(h) = \mathcal{O}(\lceil (4CL_f^{2/L} E_f^{-2/L-1})^{1/k} \rceil). \end{aligned}$$

We note that the new bound incorporates similar elements as the bound presented in Theorem 4.3, such as the number of variables n , the number of constraints m , etc. Nonetheless, the new bound is subjected to alteration by an integer k , which can be arbitrarily chosen. In the bound of Theorem 4.3, the exponent of E_f is $-2.5n/L$, whereas in our bound, the exponent of E_f is

$$\frac{1}{2} \left[\left(\frac{-2}{L} - 1 \right) \frac{n+2}{k} - \frac{1}{L} - 1 \right].$$

This is smaller than $-2.5nL$ even when we choose $k = 2$.

5. Conclusion. We have introduced novel SOS-hierarchies tailored for a polynomial optimization whose feasible set is defined by a matrix polynomial semidefinite inequality. We establish the convergence rates of the hierarchies through a penalty function approach. Our findings not only broaden the scope of scalar polynomial optimization to a wider setting but also slightly enhance the overall rates. Our future goal is to leverage analogous techniques to extend further advantageous attributes of the SOS-hierarchy from scalar polynomial optimization to semidefinite polynomial optimization.

Appendix A. Differences in the quadratic modules generated by polynomial inequalities and matrix inequality.

Example A.1. Consider the semi-algebraic set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ defined by the following matrix inequality.

$$K := \left\{ x = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & 1 \\ 1 & x_2 \end{pmatrix} \succeq 0 \right\}.$$

Due to Descartes's Rule of Signs, K is also defined by polynomial inequalities as follow:

$$K := \{x = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x_1 + x_2 \geq 0, x_1x_2 - 1 \geq 0\}.$$

Then the quadratic module generated by matrix inequality is given by

$$\mathcal{Q}_1 := \left\{ s(x) + \left\langle R(x), \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & 1 \\ 1 & x_2 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle : s(x) \in \Sigma[x], R(x) \text{ is an S.O.S matrix} \right\},$$

and the quadratic module generated by polynomial inequalities is given by

$$\mathcal{Q}_2 := \{s_1(x) + s_2(x)(x_1 + x_2) + s_3(x)(x_1x_2 - 1) : s_i \in \Sigma[x] \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2, 3\}\}.$$

Claim: $\mathcal{Q}_1 \not\subseteq \mathcal{Q}_2$.

Proof. Let us choose $s(x) = 0$ and $R(x) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, then the polynomial $p_1(x) := x_1 \in \mathcal{Q}_1$. We now prove that $p_1(x) \notin \mathcal{Q}_2$. Suppose on the contrary that $p_1(x) \in \mathcal{Q}_2$. Then

$$x_1 = s_1(x) + s_2(x)(x_1 + x_2) + s_3(x)(x_1x_2 - 1), \quad s_i \in \Sigma[x] \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2, 3\}.$$

Because the largest coefficient of an S.O.S polynomial is positive, as well as that of the polynomials $x_1 + x_2$ and $x_1x_2 - 1$, we can conclude based on a degree argument that $s_2 = 0$, $s_3 = 0$ and s_1 is constant, which leads to a contradiction. \square

Claim: $\mathcal{Q}_2 \not\subseteq \mathcal{Q}_1$.

Proof. Let us consider the polynomial $x_1x_2 - 1 \in \mathcal{Q}_2$, and assume that

$$x_1x_2 - 1 = s(x) + \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} a(x) & b(x) \\ b(x) & c(x) \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & 1 \\ 1 & x_2 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle \in \mathcal{Q}_1.$$

Here, $\begin{pmatrix} a(x) & b(x) \\ b(x) & c(x) \end{pmatrix}$ is an S.O.S matrix polynomial, which implies that $a(x)$ and $c(x)$ are S.O.S polynomials, and the polynomial $a(x)c(x) - b(x)^2$ is non-negative. Hence, without loss of generality, we can assume that $\deg(a) = \max\{\deg(a), \deg(b), \deg(c)\}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} x_1x_2 - 1 &= a(x)x_1 + 2b(x) + c(x)x_2 \\ \Rightarrow 2 &\geq \deg(a) + 1 \Rightarrow \deg(a) \leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

But $a(x)$ is an S.O.S polynomial, then all the polynomials a, b and c are constant, which leads to a contradiction. \square

Remark A.2. The above example illustrates that typically, the hierarchies of lower bounds derived from different quadratic modules, whether from matrix inequalities or polynomial inequalities, exhibit distinct characteristics. Let's consider the optimization problem

$$p^* = \inf\{x_1 : (x_1, x_2) \in K\}.$$

This demonstrates that $\text{lb}(p, \mathcal{Q}_1)_1 = p^* = 0$, whereas $\text{lb}(p, \mathcal{Q}_2)_r < 0$ for every $r \in \mathbb{N}$. This suggests that employing the hierarchy rooted in the quadratic module generated by matrix inequalities proves to be more advantageous compared to that based on polynomial inequalities. In addition, the quadratic module based on the matrix inequality provides a direct approach to handle the problem (1.7), which is more attractive since it is challenging generally to transform a matrix inequality to a system of polynomial inequalities.

Appendix B. Proof of Theorem 4.4. Let us recall an effective version of Schmüdgen's Positivstellensatz for the hypercube $[-1, 1]^n$ in [15].

THEOREM B.1. *Consider $f \in \mathbb{R}[x]$, $\deg(f) = d$ and f is positive on the hypercube $[-1, 1]^n$. Let $f^* = \min_{[-1, 1]^n} f(x) > 0$ and $f_{\max} = \max_{[-1, 1]^n} f(x)$. Then there exists a constant $C(n, d)$ (depending only on n and d) such that $f \in \mathcal{T}(\{1 \pm x_i : i \in [n]\})_{nr}$, where*

$$r \geq \max \left\{ \pi d \sqrt{2n}, \sqrt{\frac{C(n, d)(f_{\max} - f^*)}{f^*}} \right\}.$$

Moreover, the constant $C(n, d)$ is a polynomial in d for fixed n such that:

$$C(n, d) \leq 2\pi^2 d^2 (d+1)^n n^3 = \mathcal{O}(d^{n+2} n^3).$$

The following lemma shows the connection between the preordering of the hypercube and the quadratic module of the unit ball, see [1].

LEMMA B.2. *The preordering associated with the hypercube $[-1, 1]^n$ is included in the quadratic module of the unit ball. In particular $\mathcal{T}(\{1 \pm x_i : i \in [n]\})_d \subset \mathcal{Q}(\{1 - \|x\|_2^2\})_{d+n}$.*

We aim to construct a penalty polynomial $P(x)$ such that $f(x) + P(x)$ is positive over the hypercube $[-1, 1]^n$ and $P(x)$ admits the form $-\langle h(G(x)), G(x) \rangle$, where $h(t)$ is a nonnegative univariate polynomial over the interval $[-1, 1]$. For $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, let us consider the penalty function

$$P(x) = -\left\langle p_k^{[v]}\left(-\lambda, \frac{3M_f}{\lambda}\right)(G(x)), G(x) \right\rangle.$$

Then Corollary 2.12 implies that

$$(B.1) \quad 0 \leq p_k^{[v]}\left(-\lambda, \frac{3M_f}{\lambda}\right)(t) - q_k\left(-\lambda, \frac{3M_f}{\lambda}\right)(t) \leq \frac{24M_f M_k \lambda^{-k-1}}{\pi k(v-k)^k} \quad \forall t \in [-1, 1].$$

Thus, for any $x \in V(\lambda)$

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) + P(x) &\geq f(x) - f(P_{\mathcal{X}}(x)) + f(P_{\mathcal{X}}(x)) - \sum_{\lambda_i(x) \geq 0} p_k^{[v]}\left(-\lambda, \frac{3M_f}{\lambda}\right)(\lambda_i(x)) \lambda_i(x) \\ &\geq f^* - CL_f \lambda^L - \frac{24mM_f M_k \lambda^{-k-1}}{\pi k(v-k)^k}. \end{aligned}$$

In the above inequality, we used Theorem 3.2 to get $f(x) - f(P_{\mathcal{X}}(x)) \geq -CL_f \lambda^L$ and (B.1) to get the last term of the inequality. On the other hand, for any $x \in [-1, 1]^n - V(\lambda)$,

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) + P(x) &\geq -M_f + \frac{3M_f}{\lambda} \lambda - \sum_{\lambda_i(x) \geq 0} p_k^{[v]}\left(-\lambda, \frac{3M_f}{\lambda}\right)(\lambda_i(x)) \lambda_i(x) \\ &\geq 2M_f - (m-1) \frac{24M_f M_k \lambda^{-k-1}}{\pi k(v-k)^k}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us choose λ and v such that

$$(B.2) \quad CL_f \lambda^L \leq \frac{f^*}{4},$$

$$(B.3) \quad \frac{24mM_f M_k \lambda^{-k-1}}{\pi k(v-k)^k} \leq \frac{f^*}{4}.$$

If these inequalities hold, then for all $x \in [-1, 1]^n$, we obtain that

$$f(x) + P(x) \geq \frac{f^*}{2} > 0.$$

Next, we elaborate on the inequalities (B.2) and (B.3). Without loss of generality, let us assume $M_f = 1$. Then $f^* \leq 1$, and f^* in inequalities (B.2) and (B.3) is replaced by $E_f = \frac{f^*}{M_f}$. Then, we consider

$$CL_f \lambda^L \leq \frac{E_f}{4} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \lambda \leq \left[\frac{E_f}{4CL_f} \right]^{1/L}.$$

In addition, the inequality (B.3) becomes

$$\frac{\gamma(k)m\lambda^{-2}}{v^k} \leq \frac{E_f}{4} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad v^k \geq \frac{4\gamma(k)m\lambda^{-2}}{E_f}.$$

Here, $\gamma(k)$ is a constant that depends on k polynomially. Hence, without loss of generality, we can assume $\left[\frac{E_f}{4CL_f}\right]^{1/L} \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Now we choose

$$\lambda = \left[\frac{E_f}{4CL_f}\right]^{1/L},$$

and $v^k \geq 4\gamma(k)mE_f^{-2/L-1}(4CL_f)^{2/L}$. Then we can simplify as

$$v = \mathcal{O}([(4CL_f)^{2/L}E_f^{-2/L-1}]^{1/k}).$$

We next calculate the necessary terms to apply Theorem B.1. Note that

$$\deg(f(x) + P(x)) \leq \max\{d, vl + l\} = \mathcal{O}(l[(4CL_f)^{2/L}E_f^{2/L-1}]^{1/k}).$$

Let $F(x) = f(x) + P(x)$. Then simplifying the following inequality by choosing $k = 1$, v and λ as above, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |F(x)| &= |f(x) + P(x)| \\ &\leq |f(x)| + \sum_{i=1}^m \left[p_k^{[v]} \left(-\lambda, \frac{3M_f}{\lambda} \right) (\lambda_i(x)) - q_k \left(-\lambda, \frac{3M_f}{\lambda} \right) (\lambda_i(x)) \right] \lambda_i(x) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^m q_k \left(-\lambda, \frac{3M_f}{\lambda} \right) (\lambda_i(x)) \lambda_i(x) \\ &\leq M_f + \frac{24mM_fM_k\lambda^{-k-1}}{\pi k(v-k)^k} + \frac{3mM_f}{\lambda} = \mathcal{O}(m(4CL_f)^{1/L}E_f^{-1/L}). \end{aligned}$$

We recall that $C(n, m) = \mathcal{O}(n^3m^{n+2})$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} &\sqrt{\frac{C(n, \deg(F))(F_{\max} - F_{\min})}{F_{\min}}} \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{n^3(vl+l)^{n+2} \frac{m(4CL_f)^{1/L}E_f^{-1/L}}{E_f}}\right) \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{mn^3l^{n+2} \left((4CL_f)^{2/L}E_f^{-2/L-1}\right)^{(n+2)/k} (4CL_f)^{1/L}E_f^{-1/L-1}}\right) \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{mn^3l^{n+2} (4CL_f)^{2(n+2)/Lk+1/L}E_f^{(-2/L-1)(n+2)/k-1/L-1}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

We apply Theorem B.1 and Lemma B.2 to obtain $F(x) \in \mathcal{Q}(1 - \|x\|_2^2)_r$, and

$$r = n\mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{mn^3l^{n+2} (4CL_f)^{2(n+2)/Lk+1/L}E_f^{(-2/L-1)(n+2)/k-1/L-1}}\right).$$

This complete the proof.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. BALDI AND B. MOURRAIN, *On moment approximation and the effective Putinar’s positivstellensatz*, *Mathematical Programming*, 200 (2023), pp. 71–103.
- [2] S. N. BERNSTEIN, *On the best approximation of continuous functions by polynomials of a given degree*, *Comm. Soc. Math. Kharkow*, Ser. 2 (1912), pp. 49–194.
- [3] E. DE KLERK, R. HESS, AND M. LAURENT, *Improved convergence rates for Lasserre-type hierarchies of upper bounds for box-constrained polynomial optimization*, 2017, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1603.03329>.
- [4] S. T. DINH AND T. S. PHAM, *Lojasiewicz-type inequalities with explicit exponents for the largest eigenvalue function of real symmetric polynomial matrices*, *International Journal of Mathematics*, 27 (2016), p. 1650012.
- [5] H. FAWZI, J. SAUNDERSON, AND P. A. PARRILO, *Sparse sum-of-squares certificates on finite abelian groups*, 2015 54th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), (2015), pp. 5909–5914.
- [6] D. HENRION AND J.-B. LASSERRE, *Convergent relaxations of polynomial matrix inequalities and static output feedback*, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 51 (2006), pp. 192–202.
- [7] C. W. HOL AND C. W. SCHERER, *Sum of squares relaxations for polynomial semidefinite programming*, (2004).
- [8] M. KOJIMA, *Sums of squares relaxations of polynomial semidefinite programs*, (2003).
- [9] J. LASSERRE, *A unified criterion for positive definiteness and semidefiniteness*, LAAS-CNRS, Toulouse, France, Res. Rep. 05, 283 (2005), p. 219.
- [10] J. B. LASSERRE, *An explicit exact SDP relaxation for nonlinear 0-1 programs*, in *International Conference on Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization*, Springer, 2001, pp. 293–303.
- [11] J. B. LASSERRE, *Global optimization with polynomials and the problem of moments*, *SIAM J. on optimization*, 11 (2001), pp. 796–817.
- [12] J. B. LASSERRE, *Moments, positive polynomials and their applications*, vol. 1, World Scientific, 2009.
- [13] J. B. LASSERRE, *A new look at nonnegativity on closed sets and polynomial optimization*, *SIAM J. on Optimization*, 21 (2011), pp. 864–885.
- [14] M. LAURENT, *A comparison of the Sherali-Adams, Lovász-Schrijver, and Lasserre relaxations for 0-1 programming*, *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 28 (2003), pp. 470–496.
- [15] M. LAURENT AND L. SLOT, *An effective version of Schmüdgen’s positivstellensatz for the hypercube*, *Optimization Letters*, 17 (2023), pp. 515–530.
- [16] N. H. A. MAI AND V. MAGRON, *On the complexity of Putinar–Vasilescu’s positivstellensatz*, *Journal of Complexity*, 72 (2022), p. 101663, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jco.2022.101663>, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0885064X22000280>.
- [17] J. NIE AND M. SCHWEIGHOFER, *On the complexity of Putinar’s positivstellensatz*, *Journal of Complexity*, 23 (2007), pp. 135–150.
- [18] W. RUDIN, *Principles of mathematical analysis*, 1953.
- [19] S. SAKAUE, A. TAKEDA, S. KIM, AND N. ITO, *Exact semidefinite programming relaxations with truncated moment matrix for binary polynomial optimization problems*, *SIAM J. on Optimization*, 27 (2017), pp. 565–582.
- [20] M. SCHWEIGHOFER, *On the complexity of Schmüdgen’s positivstellensatz*, *Journal of Complexity*, 20 (2004), pp. 529–543.
- [21] L. SLOT, *Sum-of-squares hierarchies for polynomial optimization and the Christoffel-Darboux kernel*, *SIAM J. Optimization*, 32 (2022), pp. 2612–2635.
- [22] L. SLOT AND M. LAURENT, *Sum-of-squares hierarchies for binary polynomial optimization*, *Mathematical Programming*, 197 (2023), pp. 621–660.
- [23] E. M. STEIN AND R. SHAKARCHI, *Complex analysis*, vol. 2, Princeton University Press, 2010.
- [24] L. N. TREFETHEN, *Approximation theory and approximation practice*, SIAM, Philadelphia, USA, 2013.