

# The Effective Generalized Moment Problem

Lucas Gamertsfelder & Bernard Mourrain

January 20, 2025

## Abstract

We establish new convergence rates for the moment-sum-of-squares (Moment-SOS) relaxations for the Generalized Moment Problem (GMP). These bounds, which adapt to the geometry of the underlying semi-algebraic set, apply to both the convergence of optima, and to the convergence in Hausdorff distance between the relaxation feasibility set and the GMP feasibility set. This research extends previous works limited to specific problems in polynomial optimization, volume computation and optimal control. We complement our theoretical analysis with an application: minimal rank symmetric tensor decomposition. In the examples, we formulate the problem as a GMP, solve using Moment-SOS relaxation, and apply the theoretical results to observe a convergence rate of the relaxations.

## 1 Introduction

The Generalized Moment Problem (GMP) extends classical moment problems into the framework of conic linear programming over positive Borel measures. Building on moment problems such as those of Hamburger, Stieltjes, and Hausdorff, the GMP incorporates an optimization: finding measures that both satisfy moment constraints and minimize a given linear functional. With applications in numerous fields including control, signal processing, and statistics (see e.g. [Las18]), moment problems remain an active area of research since their introduction in the 19th century (see [Akh20, Lan87, S<sup>+</sup>17] for an historical overview).

Moment-sum-of-squares (SOS) relaxations provide a systematic approach to solving the GMP [Las01, Las18]. The method proceeds in two steps: first relaxing the cone of positive Borel measures to non-negative linear functionals over an infinite-dimensional quadratic module; a relaxation that is exact under the Archimedean condition via Putinar’s Positivstellensatz [Put93]. Second, truncating the quadratic module’s degree yields a hierarchy of semi-definite programs (SDPs), with accuracy improving as the truncation degree increases. This approach has been successfully applied to Polynomial Optimization Problems (POP), which are a special class of moment problems. While the convergence of Moment-SOS relaxations for POP was proven (under an Archimedean condition) in [Las01], only recent contributions provide polynomial convergence rates [FF20, LS23, BM23, BS24, BMP25].

The GMP and its Moment-SOS relaxations have been investigated in [Las08], for the case of a single measure. The convergence is proven under conditions similar to Assumption 2.1 and Assumption 3.1.

Convergence rates for the Moment-SOS hierarchy of the GMP have been analyzed for specific applications. In Polynomial Optimization Problems, where there is a single moment equality constraint  $\langle \mu, 1 \rangle = 1$ , convergence rates have been analyzed, e.g. in [Sch04, NS07, KL19, FF20, LS23, BM23, BS24].

In optimal control, where there are moment equality constraints on a single (occupational) measure, convergence rates have been studied, for example, in [KHJ17]. For volume computation, where Stokes equations are exploited to derive moment equality constraints on an

optimal measure supported on the semi-algebraic set, convergence rates have been investigated, e.g., in [TLH23]. In [STL24] a general framework for analyzing the convergence rates for GMP on vectors of measures with moment equality constraints is proposed, and polynomial convergence rates for optimal control and volume computation are derived. Rates for the general case have, however, not been established.

In this paper, we consider generalized moment optimization problems, that is, general *linear programs on measures*. The unknown is a vector  $\mu = [\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m]$  of positive measures  $\mu_i$  supported on compact sets  $S_i \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ . The constraints are of the form  $t - \langle \mu, h \rangle \in K$  where  $K$  is a cone of  $\mathbb{R}^N$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}^N$ ,  $h = (h_{i,j}) \in (\prod_{i=1}^m \mathcal{C}_i)^N$  is a matrix of continuous functions  $h_{i,j} \in \mathcal{C}_i$  on  $S_i$  and  $\langle \mu, h \rangle = [\sum_{i=1}^m \int_{S_i} h_{i,j} d\mu_i, j = 1 \dots, N]$ . The objective function is of the form  $\langle \mu, f \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^m \int_{S_i} f_i d\mu_i$  where  $f = (f_1, \dots, f_m) \in \prod_{i=1}^m \mathcal{C}_i$ . This linear program on measures is approximated by a hierarchy of Moment-SOS convex relaxations (also known as Lasserre's relaxation).

We establish the convergence of these hierarchies under an  $S$ -fullness condition and an Archimedean condition, and we provide polynomial convergence rates that adapt to the underlying semi-algebraic set geometry. Our results apply both to the convergence of optima and to the convergence of the moment feasibility sets. Our main results are the following.

**Theorem A.** (See Corollary 3.5) *Under Assumption 2.1 and Assumption 3.1,*

$$0 \leq \mathfrak{p} - \mathfrak{p}_\ell \leq \mathfrak{d} - \mathfrak{d}_\ell \leq \kappa \ell^{-\theta}$$

where  $\mathfrak{p}$ ,  $\mathfrak{d}$  (resp.  $\mathfrak{p}_\ell$ ,  $\mathfrak{d}_\ell$ ) are the optima of the (resp. relaxation of the) primal and dual General Moment Problem (2) and (3) (resp. at order  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ ), and  $\kappa, \theta$  are constant depending explicitly on the input data of the GMP.

**Theorem B.** (See Theorem 3.10) *Under Assumption 2.1 and Assumption 3.1, for  $\ell \geq k$ ,*

$$\rho_H(\Lambda^{(k)}, L_\ell^{(k)}) \leq \kappa \ell^{-\theta},$$

where  $\Lambda^{(k)}$ ,  $L^{(k)}$  are respectively the cones of moment sequences truncated at order  $k$  of positive measures and linear functionals positive on squares, and  $\rho_H$  is the Hausdorff distance.

These results establish polynomial rates of convergence for GMPs, building on the recent progresses on the Effective Positivstellensatz (see Theorem 3.3).

We apply this analysis to minimal symmetric tensor decomposition (Section 4). Symmetric tensors play important roles in independent component analysis, telecommunications, and psychometrics; see [KB09, BCMT10] for overviews. Additive decompositions of a tensor provide a convenient representation, and minimal decompositions are particularly valuable [MO20]. Current algorithms can recover symmetric decompositions [BCMT10], and minimal forms for low-rank tensors [MO20]. However, high-rank tensor decompositions remains challenging. We propose an optimization approach to this problem, formulating the minimal decomposition as a GMP. Our approach leverages the homogeneous polynomial representation of symmetric tensors, and the *apolar product*. A homogeneous polynomial admits a Waring decomposition when its dual linear functional with respect to the apolar product can be represented as a finite sum of weighted Dirac measures. The GMP formulation is based upon finding such a minimal representation.

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we formally introduce the GMP and its dual formulation. We present the  $S$ -fullness condition, which ensures both strong duality between the primal and dual formulations, and compactness in the primal. Additionally, we verify that the  $S$ -fullness condition holds in the case of the POP.

In Section 3, we introduce the moment-sum-of-squares (SOS) relaxations of the GMP and analyze their rate of convergence under the  $S$ -fullness condition and Archimedean condition. We prove our first main result, Corollary 3.5, providing bounds on the difference in value between the GMP and its Moment-SOS relaxation. We also prove the second main result, Theorem 3.10, providing bounds on the Hausdorff distance between the GMP cone and the relaxed cones.

Finally, in Section 4, we provide examples in symmetric tensor decomposition and formulate them as GMPs. We verify that the  $S$ -fullness condition holds, and study the convergence rates of the moment relaxations in these examples using the main result.

## 2 The Generalized Moment Problem

Let  $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a compact subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{C}(S)$  the set of continuous functions on  $S$ . It is a Banach space when endowed with the sup-norm: for  $q \in \mathcal{C}(S)$ ,  $\|q\|_\infty = \max_{x \in S} |q(x)|$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{C}_+(S)$  the convex cone of continuous functions  $f \in \mathcal{C}(S)$  which are positive on  $S$ :  $\forall x \in S, f(x) \geq 0$ .

We denote by  $\mathcal{M}(S) = \mathcal{C}(S)^*$  the space of continuous linear functionals on  $\mathcal{C}(S)$ , equipped with the weak\* topology and the operator norm: for  $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}(S)$ ,  $\|\lambda\|_\infty = \max_{\|q\|_\infty \leq 1} \langle \lambda, q \rangle$ . In the weak\* topology, a sequence  $\{\lambda_n\} \subset \mathcal{M}(S)$  converges to  $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}(S)$  if and only if

$$\forall q \in \mathcal{C}(S), \quad \langle \lambda_n, q \rangle \rightarrow \langle \lambda, q \rangle. \quad (1)$$

By [Ash14, Theorem 4.3.13],  $\mathcal{M}(S)$  is the set of finite signed Borel measures on  $S$ , so that  $\forall \mu \in \mathcal{M}(S)$ ,  $\int_S q d\mu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle \mu, q \rangle$ .

Note that when the space of measures  $\mathcal{M}(S)$  is endowed with the norm of total variation (equivalently the operator norm on the linear functional representation [Ash14, p. 186]) it is a Banach space.

Let  $\mathcal{M}_+(S)$  be its positive cone, i.e., the space of positive Borel measures on  $S$ . By Riesz-Haviland Theorem (see [Rud87, Theorem 2.14]), for any  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(S)$ ,  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+(S)$  if and only if  $\forall p \in \mathcal{C}_+(S)$ ,  $\langle \mu, p \rangle \geq 0$ .

Let  $m$  be a non-zero natural number. For  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , let  $S_i \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$  be a compact subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{n_i}$  for  $n_i \in \mathbb{N}$ . Where  $\mathcal{C}(S_i)$ ,  $\mathcal{M}(S_i)$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_+(S_i)$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_+(S_i)$  are as above, define  $\mathcal{C} = \prod_{i=1}^m \mathcal{C}(S_i)$ ,  $\mathcal{M} = \prod_{i=1}^m \mathcal{M}(S_i)$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_+ = \prod_{i=1}^m \mathcal{M}_+(S_i)$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_+ = \prod_{i=1}^m \mathcal{C}_+(S_i)$ .

Let  $f \in \mathcal{C}$ ,  $h_1, \dots, h_N \in \mathcal{C}$ ,  $h = [h_1, \dots, h_N] = (h_{i,j})_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq N} \in \mathcal{C}^N$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}^N$  and  $K \subset \mathbb{R}_+^N$  a closed convex cone in the positive orthant  $\mathbb{R}_+^N$  where  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ . We equip  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{M}$  with the product topologies: sequences in the former sets converge if and only if each component converges independently. We consider the  $m$ -dimensional Generalized Moment Problem ( $m$ -GMP): For  $f \in \mathcal{C}$ ,  $h_1, \dots, h_N \in \mathcal{C}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{p}^* &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf \langle \mu, f \rangle \\ &\text{s.t. } t - \langle \mu, h \rangle \in K \\ &\quad \mu \in \mathcal{M}_+, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where

$$\langle \mu, f \rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^m \langle \mu_i, f_i \rangle, \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \mu, h \rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left( \sum_{i=1}^m \langle \mu_i, h_{i,j} \rangle \right)_{j=1}^N.$$

The feasible set of  $\mathfrak{p}^*$  has the form

$$\Omega \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{ \mu \in \mathcal{M}_+ \mid t - \langle \mu, h \rangle \in K \}.$$

We consider also the  $m$ -dimensional Dual Generalized Moment Problem ( $m$ -DGMP):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{d}^* &= \sup t \cdot v \\ \text{s.t. } & f - h \cdot v \in \mathcal{C}_+, \\ & v \in -K^*. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where  $h \cdot v = \sum_{i=1}^N h_i v_i$  and  $K^* = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^N : \forall w \in K, w \cdot v \geq 0\}$  is dual cone of  $K$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ .

**Example.** When  $m = 1$ ,  $N = 1$ ,  $h = 1 \in \mathcal{C}(S)$ ,  $t = 1 \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $K = \{0\}$ , we recover the optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\min} &= \inf_{x \in S} f(x) = \inf \langle \mu, f \rangle &= \sup \lambda \\ \text{s.t. } & 1 - \langle \mu, 1 \rangle = 0 & \text{s.t. } f - \lambda \in \mathcal{C}_+(S) \\ & \mu \in \mathcal{M}_+ & \lambda \in \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

**Remark 1.** The LP problem  $\mathfrak{p}^*$  may be infeasible, e.g. by imposing constraints  $\langle \mu, 1 \rangle = -1$  and  $\langle \mu, 1 \rangle = 1$ . Such cases necessarily fall outside the scope of the subsequent convergence analyses. We thus assume  $\mathfrak{p}^*$  has a nonempty feasible set  $\Omega$ ; that is, there exists at least one measure satisfying all moment constraints.

## 2.1 Slater's condition and compactness

To guarantee the existence of solutions to the Generalized Moment Problem, we make the following assumption:

**Assumption 2.1** ( $S$ -fullness). *The  $S$ -fullness condition is said to be satisfied for problem (2) when there exists  $b = h \cdot w$ ,  $w \in K^*$ , such that  $b_i > 0$  on  $S_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ .*

Note that  $S$ -fullness holds trivially in the case  $\Omega$  describes a product of probability measures: order the matrix  $h$  so that  $(h_{i,j})_{1 \leq i, j \leq m} = \text{Id}$  and set  $w = (\overbrace{1, \dots, 1}^m, 0, \dots, 0)$ . Then,  $b = (\overbrace{1, \dots, 1}^m)$  and  $b_i = 1 > 0$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, m$ .

Observe that the problem being  $S$ -full implies that  $\Omega$  is bounded:

**Lemma 2.2.** *Under Assumption 2.1, the set  $\Omega$  is weak\* compact in the product topology. Furthermore, the value of  $\mathfrak{p}^*$  is attained.*

*Proof.* Observe firstly that  $\Omega$  is closed in  $\mathcal{M}$ . Let  $\mu_n \xrightarrow{w} \mu$  with  $\mu_n \in \Omega$  and  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ . We readily have that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (t - \langle \mu_n, h \rangle) = t - \langle \mu, h \rangle \in K.$$

since  $K$  is closed in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Moreover, for any  $q \in \mathcal{C}_+(S)$ , we have  $\langle \mu_n, q \rangle \geq 0$ , thus  $\langle \mu, q \rangle = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \mu_n, q \rangle \geq 0$ . The previous statements imply  $\mu \in \Omega$ , and so  $\Omega$  is closed.

The Banach-Alaoglu theorem (see e.g. [Ash14, Theorem 3.5.16]) implies that the closed unit ball  $B_1(\mathcal{M}(S_i))$  in the space  $\mathcal{M}(S_i)$  is weak\* compact, as well as the ball  $B_\kappa(\mathcal{M}(S_i))$  of radius  $\kappa$  by rescaling. By Tychonoff's Theorem, the ball  $B_\kappa(\mathcal{M})$  is also weak\* compact.

Let  $b_{\min} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min_{i=1, \dots, m} (\min_{x \in S_i} b_i(x)) > 0$ , since  $b_i > 0$  on  $S_i$  and  $S_i$  is compact. Then, for  $w \in K^*$  and  $\mu \in \Omega$ , we have  $(t - \langle \mu, h \rangle) \cdot w \geq 0$ . We deduce that

$$t \cdot w \geq (\langle \mu, h \rangle) \cdot w = \langle \mu, h \cdot w \rangle = \langle \mu, b \rangle \geq b_{\min} \sum_{i=1}^m \langle \mu_i, 1 \rangle$$

This implies that

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \langle \mu_i, 1 \rangle \leq \rho \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{t \cdot w}{b_{\min}}. \quad (5)$$

For  $q \in \mathcal{C}$  with  $\|q\|_\infty \leq 1$  and  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+$ , we have

$$|\langle \mu, q \rangle| = \left| \sum_{i=1}^m \langle \mu_i, q_i \rangle \right| \leq \sum_{i=1}^m |\langle \mu_i, q_i \rangle| \leq \sum_{i=1}^m \langle \mu_i, 1 \rangle \leq \rho \quad (6)$$

since  $1 \pm q_i \in \mathcal{C}_+(S_i)$  and  $\mu$  satisfies (5). Thus  $\|\mu\|_\infty \leq \rho$ , and  $\mu \in B_\rho(\mathcal{M})$ . We deduce that  $\Omega$  is a closed subset of the weak\* compact set in  $B_\rho(\mathcal{M})$ , and is therefore also weak\* compact. The fact that the value of  $\mathfrak{p}^*$  is attained follows by the extreme value theorem.  $\square$

We consider an interior point criterion for strong duality between problems  $\mathfrak{p}^*$  and  $\mathfrak{d}^*$ .

**Condition 2.3** (Slater's Condition). *Let  $(X, Y)$  and  $(Z, V)$  be two dual pairs of Banach spaces, where  $Y$  and  $W$  are the dual spaces of  $X$  and  $Z$ , respectively. Let  $A : X \rightarrow Z$  be a continuous linear operator. Define  $P$  as the positive cone in  $X$ , and  $Q$  the positive cone in  $Z$ . Let  $b \in Z$  and  $c \in Y$ . A problem of the form*

$$\begin{aligned} \inf \quad & \langle x, c \rangle \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & Ax - b \in Q, \\ & x \in P, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

is said to satisfy Slater's Condition when it has a finite infimum, and  $\exists x_0 \in P$  with  $Ax_0 - b$  is in the interior of  $Q$ .

The importance of Slater's Condition lies in its establishment of strong duality between problem (7) and its dual, given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \sup \quad & \langle b, w \rangle \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & c - A^*w \in P^*, \\ & w \in Q^*. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

**Theorem 2.4** ([And83, Theorem 10]). *If Slater's Condition is satisfied for (7), then strong duality holds between the problems (7) and (8).*

**Remark 2.** In [And83, Theorem 10], the hypothesis requires an element from the Mackey interior. Since we work in Banach spaces, which are locally convex, the Mackey topology coincides with the norm topology on convex sets [Bou13, Proposition 4, Chapter IV]. Therefore, we only consider points in the interiors with respect to the norm induced by our Banach spaces.

**Proposition 2.5.** *Under Assumption 2.1, strong duality holds between  $\mathfrak{d}^*$  and  $\mathfrak{p}^*$ .*

*Proof.* By taking the following series of substitutions, (7) can be realized as  $-\mathfrak{d}^*$ , the problem identical to (3) except for the sign of the objective:

1.  $v \rightarrow x$ ,
2.  $h \cdot v \rightarrow Ax$ ,
3.  $t \rightarrow c$ ,
4.  $\sup t \cdot v \rightarrow -\inf c \cdot -v$ ,
5.  $\mathcal{C}_+ \rightarrow Q$ ,
6.  $K^* \rightarrow P$ ,
7.  $b \rightarrow -f$ .

Specifically, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathfrak{d}^* &= \inf t \cdot v \\ \text{s.t. } & h \cdot v + f \in \mathcal{C}_+, \\ & v \in K^*. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $K$  is closed,  $K^{**} = K$  (see e.g. [Roc97, p. 121], [BV04, p. 53]) and by Haviland theorem  $(\mathcal{C}_+)^* = \mathcal{M}_+$ . It is then readily verified with reference to the above substitutions and (8) that the dual to the above problem is  $-\mathfrak{p}^*$ . The weak duality condition is satisfied:  $-\mathfrak{d}^* \geq -\mathfrak{p}^*$ , and hence by Lemma 2.2,  $-\mathfrak{d}^*$  has a finite infimum. To satisfy Condition 2.3, it remains to locate a vector  $v_0$  such that  $h \cdot v_0 + f$  is in the interior of  $\mathcal{C}_+$ . By Assumption 2.1, there exists  $w \in K^*$  such that  $b = h \cdot w \geq b_{\min} > 0$ . Since  $f_i$  is bounded on  $S_i$ , we can find  $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that

$$\eta(h \cdot w)_i + f_i > 0 \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, M,$$

implying that  $v_0 = \eta w \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$  is the required vector. Thus, Condition 2.3 holds for  $-\mathfrak{d}^*$ , implying  $-\mathfrak{d}^* = -\mathfrak{p}^*$ , or equivalently,  $\mathfrak{d}^* = \mathfrak{p}^*$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.** If there exists  $w \in K^*$  such that  $f_i + h_i \cdot w > 0$  on  $S_i$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , then Slater's Condition holds and strong duality follows, i.e.,  $\mathfrak{p}^* = \mathfrak{d}^*$ . However, the optimal value of  $\mathfrak{p}^*$  is not necessarily attained since Assumption 2.1 may not hold.

### 3 Moment-SOS relaxations of the Generalized Moment Problem

In the following sections, the usage of  $i$  refers to an arbitrary element from the sequence  $\{1, \dots, m\}$ , where  $m$  is the dimension of the generalized moment problem.

Let  $\mathcal{R}_i$  be the ring of polynomial functions in  $n_i$  variables (that we denote  $X_{i,1}, \dots, X_{i,n_i}$ ) with coefficients in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Let  $\mathcal{R} = \prod_{i=1}^m \mathcal{R}_i$ . For  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ , the vector space of polynomials of degree  $\leq l$  is denoted  $\mathcal{R}_{i,l}$ .

The dual space  $\mathcal{R}_i^*$  of linear functionals on  $\mathcal{R}_i$  is denoted  $\mathcal{D}_i$ . Let  $\mathcal{D} = \prod_{i=1}^m \mathcal{D}_i$ . It is equipped with the weak\* topology. By Hahn-Banach theorem (see e.g. [Rud91, Theorem 3.6]), any continuous linear functional on  $\mathcal{R}_i$  can be uniquely extended to a measure in  $\mathcal{M}(S_i)$ . Thus, we will identify elements in  $\mathcal{M}(S_i)$  with the elements in  $\mathcal{D}_i$ , which are continuous for the weak\* topology.

Hereafter, we assume that the compact sets  $S_i$  are defined as

$$S_i = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n, g_{i,1}(x) \geq 0, \dots, g_{i,r_i}(x) \geq 0\} \quad (9)$$

for some polynomial vectors  $g_i = (g_{i,1}, \dots, g_{i,r_i}) \in \mathcal{R}_i^{r_i}$ , where  $\mathcal{R}_i^{r_i}$  is the  $r_i$ -fold product space. We denote by  $\mathcal{Pos}(S_i)$  the convex cone of polynomials  $p \in \mathcal{R}_i$  such that  $\forall x \in S_i, p(x) \geq 0$ . Hereafter, we consider  $S_i$  to be a set of the form  $S_i = g_i^{-1}(\mathbb{R}_+^{r_i})$  with  $g_i \in \mathcal{R}_i^{r_i}$ . Let  $\Sigma_i^2 = \{q_1^2 + \dots + q_s^2 \mid s \in \mathbb{N}, q_i \in \mathcal{R}_i\} \subset \mathcal{R}_i$  be the convex cone of Sums of Squares (SOS). The *quadratic module* generated by the polynomials  $g_i \in \mathcal{R}_i^{r_i}$  is

$$\mathcal{Q}(g_i) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Sigma_i^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} \Sigma_i^2 \cdot g_{i,j}.$$

Hereafter, we will make the following assumption:

**Assumption 3.1** (Archimedean quadratic module). *For all  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , the quadratic module  $\mathcal{Q}(g_i)$  contains a polynomial of the form  $R_i^2 - (X_1^2 + \dots + X_{n_i}^2)$ , where  $R_i \in \mathbb{R}_+$ .*

This assumption is easy to satisfy when  $S_i$  is bounded, that is, included in a ball of some radius  $R_i$  centered at the origin, since we can add the sign constraint  $R_i^2 - (X_1^2 + \dots + X_{n_i}^2) \geq 0$  to  $g_i$  without changing  $S_i$ .

We define the dual cones:  $\mathcal{L}(g_i) = \mathcal{Q}(g_i)^* = \{\lambda \in \mathcal{D}(S_i) \mid \forall q \in \mathcal{R}_i, \lambda(g_{i,j}q^2) \geq 0, \lambda(q^2) \geq 0, \forall j = 1, \dots, r_i\}$  and  $\mathcal{L} = \prod_{i=1}^m \mathcal{L}(g_i), \mathcal{Q} = \prod_{i=1}^m \mathcal{Q}(g_i)$ .

Under Assumption 3.1, it is readily verified by Putinar's Positivstellensatz that  $\mathcal{L}(g_i) = \mathcal{M}_+(S_i)$ . Therefore, given a cost function  $f \in \mathcal{R}$  and  $h_{i,j} \in \mathcal{R}_i$ , the primal relaxation of (2) translates as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{p}^* &= \inf \langle \lambda, f \rangle \\ \text{s.t. } &t - \langle \lambda, h \rangle \in K, \\ &\lambda \in \mathcal{L}, \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

whose feasible set is denoted

$$\Lambda = \{\lambda \in \mathcal{L} \mid t - \langle \lambda, h \rangle \in K\}. \tag{11}$$

We consider also the dual SOS relaxation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{d}^* &= \sup v \cdot t \\ \text{s.t. } &f - h \cdot v \in \mathcal{Q} \\ &v \in -K^* \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

whose feasible set is

$$E = \{v \in -K^* : f - h \cdot v \in \mathcal{Q}\}. \tag{13}$$

It is readily verified under Assumption 3.1 that  $\mathcal{P}\text{os} = \overline{\mathcal{Q}}$ , where the closure of  $\mathcal{Q}$  is taken in the weak\* topology ( $p_n \xrightarrow{w} p$  in  $\mathcal{R}$  iff  $\forall \lambda \in \mathcal{D}, \langle \lambda, p_n \rangle \rightarrow \langle \lambda, p \rangle$  equivalent to the point-wise convergence). We deduce from the previous section the following result:

**Lemma 3.2.** *Under Assumption 2.1 and Assumption 3.1,  $M$  is weak\* compact and  $\mathbf{p}^* = \mathfrak{d}^* = \underline{\mathfrak{d}}$ . Furthermore, the value of  $\mathbf{p}^*$  is attained.*

### 3.1 Convergence of the optima

We now introduce the Moment-SOS hierarchies, which consist of a sequence of convex optimization problems indexed by degree  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ . For  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\Sigma_{i,\ell}^2 = \{q_1^2 + \dots + q_s^2 \mid s \in \mathbb{N}, q_i \in \mathcal{R}_{i, \lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor}\} \subset \mathcal{R}_{i,\ell}$  be the convex finite dimensional cone of Sums of Squares (SOS) of degree  $\leq \ell$ . The *truncated quadratic module* generated by the polynomials  $g_i \in \mathcal{R}_i^{r_i}$  in degree  $\leq \ell$  is

$$\mathcal{Q}_\ell(g_i) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Sigma_{i,\ell}^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} \Sigma_{i,\ell - \deg(g_{i,j})}^2 \cdot g_{i,j}.$$

Let  $\mathcal{Q}_\ell = \prod_{i=1}^m \mathcal{Q}_\ell(g_i), \mathcal{L}_\ell(g_i) = \mathcal{Q}_\ell(g_i)^* = \{\lambda \in \mathcal{D}(S_i) \mid \forall q \in \mathcal{Q}_\ell(g_i), \langle \lambda, q \rangle \geq 0\}$ , and  $\mathcal{L}_\ell = \prod_{i=1}^m \mathcal{L}_\ell(g_i)$ .

Henceforth, we specify  $f$  and  $h_j$  to be elements of  $\mathcal{R}$ . We consider the following hierarchy of truncated primal relaxations

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{p}_\ell^* &= \inf \langle \lambda, f \rangle \\ \text{s.t. } &t - \langle \lambda, h \rangle \in K, \\ &\lambda \in \mathcal{L}_\ell, \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

along with the corresponding dual  $\ell$ -degree SOS relaxations:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{d}_\ell^* &= \sup v \cdot t \\ \text{s.t. } & f - h \cdot v \in \mathcal{Q}_\ell, \\ & v \in -K^*. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

It is readily verified that weak duality holds:  $\mathfrak{d}_\ell^* \leq \mathfrak{p}_\ell^*$  and that  $\mathfrak{d}_\ell^* \leq \mathfrak{d}_{\ell+1}^* \leq \mathfrak{d}^*$ ,  $\mathfrak{p}_\ell^* \leq \mathfrak{p}_{\ell+1}^* \leq \mathfrak{p}^*$ .

To analyze the convergence of the hierarchy, we will use the following Positivstellensätze, which holds under Assumption 3.1:

**Theorem 3.3** (Effective Positivstellensätze). *For  $n \geq 2$ ,  $g \subset \mathcal{R}$  finite such that  $\mathcal{Q}(g)$  satisfies Assumption 3.1,  $S = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \forall p \in g, p(x) \geq 0\}$  and  $p$  strictly positive on  $S$ , one has that  $p \in \mathcal{Q}_\ell(g)$  for*

$$\ell \geq \max\left\{\gamma \left(\frac{p_{\max}}{p_{\min}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\theta}}, \ell_0\right\}.$$

where  $\theta > 0$ , and  $\gamma, \ell_0$  are constants depending on  $n, g$  and  $\deg(p)$ , and  $p_{\min} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min_{x \in S} p(x)$   $p_{\max} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{x \in S} p(x)$ . We have

- $\theta = \frac{1}{2.5nL}$ ,  $\gamma = \gamma'(n, g) \deg(p)^{-3.5nL}$  and  $\ell_0 = 0$ , where  $\gamma'(n, g)$  is a constant depending on  $n$  and  $g$ ,  $L$  is the exponent in the Lojasiewicz inequality between the semi-algebraic distance defined from the polynomials  $g$  and the Euclidean distance to  $S$  (see [BM23, Theorem 1.7]),
- $\theta = 1$ ,  $\gamma$  depends polynomially on  $\deg(p)$  for  $n$  fixed and  $\ell_0 = \pi n \sqrt{2n} \deg(p)$ , when  $S$  is the box  $S = [-\rho, \rho]^n$  and  $g = \{\rho^2 - x_i^2, i = 1, \dots, m\}$  (see [BS24, Theorem 11]),
- $\theta = 2$ ,  $\gamma$  depends polynomially on  $\deg(p)$  for  $n$  fixed and  $\ell_0 = \pi n \sqrt{2n} \deg(p)$ , when  $S$  is the box  $S = [-1, 1]^n$  and  $g = \{\prod_{i=1}^n (1 - x_i^2)^{e_i}, \text{ for } e = [e_1, \dots, e_n] \in \{0, 1\}^n\}$  (see [LS23, Corollary 3]),
- $\theta = 2$ ,  $\gamma$  depends polynomially on  $\deg(p)$  for  $n$  fixed and  $\ell_0 = 2n \deg(p)^{\frac{3}{2}}$ , when  $S = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid 1 - \|x\|^2 \geq 0\}$  is the unit ball (see [Slo22, Theorem 3]).

The main result of the section is as follows:

**Theorem 3.4.** *Let Assumption 2.1 and Assumption 3.1 be satisfied. Where  $\mathfrak{d}^*$  is as in (3) and  $\mathfrak{d}_\ell^*$  is as in (15), we have for  $\ell \geq \max_{i=1, \dots, m} \ell_{i,0}$ ,*

$$0 \leq \mathfrak{d}^* - \mathfrak{d}_\ell^* \leq \kappa \ell^{-\theta}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa &= \max_{i=1, \dots, m} \frac{1+t \cdot w}{(h_i \cdot w)_{\min}} \gamma_i^{\theta_i} (3f_{i, \max} + \|v^*\|_1 h_{i, \max}) \\ \theta &= \min_{i=1, \dots, m} \theta_i, \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

with

- $\gamma_i, \theta_i$  as in Theorem 3.3 for  $S_i$ ,
- $w$  as in Assumption 2.1,
- $v^*$  the vector achieving the supremum in  $\mathfrak{d}^*$ ,

*Proof.* By Proposition 2.5, the value of the dual (3) exists. Hence, there exists a sequence  $(v_k)$ ,  $v_k \in \mathbb{R}^N$  such that  $v_k \rightarrow v^*$  with  $\mathfrak{d}^* = t \cdot v^*$ . For all  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $k$  such that

$$0 \leq \|v^* - v_k\|_1 < \frac{\epsilon}{\|t\|_\infty}. \quad (17)$$

By Hölder's inequality, we have

$$0 \leq |t \cdot v^* - t \cdot v_k| < \epsilon. \quad (18)$$

Let  $v_\epsilon$  be the first vector in the sequence  $(v_k)$  that satisfies the above. Define the perturbed vector  $\tilde{v}_\epsilon$  by

$$\tilde{v}_\epsilon = v_\epsilon - \epsilon w, \quad (19)$$

where  $w$  is as in Assumption 2.1. Corresponding to  $\tilde{v}_\epsilon$  we have the strictly positive polynomial sequence  $q = (q_i) \in \mathcal{C}$ :

$$q \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f - h \cdot \tilde{v}_\epsilon = f - h \cdot v_\epsilon + \epsilon h \cdot w > 0$$

by the feasibility of  $v_\epsilon$  in (3), and since  $h \cdot w > 0$  by Assumption 2.1. Thus, the premise for Theorem 3.3 holds for  $q \in \mathcal{P}\text{os}$ . We have

$$\ell \geq \max_{i=1,\dots,m} \left( \gamma_i \left( \frac{q_{i,\max}}{q_{i,\min}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\theta_i}}, \ell_{i,0} \right) \implies q \in \mathcal{Q}_\ell.$$

By the feasibility of  $v_\epsilon$  in (3),

$$q_{i,\min} = (f_i - h_i \cdot v_\epsilon)_{\min} + (\epsilon h_i \cdot w)_{\min} \geq \epsilon (h_i \cdot w)_{\min} > 0,$$

where  $(h_i \cdot w)_{\min} > 0$  by Assumption 2.1. Also, letting  $h_{i,\max} = \max_{j=1,\dots,N} (h_{i,j})_{\max}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} q_{i,\max} &= (f_i - h_i \cdot \tilde{v}_\epsilon)_{\max} \leq f_{i,\max} + (-h_i \cdot v_\epsilon)_{\max} + \epsilon (h_i \cdot w)_{\max} \\ &\leq f_{i,\max} + \|v_\epsilon\|_1 h_{i,\max} + \epsilon (h_i \cdot w)_{\max} \\ &\leq f_{i,\max} + \|v^*\|_1 h_{i,\max} + \epsilon \frac{h_{i,\max}}{t_{\max}} + \epsilon (h_i \cdot w)_{\max} \leq 3f_{i,\max} + \|v^*\|_1 h_{i,\max} \end{aligned}$$

by (17), and by choosing  $\epsilon \leq \min\{t_{\max}/h_{i,\max}, 1/(h_i \cdot w)_{\max}\} f_{i,\max}$ .

We have  $\tilde{v}_\epsilon \in \mathcal{Q}_\ell$  for

$$\ell \geq \max_{i=1,\dots,m} \max \left( \gamma_i \left( \frac{3f_{i,\max} + \|v^*\|_1 h_{i,\max}}{\epsilon (h_i \cdot w)_{\min}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\theta_i}}, \ell_{i,0} \right). \quad (20)$$

By (19), we have

$$0 \leq \mathfrak{d}^* - \mathfrak{d}_\ell^* = \mathfrak{d}^* - (t \cdot v_\epsilon - t \cdot \tilde{v}_\epsilon - \epsilon t \cdot w) - \mathfrak{d}_\ell^* = \mathfrak{d}^* - t \cdot v_\epsilon + t \cdot \tilde{v}_\epsilon - \mathfrak{d}_\ell^* + \epsilon t \cdot w.$$

Recall that  $t \cdot w$  is positive when the generalized moment problem is feasible (see proof of Lemma 2.2). By (18),  $\mathfrak{d}^* - t \cdot v_\epsilon < \epsilon$ , and by feasibility of  $\tilde{v}_\epsilon$  for  $\ell$  satisfying (20),  $t \cdot \tilde{v}_\epsilon - \mathfrak{d}_\ell^* \leq 0$ . Thus

$$0 \leq \mathfrak{d}^* - \mathfrak{d}_\ell^* \leq \epsilon(1 + t \cdot w).$$

Rearranging (20) for  $\epsilon$  and substituting into the above gives the result for  $\ell \geq \max_{i=1,\dots,m} \ell_{i,0}$ :

$$0 \leq \mathfrak{d}^* - \mathfrak{d}_\ell^* \leq \max_{i=1,\dots,m} \left( \frac{1 + t \cdot w}{(h_i \cdot w)_{\min}} \left( \frac{\gamma_i}{\ell} \right)^{\theta_i} (3f_{i,\max} + \|v^*\|_1 h_{i,\max}) \right) \leq \kappa \ell^{-\theta}.$$

with  $\kappa$  and  $\theta$  as in (16).  $\square$

**Corollary 3.5.** *Under Assumption 2.1 and Assumption 3.1,*

$$0 \leq \mathfrak{p}^* - \mathfrak{p}_\ell^* \leq \mathfrak{d}^* - \mathfrak{d}_\ell^* \leq \kappa \ell^{-\theta}$$

with  $\kappa, \theta$  as in Theorem 3.4.

*Proof.* Follows from strong duality in the generalized moment problem (Proposition 2.5), weak duality in the Moment-SOS hierarchy and Theorem 3.4.  $\square$

### 3.2 Convergence of the moment feasibility sets

In this section, we establish the convergence between the GMP feasibility set (11) and the feasibility set of the relaxations.

For  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\lambda \in \mathcal{D}_i$ , let  $\lambda^{(k)} \in \mathcal{D}_i$  such that  $\lambda|_{\mathcal{R}_k} = \lambda^{(k)}$  and  $\langle \lambda^{(k)}, \mathbf{x}_i^\alpha \rangle = 0$  if  $|\alpha| > k$ . Let  $\mathcal{D}_i^{(k)} = \{\lambda^{(k)} \mid \lambda \in \mathcal{D}_i\}$  and  $\mathcal{D}^{(k)} = \prod_{i=1}^m \mathcal{D}_i^{(k)}$ . To study the distance between spaces of linear functionals, we equip  $\mathcal{D}_i$  with the weighted norm  $\|\cdot\|_i$  defined such that for  $\mathbf{x}_i = (\mathbf{x}_{i,1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{i,n_i})$ ,

$$\|\lambda\|_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{n_i}} \frac{|\lambda(\mathbf{x}_i^\alpha)|}{\alpha!}.$$

This norm was applied in [Las13] to ensure continuity of linear functionals over closed (not necessarily compact) semi-algebraic sets. We denote  $\mathcal{D}_i^b = \{\lambda \in \mathcal{D}_i \mid \|\lambda\|_i < \infty\}$  and  $\mathcal{D}^b = \prod_{i=1}^m \mathcal{D}_i^b$  equipped with the product norm, which we denote with  $\|\cdot\|$ .

**Lemma 3.6.**  $\mathcal{D}_i^b = \mathcal{M}(S_i)$ .

*Proof.* First we prove that  $\mathcal{M}(S_i) = \mathcal{M}_+(S_i) - \mathcal{M}_+(S_i) \subset \mathcal{D}_i^b$  or equivalently that  $\mathcal{M}_+(S_i) \subset \mathcal{D}_i^b$ . Let  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+(S_i)$ . Since  $S_i$  is compact,  $\forall x \in S_i, |x^\alpha| \leq R^{|\alpha|}$  for some  $R > 0$ , implying  $|\mu(\mathbf{x}_i^\alpha)| \leq R^{|\alpha|} \mu(S_i)$ , where  $|\alpha| \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{n_i} \alpha_i$ . Then  $\|\mu\|_i = \sup_\alpha |\mu(\mathbf{x}_i^\alpha)|/\alpha! \leq \sup_\alpha R^{|\alpha|} \mu(S_i)/\alpha! < \infty$ , so  $\mu \in \mathcal{D}_i^b$ .

Conversely, we prove that  $\mathcal{D}_i^b \subset \mathcal{M}(S_i)$ . Let  $\lambda \in \mathcal{D}_i^b$  with  $\|\lambda\|_i = b < \infty$ . Then

$$\frac{|\lambda(\mathbf{x}_{i,j}^{2k})|}{2k!} \leq b_0 < \infty \implies \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\lambda(x^{2k})|^{\frac{1}{2k}} > \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_0 (2k!)^{\frac{1}{2k}} = \infty.$$

By the Carleman's Condition [Ber87],  $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}(S_i)$  which implies  $\mathcal{D}_i^b \in \mathcal{M}(S_i)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.7.** *The topological dual to the space  $\mathcal{D}_i^b$  equipped with the norm  $\|\cdot\|_i$  is isometrically isomorphic to the space of real-analytic functions  $A$  with norm  $\|h\|_A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{n_i}} \alpha! |h_\alpha|$ .*

*Proof.* The result follows readily by verifying the following mapping is an isometric isomorphism:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi : (\mathcal{D}_i^b)^* &\rightarrow A \\ \varphi(f)(x) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{n_i}} f(\delta_\alpha) x^\alpha, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\delta_\alpha(x^\beta) = 1$  if  $\alpha = \beta$  and 0 otherwise.  $\square$

We define the convex cones  $\mathcal{L}_\ell^b(g_i) = \mathcal{L}_\ell(g_i) \cap \mathcal{D}_i^b$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_\ell^b = \prod_{i=1}^m \mathcal{L}_i^b(g_i)$  and the corresponding relaxation:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{p}_\ell^b &= \inf && \langle \lambda, f \rangle \\ \text{s.t.} &&& t - \langle \lambda, h \rangle \in K \\ &&& \lambda \in \mathcal{L}_\ell^b. \end{aligned}$$

The feasible set of the primal problem is denoted  $L_\ell^b = \{\lambda \in \mathcal{L}_\ell^b \mid t - \langle \lambda, h \rangle \in K\}$ .

**Lemma 3.8.** For  $\ell \geq \max\{\deg(f), \deg(h_{i,j})\}$ ,  $\mathfrak{p}_\ell^b = \mathfrak{p}_\ell^*$ .

*Proof.* Let  $(\lambda_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a minimizing sequence in  $\mathfrak{p}_\ell^*$  converging to  $\lambda^*$ . As  $\ell \geq \max\{\deg(f), \deg(h_{i,j})\}$ , we have that  $\langle \lambda_k^{(\ell)}, f \rangle = \langle \lambda_k, f \rangle$  and  $t - \langle \lambda_k^{(\ell)}, h \rangle = t - \langle \lambda_k, h \rangle$  for all  $k$ . That is, the sequence  $\lambda_k^{(\ell)}$  is feasible in  $\mathfrak{p}_\ell^b$ , belongs to  $\mathcal{L}_\ell^b$  and achieves the same infimum  $\mathfrak{p}_\ell^*$ . Thus  $\mathfrak{p}_\ell^b \leq \mathfrak{p}_\ell^* \leq \mathfrak{p}_\ell^b$ .  $\square$

Denoting the distance associated to the product norm  $\|\cdot\|$  as  $\rho$ , we can define the “distance”  $\rho(\mu, \Gamma)$  between  $\mu \in \mathcal{D}^b$  and  $\Gamma \subset \mathcal{D}^b$  and the Hausdorff distance  $\rho_H(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$  between  $\Gamma_1 \subset \mathcal{D}^b$  and  $\Gamma_2 \subset \mathcal{D}^b$  as follows:

$$\rho(\mu, \Gamma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf_{\mu' \in \Gamma} \rho(\mu, \mu'), \quad \rho_H(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max\left\{ \sup_{\mu \in \Gamma_1} \rho(\mu, \Gamma_2), \sup_{\mu \in \Gamma_2} \rho(\mu, \Gamma_1) \right\}. \quad (21)$$

**Lemma 3.9.** Assume the value of  $\mathfrak{p}_\ell^*$  is attained for any  $f \in \mathcal{R}$ . For any  $\alpha \geq 0$ , any  $f \in \mathcal{R}$  with  $\|f\|_\infty = 1$ , and  $\ell \geq \max\{\deg(f), \deg(h_{i,j})\}$ ,

$$0 \leq \mathfrak{p}^* - \mathfrak{p}_\ell^* \leq \alpha \iff \rho_H(\Lambda, L_\ell^b) \leq \alpha.$$

*Proof.* We prove first the backward direction. Let

$$\rho_H(\Lambda, L_\ell^b) \leq \alpha.$$

Take  $\mu_1^* \in \Lambda$  such that  $\mathfrak{p}^* = \langle \mu_1^*, f \rangle$ , and  $\mu_2^* \in L_\ell^b$  such that  $\mathfrak{p}_\ell^b = \langle \mu_2^*, f \rangle$ . Denote by  $B_\alpha(\mathcal{D}^b)$  the ball of linear functionals centered at zero with radius  $\alpha$ :

$$B_\alpha(\mathcal{D}^b) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\lambda \in \mathcal{D}^b \mid \|\lambda\| \leq \alpha\}.$$

Since  $\mathcal{M}_+ \subset \mathcal{D}^b$ , we have  $\Lambda \subseteq L_\ell^b$ , and there exists  $\mu_\alpha \in B_\alpha(\mathcal{D}^b)$  such that, for some  $\mu_1 \in \Lambda$ ,

$$\mu_1 + \mu_\alpha = \mu_2^*.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{p}^* - \mathfrak{p}_\ell^b &= \langle \mu_1^*, f \rangle - \langle \mu_2^*, f \rangle = \langle \mu_1^*, f \rangle - \langle \mu_1 + \mu_\alpha, f \rangle \\ &\leq -\langle \mu_\alpha, f \rangle \leq \alpha \|f\| \leq \alpha \|f\|_B = \alpha, \end{aligned}$$

the required result follows from Lemma 3.8. We prove now the forward direction via contradiction. Take  $0 \leq \mathfrak{p}^* - \mathfrak{p}_\ell^* \leq \alpha$  and assume  $\rho_H(\Lambda, L_\ell^b(S)) > \alpha$ . Then,  $\exists \mu' \in L_\ell^b \setminus (\Lambda + B_\alpha(\mathcal{D}^b))$ . We apply the separation theorem (see, e.g., [Rud91, p. 59]) between  $\{\mu'\}$  and  $\Lambda + B_\alpha(\mathcal{D}^b)$ : there exists a real-analytic function  $q \in A$  (see Lemma 3.7) such that

$$\min_{\mu \in \Lambda + B_\alpha(\mathcal{D}^b)} \langle \mu, q \rangle - \langle \mu', q \rangle = \beta > 0.$$

By Stone-Weierstrass theorem, we can choose  $q' \in \mathcal{R}$  close enough to  $q$  such that

$$\min_{\mu \in \Lambda + B_\alpha(\mathcal{D}^b)} \langle \mu, q' \rangle - \langle \mu', q' \rangle = \beta/2 > 0.$$

Considering the problems  $\mathfrak{p}^*$  and  $\mathfrak{p}_\ell^*$  with objective  $f = q'/\|q'\|$ . We have by the above that

$$\mathfrak{p}^* - \alpha > \mathfrak{p}_\ell^*,$$

that is

$$\mathfrak{p}^* - \mathfrak{p}_\ell^* > \alpha,$$

a contradiction.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.10.** *Under Assumption 2.1 and Assumption 3.1,*

$$\rho_H(\Lambda, L_\ell^b) \leq \kappa' \ell^{-\theta}$$

where

$$\kappa' = \max_{i=1, \dots, m} \left( \frac{1 + t \cdot w}{(h_i \cdot w)_{\min}} \gamma_i^{\theta_i} (3 + \|v^*\|_1 h_{i, \max}) \right),$$

and  $\theta, \gamma_i, L_i, w, v^*, h_{i, \max}$  as in Theorem 3.4.

*Proof.* Take  $f$  such that  $\|f\|_\infty = 1$ . By Theorem 3.4,

$$0 \leq \mathfrak{p}^* - \mathfrak{p}_\ell^* \leq \kappa' \ell^{-\theta}$$

which, by Lemma 3.9, implies the result.  $\square$

Let

$$\Lambda^{(k)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Lambda \cap \mathcal{D}^{(k)}, \quad L_\ell^{(k)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} L_\ell^b \cap \mathcal{D}^{(k)}.$$

**Corollary 3.11.** *Under Assumption 2.1 and Assumption 3.1, for  $\ell \geq k$*

$$\rho_H(\Lambda^{(k)}, L_\ell^{(k)}) \leq \kappa' \ell^{-\theta},$$

with  $\kappa', \theta$  as in Theorem 3.10.

*Proof.* Note firstly for any  $\lambda \in \mathcal{D}^b$  that  $\|\lambda^{(k)}\| = \sup_\alpha \frac{|\lambda^{(k)}(x^\alpha)|}{\alpha!} \leq \|\lambda\|$ . We prove that

$$\rho_H(\Lambda^{(k)}, L_\ell^{(k)}) = \max\left\{ \sup_{\mu' \in \Lambda^{(k)}} \rho(\mu', L_\ell^{(k)}), \sup_{\mu'' \in L_\ell^{(k)}} \rho(\Lambda^{(k)}, \mu'') \right\} \leq \rho_H(\Lambda, L_\ell^b). \quad (22)$$

For the first term within the maximum, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mu' \in \Lambda^{(k)}} \rho(\mu', L_\ell^{(k)}) &= \sup_{\mu' \in \Lambda^{(k)}} \inf_{\mu'' \in L_\ell^{(k)}} \|\mu' - \mu''\| = \sup_{\mu' \in \Lambda} \inf_{\mu'' \in L_\ell^b} \|\mu'^{(k)} - \mu''^{(k)}\| \\ &\leq \sup_{\mu' \in \Lambda} \inf_{\mu'' \in L_\ell^b} \|\mu' - \mu''\| \leq \sup_{\mu' \in \Lambda} \rho(\mu', L_\ell^b). \end{aligned}$$

By following the same steps, we show that  $\sup_{\mu'' \in L_\ell^{(k)}} \rho(\Lambda^{(k)}, \mu'') \leq \sup_{\mu'' \in L_\ell^b} \rho(\Lambda, \mu'')$ , from which we deduce (22). The result follows from Theorem 3.10.  $\square$

This corollary demonstrates that the cone of pseudo-moments  $L_\ell^{(k)}$  converges to the cone of truncated moments of measures  $\Lambda^{(k)}$  with the same rate of convergence,  $\theta$ , as the optima, as  $\ell \rightarrow \infty$  with  $k$  is fixed. That is, the pseudo-moments up to order  $k$  of an optimum solution of the GMP  $\mathfrak{p}_\ell^*$  are close to the moments of a measure for large enough  $\ell$ .

### 3.3 Bounds on the optima

In this section, we establish a bound on  $\|v^*\|_1$  appearing in Theorem 3.4. We focus on the equality-constrained  $m = 2$  GMP, though a similar argument extends to the  $m = 1$  case. These two formulations of the GMP cover our examples discussed in the next section.

Consider the equality constrained version of (2) given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{p}_E^* &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf \langle \mu_1, f_1 \rangle + \langle \mu_2, f_2 \rangle \\ \text{s.t. } &t = \langle \mu_1, h_1 \rangle + \langle \mu_2, h_2 \rangle \\ &[\mu_1, \mu_2] \in \mathcal{M}_+(S_1) \times \mathcal{M}_+(S_2), \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

with the additional constraint  $h_{1,1} = 1$ ,  $h_{2,1} = 1$  and  $t_1 > 0$ . When  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$  represent the Jordan decomposition of signed measure, this constraint ensures boundedness of the total variation. By adding a multiple of the equality  $t_1 = \langle \mu_1, h_{1,1} \rangle + \langle \mu_2, h_{2,1} \rangle$  to the constraints  $t_i = \langle \mu_1, h_{1,i} \rangle + \langle \mu_2, h_{2,i} \rangle$ ,  $i = 2, \dots, N$ , we assume without loss of generality that  $h_{1,i} > 0$ ,  $h_{2,i} > 0$ ,  $t_i > 0$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . Let

$$\mathcal{H} = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid f_1 - h_1 \cdot v \geq 0, \quad f_2 - h_2 \cdot v \geq 0\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{V} = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid \exists \mu_1 \in \mathcal{M}_+(S_1), \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}_+(S_2), \exists A \in \mathbb{R}, \\ t = \langle \mu_1, h_1 \rangle + \langle \mu_2, h_2 \rangle, v = \int_{S_1} h A d\mu_1 + \int_{S_2} h A d\mu_2\}.$$

Consider the dual  $\mathfrak{d}_E^*$  to (23) and a related problem  $\bar{\mathfrak{d}}_E^*$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{d}_E^* &= \sup t \cdot v \\ \text{s.t. } & f_1 - h_1 \cdot v \geq 0, \\ & f_2 - h_2 \cdot v \geq 0, \\ & v \in \mathbb{R}^N. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathfrak{d}}_E^* &= \sup t \cdot A t \\ \text{s.t. } & f_1 - h_1 \cdot A t \geq 0, \\ & f_2 - h_2 \cdot A t \geq 0, \\ & A \in \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

**Lemma 3.12.**  $\mathfrak{d}_E^* = \bar{\mathfrak{d}}_E^*$ .

*Proof.* Clearly  $\bar{\mathfrak{d}}_E^* \leq \mathfrak{d}_E^*$ . We prove the converse relation by contradiction. Let  $v^* = A t$  be the optimizer for  $\bar{\mathfrak{d}}_E^*$  and assume there exists  $v' = B t + C s$  where  $t \cdot s = 0$ , and  $t \cdot v' > t \cdot v^*$ . This implies that  $B > A$ , since  $t \cdot v' = B t \cdot t > t \cdot v^* = A t \cdot t$ , by assumption. Note  $A$  is the largest constant such that

$$f_1(x) - h_1(x) \cdot A t \geq 0 \quad \forall x \in S.$$

and

$$f_2(x) - h_2(x) \cdot A t \geq 0 \quad \forall x \in S.$$

Since  $B > A$ , there exists  $x' \in S$  such that

$$f_1(x') - h_2(x') \cdot B t < 0 \quad \text{and/or} \quad f_1(x') - h_2(x') \cdot B t < 0.$$

By the feasibility constraint in (24),

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(x') - h_1(x') \cdot B t - h_1(x') \cdot C s &\geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad f_2(x') - h_2(x') \cdot B t - h_2(x') \cdot C s \geq 0 \\ \implies h_1(x') \cdot (-C s) &> 0 \quad \text{and/or} \quad h_2(x') \cdot (-C s) > 0 \end{aligned}$$

Assume  $h_1(x') \cdot (-C s) > 0$ . The argument for  $h_2(x') \cdot (-C s) > 0$  follows in an analogous manner and leads to the same conclusion.

Let  $\mu'_2 = 0$  and consider  $\mu'_1 \in \mathcal{M}_+(S)$  satisfying  $\int h_1 d\mu'_1 = t$ , where  $x'$  lies in the support of  $\mu'_1$ . We can construct such a measure by setting  $\mu'_1 = a \delta_{x'} + \eta$ , where  $a > 0$  and  $t - a h(x') > 0$ . Here,  $\eta = \sum_{i=1}^{N'} c_i \delta_{x_i}$  is an element of  $\mathcal{M}_+(S)$ , with coefficients  $c_i \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , and  $\delta_x \in \mathcal{M}_+(S)$  denotes the Dirac measure concentrated at  $x \in S$ . The points  $x_i$  are chosen in a neighborhood

of  $x'$  such that  $h(x_i) \cdot (-Cs) > 0$  holds for all  $x_i$ . Setting  $N'$  large enough and solving the linear system

$$\int_{S_1} h_1 d\mu'_1 = t,$$

that is

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N'} c_i h_1(x_i) = t - ah_1(x'),$$

for  $c_i$ , we retrieve the required  $\mu'_1$ .

Then

$$\begin{aligned} -Ct \cdot s &= \int_{S_1} h_1 d\mu'_1 \cdot (-Cs) \\ &= ah_1(x') \cdot (-Cs) + \sum_{i=1}^{N'} c_i h_1(x_i) \cdot (-Cs) \geq ah_1(x') \cdot (-Cs) > 0, \end{aligned}$$

contradicting  $t \cdot s = 0$  □

**Lemma 3.13.** *For the problem (23), the optimizer  $v^*$  of  $\mathfrak{d}_E^*$  satisfies*

$$v^* \in \mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{H}.$$

*Proof.* The fact  $v^* \in \mathcal{H}$  holds trivially. The fact  $v^* \in \mathcal{V}$  follows from Lemma 3.12:  $v^*$  has representation  $At$ , where  $A$  is the largest constant satisfying

$$f_1 - h_1 \cdot At \geq 0.$$

and

$$f_2 - h_2 \cdot At \geq 0.$$

That is, where

$$A = \min\left\{\inf_{x \in S} (f_1(x)/t \cdot h_1(x)), \inf_{x \in S} (f_2(x)/t \cdot h_2(x))\right\}. \quad (26)$$

The infimum is obtained since  $t \cdot h_1 > 0$ ,  $t \cdot h_2 > 0$ , and from the compactness of  $S_1$ ,  $S_2$ . Existence of  $A$  implies  $v^*$  has representation  $v^* = \int_{S_1} h_1 A d\mu_1 + \int_{S_2} h_2 A d\mu_2$  for any feasible  $\mu_1$ ,  $\mu_2$  in  $\mathfrak{p}_E^*$ . That is,  $v^* \in \mathcal{V}$ . □

**Lemma 3.14.** *We have*

$$\mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{B}$$

where

$$\mathcal{B} = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid v \cdot v \leq \min\{f_{1,\min}^2 / \|\mathbf{h}_{1,\min}\|^2, f_{2,\min}^2 / \|\mathbf{h}_{2,\min}\|^2\}\},$$

where  $\mathbf{h}_{i,\min} = (\max_{x \in S_i} (h_{i,1}), \dots, \max_{x \in S_i} (h_{i,N}))$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ .

*Proof.* Let  $v^* \in \mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{H}$ , that is,  $v^* = \int_{S_1} h_1 A d\mu_1 + \int_{S_2} h_2 A d\mu_2$  for some  $\mu'_1 \in \mathcal{M}_+(S_1)$ ,  $\mu'_2 \in \mathcal{M}_+(S_2)$ , and

$$h_1 \cdot v^* \leq f_1, \quad h_2 \cdot v^* \leq f_2. \quad (27)$$

Since  $v^* \in \mathcal{V}$ ,

$$v^* \cdot v^* = A^2 t \cdot t. \quad (28)$$

From (26),

$$v^* \cdot v^* \leq \min \left\{ \inf_{x \in S} \frac{f_{1,\min}^2(x)}{(t \cdot \mathbf{h}_{1,\min})^2}, \frac{f_{2,\min}^2(x)}{(t \cdot \mathbf{h}_{2,\min})^2} \right\} t \cdot t$$

By the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality,

$$v^* \cdot v^* \leq \min \{ f_{1,\min}^2 / \|\mathbf{h}_{1,\min}\|^2, f_{2,\min}^2 / \|\mathbf{h}_{2,\min}\|^2 \}.$$

□

**Lemma 3.15.** *The optimizer  $v^*$  of  $\mathfrak{d}_E^*$  satisfies*

$$\|v^*\|_1 \leq \sqrt{N} \min \{ |f_{1,\min}|, |f_{2,\min}| \}.$$

*Proof.* Follows from Lemma 3.13 - Lemma 3.14 and the fact that  $\|\mathbf{h}_{i,\min}\|_2 \geq \|h_{i,1}\|_2 = 1$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . □

## 4 Application to symmetric tensor decomposition

The tensor decomposition problem consists in decomposing a tensor of order  $d$  into a weighted sum of a minimal number of tensor products of  $d$  vectors. When the tensor is symmetric (i.e. invariant by permutation of the indices), the symmetric decomposition is the weighted sum of a minimal number of tensor products of the same vector. This can be cast into a generalized moment problem on polynomials as follows.

We identify symmetric tensors  $F \in S^d(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$  of order  $d$ , with polynomials of degree  $\leq d$  in  $n$  variables:  $F(x_1, \dots, x_n) = F(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq d} F_\alpha \mathbf{x}^\alpha$  where  $F_\alpha$  are the coefficients of the symmetric tensor  $F$  in the basis  $(\mathbf{e}_0^{d-|\alpha|} \mathbf{e}_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots \mathbf{e}_n^{\alpha_n})_{|\alpha| \leq d}$  of  $S^d(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$  and  $(\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n)$  is the canonical basis of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ .

Decomposing the symmetric tensor  $F$  consists in writing  $F(\mathbf{x})$  as a weighted sum of a minimal number  $r$  of  $d^{\text{th}}$  power of degree-1 polynomials:

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^r \omega_i (\xi_{i,0} + \xi_{i,1}x_1 + \cdots + \xi_{i,n}x_n)^d$$

with  $\omega_i, \xi_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}$ . Hereafter, we are considering decompositions with  $\xi_{i,0} \neq 0$  (which we can achieve by a generic change of coordinates in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ ). By scaling, we can then assume that  $\xi_{i,0} = 1$  and the decomposition we are considering is of the form

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^r \omega_i (1 + \langle \xi_i, \mathbf{x} \rangle)^d \quad (29)$$

with  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\xi_i = (\xi_{i,1}, \dots, \xi_{i,n}) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . We can further constrain the problem by asking  $\xi_i \in S$ , where  $S$  is a compact subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

To transform the tensor decomposition problem into a moment problem, we introduce the *apolar product*:  $\forall f = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq d} f_\alpha \mathbf{x}^\alpha$ ,  $g = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq d} g_\alpha \mathbf{x}^\alpha \in \mathcal{R}_{\leq d}$ ,

$$\langle f, g \rangle_d = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq d} \binom{d}{\alpha}^{-1} f_\alpha g_\alpha$$

with  $\binom{d}{\alpha} = \frac{d!}{(d-|\alpha|)! \alpha_1! \cdots \alpha_n!}$ . We directly verify that  $\forall g \in \mathcal{R}_{\leq d}, \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,

$$\langle (1 + \langle \xi, \mathbf{x} \rangle)^d, g \rangle_d = \langle \delta_\xi, g \rangle = g(\xi)$$

where  $\delta_\xi \in \mathcal{M}(S)$  is the Dirac measure at  $\xi \in S$ .

Therefore,  $F$  has a decomposition of the form (29), if and only if,  $\Lambda_F : p \in \mathcal{R}_{\leq d} \mapsto \langle F, p \rangle_d \in \mathbb{R}$  coincides with  $\mu = \sum_{i=1}^r \omega_i \delta_{\xi_i}$  on  $\mathcal{R}_{\leq d}$ .

## 4.1 Positive symmetric tensor decomposition

We consider first the case, where  $F$  admits a decomposition of the form (29) with  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $\xi_i \in S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ . In this case, we are searching a positive measure  $\mu = \sum_{i=1}^r \omega_i \delta_{\xi_i} \in \mathcal{M}_+(S)$ , which satisfies

$$\langle \mu, \mathbf{x}^\alpha \rangle = \langle F, \mathbf{x}^\alpha \rangle_d = \binom{d}{a}^{-1} F_\alpha \quad \text{for } |\alpha| \leq d.$$

This yields a *positive decomposition* of  $F$ , that can be reformulated into the following **Generalized Moment Problem for Positive Symmetric Tensor Decomposition:** For  $F = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq d} F_\alpha \mathbf{x}^\alpha$ , solve the optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{argmin} \quad \sharp(\mu) \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad \langle \mu, \mathbf{x}^\alpha \rangle = \binom{d}{a}^{-1} F_\alpha \text{ for } |\alpha| \leq d, \\ & \quad \mu \in \mathcal{M}_+(S) \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

where  $\sharp(\mu)$  is the number of points in the support of  $\mu$ . Since this objective function is hard to compute, we relax it into a linear cost function  $\langle \mu, \Psi \rangle$  where  $\Psi = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq \ell} \mathbf{x}^{2\alpha}$ , which controls the magnitude of the moments of squared monomials. The generalized moment problem is then relaxed into a hierarchy of pseudo-moment convex optimization problems:

$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{argmin} \quad \sum_{|\alpha| \leq \ell} \langle \lambda, \mathbf{x}^{2\alpha} \rangle \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad \langle \lambda, \mathbf{x}^\alpha \rangle = \binom{d}{a}^{-1} F_\alpha \text{ for } |\alpha| \leq d, \\ & \quad \lambda \in \mathcal{L}_\ell(S). \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

**Example 1.**  $n = 2, d = 4, r = 4$ . We consider the tensor of dimension  $n + 1 = 3$  and order  $d = 4$ , corresponding to the derivative with respect to the first variable  $x_0$  of the first example in [BCMT10], divided by 5:

$$\begin{aligned} F(\mathbf{x}) = & 88518 x_2^4 - 309888 x_1 x_2^3 + 483408 x_1^2 x_2^2 - 165888 x_0^3 x_2 + 166368 x_0^4 \\ & - 23664 x_0 x_1^3 + 66528 x_0 x_1 x_2^2 - 88992 x_0 x_1^2 x_2 - 13824 x_0 x_1^3 \\ & + 4932 x_0^2 x_2^2 - 3456 x_0^2 x_1 x_2 + 7632 x_0^2 x_1^2 \\ & + 144 x_0^3 x_2 - 96 x_0^3 x_1 + 38 x_0^4. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting  $x_0 = 1$ , we seek a decomposition with positive weights  $\omega_i$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, r$ , solving (31). We choose  $S = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid 1 - x_1^2 - x_2^2 \geq 0\}$ , the unit ball. With this definition of  $S$ , the problem satisfies Assumption 3.1 trivially. Assumption 2.1 is satisfied since we have the moment constraint  $\lambda(1) = 38$ . We apply Theorem 3.4, and Corollary 3.5 to obtain

$$0 \leq \mathfrak{d}^* - \mathfrak{d}_\ell^* \leq \kappa \ell^{-\theta}, \quad 0 \leq \mathfrak{p}^* - \mathfrak{p}_\ell^* \leq \kappa \ell^{-\theta}.$$

Since we are working with the unit sphere, the fourth choice  $\gamma_i, \theta$  in Theorem 3.3 is applied. For  $\ell \geq 2n \deg(h)^{3/2}$ ,  $\kappa$  and  $\theta$  are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa &= \left( \frac{1+t \cdot w}{(h \cdot w)_{\min}} \gamma^\theta (3f_{\max} + \|v^*\|_1 h_{\max}) \right), \\ \theta &= 2 \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

with

- $w = [w_1, 0, \dots, 0]$  for any  $w_1 > 0$ . Letting  $w_1 \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\frac{1+t \cdot w}{(h \cdot w)_{\min}} = 1$ .
- $f$  is maximized for  $x_i = 1$  for  $i = 1, 2$ :

$$f_{\max} = \binom{\ell + 2}{2}.$$

- Since  $h = (x^\alpha)_\alpha$ ,  $h_{\max} = 1$ .
- $v^*$  is the vector achieving the supremum in  $\mathfrak{D}^*$ . Lemma 3.15 is applied in bounding  $\|v^*\|_1$  in terms of  $h$  and  $f$ :

$$\|v^*\|_1 \leq \sqrt{N} |f_{\min}| \leq \sqrt{15}$$

where  $f_{\min} = 1$ , and  $N = 15$  is the number of non-zero coefficients of  $F(\mathbf{x})$ .

- and where  $\gamma$  is as in [Slo22, Theorem 3].

We set  $\ell = 6$  and solve the relaxation via Julia package [MomentPolynomialOpt.jl](#). The following vector of weights  $\omega$  is retrieved:

$$\omega = \begin{bmatrix} 5.000000920403701 \\ 3.000000015538793 \\ 15.000004556660205 \\ 14.999994501024343 \end{bmatrix}$$

along with the corresponding matrix of support points  $\Xi$ :

$$\Xi = \begin{bmatrix} 1.0 & 1.0 & 1.0 & 1.0 \\ -12.0 & 12.0 & -2.0 & 2.0 \\ -3.0 & -13.0 & 3.0 & 3.0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

By an appropriate re-scaling, we observe the same decomposition as in [BCMT10]. This example also shows that the hierarchy of relaxations (31) is (numerically) exact, i.e. it achieves the optimum at a finite order ( $\ell = 6$  here) of relaxation. This phenomenon has been observed for polynomial optimization problems, for which regularity or generality assumptions imply the SOS and moment exactness of the relaxation [BM24, Nie14]. This computation also shows that the bounds on the rate of convergence of Theorem 3.4 can be very pessimistic.

## 4.2 Real symmetric tensor decomposition

When the weights  $\omega_i$  in (29) are not necessarily all positive, we write  $\mu = \mu_+ - \mu_-$  where  $\mu_+ = \sum_{\omega_i > 0} \omega_i \delta_{\xi_i}$ ,  $\mu_- = \sum_{\omega_i < 0} -\omega_i \delta_{\xi_i} \in \mathcal{M}_+(S)$ . We obtain the following reformulation of the symmetric tensor decomposition for points in  $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ .

**Generalized Moment Problem for Symmetric Tensor Decomposition:** For  $F = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq d} F_\alpha \mathbf{x}^\alpha$ , solve the optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{argmin} \quad \sharp(\mu_+ + \mu_-) \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad \langle [\mu_+, \mu_-], [\mathbf{x}^\alpha, -\mathbf{x}^\alpha] \rangle = \binom{d}{a}^{-1} F_\alpha \text{ for } |\alpha| \leq d, \\ & \quad \quad [\mu_+, \mu_-] \in \mathcal{M}_+(S)^2 \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

which we relax in the followings convex optimization problems: for  $\ell \geq d$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{argmin} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq \ell} \langle \lambda_+, \mathbf{x}^{2\alpha} \rangle + \langle \lambda_-, \mathbf{x}^{2\alpha} \rangle \\
& \text{s.t. } \langle \lambda_+, \mathbf{x}^\alpha \rangle - \langle \lambda_-, \mathbf{x}^\alpha \rangle = \binom{d}{a}^{-1} F_\alpha \text{ for } |\alpha| \leq d, \\
& \lambda_+, \lambda_- \in \mathcal{L}_\ell(S).
\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

Note that generally that Assumption 2.1 cannot be satisfied, since both  $\mathbf{x}^\alpha$  and  $-\mathbf{x}^\alpha$  appear as columns in the matrix  $h$ . To circumvent this, we constrain the total variation:

$$\lambda_+ + \lambda_- \leq L$$

for  $L > 0$ . This constraint corresponds to having a finite weight minimum decomposition. With this addition assumption, the problem satisfies Assumption 2.1. Hence, the primal optimal  $\mathbf{p}^*$  of (31) with objective function  $\langle \mu, \Psi \rangle$  is attained and there is no duality gap. Moreover, if  $S$  is defined by sign constraints  $g_i$ , which generate an Archimedean quadratic module, the optima  $\mathbf{p}_\ell^*$  and  $\mathfrak{d}_\ell^*$  of (31) are converging to  $\mathbf{p}^* = \mathfrak{d}^*$  at a rate given in Theorem 3.4.

**Example 2.**  $n = 3$ ,  $d = 4$ ,  $r = 7$ . In this example, we consider the following symmetric tensor given by

$$\begin{aligned}
F(\mathbf{x}) = & -0.2489979301598193 x_3^4 - 0.5714471586952264 x_2 x_3^3 - 0.5050309495726817 x_2^2 x_3^2 \\
& + 0.20686591014734546 x_2^3 x_3 + 0.35848687448905797 x_2^4 + 0.6290084096294283 x_1 x_3^3 \\
& + 1.5863914541246662 x_1 x_2 x_3^2 + 0.09102584099156069 x_1 x_2^2 x_3 - 0.7995202943157504 x_1 x_2^3 \\
& - 1.000984626080145 x_1^2 x_3^2 - 0.7330971731383541 x_1^2 x_2 x_3 + 0.48952697145340573 x_1^2 x_2^2 \\
& + 0.3654972483140739 x_1^3 x_3 + 0.04180994666887122 x_1^3 x_2 - 0.06496525932745015 x_1^4 \\
& + 0.8614765507794534 x_0 x_3^3 + 2.518149761933887 x_0 x_2 x_3^2 + 0.11198414551091718 x_0 x_2^2 x_3 \\
& - 1.2824172455614082 x_0 x_2^3 - 3.198429373199247 x_0 x_1 x_3^2 - 2.280206948221652 x_0 x_1 x_2 x_3 \\
& + 1.51085249826687 x_0 x_1 x_2^2 + 1.8431809395581764 x_0 x_1^2 x_3 + 0.38190508335832307 x_0 x_1^2 x_2 \\
& - 0.6712764568310912 x_0 x_1^3 - 2.2452396434195863 x_0^2 x_3^2 - 1.3839699114386361 x_0^2 x_2 x_3 \\
& + 1.4125957148603887 x_0^2 x_2^2 + 1.4670698710382422 x_0^2 x_1 x_3 - 0.015953647647009017 x_0^2 x_1 x_2 \\
& - 0.361365758387135 x_0^2 x_1^2 + 1.253344034777953 x_0^3 x_3 + 0.11846876725173883 x_0^3 x_2 \\
& - 2.1207614308184404 x_0^3 x_1 + 0.6141543193928954 x_0^4
\end{aligned}$$

Let  $S = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \mid 1 - x_1^2 - x_2^2 - x_3^2 \leq 0\}$  be the unit ball. Note that Assumption 3.1 is satisfied trivially by  $S$ . Solving the problem (34) with  $\ell = 6$  and imposing constraint  $\lambda_+ + \lambda_- \leq 5$  for this tensor, one obtains a rank 16 decomposition.

However, by the Alexander-Hirschowitz Theorem (see e.g. [BO08]), tensors of dimension  $n+1 = 4$  and order  $d = 4$  have a generic rank 9. In fact, this tensor has a rank 7 decomposition, and we locate it exactly by solving (31) augmented with auxiliary constraints, which are introduced presently.

The degree 2 by degree 2 Hankel matrix  $H^{2,2}$  also known as  $(2, 2)$ -catalecticant of  $F$  [Puc98], fully determined by the coefficients of the tensor, is

	1	$x_4$	$x_3$	$x_2$	$x_1^2$	$x_4 x_3$	$x_3^2$	$x_4 x_2$	$x_3 x_2$	$x_2^2$
1	0.614154	0.313336	0.0296172	-0.53019	-0.374207	-0.115331	0.235433	0.122256	-0.00132947	-0.0602276
$x_4$	0.313336	-0.374207	-0.115331	0.122256	0.215369	0.209846	0.00933201	-0.266536	-0.0950086	0.153598
$x_3$	0.0296172	-0.115331	0.235433	-0.00132947	0.209846	0.00933201	-0.320604	-0.0950086	0.125904	0.0318254
$x_2$	-0.53019	0.122256	-0.00132947	-0.0602276	-0.266536	-0.0950086	0.125904	0.153598	0.0318254	-0.167819
$x_1^2$	-0.374207	0.215369	0.209846	-0.266536	-0.248998	-0.142862	-0.0841718	0.157252	0.132199	-0.166831
$x_4 x_3$	-0.115331	0.209846	0.00933201	-0.0950086	-0.142862	-0.0841718	0.0517165	0.132199	0.00758549	-0.0610914
$x_3^2$	0.235433	0.00933201	-0.320604	0.125904	-0.0841718	0.0517165	0.358487	0.00758549	-0.19988	0.0815878
$x_4 x_2$	0.122256	-0.266536	-0.0950086	0.153598	0.157252	0.132199	0.00758549	-0.166831	-0.0610914	0.0913743
$x_3 x_2$	-0.00132947	-0.0950086	0.125904	0.0318254	0.132199	0.00758549	-0.19988	-0.0610914	0.0815878	0.0104525
$x_2^2$	-0.0602276	0.153598	0.0318254	-0.167819	-0.166831	-0.0610914	0.0815878	0.0913743	0.0104525	-0.0649653

Assume that  $F = \sum_{i=1}^r \omega_i (1 + (\boldsymbol{\xi}_i, \mathbf{x}))^d$  with  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_i \in S$ , or equivalently that  $\mu_F = \sum_{i=1}^r \omega_i \delta_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_i}$ . We verify that a polynomial  $q$  of degree  $\leq 2$ , vanishing at  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_i$  is in the kernel of  $H^{2,2}$ :

$$\forall q' \in \mathcal{R}_{\leq 2}, \langle q', H^{2,2}(q) \rangle = \langle \mu_F, q q' \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^r \omega_i q(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i) q'(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i) = 0.$$

This implies that  $q \in \ker H^{2,2}$ .

To constrain the solution of (34), assuming that all polynomials in  $\ker H^{2,2}$  vanish at  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_i^1$ , we add the constraints  $\langle \lambda_{\pm}, q p \rangle = 0$  for  $q \in \ker H^{2,2}$  and  $p \in \mathcal{R}_{\ell-d}$ . We arrive at the following augmented form of (31):

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum_{|\alpha| \leq \ell} \langle \lambda_+, \mathbf{x}^{2\alpha} \rangle + \langle \lambda_-, \mathbf{x}^{2\alpha} \rangle \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \langle \lambda_+, \mathbf{x}^\alpha \rangle - \langle \lambda_-, \mathbf{x}^\alpha \rangle = \binom{d}{a}^{-1} F_\alpha \text{ for } |\alpha| \leq d, \\ & \langle \lambda_+, q \mathbf{x}^\beta \rangle = 0, \quad \forall q \in \ker H^{2,2}, |\beta| \leq \ell - 2, \\ & \langle \lambda_-, q \mathbf{x}^\beta \rangle = 0, \quad \forall q \in \ker H^{2,2}, |\beta| \leq \ell - 2, \\ & \lambda_+, \lambda_- \in \mathcal{L}_\ell(S). \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

We apply Theorem 3.4, and Corollary 3.5 to obtain

$$0 \leq \mathfrak{d}^* - \mathfrak{d}_\ell^* \leq \kappa \ell^{-\theta}, \quad 0 \leq \mathfrak{p}^* - \mathfrak{p}_\ell^* \leq \kappa \ell^{-\theta}.$$

Since we are working with the unit sphere, the fourth choice  $\gamma_i, \theta$  in Theorem 3.3 is applied. For  $\ell \geq 2n \deg(h)^{3/2}$ ,  $\kappa$  and  $\theta$  are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa &= \left( \frac{1+t \cdot w}{(h \cdot w)_{\min}} \gamma^\theta (3f_{\max} + \|v^*\|_1 h_{\max}) \right), \\ \theta &= 2 \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

with

- $w = [w_1, 0, \dots, 0]$  for any  $w_1 > 0$ . Letting  $w_1 \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\frac{1+t \cdot w}{(h \cdot w)_{\min}} = 1$ .
- $f = f_1 = f_2$  is maximized for  $x_i = 1$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ :

$$f_{\max} = \binom{\ell + 2}{2}.$$

- $h_{\max} = 1.3742$  is obtained by solving the POP on the constraint polynomials  $h$ .
- $v^*$  is the vector achieving the supremum in  $\mathfrak{d}^*$ . Lemma 3.15 is applied in bounding  $\|v^*\|_1$  in terms of  $h$  and  $f$ :

$$\|v^*\|_1 \leq \sqrt{N} |f_{\min}| \leq \sqrt{35}$$

where  $f_{\min} = 1$  and  $N = 35$  is the number of non-zero coefficients of  $F(\mathbf{x})$ .

- and where  $\gamma$  is as in [Slo22, Theorem 3].

---

<sup>1</sup>This is not always the case. It happens when  $d$  is big enough compared to the regularity of the points  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_r$ . Specifically, when the Vandermonde  $V_k$  in the Hankel-Vandermonde factorisation  $H^{k,l} = V_k \Delta V_l^T$  has full column rank.

We set  $\ell = 6$  and solve the relaxation via Julia package [MomentPolynomialOpt.jl](#). The following vector of weights  $\omega$  is retrieved:

$$\omega = \begin{bmatrix} -0.4424776570254827 \\ -0.8445409705776897 \\ -0.1434193311604589 \\ 0.27399137914217964 \\ 0.38387835648816826 \\ 0.8233082986137222 \\ 0.5634142439124565 \end{bmatrix}$$

along with the corresponding matrix of support points  $\Xi$ :

$$\Xi = \begin{bmatrix} 1.0 & 1.0 & 1.0 & 1.0 & 1.0 & 1.0 & 1.0 \\ 0.637235 & 0.653722 & 0.460376 & 0.517252 & 0.728496 & -0.375355 & 0.457124 \\ -0.727603 & -0.486279 & -0.255616 & -0.0368457 & -0.995796 & 0.0720327 & -0.721705 \\ -0.023974 & -0.74095 & 0.726747 & -0.630254 & -0.253459 & 0.158722 & -0.141105 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The reconstructed homogeneous polynomial  $\sum_{i=1}^r \omega_i \langle \Xi[:, i], \mathbf{x} \rangle^d$  corresponding to  $\omega$ ,  $\Xi$  differs from  $F$  by  $5.418 \times 10^{-7}$  in the apolar norm. We have an exact relaxation at the order  $\ell = 6$  up to numerical errors. Similar to the previous example, we observe that the relaxation achieves exactness at a finite order, and that the convergence rate analysis is overly conservative.

## References

- [Akh20] Naum Akhiezer. *The classical moment problem and some related questions in analysis*. SIAM, 2020.
- [And83] Edward J Anderson. A review of duality theory for linear programming over topological vector spaces. *Journal of mathematical analysis and applications*, 97(2):380–392, 1983.
- [Ash14] Robert B Ash. *Measure, integration, and functional analysis*. Academic Press, 2014.
- [BCMT10] Jerome Brachat, Pierre Comon, Bernard Mourrain, and Elias Tsigaridas. Symmetric tensor decomposition. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 433(11-12):1851–1872, 2010.
- [Ber87] Christian Berg. The multidimensional moment problem and semigroups. In *Proc. Symp. Appl. Math*, volume 37, pages 110–124, 1987.
- [BM23] Lorenzo Baldi and Bernard Mourrain. On the effective Putinar’s Positivstellensatz and moment approximation. *Mathematical Programming*, 200(1):71–103, 2023.
- [BM24] Lorenzo Baldi and Bernard Mourrain. Exact Moment Representation in Polynomial Optimization. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, page 102403, October 2024.
- [BMP25] Lorenzo Baldi, Bernard Mourrain, and Adam Parusiński. On Lojasiewicz inequalities and the effective putinar’s positivstellensatz. *Journal of Algebra*, 662:741–767, January 2025.
- [BO08] Maria Chiara Brambilla and Giorgio Ottaviani. On the Alexander–Hirschowitz theorem. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 212(5):1229–1251, 2008.

- [Bou13] Nicolas Bourbaki. *Topological vector spaces: Chapters 1–5*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [BS24] Lorenzo Baldi and Lucas Slot. Degree bounds for Putinar’s Positivstellensatz on the Hypercube. *SIAM Journal on Applied Algebra and Geometry*, 8(1):1–25, January 2024.
- [BV04] Stephen Boyd and Lieven Vandenberghe. *Convex optimization*. Cambridge university press, 2004.
- [FF20] Kun Fang and Hamza Fawzi. The sum-of-squares hierarchy on the sphere and applications in quantum information theory. *Mathematical Programming*, 190(1–2):331–360, July 2020.
- [KB09] Tamara G Kolda and Brett W Bader. Tensor decompositions and applications. *SIAM review*, 51(3):455–500, 2009.
- [KHJ17] Milan Korda, Didier Henrion, and Colin N Jones. Convergence rates of moment-sum-of-squares hierarchies for optimal control problems. *Systems & Control Letters*, 100:1–5, 2017.
- [KL19] Etienne de Klerk and Monique Laurent. A survey of semidefinite programming approaches to the generalized problem of moments and their error analysis. In *World Women in Mathematics 2018: Proceedings of the First World Meeting for Women in Mathematics (WM)<sup>2</sup>*, pages 17–56. Springer, 2019.
- [Lan87] Henry J Landau. *Moments in mathematics*, volume 37. American Mathematical Soc., 1987.
- [Las01] Jean B Lasserre. Global optimization with polynomials and the problem of moments. *SIAM Journal on optimization*, 11(3):796–817, 2001.
- [Las08] Jean B. Lasserre. A semidefinite programming approach to the generalized problem of moments. *Mathematical Programming*, 112(1):65–92, 2008.
- [Las13] Jean Lasserre. The K-moment problem for continuous linear functionals. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 365(5):2489–2504, 2013.
- [Las18] Jean B Lasserre. The moment-SOS hierarchy. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians: Rio de Janeiro 2018*, pages 3773–3794. World Scientific, 2018.
- [LS23] Monique Laurent and Lucas Slot. An effective version of Schmüdgen’s Positivstellensatz for the hypercube. *Optimization Letters*, 17(3):515–530, 2023.
- [MO20] Bernard Mourrain and Alessandro Oneto. On minimal decompositions of low rank symmetric tensors. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 607:347–377, 2020.
- [Nie14] Jiawang Nie. Optimality conditions and finite convergence of Lasserre’s hierarchy. *Mathematical Programming*, 146(1-2):97–121, 2014.
- [NS07] Jiawang Nie and Markus Schweighofer. On the complexity of Putinar’s Positivstellensatz. *Journal of Complexity*, 23(1):135–150, 2007.
- [Puc98] Mario Pucci. The Veronese variety and catalecticant matrices. *Journal of Algebra*, 202(1):72–95, 1998.

- [Put93] Mihai Putinar. Positive polynomials on compact semi-algebraic sets. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal*, 42(3):969–984, 1993.
- [Roc97] R.T. Rockafellar. *Convex Analysis*. Princeton Landmarks in Mathematics and Physics. Princeton University Press, 1997.
- [Rud87] W. Rudin. *Real and Complex Analysis*. Mathematics series. McGraw-Hill, 1987.
- [Rud91] W. Rudin. *Functional Analysis*. International series in pure and applied mathematics. McGraw-Hill, 1991.
- [S<sup>+</sup>17] Konrad Schmüdgen et al. *The moment problem*, volume 9. Springer, 2017.
- [Sch04] Markus Schweighofer. On the complexity of Schmüdgen’s Positivstellensatz. *Journal of Complexity*, 20(4):529–543, August 2004.
- [Slo22] Lucas Slot. Sum-of-squares hierarchies for polynomial optimization and the Christoffel–Darboux Kernel. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 32(4):2612–2635, November 2022.
- [STL24] Corbinian Schlosser, Matteo Tacchi, and Alexey Lazarev. Convergence rates for the moment-SoS hierarchy. *preprint arXiv:2402.00436*, 2024.
- [TLH23] Matteo Tacchi, Jean Bernard Lasserre, and Didier Henrion. Stokes, Gibbs, and volume computation of semi-algebraic sets. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 69(1):260–283, 2023.