EXISTENCE THEOREMS FOR OPTIMAL SOLUTIONS IN SEMI-ALGEBRAIC OPTIMIZATION

JAE HYOUNG LEE[†], GUE MYUNG LEE[‡], AND TIẾN SƠN PHẠM*

ABSTRACT. Consider the problem of minimizing a lower semi-continuous semi-algebraic function $f: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ on an unbounded closed semi-algebraic set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Employing adequate tools of semi-algebraic geometry, we first establish some properties of the tangency variety of the restriction of f on S. Then we derive verifiable necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of optimal solutions of the problem as well as the boundedness from below and coercivity of the restriction of f on S. We also present a computable formula for the optimal value of the problem.

1. INTRODUCTION

The existence of optimal solutions for optimization problems has been an essential research topic in optimization theory.

It is well-known that a linear function attains its infimum on a nonempty polyhedral set if it is bounded from below on the set.

In 1956, Frank and Wolfe [6] proved that a quadratic function attains its infimum on a nonempty polyhedral set if it is bounded from below on the set. In 1982, Andronov, Belousov and Shironin [1] (see also [9]) showed that this result is still true if the quadratic objective function is replaced by a cubic function.

In 2002, Belousov and Klatte [2] established the existence of optimal solutions for convex polynomial optimization problems. In 2014, Đinh, Hà and Phạm [5] (see also [14]) proved that non-degenerate polynomial optimization problems have optimal solutions. Here, we should assume that for each considered problem, the objective function is bounded from below on the constraint set.

Very recently, for a general polynomial optimization problem, Pham [15] provided necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of optimal solutions of the problem as well as the boundedness from below and coercivity of the objective function on the constraint set, where the results are presented in terms of the tangency variety of the polynomials defining the problem. Since polynomials form a subclass of semi-algebraic functions, it is natural to extend these results for semi-algebraic optimization problems.

Date: August 11, 2023.

²⁰¹⁰ Mathematics Subject Classification. 14P05 ·14P10 · 90C26 · 90C30.

Key words and phrases. Boundedness, Coercivity, Critical points, Existence of optimal solutions, Semi-Algebraic Geometry, Tangencies.

[‡]Corresponding author.

Contributions. Given a lower semi-continuous semi-algebraic function $f \colon \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ and an unbounded closed semi-algebraic set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we first establish some properties of the tangency variety of the restriction of f on S, and then we show that the following conditions can be characterized completely:

- f is bounded from below on S;
- f attains its infimum on S; and
- f is coercive on S.

Furthermore, we derive a computable formula for the optimal value $\inf_{x \in S} f(x)$.

To be concrete, we study only semi-algebraic functions and sets. Analogous results, with essentially identical proofs, also hold for functions and sets definable in an o-minimal structure (see [18] for more on the subject). However, to lighten the exposition, we do not pursue this extension here.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Some definitions and preliminary results from variational analysis and semi-algebraic geometry are recalled in Section 2. Tangencies are introduced and studied in Section 3. The main results are given in Section 4. Finally, several examples are provided in Section 5.

2. Preliminaries

Throughout this work we shall consider the Euclidean vector space \mathbb{R}^n endowed with its canonical scalar product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and we shall denote its associated norm $\|\cdot\|$. The closed ball and the sphere centered at the origin $0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ of radius R > 0 will be denoted by \mathbb{B}_R and \mathbb{S}_R , respectively. We will adopt the convention that $\inf \emptyset = +\infty$ and $\sup \emptyset = -\infty$.

For a function $f: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$, we denote its *effective domain* and *epigraph* by, respectively,

dom
$$f := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid f(x) < +\infty\},$$

epi $f := \{(x, \alpha) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \mid f(x) \le \alpha\}.$

The function f is said to be *lower semi-continuous* if for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the inequality $\liminf_{x'\to x} f(x') \geq f(x)$ holds. The *indicator function* of a set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, denoted δ_S , is defined by

$$\delta_S(x) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \in S, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

2.1. Normals and subdifferentials. Here we recall the notions of the normal cones to sets and the subdifferentials of real-valued functions used in this paper. The reader is referred to [12, 13, 17] for more details.

Definition 2.1. Consider a set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and a point $x \in S$.

(i) The regular normal cone (known also as the prenormal or Fréchet normal cone) $\widehat{N}(x; S)$ to S at x consists of all vectors $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying

 $\langle v, x' - x \rangle \leq o(\|x' - x\|)$ as $x' \to x$ with $x' \in S$.

(ii) The limiting normal cone (known also as the basic or Mordukhovich normal cone) N(x; S) to S at x consists of all vectors $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that there are sequences $x_k \to x$ with $x_k \in S$ and $v_k \to v$ with $v_k \in \widehat{N}(x_k; S)$.

If S is a manifold of class C^1 , then for every point $x \in S$, the normal cones $\widehat{N}(x; S)$ and N(x; S) are equal to the normal space to S at x in the sense of differential geometry; see [17, Example 6.8]. In particular, for all t > 0 and all $x \in \mathbb{S}_t$, we have $N(x; \mathbb{S}_t) = \{\mu x \mid \mu \in \mathbb{R}\}$.

Functional counterparts of normal cones are subdifferentials.

Definition 2.2. Consider a function $f \colon \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ and a point $x \in \text{dom} f$. The *limiting* and *horizon subdifferentials* of f at x are defined respectively by

$$\partial f(x) := \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid (v, -1) \in N((x, f(x)); \operatorname{epi} f) \right\},\\ \partial^{\infty} f(x) := \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid (v, 0) \in N((x, f(x)); \operatorname{epi} f) \right\}.$$

In [12, 13, 17] the reader can find equivalent analytic descriptions of the limiting subdifferential $\partial f(x)$ and comprehensive studies of it and related constructions. For convex f, this subdifferential coincides with the convex subdifferential. Furthermore, if the function fis of class C^1 , then $\partial f(x) = \{\nabla f(x)\}$. The horizon subdifferential $\partial^{\infty} f(x)$ plays an entirely different role–it detects horizontal "normal" to the epigraph–and it plays a decisive role in subdifferential calculus.

Lemma 2.3. For any set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and point $x \in S$, we have the representations

$$\partial \delta_S(x) = \partial^\infty \delta_S(x) = N(x; S).$$

Proof. See [13, Proposition 1.19].

Theorem 2.4 (Fermat rule). Consider a lower semi-continuous function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ and a closed subset S of \mathbb{R}^n . If $x \in \text{dom} f \cap S$ is a local minimizer of f on S and the qualification condition

$$\partial^{\infty} f(x) \cap \left(-N(x;S) \right) = \{0\}$$

is valid, then $0 \in \partial f(x) + N(x; S)$.

Proof. This follows directly from [13, Propositions 1.19 and 1.30 and Theorem 2.19]. \Box

2.2. Semi-algebraic geometry. Now, we recall some notions and results of semi-algebraic geometry, which can be found in [3] and [7, Chapter 1].

Definition 2.5. A subset S of \mathbb{R}^n is called *semi-algebraic* if it is a finite union of sets of the form

$$\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid f_i(x) = 0, \ i = 1, \dots, p; f_i(x) > 0, \ i = p+1, \dots, q\},\$$

where all f_i are polynomials. In other words, S is a union of finitely many sets, each defined by finitely many polynomial equalities and inequalities.

A map $f: S \to \mathbb{R}^m$ is said to be *semi-algebraic* if its graph

$$\{(x,y)\in S\times\mathbb{R}^m\mid y=f(x)\}$$

is a semi-algebraic set.

A major fact concerning the class of semi-algebraic sets is its stability under linear projections.

Theorem 2.6 (Tarski–Seidenberg theorem). The image of any semi-algebraic set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ under a projection to any linear subspace of \mathbb{R}^n is a semi-algebraic set.

Remark 2.7. As an immediate consequence of the Tarski–Seidenberg Theorem, we get semi-algebraicity of any set $\{x \in A : \exists y \in B, (x, y) \in C\}$, provided that A, B, and C are semi-algebraic sets in the corresponding spaces. Also, $\{x \in A : \forall y \in B, (x, y) \in C\}$ is a semi-algebraic set as its complement is the union of the complement of A and the set $\{x \in A : \exists y \in B, (x, y) \notin C\}$. Thus, if we have a finite collection of semi-algebraic sets, then any set obtained from them with the help of a finite chain of quantifiers is also semi-algebraic.

Definition 2.8. Let S, T and T' be semi-algebraic sets, $T' \subset T$, and let $f: S \to T$ be a continuous semi-algebraic map. A semi-algebraic trivialization of f over T', with fibre F, is a semi-algebraic homeomorphism $h: F \times T' \to f^{-1}(T')$, such that $f \circ h$ is the projection map $F \times T' \to T', (x,t) \mapsto t$. We say that the semi-algebraic trivialization h is compatible with a subset S' of S if there is a subset F' of F such that $h(F' \times T') = S' \cap f^{-1}(T')$.

Theorem 2.9 (Hardt's semi-algebraic triviality). Let S, T be two semi-algebraic sets, $f: S \to T$ a continuous semi-algebraic map, $\{S_i\}_{i=1,...,p}$ a finite family of semi-algebraic subsets of S. Then there exists a finite partition of T into semi-algebraic sets $T = \bigcup_{j=1}^{q} T_j$ and, for each j with $f^{-1}(T_j) \neq \emptyset$, a semi-algebraic trivialization $h_j: F_j \times T_j \to f^{-1}(T_j)$ of f over T_j , compatible with S_i , for i = 1, ..., p.

The following well-known lemmas will be of great importance for us.

Lemma 2.10 (monotonicity lemma). Let $f: (a, b) \to \mathbb{R}$ be a semi-algebraic function. Then there are finitely many points $a =: t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_p := b$ such that for each $i = 0, \ldots, p - 1$, the restriction of f to the interval (t_i, t_{i+1}) is analytic, and either constant, or strictly increasing or strictly decreasing.

Lemma 2.11 (growth dichotomy lemma). Let $f: (0, \epsilon) \to \mathbb{R}$ be a semi-algebraic function with $f(t) \neq 0$ for all $t \in (0, \epsilon)$. Then there exist constants $a \neq 0$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $f(t) = at^{\alpha} + o(t^{\alpha})$ as $t \to 0^+$. **Lemma 2.12** (curve selection lemma at infinity). Let $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a semi-algebraic set, and let $f := (f_1, \ldots, f_m) \colon \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^m$ be a semi-algebraic map. Assume that there exists a sequence $\{x_k\}_{k\geq 1} \subset S$ such that $\lim_{k\to+\infty} ||x_k|| = \infty$ and $\lim_{k\to+\infty} f(x_k) = y \in (\overline{\mathbb{R}})^m$, where $\overline{\mathbb{R}} := \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$. Then there exists an analytic semi-algebraic curve $\phi \colon (R, +\infty) \to \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\phi(t) \in S$ for all t > R, $\lim_{t\to+\infty} ||\phi(t)|| = \infty$ and $\lim_{t\to+\infty} f(\phi(t)) = y$.

Lemma 2.13 (path connectedness). The following statements hold.

- (i) Every semi-algebraic set has a finite number of connected components and each such component is semi-algebraic.
- (ii) Every connected semi-algebraic set S is semi-algebraically path connected: for every two points x, y in S, there exists a continuous semi-algebraic curve φ: [0, 1] → ℝⁿ lying in S such that φ(0) = x and φ(1) = y.

Lemma 2.14 (piecewise continuity of semi-algebraic functions). Given a semi-algebraic function $f: S \to \mathbb{R}$, where S is a semi-algebraic subset of \mathbb{R}^n , there is a finite partition of S into path connected semi-algebraic sets C_1, \ldots, C_p , such that for each $i = 1, \ldots, p$, the restriction of f on C_i is continuous.

As a consequence of the curve selection lemma at infinity, we have the following fact.

Corollary 2.15 (see [15, Corollary 2.11]). Let $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a semi-algebraic set. Then S is unbounded if and only if there exists a real number R > 0 such that the set $S \cap \mathbb{S}_t$ is nonempty for all t > R.

We close this section with the following fact (see [16, Lemma 2.4]).

Lemma 2.16. Consider a lower semi-continuous and semi-algebraic function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ and a semi-algebraic curve $\phi : [a, b] \to \text{dom} f$. Then for all but finitely many $t \in [a, b]$, the maps ϕ and $f \circ \phi$ are analytic at t and satisfy

$$v \in \partial f(\phi(t)) \implies \langle v, \dot{\phi}(t) \rangle = \frac{d}{dt} (f \circ \phi)(t),$$

$$v \in \partial^{\infty} f(\phi(t)) \implies \langle v, \dot{\phi}(t) \rangle = 0,$$

where $\dot{\phi}(t) := \frac{d}{dt}\phi(t)$.

3. TANGENCIES

In order to formulate and prove the main results of the paper, we need some notation and auxiliary results. Throughout the paper, let $f \colon \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be a lower semi-continuous and semi-algebraic function and let S be a closed semi-algebraic subset of \mathbb{R}^n such that the set dom $f \cap S$ is nonempty and unbounded.

Definition 3.1. By the set of critical points of f on S we mean the set

$$\Sigma(f,S) := \{ x \in \operatorname{dom} f \cap S \mid 0 \in \partial f(x) + N(x;S) \}.$$

By the Tarski–Seidenberg theorem (Theorem 2.6), $\Sigma(f, S)$ is a semi-algebraic set. Moreover, we have

Lemma 3.2. $f(\Sigma(f, S))$ is a finite subset of \mathbb{R} .

Proof. In view of Lemmas 2.13 and 2.14, there exists a finite partition of $\Sigma(f, S)$ into path connected semi-algebraic sets C_1, \ldots, C_p such that for each $i = 1, \ldots, p$, the restriction of fon C_i is continuous. We will show that the function f is constant on C_i . To this end, let $\phi: [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be a continuous semi-algebraic curve lying in C_i . Then the function $f \circ \phi$ is continuous; furthermore, by definition, for each $t \in [0,1]$ there exists $\omega(t) \in \partial f(\phi(t)) \cap$ $(-N(\phi(t); S))$. Note that $(\delta_S \circ \phi)(t) = 0$ and $\partial \delta_S(\phi(t)) = N(\phi(t); S)$ (see Lemma 2.3). By Lemma 2.16, for all but finitely many $t \in [0,1]$, the maps ϕ and $f \circ \phi$ are analytic at t and satisfy

$$\frac{d}{dt}(f \circ \phi)(t) = \langle \omega(t), \dot{\phi}(t) \rangle = -\langle -\omega(t), \dot{\phi}(t) \rangle = -\frac{d}{dt}(\delta_S \circ \phi)(t) = 0$$

It follows that the function $f \circ \phi$ is constant. Finally, since the semi-algebraic set C_i is path connected, any two points in C_i can be joined (in C_i) by a continuous semi-algebraic curve (by Lemma 2.13). Therefore, f is constant on C_i , which completes the proof.

Lemma 3.3. There exists a real number R > 0 such that for all t > R and all $x \in S \cap S_t$ we have

$$N(x;S) \cap \left(-N(x;\mathbb{S}_t)\right) = \{0\}.$$

Proof. Suppose to the contrary that the lemma does not hold: there exist sequences $x_k \in S$, with $\lim_{k\to+\infty} ||x_k|| = +\infty$, and $\mu_k \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $-\mu_k x_k \in N(x_k; S)$. Applying the Curve Selection Lemma at infinity (Lemma 2.12) for the semi-algebraic set

$$\{(x,\mu)\in\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}\mid x\in S, \mu\neq 0, -\mu x\in N(x;S)\}$$

and the semi-algebraic map

 $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}, \quad (x, \mu) \mapsto \|x\|,$

we get an analytic semi-algebraic curve $(\phi, \mu) \colon (R, +\infty) \to \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ with $\lim_{t \to +\infty} \|\phi(t)\| = +\infty$ such that for all t > R, we have

$$\phi(t) \in S$$
, $\mu(t) \neq 0$, and $-\mu(t)\phi(t) \in N(\phi(t); S)$.

In view of Lemma 2.10, we may assume that the function

$$(R, +\infty) \to \mathbb{R}, \quad t \mapsto \|\phi(t)\|^2,$$

is strictly increasing (perhaps after increasing R); in particular, $\frac{d}{dt} \|\phi(t)\|^2 > 0$ for all t > R.

On the other hand, since $(\delta_S \circ \phi)(t) = 0$ and $\partial \delta_S(\phi(t)) = N(\phi(t); S)$, it follows from Lemma 2.16 that for all but finitely many $t \in (R, +\infty)$,

$$0 = \frac{d}{dt}(\delta_S \circ \phi)(t) = \langle -\mu(t)\phi(t), \dot{\phi}(t) \rangle = -\frac{\mu(t)}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\|\phi(t)\|^2.$$

Therefore, $\mu(t) = 0$, a contradiction.

Lemma 3.4. There exists a real number R > 0 such that for all t > R and all $x \in S \cap S_t$ we have the inclusion

$$N(x; S \cap \mathbb{S}_t) \subset N(x; S) + N(x; \mathbb{S}_t).$$

Proof. This follows directly from Lemma 3.3 and [13, Theorem 2.16].

Definition 3.5. We say that the qualification condition ((QC) for short) holds if

$$\partial^{\infty} f(x) \cap (-N(x;S)) = \{0\} \text{ for all } x \in \operatorname{dom} f \cap S.$$

We say that the qualification condition at infinity $((QC)_{\infty} \text{ for short})$ holds, if there exists R > 0 such that

$$\partial^{\infty} f(x) \cap (-N(x;S)) = \{0\} \text{ for all } x \in (\operatorname{dom} f \cap S) \setminus \mathbb{B}_{R}.$$

Note that if f is locally Lipschitz, then $\partial^{\infty} f(x) = \{0\}$ for all x, and so the conditions (QC) and (QC)_{\sigma} hold.

Lemma 3.6. If $(QC)_{\infty}$ holds, then there exists R > 0 such that for all t > R and all $x \in \text{dom} f \cap S \cap \mathbb{S}_t$,

$$\partial^{\infty} f(x) \cap \left(-N(x; S \cap \mathbb{S}_t) \right) = \{0\}.$$

Proof. In view of Lemma 3.4, it suffices to prove that there exists R > 0 such that for all t > R and all $x \in \text{dom} f \cap S \cap \mathbb{S}_t$,

$$\partial^{\infty} f(x) \cap \left(-N(x;S) - N(x;\mathbb{S}_t) \right) = \{0\}.$$

By contradiction, there exist sequences $x_k \in \text{dom} f \cap S$ with $\lim_{k \to +\infty} ||x_k|| = +\infty$, $\omega_k \in -N(x_k; S)$ and $\mu_k \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\omega_k + \mu_k x_k \in \partial^{\infty} f(x_k) \setminus \{0\}$. Applying the Curve Selection Lemma at infinity (Lemma 2.12) for the semi-algebraic set

 $\{(x,\omega,\mu)\in\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}\mid x\in\mathrm{dom}f\cap S,\ \omega\in-N(x;S),\ \omega+\mu x\in\partial^{\infty}f(x)\setminus\{0\}\}$

and the semi-algebraic map

$$\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R},\quad (x,\omega,\mu)\mapsto\|x\|,$$

we get an analytic semi-algebraic curve $(\phi, \omega, \mu) \colon (R, +\infty) \to \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ such that $\lim_{t \to +\infty} \|\phi(t)\| = +\infty$ and for all t > R,

$$\phi(t) \in \operatorname{dom} f \cap S, \ \omega(t) \in -N(\phi(t);S) \ \text{ and } \ \omega(t) + \mu(t)\phi(t) \in \partial^{\infty}f(\phi(t)) \setminus \{0\}$$

In view of Lemma 2.10, we may assume that the function $(R, +\infty) \to \mathbb{R}, t \mapsto \|\phi(t)\|$, is strictly increasing (perhaps after increasing R); in particular, $\frac{d}{dt}\|\phi(t)\|^2 > 0$ for all t > R. By Lemma 2.16, we have for all but finitely many t > R,

$$0 = \langle \omega(t) + \mu(t)\phi(t), \phi(t) \rangle$$

= $\langle \omega(t), \dot{\phi}(t) \rangle + \frac{\mu(t)}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\phi(t)\|^2$
= $-\frac{d}{dt} (\delta_S \circ \phi)(t) + \frac{\mu(t)}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\phi(t)\|^2 = \frac{\mu(t)}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\phi(t)\|^2.$

Hence $\mu(t) = 0$, and so $\omega(t) \in \partial^{\infty} f(\phi(t)) \setminus \{0\}$, which contradicts our assumption that $(QC)_{\infty}$ holds.

Definition 3.7. By the tangency variety of f on S, we mean the set

 $\Gamma(f,S) := \{ x \in \operatorname{dom} f \cap S \mid \text{there exists } \mu \in \mathbb{R} \text{ such that } 0 \in \partial f(x) + N(x;S) + \mu x \}.$

Observe that $\Gamma(f, S)$ is a semi-algebraic set containing $\Sigma(f, S)$. Moreover, we have

Lemma 3.8. Assume that $(QC)_{\infty}$ holds. Then the tangency variety $\Gamma(f, S)$ is nonempty and unbounded.

Proof. Since the set dom $f \cap S$ is semi-algebraic and unbounded, it follows from Corollary 2.15 that there exists a real number R > 0 such that for any t > R, the set

$$\{x \in \text{dom} f \cap S \mid \|x\|^2 = t^2\}$$

is nonempty and bounded. Hence, by the lower semi-continuity of f, the optimization problem

minimize
$$f(x)$$
 subject to $x \in S$ and $||x||^2 = t^2$

has at least one optimal solution, say, $\phi(t)$. Clearly, $\phi(t) \in \text{dom} f$. By Theorem 2.4 and Lemmas 3.4, 3.6, we have for all t large enough,

$$0 \in \partial f(\phi(t)) + N(\phi(t); S \cap \mathbb{S}_t) \subset \partial f(\phi(t)) + N(\phi(t); S) + N(\phi(t); \mathbb{S}_t)$$

= $\partial f(\phi(t)) + N(\phi(t); S) + \{\mu\phi(t) \mid \mu \in \mathbb{R}\}.$

Therefore, $\phi(t) \in \Gamma(f, S)$. Since $\|\phi(t)\| = t$, $\Gamma(f, S)$ is unbounded.

By Lemma 2.14, there is a finite partition of $\Gamma(f, S)$ into semi-algebraic sets $C_i, i = 1, \ldots, \ell$ such that the restriction of f on C_i is continuous. Applying Hardt's triviality theorem (Theorem 2.9) for the continuous semi-algebraic function

$$\rho \colon \Gamma(f, S) \to \mathbb{R}, \quad x \mapsto \|x\|,$$

we find a real number R > 0, semi-algebraic sets $F_i, i = 1, \ldots, \ell$ and a semi-algebraic homeomorphism

$$h: (\cup_{i=1}^{\ell} F_i) \times (R, +\infty) \to \Gamma(f, S) \setminus \mathbb{B}_R$$

such that $h(F_i \times (R, +\infty)) = C_i \setminus \mathbb{B}_R$ for $i = 1, \ldots, \ell$ and the following diagram commutes:

$$\Gamma(f,S) \setminus \mathbb{B}_R \xrightarrow{\rho} (R,+\infty)$$

$$\stackrel{h}{\longrightarrow} \xrightarrow{\pi} (R,+\infty)$$

$$(\cup_{i=1}^{\ell} F_i) \times (R,+\infty)$$

where π is the projection on the second component of the product, i.e., $\pi(x,t) = t$. Since F_i is semi-algebraic, the number of its connected components, say, p_i , is finite. Then $C_i \setminus \mathbb{B}_R$ has exactly p_i connected components, which are unbounded semi-algebraic sets. Therefore, we may decompose the set $\Gamma(f, S) \setminus \mathbb{B}_R$ as a disjoint union of finitely many semi-algebraic sets $\Gamma_k, k = 1, \ldots, p := \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} p_i$ such that the following conditions hold:

- (i) Γ_k is connected and unbounded;
- (ii) for each t > R, the set $\Gamma_k \cap \mathbb{S}_t$ is nonempty and connected; and
- (iii) the restriction of f on Γ_k is continuous.

Corresponding to each Γ_k , let

$$f_k \colon (R, +\infty) \to \mathbb{R}, \quad t \mapsto f_k(t),$$

be the function defined by $f_k(t) := f(x)$, where $x \in \Gamma_k \cap \mathbb{S}_t$. The definition is well-posed as shown in the following lemma.

Lemma 3.9. Assume that $(QC)_{\infty}$ holds. For all R large enough and all k = 1, ..., p, the following statements hold:

- (i) The function f_k is well-defined and semi-algebraic;
- (ii) The function f_k is either constant or strictly monotone;
- (iii) The function f_k is constant if and only if $\Gamma_k \subset \Sigma(f, S)$.

Proof. (i) Fix t > R and let $\phi: [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be a continuous semi-algebraic curve such that for all $\tau \in [0,1]$ we have $\phi(\tau) \in \Gamma_k \cap \mathbb{S}_t$. By definition, $\|\phi(\tau)\| = t$ and there exist $\omega(\tau) \in -N(\phi(\tau); S)$ and $\mu(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\omega(\tau) + \mu(\tau)\phi(\tau) \in \partial f(\phi(\tau)).$$

By Lemma 2.16, for all but finitely many $\tau \in [0, 1]$, the maps ϕ and $f \circ \phi$ are analytic at τ and satisfy

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}(f \circ \phi)(\tau) = \langle \omega(\tau) + \mu(\tau)\phi(\tau), \dot{\phi}(\tau) \rangle$$

$$= \langle \omega(\tau), \dot{\phi}(\tau) \rangle + \mu(\tau)\langle \phi(\tau), \dot{\phi}(\tau) \rangle$$

$$= -\frac{d}{d\tau}(\delta_S \circ \phi)(\tau) + \frac{\mu(\tau)}{2}\frac{d}{d\tau} \|\phi(\tau)\|^2$$

$$= 0 + \frac{\mu(\tau)}{2}\frac{d}{d\tau}t^2 = 0.$$

It follows that the function $f \circ \phi$ is constant. Now, since the semi-algebraic set $\Gamma_k \cap \mathbb{S}_t$ is path connected, any two points in $\Gamma_k \cap \mathbb{S}_t$ can be joined (in $\Gamma_k \cap \mathbb{S}_t$) by a continuous semi-algebraic curve (by Lemma 2.13). Therefore, f is constant on $\Gamma_k \cap \mathbb{S}_t$, and so f_k is well-defined. The semi-algebraicity of f_k is easy to check, and so is left to the reader.

(ii) Increasing R (if necessary) and applying the monotonicity lemma (Lemma 2.10), the claim follows.

(iii) Necessity. By Hardt's triviality theorem (Theorem 2.9) and by increasing R (if necessary), we get a semi-algebraic set $F \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and a semi-algebraic homeomorphism $\overline{h}: F \times (R, +\infty) \to \Gamma_k \setminus \Sigma(f, S)$ such that the following diagram commutes:



where π is the projection on the second component of the product, i.e., $\pi(x, t) = t$.

We now assume that the function f_k is constant but $\Gamma_k \setminus \Sigma(f, S) \neq \emptyset$. Let x^* be any fixed point in F and define the semi-algebraic function $\phi \colon (R, +\infty) \to \Gamma_k \setminus \Sigma(f, S)$ by $\phi(t) = \overline{h}(x^*, t)$ for all t > R. The function $f|_{\Gamma_k}$ is constant so is $f \circ \phi$. Since $\rho \circ \overline{h} = \pi$, $\|\phi(t)\| = t$ for all t > R. Since $\phi(t) \in \Gamma_k \setminus \Sigma(f, S)$, there exist $\omega(t) \in -N(\phi(t); S)$ and $\mu(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\omega(t) + \mu(t)\phi(t) \in \partial f(\phi(t)).$$

By Lemma 2.16, for all but finitely many t > R, the maps ϕ and $f \circ \phi$ are analytic at t and satisfy

$$0 = \frac{d}{dt}(f \circ \phi)(t) = \langle \omega(t) + \mu(t)\phi(t), \dot{\phi}(t) \rangle$$
$$= \langle \omega(t), \dot{\phi}(t) \rangle + \frac{\mu(t)}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\phi(t)\|^{2}$$
$$= -\frac{d}{dt} (\delta_{S} \circ \phi)(t) + \mu(t)t = \mu(t)t$$

Hence $\mu(t) = 0$ and so $\phi(t) \in \Sigma(f, S)$, a contradiction.

Sufficiency. Assume that $\Gamma_k \subset \Sigma(f, S)$. It suffices to show that the restriction of f on Γ_k is constant. To see this, let $\phi: [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be a continuous semi-algebraic curve lying in Γ_k . We have $(f \circ \phi)([0,1]) \subset f(\Gamma_k) \subset f(\Sigma(f,S))$ -a finite set in view of Lemma 3.2. Hence, by Lemma 2.10, there are finitely many points $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_\ell = 1$ such that the restriction of $f \circ \phi$ to the interval $(t_i, t_{i+1}), i = 0, \ldots, \ell - 1$, is constant. On the other hand, by construction, the restriction of f on Γ_k is continuous. Therefore, $f \circ \phi$ is constant. Finally, since the semi-algebraic set Γ_k is path connected, any two points in Γ_k can be joined (in Γ_k) by a continuous semi-algebraic curve (by Lemma 2.13). Therefore, f is constant on Γ_k , which completes the proof.

For any t > R, the set dom $f \cap S \cap \mathbb{S}_t$ is nonempty and bounded. Since f is lower semicontinuous and semi-algebraic, the function

$$\psi \colon (R, +\infty) \to \mathbb{R}, \quad t \mapsto \psi(t) := \min_{x \in S \cap \mathbb{S}_t} f(x),$$

is well-defined and semi-algebraic. With this definition, we have the following three lemmas, whose proofs are similar to those in [15, Lemmas 3.18, 3.19 and 3.20] and are included here for the sake of completeness.

Lemma 3.10. Assume that $(QC)_{\infty}$ holds. Then for R large enough, the following statements hold:

- (i) Any two of the functions ψ, f_1, \ldots, f_p either coincide or are distinct.
- (ii) $\psi(t) = \min_{k=1,...,p} f_k(t)$ for all t > R.
- (iii) There is an index $k \in \{1, ..., p\}$ such that $\psi(t) = f_k(t)$ for all t > R.

Proof. (i) This is an immediate consequence of the monotonicity lemma (Lemma 2.10) and the semi-algebraicity of the functions in question.

(ii) By Corollary 2.15, for all t > R, $\Gamma(f, S) \cap \mathbb{S}_t \neq \emptyset$, $\Gamma_k \cap \mathbb{S}_t \neq \emptyset$, $k = 1, \ldots, p$, and $S \cap \mathbb{S}_t \neq \emptyset$. Since $\Gamma(f, S) \subset S$,

$$\min_{x \in S \cap \mathbb{S}_t} f(x) \le \min_{x \in \Gamma(f,S) \cap \mathbb{S}_t} f(x).$$

Let \tilde{x} be an optimal solution of the problem:

$$\min_{x \in S \cap \mathbb{S}_t} f(x).$$

By Theorem 2.4, Lemma 3.4, and Lemma 3.6, there exists $\mu \ge 0$ such that

$$0 \in \partial f(\tilde{x}) + N(\tilde{x}; S) + \mu \tilde{x}.$$

Thus, $\tilde{x} \in \Gamma(f, S) \cap \mathbb{S}_t$, and so,

$$\min_{x \in S \cap \mathbb{S}_t} f(x) = \min_{x \in \Gamma(f,S) \cap \mathbb{S}_t} f(x).$$

Moreover,

$$\min_{x\in\Gamma(f,S)\cap\mathbb{S}_t}f(x) = \min_{x\in\left(\bigcup_{k=1}^p\Gamma_k\right)\cap\mathbb{S}_t}f(x) = \min_{k=1,\dots,p}\min_{x\in\Gamma_k\cap\mathbb{S}_t}f(x) = \min_{k=1,\dots,p}f_k(t).$$

Hence $\psi(t) = \min_{k=1,\dots,p} f_k(t)$ for all t > R.

(iii) This follows from items (i) and (ii).

We have associated to the function f a finite number of functions f_k of a single variable, each function f_k is either constant or strictly monotone. In particular, the following limits exist:

$$\lambda_k := \lim_{t \to +\infty} f_k(t) \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm \infty\} \quad \text{for} \quad k = 1, \dots, p.$$

In view of Lemma 3.9(iii), if $f_k \equiv \lambda_k$, then $\lambda_k \in f(\Sigma(f, S))$. Furthermore, by Lemma 3.10(iii), the limit $\lim_{t\to+\infty} \psi(t)$ exists and equals to λ_k for some k.

Lemma 3.11. Assume that $(QC)_{\infty}$ holds. Then

$$\lim_{t \to +\infty} \psi(t) = \min_{k=1,\dots,p} \lambda_k.$$

Proof. Indeed, by Lemma 3.10(ii), $\psi(t) \leq f_k(t)$ for all t > R and all $k = 1, \ldots, p$. Letting $t \to +\infty$, we get

$$\lim_{t \to +\infty} \psi(t) \leq \min_{k=1,\dots,p} \lambda_k.$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 3.10(iii), there exists an index $k \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$ such that $\psi \equiv f_k$, and so

$$\lim_{t \to +\infty} \psi(t) = \lambda_k.$$

Combining this with the previous inequality, we get the desired conclusion.

Lemma 3.12. We have

$$\lim_{t \to +\infty} \psi(t) \geq \inf_{x \in S} f(x)$$

with the equality if f does not attain its infimum on S.

Proof. Indeed, we have for all t > R,

$$\psi(t) = \min_{x \in S \cap \mathbb{S}_t} f(x) \ge \inf_{x \in S} f(x)$$

Letting $t \to +\infty$, we get $\lim_{t\to+\infty} \psi(t) \ge \inf_{x\in S} f(x)$.

Now suppose that f does not attain its infimum on S; then there exists a sequence $x_k \in \text{dom } f \cap S$ such that

$$\lim_{k \to +\infty} \|x_k\| = +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{k \to +\infty} f(x_k) = \inf_{x \in S} f(x).$$

On the other hand, by definition, it is clear that $\psi(||x_k||) \leq f(x_k)$ for all k large enough. Therefore, $\lim_{t\to+\infty} \psi(t) \leq \inf_{x\in S} f(x)$, and so the desired conclusion follows.

Note that in the above lemma we do not assume that f is bounded from below on S.

4. Results

Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be a lower semi-continuous and semi-algebraic function and let S be a closed semi-algebraic subset of \mathbb{R}^n such that the set dom $f \cap S$ is nonempty and unbounded. Consider the constrained optimization problem:

minimize
$$f(x)$$
 subject to $x \in S$. (P)

Following the approach in [15], we provide verifiable necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of optimal solutions of the problem (P) as well as the boundedness from below and coercivity of the restriction of f on S. We also present a computable formula for the optimal value of the problem.

Keeping the notation as in the previous section, we can write $\Gamma(f, S) \setminus \mathbb{B}_R = \bigcup_{k=1}^p \Gamma_k$, where each Γ_k is an unbounded connected semi-algebraic set. Corresponding to each Γ_k , the semi-algebraic functions

$$f_k \colon (R, +\infty) \to \mathbb{R}, \quad t \mapsto f_k(t) := f|_{\Gamma_k \cap \mathbb{S}_t},$$

are well-defined, and so are the real numbers

$$\lambda_k := \lim_{t \to +\infty} f_k(t) \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm \infty\}.$$

Also, recall that the semi-algebraic function $\psi \colon (R, +\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$\psi(t) := \min_{x \in S \cap \mathbb{S}_t} f(x).$$

Here and in the following, R is chosen large enough so that the conclusions of Lemmas 3.3, 3.4, 3.6, 3.9 and 3.10 hold.

4.1. Boundedness from below. In this subsection we present necessary and sufficient conditions for the boundedness from below of the objective function f on the constraint set S.

Theorem 4.1. Assume that $(QC)_{\infty}$ holds. Then f is bounded from below on S if and only if it holds that

$$\min_{k=1,\dots,p}\lambda_k > -\infty.$$

Proof. From the proof of Lemma 3.10,

$$\psi(t) = \inf_{x \in S \cap \mathbb{S}_t} f(x) = \min_{k=1,\dots,p} f_k(t)$$

So, if f is bounded from below on S, for k = 1, ..., p,

$$-\infty < \inf_{x \in S} f(x) \le \inf_{x \in S \cap \mathbb{S}_t} f(x) \le f_k(t),$$

and so, $-\infty < \min_{k=1,\dots,p} \lambda_k$.

Suppose that f is not bounded from below on S. Then there exist $x_l \in S$, l = 1, 2, ..., such that $f(x_l) \to -\infty$ as $l \to \infty$. We may assume that $||x_l|| \to +\infty$ as $l \to \infty$. Then

$$-\infty = \inf_{x \in S} f(x) = \lim_{l \to \infty} f(x_l) \ge \lim_{l \to \infty} \inf_{x \in S \cap \mathbb{S}_{||x_l||}} f(x) = \lim_{t \to \infty} \psi(t) \ge \min_{k=1,\dots,p} \lambda_k$$

where the last equality holds since $\lim_{t\to\infty} \psi(t)$ exists (when we include $\pm\infty$ as the limits) and the last inequality holds from Lemma 3.10 (iii). Hence

$$\min_{k=1,\dots,p}\lambda_k = -\infty.$$

In what follows we let

 $K := \{k \mid f_k \text{ is not constant}\}.$

By the growth dichotomy lemma (Lemma 2.11), we can assume that each function $f_k, k \in K$, is developed into a fractional power series of the form

 $f_k(t) = a_k t^{\alpha_k} +$ lower order terms in t as $t \to +\infty$,

where $a_k \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ and $\alpha_k \in \mathbb{Q}$.

Theorem 4.2. Assume that $(QC)_{\infty}$ holds. Then f is bounded from below on S if and only if for any $k \in K$,

$$\alpha_k > 0 \implies a_k > 0.$$

Proof. In light of Lemma 3.2, $f(\Sigma(f, S))$ is a finite subset of \mathbb{R} . By Lemma 3.9(iii), if $k \notin K$, then $f|_{\Gamma_k} \equiv \lambda_k$ and $\Gamma_k \subset \Sigma(f, S)$, which yield $\lambda_k \in f(\Sigma(f, S))$, and so λ_k is finite. Therefore, in view of Theorem 4.1, f is bounded from below on S if and only if it holds that

$$\lambda_k = \lim_{t \to +\infty} f_k(t) > -\infty \quad \text{for all} \quad k \in K.$$

Then the desired conclusion follows immediately from the definition of α_k and a_k .

4.2. **Optimal values.** The following result shows that to compute the optimal value of the problem (P) it suffices to know the *finite* set $f(\Sigma(f, S))$ and the values $\lambda_k, k = 1, \ldots, p$.

Theorem 4.3. Assume that (QC) holds. Then

$$\inf_{x \in S} f(x) = \min \left\{ \min_{x \in \Sigma(f,S)} f(x), \min_{k=1,\dots,p} \lambda_k \right\}$$

Proof. We first assume that f attains its infimum on S, i.e., there exists a point $x^* \in S$ such that

$$f(x^*) = \inf_{x \in S} f(x).$$

In light of Theorem 2.4, $x^* \in \Sigma(f, S)$ and so

$$\inf_{x \in S} f(x) \geq \min_{x \in \Sigma(f,S)} f(x).$$

We now assume that f does not attain its infimum on S. Then there exists a sequence $x_k \in \text{dom} f \cap S$ such that

$$\lim_{k \to +\infty} \|x_k\| = +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{k \to +\infty} f(x_k) = \inf_{x \in S} f(x).$$

Since the function f is lower semi-continuous and the set $\{x \in \text{dom} f \cap S \mid ||x||^2 = ||x_k||^2\}$ is nonempty compact, the optimization problem

minimize
$$f(x)$$
 subject to $x \in S$ and $||x||^2 = ||x_k||^2$

has at least one optimal solution, say, y_k . Clearly, y_k belongs to dom $f \cap S$ and satisfies

$$\lim_{k \to +\infty} \|y_k\| = +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{k \to +\infty} f(y_k) = \inf_{x \in S} f(x).$$

Furthermore, by Theorem 2.4 and Lemmas 3.4, 3.6, we have for all k large enough,

$$0 \in \partial f(y_k) + N(y_k; S \cap \mathbb{S}_{||x_k||}) \subset \partial f(y_k) + N(y_k; S) + N(y_k; \mathbb{S}_{||x_k||})$$

= $\partial f(y_k) + N(y_k; S) + \{\mu y_k \mid \mu \in \mathbb{R}\},$

and so $y_k \in \Gamma(f, S)$. Passing to a subsequence if necessary, we may assume that for all k, $y_k \in \Gamma_\ell$ for some $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$. Then

$$\inf_{x \in S} f(x) = \lim_{k \to +\infty} f(y_k) = \lim_{k \to +\infty} f_\ell(||y_k||) = \lambda_\ell.$$

Therefore, in both cases, we have

$$\inf_{x \in S} f(x) \ge \min \left\{ \min_{x \in \Sigma(f,S)} f(x), \min_{k=1,\dots,p} \lambda_k \right\}.$$

Since $\Sigma(f, S) \subset S$,

$$\inf_{x \in S} f(x) \le \min_{x \in \Sigma(f,S)} f(x).$$

Since $\Gamma_k \cap \mathbb{S}_t \subset S, \ k = 1, \dots, p$,

$$\inf_{x \in S} f(x) \le f_k(t), \quad k = 1, \dots, p,$$

and hence,

$$\inf_{x \in S} f(x) \le \min_{k=1,\dots,p} f_k(t).$$

Thus,

$$\inf_{x \in S} f(x) \le \min \left\{ \min_{x \in \Sigma(f,S)} f(x), \min_{k=1,\dots,p} \lambda_k \right\}.$$

4.3. Existence of optimal solutions. In this subsection we provide necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of optimal solutions to the problem (P). We start with the following result.

Theorem 4.4. Assume that (QC) holds. Then f attains its infimum on S if and only if it holds that

$$\Sigma(f,S) \neq \emptyset$$
 and $\min_{x \in \Sigma(f,S)} f(x) \leq \min_{k \in K} \lambda_k.$

Proof. Note that $f(\Sigma(f, S))$ is a finite subset of \mathbb{R} (see Lemma 3.2).

Necessity. Let f attain its infimum on S, i.e., there exists a point $x^* \in S$ such that

$$f(x^*) = \inf_{x \in S} f(x).$$

In light of Theorem 2.4, $x^* \in \Sigma(f, S)$ and so $\Sigma(f, S)$ is nonempty. Moreover, we have

$$\min_{x \in \Sigma(f,S)} f(x) \leq f(x^*) = \inf_{x \in S} f(x) \leq \min_{k=1,\dots,p} \lambda_k \leq \min_{k \in K} \lambda_k,$$

where the second inequality follows from Theorem 4.3.

Sufficiency. By the assumption, we have

$$-\infty < \min_{x \in \Sigma(f,S)} f(x) \leq \min_{k \in K} \lambda_k.$$

On the other hand, it is clear from Lemma 3.9(iii) that $\lambda_k \in f(\Sigma(f, S))$ for all $k \notin K$ and so

$$\min_{\lambda \in f(\Sigma(f,S))} \lambda \leq \min_{k \notin K} \lambda_k.$$

Therefore,

$$-\infty < \min_{x \in \Sigma(f,S)} f(x) = \min_{\lambda \in f(\Sigma(f,S))} \lambda \le \min_{k=1,\dots,p} \lambda_k$$

which, together with Theorem 4.1, yields that f is bounded from below on S. Moreover, by Theorem 4.1, we have

$$\min_{x \in \Sigma(f,S)} f(x) = \inf_{x \in S} f(x)$$

which implies that f attains its infimum on S.

Theorem 4.5. Assume that (QC) holds. Then the set of all optimal solutions of the problem (P) is nonempty compact if and only if it holds that

$$\Sigma(f,S) \neq \emptyset$$
, $\min_{x \in \Sigma(f,S)} f(x) \leq \min_{k \in K} \lambda_k$, and $\min_{x \in \Sigma(f,S)} f(x) < \min_{k \notin K} \lambda_k$.

Proof. Recall that, by Theorem 2.4, if the problem (P) has an optimal solution, then

$$\min_{x \in \Sigma(f,S)} f(x) = \inf_{x \in S} f(x).$$

Necessity. Take any $k \notin K$. Then $f|_{\Gamma_k} \equiv \lambda_k$. It is clear that $\inf_{x \in S} f(x) \leq \lambda_k$. If $\inf_{x \in S} f(x) = \lambda_k$, then the set of all optimal solutions of the problem (P) is unbounded. Since $f|_{\Gamma_k} = \lambda_k$ and Γ_k is unbounded,

$$\inf_{x\in S} f(x) < \lambda_k,$$

which is contradicts the assumption. Since Γ_k is unbounded, our assumption implies that

$$\min_{x \in \Sigma(f,S)} f(x) = \inf_{x \in S} f(x) < \lambda_k,$$

which, together with Theorem 4.4, yields the desired conclusion.

Sufficiency. The function f is lower semi-continuous. Hence, in view of Theorem 4.4, it suffices to show that the set of all optimal solutions of the problem (P) is bounded. Suppose to the contrary that the semi-algebraic set

$$\{x \in S \setminus \mathbb{B}_R \mid f(x) = \inf_{x \in S} f(x)\}$$

is unbounded. By Lemma 2.13(i), this set must contain an unbounded (semi-algebraic) connected component, say, X. Observe that

$$X \subset \Sigma(f, S) \subset \Gamma(f, S).$$

Therefore, $X \subset \Gamma_k$ for some $k \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$. Thanks to Corollary 2.15, for all t large enough, the set $X \cap S_t$ is nonempty and so

$$f_k(t) = f|_{\Gamma_k \cap \mathbb{S}_t} = f|_{X \cap \mathbb{S}_t}.$$

Consequently, f_k is constant $\inf_{x \in S} f(x)$, which yields $k \notin K$ and $\lambda_k = \inf_{x \in S} f(x)$, which contradicts the assumption that

$$\inf_{x \in S} f(x) = \min_{x \in \Sigma(f,S)} f(x) < \min_{k \neq K} \lambda_k.$$

The theorem is proved.

4.4. Coercivity. The function f is coercive on the set S if for every sequence $x_k \in S$ such that $||x_k|| \to +\infty$, we have $f(x_k) \to +\infty$. It is well known that if f is coercive on S, then f achieves its infimum on S. A necessary and sufficient condition for the coercivity of f on S is as follows.

Theorem 4.6. Assume that $(QC)_{\infty}$ holds. Then the following statements are equivalent:

- (i) The function f is coercive on S.
- (ii) $\lambda_k = +\infty$ for all $k = 1, \ldots, p$.

Proof. Recall that $\psi(t) := \min_{x \in S \cap \mathbb{S}_t} f(x)$ for t > R. Hence, f is coercive on S if and only if $\lim_{t \to +\infty} \psi(t) = +\infty$, or equivalently, $\min_{k=1,\dots,p} \lambda_k = +\infty$ in view of Lemma 3.11. \Box

5. Examples

In this section we give examples to illustrate our main results.

Example 5.1. Let $S := \mathbb{R}^2$ and $f(x, y) := x^2 + |y|$. A direct calculation shows that $N((x, y); \mathbb{R}^2) = \{(0, 0)\}, \partial^{\infty} f(x, y) = \{(0, 0)\}$ (as f is locally Lipschitz) and that

$$\partial f(x,y) = \begin{cases} \{(2x,\xi) \mid \xi \in [-1,1]\} & \text{if } y = 0, \\ \{(2x,1)\} & \text{if } y > 0, \\ \{(2x,-1)\} & \text{if } y < 0. \end{cases}$$

It follows that $\Sigma(f, \mathbb{R}^2) = \{(0, 0)\}$ and

$$\Gamma(f, \mathbb{R}^2) = [\mathbb{R} \times \{0\}] \cup [\{0\} \times \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}] \cup \{(x, y) \mid x \in \mathbb{R}, \ y = \pm \frac{1}{2}\}.$$

Hence, for $R > \frac{1}{2}$, the set $\Gamma(f, \mathbb{R}^2) \setminus \mathbb{B}_R$ has eight connected components:

$$\Gamma_{\pm 1} := \{(\pm t, 0) \mid t > R\},
\Gamma_{\pm 2} := \{(0, \pm t) \mid t > R\},
\Gamma_{\pm 3} := \left\{ \left(t, \frac{1}{2}\right) \mid t > \sqrt{R - \frac{1}{4}} \right\},
\Gamma_{\pm 4} := \left\{ \left(t, -\frac{1}{2}\right) \mid t > \sqrt{R^2 - \frac{1}{4}} \right\}.$$

Consequently, the restriction of f on these components are given by

$$f|_{\Gamma_{\pm 1}} = t^2, \quad f|_{\Gamma_{\pm 2}} = t,$$

$$f|_{\Gamma_{\pm 3}} = f|_{\Gamma_{\pm 4}} = t^2 + \frac{1}{4}.$$

Thus

$$\lambda_{\pm 1} = \lambda_{\pm 2} = \lambda_{\pm 3} = \lambda_{\pm 4} = +\infty$$

The results presented in the previous section show that the set of global minimizers of f on S is nonempty compact and that

$$\inf_{(x,y)\in\mathbb{R}^2} f(x,y) = \min_{(x,y)\in\Sigma(f,S)} f(x,y) = f(0,0) = 0.$$

Furthermore, in light of Theorem 4.6, f is coercive.

Example 5.2. Let $S := \mathbb{R}^2$ and f(x, y) := x + y. Then, by simple calculations, we have

$$\Gamma(f,\mathbb{R}^2) = \{(x,y) \mid x = y\}$$

For R > 0, let $\Gamma_1 := \{(t,t) \mid t \ge R\}$ and let $\Gamma_2 := \{(-t,-t) \mid t \ge R\}$. Then we see that the restriction of f on these components are given by

$$f|_{\Gamma_1} = \sqrt{2t}, \quad f|_{\Gamma_2} - \sqrt{2t}.$$

So, we have

$$\lambda_1 = \lim_{t \to \infty} f|_{\Gamma_1} = +\infty, \quad \lambda_2 = \lim_{t \to \infty} f|_{\Gamma_2} = -\infty.$$

and thus, by Theorem 4.1, f is not bounded from below on S.

Example 5.3. Let $S := \mathbb{R}^2$ and $f(x, y) := (xy - 1)^2 + |y|$. We have $N((x, y); \mathbb{R}^2) = \{(0, 0)\}, \partial^{\infty} f(x, y) = \{(0, 0)\}$ (as f is locally Lipschitz) and

$$\partial f(x,y) = \begin{cases} \{(0,-2x+\xi) \mid \xi \in [-1,1]\} & \text{if } y = 0, \\ \{(2(xy-1)y,2(xy-1)x+1)\}, & \text{if } y > 0, \\ \{(2(xy-1)y,2(xy-1)x-1)\}, & \text{if } y < 0. \end{cases}$$

It follows that $\Sigma(f, \mathbb{R}^2) = \left[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right] \times \{0\}$ and

$$\Gamma(f, \mathbb{R}^2) = \Sigma(f, \mathbb{R}^2) \cup \{(x, y) \mid g_+(x, y) = 0, y > 0\} \cup \{(x, y) \mid g_-(x, y) = 0, y < 0\},\$$

where $g_{\pm}(x, y) := -2 x^3 y + 2 x y^3 \mp x + 2 x^2 - 2 y^2$. Then we can see that¹ for R large enough, the set $\Gamma(f, \mathbb{R}^2) \setminus \mathbb{B}_R$ has eight connected components:

$$\begin{split} \Gamma_{\sigma,1} : & x := (-t^{-1} - \frac{1}{2} \sigma t^2 + O(t^4)), & y := (-t^{-1} - \frac{1}{4} \sigma t^2 + O(t^4)), \\ \Gamma_{\sigma,2} : & x := (\frac{1}{3}t^{-1} + \frac{3}{2} \sigma t^2 + O(t^4)), & y := (-\frac{1}{3}t^{-1} + \frac{3}{4} \sigma t^2 + O(t^4)), \\ \Gamma_{\sigma,3} : & x := (-2t + 4t^3 + O(t^4)), & y := (-\frac{1}{2}t^{-1} - t + 2t^3 + O(t^4)), \\ \Gamma_{\sigma,4} : & x := (t^{-1} + 2t - \sigma t^2 - 4t^3 + O(t^4)), & y := (t - \frac{1}{2} \sigma t^2 - 2t^3 + 3\sigma t^4), \end{split}$$

where $\sigma = \pm 1$ and $t \to \pm 0$ for k = 1, 2, 3, and $t \to \pm 0$ for k = 4. Then substituting these expansions in f we get

$$\begin{split} f|_{\Gamma_{\sigma,1}} &= (t^{-4} - 2\,t^{-2} + \frac{1}{2}\,\sigma\,t^{-1} + 1 + O\,(t)), \\ f|_{\Gamma_{\sigma,2}} &= (\frac{1}{81}t^{-4} + \frac{2}{9}t^{-2} - \frac{5}{18}\,\sigma\,t^{-1} + 1 + O\,(t)), \\ f|_{\Gamma_{\sigma,3}} &= (-\frac{1}{2}\,\sigma\,t^{-1} - \sigma\,t + 2\,\sigma\,t^3 + O\,(t^4)), \\ f|_{\Gamma_{\sigma,4}} &= (\sigma\,t - \frac{1}{4}\,\sigma^2t^2 - 2\,\sigma\,t^3 + 2\,\sigma^2t^4 + O\,(t^5)). \end{split}$$

¹The computations are performed with the software Maple, using the command "puiseux" of the package "algcurves" for the rational Puiseux expansions.

It follows that

$$\lambda_{\sigma,1} = \lambda_{\sigma,2} = \lambda_{\sigma,3} = +\infty, \quad \lambda_{\sigma,4} = 0.$$

In light of Theorem 4.1, f is bounded from below. Note that

$$f|_{\Sigma(f,\mathbb{R}^2)} \equiv 1 > 0 = \min_{k=1,\dots,4} \lambda_{\sigma,k}.$$

Hence, by Theorem 4.4, f does not attain its infimum. In view of Theorem 4.3, we have

$$\inf_{(x,y)\in\mathbb{R}^2} f(x,y) = 0.$$

Furthermore, by Theorem 4.6, f is not coercive.

Example 5.4. Let $f(x, y) := \min\{x + y, 1\}$ and let $S := \mathbb{R}^2_+$. Then the function f is semialgebraic and (QC) holds. Note that the function f is continuous and concave. Then it follows from [8, Proposition 7] that we have

$$\partial f(x,y) = \begin{cases} \{(0,0)\} & \text{if } x+y > 1, \\ \{(0,0),(1,1)\}, & \text{if } x+y = 1, \\ \{(1,1)\}, & \text{if } x+y < 1. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, by a simple calculation, we see that

$$N((x,y);S) = \begin{cases} -\mathbb{R}^2_+ & \text{if } (x,y) = (0,0), \\ \{0\} \times (-\mathbb{R}_+), & \text{if } x > 0, \ y = 0, \\ -\mathbb{R}_+ \times \{0\}, & \text{if } x = 0, \ y > 0, \\ \{(0,0)\}, & \text{if } x > 0, \ y > 0, \end{cases}$$

and so,

$$\begin{split} \Gamma(f,S) &= & \{(x,y) \in S \mid x=y, \; x+y < 1\} \cup \{(x,y) \in S \mid \; x+y \geq 1\} \\ & \cup \{(x,y) \in S \mid \; x=0, \; y>0\} \cup \{(x,y) \in S \mid \; x>0, \; y=0\} \cup \{(0,0)\} \end{split}$$

Note that

$$\Sigma(f,S) = \{(x,y) \in S \mid x+y \ge 1\} \cup \{(0,0)\}$$

Now, for R > 1, let $\Gamma_1 := \Gamma(f, S) \setminus \mathbb{B}_R$. Then we have $f|_{\Gamma_1} \equiv 1$, and so $\lambda_1 = \lim_{t \to \infty} f|_{\Gamma_1} = 1$. Thus,

$$\min_{(x,y)\in\Sigma(f,S)}f(x,y)=0<1=\lambda_1.$$

By Theorem 4.5, the set of all optimal solutions of f on S is nonempty compact, that is $\{(0,0)\}$. Moreover, it follows from Theorem 4.6 that the function f is not coercive on S.

Example 5.5. Let $S := \mathbb{R}^2_+$. Consider the following function from \mathbb{R}^2 to \mathbb{R} :

$$f(x,y) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } (x,y) \in A, \\ 1, & \text{if } (x,y) \notin A, \end{cases}$$

where $A := \{(x, y) \mid x \in \mathbb{R}, y \ge 0\}$. Note that the function f is lower semi-continuous and semi-algebraic, but not local Lipschitz. Note also that Normal cone to S at x is same in Example 5.4. So, by a direct calculation, we see that

$$\partial f(x,y) = \begin{cases} \{0\} \times (-\mathbb{R}_+) & \text{if } x \ge 0, \ y = 0, \\ \{(0,0)\}, & \text{if } x \ge 0, \ y > 0. \end{cases}$$

and $\Gamma(f, S) = \mathbb{R}^2_+$. Let $\Gamma_1 := \Gamma(f, S) \setminus \mathbb{B}_R$ for R > 0. Then we have $f|_{\Gamma_1} \equiv 0$, and so, $\lambda_1 = \lim_{t \to \infty} f|_{\Gamma_1} = 0$. Note that $\Sigma(f, S) = \mathbb{R}^2_+$. Then we see that

$$\min_{(x,y)\in\Sigma(f,S)}f(x,y)=0=\lambda_1.$$

So, it follows from Theorem 4.4, f attains its infimum on S, that is, 0. Moreover, by Theorem 4.5, we see that the set of all optimal solutions of f on S is nonempty, but not compact.

References

- V. G. Andronov, E. G. Belousov, and V. M. Shironin. On solvability of the problem of polynomial programming. *Izvestija Akadem. Nauk SSSR*, *Tekhnicheskaja Kibernetika (in Russian)*, (4):194–197, 1982.
- [2] E. G. Belousov and D. Klatte. A Frank-Wolfe type theorem for convex polynomial programs. Comput. Optim. Appl., 22(1):37–48, 2002.
- [3] J. Bochnak, M. Coste, and M.-F. Roy. Real Algebraic Geometry, volume 36. Springer, Berlin, 1998.
- [4] J. M. Borwein. On the existence of pareto efficient points. Math. Oper. Res, 8:64–73, 1983.
- [5] S. T. Dinh, H. V. Hà, and T. S. Pham. A Frank–Wolfe type theorem for nondegenerate polynomial programs. *Math. Program. Ser. A.*, 147(1–2):519–538, 2014.
- [6] M. Frank and P. Wolfe. An algorithm for quadratic programming. Naval Res. Logist. Quart., 3:95–110, 1956.
- [7] H. V. Hà and T. S. Phạm. Genericity in Polynomial Optimization, volume 3 of Ser. Optim. Appl. World Scientific, Singapore, 2017.
- [8] A. D. Ioffe. Approximate subdifferentials and applications. i: The finite dimensional theory. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 281:389–416, 1984.
- [9] D. Klatte. On a frank-wolfe type theorem in cubic optimization. Optimization, 68(2-3):539–547, 2019.
- [10] K. B. Lee. On optimality conditions for nonsmooth vector optimization problems. Thesis for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, 2004.
- [11] D. T. Luc. An existence theorem in vector optimization. Math. Oper. Res., 14:693-699, 1989.
- [12] B. S. Mordukhovich. Variational Analysis and Generalized Differentiation, I: Basic Theory; II: Applications. Springer, Berlin, 2006.
- [13] B. S. Mordukhovich. Variational Analysis and Applications. Springer, New York, 2018.
- [14] T. S. Pham. Optimality conditions for minimizers at infinity in polynomial programming. Math. Oper. Res., 44(4):1381–1395, 2019
- [15] T. S. Pham. Tangencies and polynomial optimization. Math. Program. Ser. A., 199(1-2):1239-1272, 2023.
- [16] T. S. Pham. Local minimizers of semi-algebraic functions from the viewpoint of tangencies. SIAM J. Optim., 30(3):1777–1794, 2020.
- [17] R. T. Rockafellar and R. Wets. Variational Analysis, volume 317 of Grundlehren Math. Wiss. Springer, Berlin, 1998.

[18] L. van den Dries and C. Miller. Geometric categories and o-minimal structures. Duke Math. J., 84:497– 540, 1996.

DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS, PUKYONG NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, BUSAN 48513, KOREA *Email address*: mc7558@naver.com

DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS, PUKYONG NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, BUSAN 48513, KOREA *Email address*: gmlee@pknu.ac.kr

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, DALAT UNIVERSITY, 1 PHU DONG THIEN VUONG, DALAT, VIETNAM *Email address*: sonpt@dlu.edu.vn