

## 11 The cone of nonnegative univariate polynomials

Recall that  $P_{2d}$  is the cone of nonnegative polynomials (in one variable) of degree  $2d$ :

$$P_{2d} = \left\{ (p_0, \dots, p_{2d}) : \sum_{k=0}^{2d} p_k x^k \geq 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R} \right\}. \quad (1)$$

We saw last time that  $P_{2d}$  is a proper cone and that it has the following *semidefinite representation*:

$$p \in P_{2d} \iff \exists M \in \mathbf{S}_+^{d+1} \text{ s.t. } \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i, j \leq d \\ i+j=k}} M_{ij} = p_k. \quad (2)$$

This means that any conic program over  $P_{2d}$  is actually a semidefinite program.

**Duality** For any  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  consider the vector  $y_x \in \mathbb{R}^{2d+1}$  defined by:

$$y_x = (1, x, x^2, \dots, x^{2d}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d+1}. \quad (3)$$

Let  $M_{2d}$  be the curve drawn by these vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^{2d+1}$ , known as the *moment curve* of degree  $2d$ :

$$M_{2d} = \{y_x : x \in \mathbb{R}\}. \quad (4)$$

Observe that the definition (1) of  $P_{2d}$  simply expresses that  $P_{2d}$  is the dual cone<sup>1</sup> of  $M_{2d}$ , i.e.,

$$P_{2d} = M_{2d}^*.$$

By the biduality theorem for closed convex cones (Theorem 2.3, cf. also footnote 1) we thus get automatically that

$$P_{2d}^* = \text{cl cone}(M_{2d}). \quad (5)$$

The vectors  $y_x$ , when interpreted as linear forms on the space of polynomials, correspond to *point evaluations*. Indeed if  $p$  is a polynomial of degree  $2d$  with coefficients  $(p_0, \dots, p_{2d})$ , then the inner product  $\langle p, y_x \rangle$  is nothing but  $p(x)$ , the *point evaluation* of  $p$  at  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . It is clear that point evaluations  $y_x$  live in  $P_{2d}^*$  (since the point evaluation of any nonnegative polynomial at  $x$  gives a nonnegative number). Equation (5) tells us that (up to closure) any element in  $P_{2d}^*$  is a nonnegative combination of point evaluations.

**Remark 1** (Remark on the closure in (5)). *The cone generated by the moment curve  $M_{2d}$  is not closed in general and so we cannot remove the closure operation in (5). For example one can verify  $(0, 0, 1) \in \text{cl}(\text{cone}(M_2)) \setminus \text{cone}(M_2)$ : indeed, on the one hand it is not possible to write  $(0, 0, 1)$  as a conic combination of the  $\{y_x : x \in \mathbb{R}\}$ , and on the other hand we have  $(0, 0, 1) = \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{x^2} y_x$ . The main reason why  $\text{cone}(M_{2d})$  is not closed is because we are allowing  $x$  to be arbitrarily large on the real line. If we restrict  $x$  in the definition of the moment curve (4) to live in a compact interval  $x \in [a, b]$  then the cone would be closed in this case.*

<sup>1</sup>In lecture 2 we only defined the dual of a *cone*; however the definition works for any set  $S$ : the dual of a set  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  is  $\{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle y, x \rangle \geq 0 \quad \forall x \in S\}$ . Theorem 2.3 easily extends to show that for any set  $S$ ,  $S^{**} = \text{cl cone}(S)$ .

**Moment interpretation of  $P_{2d}^*$**  Consider the following question, called the (truncated) *moment problem*: given numbers  $(y_0, y_1, \dots, y_{2d}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d+1}$ , does there exist a nonnegative measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  such that  $\int x^k d\mu(x) = y_k$  for all  $k = 0, \dots, 2d$ ? If the answer is yes we will say that  $y$  is a *valid moment vector*. It is clear that not any vector  $y \in \mathbb{R}^{2d+1}$  is a valid moment vector. For example we must have  $y_k \geq 0$  for any  $k$  even. Also we must have  $y_2 + (y_0 - 2)y_1^2 \geq 0$  since  $y_2 + (y_0 - 2)y_1^2 = \int (x - y_1)^2 d\mu(x) \geq 0$ . What other inequalities must be true? If  $p$  is any polynomial nonnegative on  $\mathbb{R}$  then we must have  $\int p(x) d\mu(x) \geq 0$ . If we let  $p = (p_0, \dots, p_{2d})$  be the coefficients of this polynomial this means we must have:

$$0 \leq \int p(x) d\mu(x) = \int \sum_{k=0}^{2d} p_k x^k d\mu(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{2d} p_k \int x^k d\mu(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{2d} p_k y_k.$$

In other words if  $y$  is a valid moment vector then we must have

$$\langle p, y \rangle \geq 0 \quad \forall p \in P_{2d}.$$

This means, by definition of dual cone, that  $y \in P_{2d}^*$ . Note that the vectors  $y_x$  defined in (3) are actually valid moment vectors:  $y_x$  is simply the moment vector for the Dirac probability measure  $\delta_x$  that puts all its mass at  $\{x\}$ . Any conic combination of these vectors is a valid moment vector. Indeed if  $y = \sum_{i=1}^N p_i y_{x_i}$  where  $p_1, \dots, p_N \geq 0$ , then  $y$  is the moment vector of the nonnegative atomic measure  $\sum_{i=1}^N p_i \delta_{x_i}$ . It thus follows that any element of  $\text{conv}(y_x : x \in \mathbb{R})$  is a valid moment vector. To summarise we have the following duality picture:

nonnegative polynomials of degree $\leq 2d$	$\xleftrightarrow{\text{duality}}$	moment vectors $(y_0, \dots, y_{2d})$ of nonnegative measures (up to closure)
--	------------------------------------	---

Let us try to push this duality picture further. We have seen that if  $p$  is a polynomial of degree  $2d$  then the minimum of  $p$  over  $\mathbb{R}$  can be expressed as:

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}} p(x) = \max_{\gamma} \gamma : p - \gamma \in P_{2d}.$$

The maximization problem on the right-hand side is a conic program over  $P_{2d}$  that is strictly feasible. Let us try to write its dual. Let  $y \in P_{2d}^*$  denote our dual variable for the constraint  $p - \gamma \in P_{2d}$  which allows us to write  $\langle p - \gamma, y \rangle \geq 0$ , i.e.,  $\gamma y_0 \leq \langle p, y \rangle$ . Since we are interested in the objective function  $\gamma$ , we want  $y_0 = 1$  and so the dual problem becomes:

$$\min_y \langle p, y \rangle \quad \text{s.t.} \quad y \in P_{2d}^*, y_0 = 1. \tag{6}$$

We know that elements of  $P_{2d}^*$  correspond (up to closure) to moments of nonnegative measures. Requiring that  $y_0 = 1$  means we are restricting ourselves to *probability* measures. Thus problem (6) is equivalent to

$$\min \int p d\mu \quad : \quad \mu \text{ probability measure on } \mathbb{R}. \tag{7}$$

It is interesting to compare (7) to the problem  $\min\{p(x) : x \in \mathbb{R}\}$ . It is not hard to see that the two have the same value: indeed let  $p^* = \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}} p(x)$  and  $x^*$  be a minimizer of  $p$ . Then clearly for any nonnegative probability measure on  $\mathbb{R}$  we have  $\int p d\mu(x) \geq \int p^* d\mu(x) = p^*$  and so the value of (7) is greater than or equal  $p^*$ . Now if we choose  $\mu = \delta_{x^*}$  then the value of  $\int p d\mu$  is equal to  $p^*$ . Thus this shows that the optimal value of (7) is indeed  $p^*$ .

Note that even though  $p$  can be a complicated nonconvex polynomial, problem (7) has a linear objective function (in  $\mu$ ), irrespective of what  $p$  is. However (7) is an infinite-dimensional problem since the underlying space is the space of measures on  $\mathbb{R}$ . Note that the objective function of (7) only depends on the moments up to degree  $2d$  of the measure  $\mu$ . Problem (6) can be seen as a finite-dimensional “projection” of (7) where we only work with the moments, up to degree  $2d$ , of these measures.