## 11 The cone of nonnegative univariate polynomials

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

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

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

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

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

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

$$M_{2d} = \{y_x : x \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

$$\tag{4}$$

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

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

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  $(p_0, \ldots, p_{2d})$ , 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  $(0,0,1) \in \operatorname{cl}(\operatorname{cone}(M_2)) \setminus \operatorname{cone}(M_2)$ : 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  $(0,0,1) = \lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{1}{x^2}y_x$ . The main reason why  $\operatorname{cone}(M_{2d})$  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>&</sup>lt;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  $\{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle y, x \rangle \ge 0 \ \forall x \in S\}$ . Theorem 2.3 easily extends to show that for any set S,  $S^{**} = \text{cl} \text{ cone}(S)$ .

Moment interpretation of  $P_{2d}^*$  Consider the following question, called the (truncated) moment problem: given numbers  $(y_0, y_1, \ldots, y_{2d}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d+1}$ , does there exist a nonnegative measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  such that  $\int x^k d\mu(x) = y_k$  for all  $k = 0, \ldots, 2d$ ? 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  $y_k \ge 0$  for any k even. Also we must have  $y_2 + (y_0 - 2)y_1^2 \ge 0$  since  $y_2 + (y_0 - 2)y_1^2 = \int (x - y_1)^2 d\mu(x) \ge 0$ . What other inequalities must be true? If p is any polynomial nonnegative on  $\mathbb{R}$  then we must have  $\int p(x)d\mu(x) \ge 0$ . If we let  $p = (p_0, \ldots, p_{2d})$  be the coefficients of this polynomial this means we must have:

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

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

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

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  $p_1, \ldots, p_N \ge 0$ , 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  $\operatorname{conv}(y_x : x \in \mathbb{R})$  is a valid moment vector. To summarise we have the following duality picture:

nonnegative polynomials of degree $\leq 2d$	$\stackrel{duality}{\longleftrightarrow}$	moment vectors $(y_0, \ldots, y_{2d})$ 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:

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

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  $\langle p - \gamma, y \rangle \ge 0$ , i.e.,  $\gamma y_0 \le \langle p, y \rangle$ . Since we are interested in the objective function  $\gamma$ , we want  $y_0 = 1$  and so the dual problem becomes:

$$\min_{y} \langle p, y \rangle \quad \text{s.t.} \quad y \in P_{2d}^*, \ y_0 = 1.$$
(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 
$$\int pd\mu$$
 :  $\mu$  probability measure on  $\mathbb{R}$ . (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  $\int pd\mu(x) \geq \int p^*d\mu(x) = p^*$  and so the value of (7) is greater than or equal  $p^*$ . Now if we choose  $\mu = \delta_{x^*}$  then the value of  $\int pd\mu$  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.