

Divide and conquer roadmap for algebraic sets

SAUGATA BASU

Department of Mathematics
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907
USA

Email: sbasu@math.purdue.edu

MARIE-FRANÇOISE ROY

IRMAR (URA CNRS 305)
Universite de Rennes 1
Campus de Beaulieu
35042 Rennes, cedex
France

Email: marie-francoise.roy@univ-rennes1.fr

Abstract

Let $\mathbb{R}$ be a real closed field, and $\mathbb{D} \subset \mathbb{R}$ an ordered domain. We describe an algorithm that given as input a polynomial $P \in \mathbb{D}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$, and a finite set, A , of points contained in $V = \text{Zer}(P, \mathbb{R}^k)$, computes a roadmap of V containing A . The complexity of the algorithm, measured by the number of arithmetic operations in $\mathbb{D}$, is bounded by $(kd)^{\tilde{O}(k)}$, where $d = \deg(P)$, where we also assume that the $\text{card}(A)$, as well as the degrees of the univariate representations describing the points in A , are both bounded by $d^{O(k)}$. The size of the output, as well as the degrees of the polynomials appearing in the output, are also bounded by $(kd)^{\tilde{O}(k)}$. Given that the number of semi-algebraically connected components of such a variety could be as large as $(\Omega(d))^k$, this complexity can be considered to be quasi-optimal. The best previous algorithm for this problem had complexity $O(d^{k^{3/2}})$ [3]. As an application of our result we prove that for any real algebraic subset V of $\mathbb{R}^k$ defined by a polynomial of degree d , and any connected component C of V contained in the unit ball, the maximum length and complexity of a semi-algebraic path with image in C that is needed to connect any two points of C is bounded by $(kd)^{\tilde{O}(k)}$. While it was known previously, by a result of Kurdyka and D'Acunto [6], that there always exists a path of length $(O(d))^{k-1}$ connecting two such points, there was no upper bound on the complexity of such a path.

1 Introduction

Let $\mathbb{R}$ be a fixed real closed field and $\mathbb{D} \subset \mathbb{R}$ an ordered domain. We consider in this paper the algorithmic problem of given a polynomial $Q \in \mathbb{D}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$ determining the number of semi-algebraically connected components of the set, $\text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k)$, of zeros of Q in $\mathbb{R}^k$. Moreover, given two points $x, y \in \text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k)$, described by real univariate representations (see Section 7 below for precise definition), we would like to decide if x, y belongs to the same semi-algebraically connected component of $\text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k)$, and if so, to compute a semi-algebraic path with image contained in $\text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k)$, connecting them. We measure the complexity of an algorithm by the number of arithmetic operations performed in the ring $\mathbb{D}$.

This problem is very well studied in algorithmic semi-algebraic geometry with a fairly long history. It follows from Collin's algorithm for computing cylindrical algebraic decomposition [5] (see also [15]) that this problem can be solved with complexity $d^{2^{O(k)}}$, where $d = \deg Q$. Notice that this complexity is doubly exponential in k . Singly exponential algorithms for solving this problem was given by Canny in [4] and successively refined in [9],[10],[1]. However, even the best singly exponential time algorithms for solving

this problem remained unsatisfactory from the complexity point of view for the following reason. It is a classical result due to Oleĭnik and Petrovskiĭ [13], Thom [16] and Milnor [12] that the number of semi-algebraically connected components of a real algebraic variety in $\mathbb{R}^k$ defined by polynomials of degree at most d (in fact, the sum of all the Betti numbers of the variety) is bounded by $d(2d-1)^{k-1} = O(d)^k$. Indeed, the Morse-theoretic proof of this fact had inspired the so called “critical point” method, that is at the base of many algorithms in semi-algebraic geometry. The best algorithms using the critical point method usually have complexity $d^{O(k)}$ when applied to real algebraic varieties defined by polynomials of degree d . In light of the bound on the number of semi-algebraically connected components mentioned before, this complexity can be considered to be nearly optimal. Problems for which such a nearly optimal algorithm is known include testing emptiness, computing at least one point in every connected component, polynomial optimization and computing the Euler-Poincare characteristics of a given variety (see for example, [2]). However, in the case of counting the number of semi-algebraically connected components and computing semi-algebraic paths, such a nearly optimal algorithm is not known.

All known singly exponential algorithm for deciding connectivity relies on computing a certain one dimensional semi-algebraic subset, say of $\text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k)$, which is customarily now referred to as a *roadmap* (say M) of $\text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k)$. The classical definition of a roadmap of an arbitrary semi-algebraic set S (not just a real variety) is as follows.

Definition 1. A roadmap for S is a semi-algebraic set M of dimension at most one contained in S which satisfies the following roadmap conditions:

- RM₁ For every semi-algebraically connected component D of S , $D \cap M$ is semi-algebraically connected.
- RM₂ For every $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and for every semi-algebraically connected component D' of $S_x = S \cap \pi_1^{-1}(\{x\})$, $D' \cap M \neq \emptyset$, where $\pi_1: \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the projection on the first co-ordinate. $\square$

The singly exponential algorithms that we have referred to above compute a roadmap of a given semi-algebraic or algebraic set containing any finite set of points supplied at the input. Once such a roadmap is computed with singly exponential size, questions about connectivity are reduced to the same questions in a finite graph, and can be answered with complexity no greater than (polynomials in) the size of the roadmap itself. Moreover, all these algorithms for computing roadmaps follow a certain paradigm which can be roughly described as follows. Given a semi-algebraic set $V \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ (might be assumed to satisfy certain additional properties, such as being a bounded, non-singular hypersurface), one defines

- i. a certain semi-algebraic subset $V^0 \subset V$, with dimension of V^0 bounded by $p < k$,
- ii. a finite subset of points of $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathbb{R}^p$.

The set V^0 and the finite set $\mathcal{N}$ are not arbitrary but must satisfy certain intricate conditions. A crucial mathematical result is then proved that says, that for any semi-algebraically connected component C of V , $C \cap (V^0 \cup V_{\mathcal{N}})$ is non-empty and semi-algebraically connected, where $V_{\mathcal{N}} = V \cap \pi_{[1,p]}^{-1}(\mathcal{N})$ and $\pi_{[1,p]}: \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ is the projection on the first p co-ordinates (see, for example, Proposition 15.7 in [2] for the special case when $p=1$, Theorem 14 in [7], Proposition 3 in [3], or Proposition 14 of the current paper).

The actual algorithm then proceeds by reducing the problem of computing the roadmap of V to computing the roadmaps of V^0 and the fibers $V_{\mathcal{N}}$, each such roadmap containing a well chosen set of points containing the intersection of V^0 and the fibers

in $V_{\mathcal{N}}$. These roadmaps of the smaller sets are either computed using a recursive method or calling a different algorithm. The important difference between the different algorithms which results in difference in complexities is related to the different choices of the parameter p , and the complexities of the different methods used to compute roadmaps of V^0 and $V_{\mathcal{N}}$. For example, in the classical algorithm (see, for example, Chapter 15, [2]), $p = 1$, and thus V^0 has dimension at most one, and is already a roadmap of itself. The complexity of this algorithm for computing the roadmap of an algebraic set $V \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ defined by a polynomial of degree d is $d^{O(k^2)}$. The exponent of $O(k^2)$ (compared to $O(k)$ in the nearly optimal algorithms mentioned above) in the complexity of algorithms for computing roadmaps remained a very difficult obstacle to overcome for many years, and the first progress was reported only very recently.

Inspired by ideas introduced in [7] where the authors give a probabilistic algorithm for computing roadmaps of smooth bounded hypersurfaces of degree d with complexity $d^{O(k^{3/2})}$, a fully general, deterministic algorithm with the same complexity was given in [3]. In this *Baby-step Giant-step* algorithm, the parameter p (from the last paragraph) is chosen to be equal to $\approx \sqrt{k}$, the roadmaps of the fibers are computed recursively using the same algorithm, while that of V^0 is computed using the classical algorithm. The main reason for having such an unbalanced approach, and not using recursion to compute a roadmap of V^0 as well, is that the good properties of V under which the mathematical connectivity result is proved, are not inherited by V^0 . In [3] the difficulty related to maintaining the good property in the induction is avoided by making a call to the classical roadmap for V^0 . The classical roadmap algorithm which has complexity $d^{O(k^2)}$ can be modified so that its complexity is $d^{O(pk)}$ for algebraic sets of dimension at most p . However, any further improvement seems to be a difficult problem. One is thus forced to have an unbalanced approach where the dimension p of V^0 is much smaller (roughly $p = \sqrt{k}$) compared to the dimension of the various fibers (roughly $k - \sqrt{k}$), which remain hypersurfaces, assuming that V is a hypersurface. The complexity of this Baby-step Giant-step algorithm is bounded by $d^{O(pk)} = d^{O(\sqrt{k}k)}$. It is reasonable to hope that a more balanced algorithm in which $p \approx k/2$, and where the roadmaps of both V^0 and $V_{\mathcal{N}}$ are computed recursively using the same algorithm, by a divide-and-conquer method, can compute a roadmap with quasi-optimal complexity $d^{\tilde{O}(k)}$.

We prove the following theorem which is the main result of this paper.

Theorem 2. *Let $\mathbb{R}$ be a real closed field and $\mathbb{D} \subset \mathbb{R}$ an ordered domain. There exists:*

- *an algorithm that given as input a polynomial $P \in \mathbb{D}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$, and a finite set A , with $\text{card}(A) = d^{O(k)}$, of real univariate representations of degrees bounded by $d^{O(k)}$, whose associated set, $\mathcal{A}$, of points are contained in $V = \text{Zer}(P, \mathbb{R}^k)$, computes a roadmap of V containing A . The complexity of the algorithm is bounded by $(k^{\log(k)} d)^{O(k \log^2(k))}$. The size of the output as well as the degrees of the polynomials appearing in the descriptions of the curve segments and points in the output are bounded by the $(k^{\log(k)} d)^{O(k \log(k))}$.*
- *an algorithm for counting the number of semi-algebraically connected components of V using $(k^{\log(k)} d)^{k \log^2(k)}$ arithmetic operations in $\mathbb{D}$.*
- *an algorithm for deciding whether two given points belong to the same semi-algebraically connected component of V , and if so computing a description of a semi-algebraic path connecting them with image contained in V , using $(k^{\log(k)} d)^{k \log^2(k)}$ arithmetic operations in $\mathbb{D}$. The size of the output as well as the degrees of the polynomials appearing in the descriptions of the curve segments and points in the output are bounded by the $(k^{\log(k)} d)^{O(k \log(k))}$.*

The bounds on the complexity of roadmap given in Theorem 2 gives an upper bound on the length of a semi-algebraic curve required to connect two points in the same connected component of a real algebraic variety in $\mathbb{R}^k$. In [6], the authors proved that the geodesic diameter of any connected component C of a real algebraic variety in $\mathbb{R}^k$ defined by a polynomial of degree d and contained inside the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^k$, is bounded by $(O(d))^{k-1}$. This result guarantees the existence of a semi-algebraic path connecting any two points in C of length bounded by $(O(d))^{k-1}$. Unfortunately, however, the complexity of this path (namely, the number and degrees of the polynomials needed to define it) is not uniformly bounded as a function of k and d . We obtain a path of quasi-optimal length, namely $(kd)^{\tilde{O}(k)}$, but moreover with uniformly bounded complexity. We have the following theorem.

Theorem 3. *Let $V \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ be a real algebraic variety defined by a polynomial of degree at most d , and let C be a connected component of V contained in the unit ball centered at the origin. Then, any two points $x, y \in C$, can be connected by a semi-algebraic path of length at most $(k^{\log k} d)^{O(k \log k)}$ consisting of at most $(k^{\log k} d)^{O(k \log k)}$ curve segments of degrees bounded by $(k^{\log k} d)^{O(k \log k)}$.*

Note that the algebraic case dealt with in this paper is usually the main building block in designing roadmap algorithms for more general semi-algebraic sets (see for example Chapter 16 in [2]). However, this usually involves certain further technical complications which we have chosen not to deal with in the current paper. We believe that with extra effort, the improvement in the algebraic case reported here could lead to a corresponding improvement in the general semi-algebraic setting.

We prove Theorem 2 by giving a divide-and-conquer algorithm for computing a roadmap based on two recursive calls to subvarieties whose dimensions are at most half the dimension on the given variety V (see Algorithms 7 and 8 in Section 6 below).

Such a divide-and-conquer roadmap algorithm would be quite simple if it was the case that the sub-varieties of V obtained by iterating the following two operations in any order:

1. taking the sub-variety consisting of the set of critical points of G in the fibers of V with respect to a subset of the coordinates
2. fixing a subset of coordinates (i.e. taking fibers of V)

had good properties (such as the number of critical points of G remains finite as the parameters vary)

Indeed, then, the following simple algorithm constructing a roadmap would work, supposing for simplicity that $k-1$ is a power of 2. Namely, in the very first step consider the projection map, $\pi_{[1, p/2]}$, to the first $p/2$ coordinates, where $p = \dim V = (k-1)$. For every $y \in \mathbb{R}^{p/2}$, let $V_y = V \cap \pi^{-1}(\{y\})$ be the corresponding fiber and let $V_y^0 \subset V_y$ be the set of critical points of G restricted to V_y and $V^0 = \bigcup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^{p/2}} V_y^0$. Let $\mathcal{M} \subset V$ be the set of G -critical points of V , and $\mathcal{M}^0$ the (assumed finite) G -critical points of V^0 . Let $\mathcal{N} = \pi(\mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{M}^0)$. It can be proved, using a topological connectivity argument, that a roadmap of V can be obtained by taking the union of roadmap of V^0 passing through the points of V^0 above $\mathcal{N}$, as well as for each $y \in \mathcal{N}$, a roadmap of the fiber V_y containing the points of V^0 above y . Both V^0 and the V_y , $y \in \mathcal{N}$, are of dimension $p/2$. If $p/2 = 1$, then the roadmaps of V^0 and the V_y , $y \in \mathcal{N}$ coincide with themselves. Otherwise, these roadmaps can then be computed by recursive calls to the same algorithm.

The description given above, that we are using as a guide, is flawed in a fundamental way. We know of no way to ensure that all the intermediate varieties that occur in the course of the algorithm have good properties even if the original variety V has good properties.

In order to get around this difficulty we use perturbation techniques (as done in several other prior work on computing roadmaps). The main difficulty is to ensure that good properties is preserved for the variety V^0 as we go down in the recursion.

In the divide-and-conquer scheme pursued in this paper, it is imperative, for complexity reasons, that V^0 and the fibers V_y have the same dimension (namely $1/2 \dim(V)$). So we cannot resort to the classical roadmap algorithm for V^0 any more and we need to ensure good properties for V^0 (which is no more an hypersurface even if V is) as well.

While the general scheme – that of making perturbations to reach an ideal situation – is similar to that used in [3] for the Baby-step Giant-step algorithm (and indeed in all prior algorithms) for computing roadmaps, there are many new ideas involved which we list below. We start the construction with an algebraic hypersurface V , defined as the zero set of one single equation P .

1. We make a deformation $\tilde{P}$ of P and consider the algebraic set $\tilde{V}$ defined by $\tilde{P}$ with coefficients in a new field $\tilde{\mathbb{R}}$.
2. Instead of considering critical points of the projection map on to a fixed coordinate, we consider critical points of a well chosen fixed polynomial G . This is done to ensure more genericity. Geometrically, this implies that instead of “sweeping a hyperplane orthogonal to an axis” we are going to sweep using the level surfaces of the polynomial G .
3. For every $y \in \tilde{\mathbb{R}}^{p/2}$, let $\tilde{V}^0 \subset \tilde{V}_y$ be the set of critical points of G restricted to $\tilde{V}_y$ and $\tilde{V}^0 = \cup_{y \in \tilde{\mathbb{R}}^{p/2}} \tilde{V}_y^0$. The subvariety $\tilde{V}^0$ is naturally described as the projection of some other variety involving extra variables. This causes a problem, since we need an explicit description of $\tilde{V}^0$ in order to be able to make a recursive call. We are able to express $\tilde{V}^0$ as the union of several pieces (charts), each described as a basic constructible set of the form

$$\bigwedge_{P \in \mathcal{P}} (P = 0) \wedge (Q \neq 0).$$

4. The preceding decomposition of $\tilde{V}^0$ into open charts is not very easy to use, so we modify the description using instead closed sets (by shrinking slightly the constructible sets). We are able to express (an approximation of) $\tilde{V}^0$ as a union of basic semi-algebraic sets of the form

$$\bigwedge_{P \in \mathcal{P}} (P = 0) \wedge (Q \geq 0).$$

5. This necessitates that in our recursive calls we accept as inputs not just varieties, but basic semi-algebraic sets.

6. The Morse theoretical connectivity results needed to prove the correctness of the new algorithms needs to be extended to take into account the two new features mentioned above. Namely, the fact that instead of considering projection map to a fixed coordinate, we are using the polynomial G as the “Morse function”. Secondly, instead of varieties we need to deal with more general semi-algebraic sets. We extend the notion of “special values” introduced in [1] to take into account the polynomial G , and prove the required Morse theoretical lemmas in this new setting.

7. The covering mentioned above means that we are replacing each semi-algebraic set, by several basic semi-algebraic sets, whose union of limit co-incides with the given set. In order that the union of the limits of the roadmaps computed for each of the new sets give a roadmap of the original one, we need to make sure that the roadmaps of the new sets contain certain carefully chosen points. Very roughly speaking these points will correspond to a finite number of pairs of closest points realizing the locally minimal distance between any two semi-algebraically connected components of the new sets.
8. The construction requires us to make a new perturbation using four infinitesimals at each level of the recursion. Since, there will be at most $O(\log k)$ levels, at the end we will be doing computations in a ring with $O(\log k)$ infinitesimals. At the end of the algorithm we will need to compute limits of the curves computed, and we show that this limit can be computed within the claimed complexity bound. For this the fact that we have only $O(\log k)$ infinitesimals, and not more, is crucial.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we state some basic results of Morse theory for higher co-dimensional non-singular varieties, including definitions of critical points on basic semi-algebraic sets and their properties.

In Section 3, we prove the connectivity results that we will require. We introduce a set of axioms (to be satisfied by a basic semi-algebraic set S and certain subsets of S) and prove an abstract connectivity result (Proposition 14) which forms the basis of the roadmap algorithm in this paper. The main differences between Proposition 14 and a similar result in [3] (Proposition 3.3.) is that Proposition 14 applies to basic semi-algebraic sets (not just to smooth algebraic hypersurfaces) and also that there is an auxiliary polynomial G which plays the role of the X_1 -co-ordinate in [3].

In Section 4, we discuss certain specific infinitesimal deformations that we will use in order to ensure that the properties defined in Section 3 hold. In Section 4.1, we explain a deformation techniques to reach general position and prove that the set of G -critical points is finite for a certain well chosen polynomial G . The results of this section are adapted from [11]. In Section 4.2, we define the special values with respect to a given polynomial G and state their connectivity properties, generalizing in this context results from [2]. In Section 4.3, we discuss show how the deformations are used to ensure the connectivity properties defined in Section 3.

Section 5 is devoted to a description of the set of G -critical points using minors and its properties.

Section 6 is devoted to the description of the Divide and Conquer Roadmap Algorithm. We define the tree that is computed, and describe the Divide and Conquer Algorithm first for the bounded case (Algorithm 7), and then in general (Algorithm 8).

In the annex (Section 7), we include certain technical proofs of propositions about results on G -critical points and G -special values used in the paper.

2 Critical points of algebraic and basic semi-algebraic sets

In this section we define critical points of a polynomial first on an algebraic set and then on a basic semi-algebraic set and discuss their properties.

2.1 Critical points of algebraic sets

Definition 4. Let $G \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$ and $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, \dots, P_m\} \subset \mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$ be a finite family of polynomials.

We say that x is a G -critical point of $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}, \mathbb{R}^k)$, if it is a point of $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}, \mathbb{R}^k)$ such that there exists $\lambda = (\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_m) \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ satisfying the system of equations $\text{CritEq}(\mathcal{P}, G)$

$$\begin{aligned} P_j &= 0, j = 1, \dots, m \\ \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \frac{\partial P_j}{\partial X_i} - \lambda_0 \frac{\partial G}{\partial X_i} &= 0, i = 1, \dots, k \\ \sum_{j=0}^m \lambda_j^2 - 1 &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

The set $\text{Crit}(\mathcal{P}, G) \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ is the set of G -critical points of $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}, \mathbb{R}^k)$, i.e. the projection on $\mathbb{R}^k$ of $\text{Zer}(\text{CritEq}(\mathcal{P}, G), \mathbb{R}^{k+m+1})$. Note that geometrically, in the case the polynomials $\mathcal{P}$ define a non-singular complete intersection, $\text{Crit}(\mathcal{P}, G)$ is the set of points $x \in \text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}, \mathbb{R}^k)$, such that the tangent space at x of $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}, \mathbb{R}^k)$ is orthogonal to $\text{grad}(G)(x)$. $\square$

2.2 Critical points of basic semi-algebraic sets

Notation 5. Given two finite families of polynomials $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$, we denote by $\text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$ the basic semi-algebraic set defined by

$$\text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}) = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^k \mid \bigwedge_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P(x) = 0 \wedge \bigwedge_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} Q(x) \geq 0 \right\}. \quad \square$$

Definition 6. Let $G \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$. We define $\text{Crit}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}, G)$ with $\text{card}(\mathcal{P}) \text{card}(\mathcal{Q}) \leq k$, the set of G -critical points of $\text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$ by

$$\text{Crit}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}, G) = \text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}) \cap \left(\bigcup_{\mathcal{Q}' \subset \mathcal{Q}} \text{Crit}(\mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{Q}', G) \right). \quad \square$$

Definition 7. We say that the pair $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$, is *in general position with respect to* $G \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$ if for any subset $\mathcal{Q}' \subset \mathcal{Q}$, $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{Q}', \mathbb{R}^k)$ is bounded and $\text{Crit}(\mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{Q}', G) \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ is empty or finite. $\square$

The properties of G -critical points used later in the paper are now given. The proofs, which are slight variant of classical proofs, are included in Section 7.

Notation 8. Let $T \subset \mathbb{R}^k$, G a mapping from $\mathbb{R}^k$ to $\mathbb{R}$, $a \in \mathbb{R}$. We denote

$$\begin{aligned} T_{G=a} &= \{x \in T \mid G(x) = a\}, \\ T_{G \leq a} &= \{x \in T \mid G(x) \leq a\}, \\ T_{G < a} &= \{x \in T \mid G(x) < a\}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Let $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$, $S = \text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$, S bounded, $\mathcal{M} = \text{Crit}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}, G)$. We need the following two Morse-theoretic lemmas whose proofs are postponed till later in Section 7.

Lemma 9. Suppose that $b \notin \mathcal{D} = G(\mathcal{M})$. Let C be a semi-algebraically connected component of $S_{G \leq b}$. If $a < b$ and $(a, b] \cap \mathcal{D}$ is empty, then $C_{G \leq a}$ is semi-algebraically connected.

Now assume that $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}$ are in general position with respect to G .

Lemma 10. Let C be a semi-algebraically connected component of $S_{G \leq b}$, such that $C_{G=b}$ is not empty.

1. If $\dim(C) = 0$, C is a point contained in $\mathcal{M}$.

2. If $\dim(C) \neq 0$, $C_{G < b}$ is non-empty. Let $B_1, \dots, B_r$ be the semi-algebraically connected components of $C_{G < b}$. Then,

- a. for each $i, 1 \leq i \leq r$, $\overline{B_i} \cap \mathcal{M} \neq \emptyset$;
- b. if there exist $i, j, 1 \leq i < j \leq r$ such that $\overline{B_i} \cap \overline{B_j} \neq \emptyset$, then $\overline{B_i} \cap \overline{B_j} \subset \mathcal{M}$;
- c. $\cup_{i=1}^r \overline{B_i} = C$, and hence $\cup_{i=1}^r \overline{B_i}$ is semi-algebraically connected.

3 Axiomatics for connectivity

In this subsection we identify a set of properties, to be satisfied by a basic semi-algebraic set $\text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$, a polynomial G , and certain finite subsets of points contained in $\text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$, and prove a key connectivity for such a situation which plays a key role in our recursive algorithm later. In Section 4 we will explain how to use a perturbation technique to reach the ideal situation described here.

Notation 11. Let $\pi_{[1, \ell]}$ be the projection map from $\mathbb{R}^k$ to $\mathbb{R}^\ell$ forgetting the last $k - \ell$ coordinates. For every $T \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ and $A \subset \mathbb{R}^\ell$, let $T_A := T \cap \pi_{[1, \ell]}^{-1}(A)$. For $w \in \mathbb{R}^\ell$, let $T_w := T \cap \pi_{[1, \ell]}^{-1}(\{w\})$. $\square$

Definition 12. Let $1 \leq \ell < k$, $G \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$, and $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$ be in general position with respect to G . Let $S = \text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$ and $\mathcal{M} = \text{Crit}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}, G)$ be the finite set of critical points of G on S .

- Let $S^0 \subset S$ denote a semi-algebraic set such that for every $w \in \mathbb{R}^\ell$, S_w^0 is a finite (possibly empty) set of points meeting every semi-algebraically connected component of S_w , and S_w^0 contains a minimizer of G over each semi-algebraically connected component of S_w .
- Let $\mathcal{D}^0 \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a finite set of values satisfying for every interval $[a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $c \in [a, b]$, with $\{c\} \supset \mathcal{D}^0 \cap [a, b]$, if D is a semi-algebraically connected component of $S_{a \leq G \leq b}^0$ then $D_{G=c}$ is a semi-algebraically connected component of $S_{G=c}^0$.
- Let $\mathcal{M}^0 \subset S^0$ be a finite set of points satisfying:
 - a) $G(\mathcal{M}^0) = \mathcal{D}^0$,
 - b) $\mathcal{M}^0$ meets every semi-algebraically connected component of $S_{G=a}^0$ for all $a \in \mathcal{D}^0$.

We say that a tuple $(S, \mathcal{M}, \ell, S^0, \mathcal{D}^0, \mathcal{M}^0)$ is *special* if it satisfies the properties listed above. $\square$

Definition 13. For a semi-algebraic subset $S \subset T$, we say that S has *good connectivity property* with respect to T , if the intersection of S with every semi-algebraically connected component of T is non-empty and semi-algebraically connected. $\square$

With the definition introduced above we have the following key result which generalizes Proposition 3 in [3] (see also Theorem 14 in [7]).

Proposition 14. Let $(S, \mathcal{M}, \ell, S^0, \mathcal{D}^0, \mathcal{M}^0)$ be a special tuple. Then, for every finite $\mathcal{N} \supset \pi_{[1, \ell]}(\mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{M}_0)$, the semi-algebraic set $S^0 \cup \mathcal{N}$ has good connectivity property with respect to S .

In the proof of Proposition 14 we use the following notation.

Notation 15. If $S \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ is semi-algebraic set and $x \in S$, then we denote by $\mathcal{C}(S, x)$ the semi-algebraically connected component of S containing x . $\square$

Notation 16. Given a real closed field R and a variable ζ , we denote by $R\langle\zeta\rangle$ the real closed field of algebraic Puiseux series (see [2]). In the ordered field $R\langle\zeta\rangle$, ζ is positive and infinitesimal, i.e. smaller than any positive element of R . We denote by $\lim_\zeta$ the mapping which sends a bounded Puiseux series to its term of order 0. $\square$

Notation 17. If R' is a real closed extension of a real closed field R , and $S \subset R^k$ is a semi-algebraic set defined by a first-order formula with coefficients in R , then we will denote by $\text{Ext}(S, R') \subset R'^k$ the semi-algebraic subset of R'^k defined by the same formula. It is well-known that $\text{Ext}(S, R')$ does not depend on the choice of the formula defining S (see [2] for example). $\square$

Proof: Let $S^1 = S_{\pi_{[1, \epsilon]}(\mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{M}_0)}$. We are going to prove that $S^0 \cup S^1$ has good connectivity property with respect to S , which implies Proposition 14.

For a in R , we say that property $\text{GCP}(a)$ holds if $(S^0 \cup S^1)_{G \leq a}$ has good connectivity property with respect to V .

We prove that for all a in R , $\text{GCP}(a)$ holds; taking $a \geq \max_{x \in V} G(x)$ suffices to prove the proposition since V is bounded.

The proof uses two intermediate results:

Step 1: For every $a \in \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}^0$, $\text{GCP}(a) \Rightarrow \text{GCP}(b)$ for all $b \in R$ with $(a, b] \cap (\mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}^0) = \emptyset$.

Step 2: For every $b \in \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}^0$, if $\text{GCP}(a)$ holds for all $a < b$, then $\text{GCP}(b)$ holds.

Since for $a < \min_{x \in V} (G(x))$, property $\text{GCP}(a)$ holds vacuously, and the combination of these two results gives by an easy induction $\text{GCP}(a)$ for all a in R , thereby proving the proposition.

We now prove the two steps.

Step 1. We suppose that $a \in \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}^0$, $\text{GCP}(a)$ holds, take $b \in R$, $a < b$ with $(a, b] \cap (\mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}^0) = \emptyset$ and prove that $\text{GCP}(b)$ holds. Let C be a semi-algebraically connected component of $S_{G \leq b}$. We have to prove that $C \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$ is semi-algebraically connected.

Since $(a, b] \cap (\mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}^0) = \emptyset$, it follows that $\mathcal{M}_{a < G \leq b} = \emptyset$, and $C_{G \leq a}$ is a semi-algebraically connected component of $S_{G \leq a}$ using Lemma 9. So, using property $\text{GCP}(a)$, we see that $C_{G \leq a} \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$ is non-empty and semi-algebraically connected.

Let $x \in C \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$. We prove that x can be semi-algebraically connected to a point in $C_{G \leq a} \cap S^0$ by a semi-algebraic path in $C \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$, which is enough to prove that $C \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$ is semi-algebraically connected.

There are three cases to consider.

Case 1: $x \in S^1$. In this case, consider $\mathcal{C}(S_{\pi_{[1, \epsilon]}(x)}, x) = \mathcal{C}(S_{\pi_{[1, \epsilon]}^1(x)}, x)$. Then, by Property 3, there exists $x' \in \mathcal{C}(S_{\pi_{[1, \epsilon]}(x)}, x) \cap S^0$ such that x' is a minimizer of G over $\mathcal{C}(S_{\pi_{[1, \epsilon]}(x)}, x)$ i.e. $G(x') = \min_{x'' \in \mathcal{C}(S_{\pi_{[1, \epsilon]}(x)}, x)} G(x'')$. In particular, $x' \in \mathcal{C}(S_{G \leq b}^0, x) \subset C$. Connecting x to x' by a semi-algebraic path inside $\mathcal{C}(S_{\pi_{[1, \epsilon]}^1(x)}, x)$ we reduce to $x \in S^0$.

Case 2: $x \in S^0$, $G(x) \leq a$. In this case there is nothing to prove.

Case 3: $x \in S^0$, $G(x) > a$. By Property 4 (c) applied to $\mathcal{C}(S_{a \leq G \leq b}^0, x)$ we have that $a \in G(\mathcal{C}(S_{a \leq G \leq b}^0, x))$ and $\mathcal{C}(S_{a \leq G \leq b}^0, x)_{G=a}$ is non-empty. Hence there exists a semi-algebraic path connecting x to a point in $\mathcal{C}(S_{a \leq G \leq b}^0, x)_{G=a}$ inside $\mathcal{C}(S_{a \leq G \leq b}^0, x)$. Since $\mathcal{C}(S_{a \leq G \leq b}^0, x) \subset S^0$ and $\mathcal{C}(S_{a \leq G \leq b}^0, x) \subset C$, it follows that $\mathcal{C}(S_{a \leq G \leq b}^0, x) \subset C \cap S^0$ and we are done.

This finishes the proof of Step 1.

Step 2. We suppose that $b \in \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}^0$, and $\text{GCP}(a)$ holds for all $a < b$, and prove that $\text{GCP}(b)$ holds.

Let C be a semi-algebraically connected component of $S_{G \leq b}$.

If $\dim(C) = 0$, C is a point, belonging to $\mathcal{M} \subset (S^0 \cup S^1)$ by Lemma 10. So $C \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$ is semi-algebraically connected.

Hence, we can assume that $\dim(C) > 0$. If $C_{G=b} = \emptyset$ there is nothing to prove. Suppose that $C_{G=b}$ is non-empty, so that $C_{G<b}$ is non-empty by Lemma 10.

Our aim is to prove that $C \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$ is semi-algebraically connected. We do this in two steps. We prove the following statements:

- (a). If B is a semi-algebraically connected component of $C_{G<b}$, then $\overline{B} \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$ is non-empty and semi-algebraically connected, and
- (b). and, using (a) $C \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$ is semi-algebraically connected.

Proof of (a) We prove that if B is a semi-algebraically connected component of $V_{G<b}$, then $\overline{B} \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$ is non-empty and semi-algebraically connected.

Since $\overline{B}$ contains a point of $\mathcal{M}$ it follows that $\overline{B} \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$ is not empty.

Note that if $\overline{B} \cap (S^0 \cup S^1) = B \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$, then there exists a with

$$\max(\{G(x) \mid x \in B \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)\}) < a < b,$$

with $B \cap (S^0 \cup S^1) = (B \cap (S^0 \cup S^1))_{G \leq a}$ and $B_{G \leq a}$ semi-algebraically connected using Lemma 9. So $B \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$ is semi-algebraically connected since $\text{GCP}(a)$ holds.

We now suppose that $(\overline{B} \setminus B) \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$ is non-empty. Taking $x \in (\overline{B} \setminus B) \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$, we are going to show that x can be connected to a point z in $B \cap S^0$ by a semi-algebraic path γ inside $\overline{B} \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$. Notice that $G(x) = b$.

We first prove that we can assume without loss of generality that $x \in S_0$. Otherwise, since $x \in S^0 \cup S^1$, we must have that $x \in S_w$ with $w = \pi_{[1, \ell]}(x)$, and $S_w \subset S^1$. Let $A = \mathcal{C}(S_w \cap \overline{B}, x)$. We now prove that $A \cap S_w^0 \neq \emptyset$. Using the curve section lemma choose a semi-algebraic path $\gamma: [0, \varepsilon] \rightarrow \text{Ext}(\overline{B}, \mathbb{R}(\varepsilon))$ such that $\gamma(0) = x$, $\lim_{\varepsilon} \gamma(\varepsilon) = x$ and $\gamma((0, \varepsilon]) \subset \text{Ext}(B, \mathbb{R}(\varepsilon))$. Let $w_{\varepsilon} = \pi_{[1, \ell]}(\gamma(\varepsilon))$ and

$$A_{\varepsilon} = \mathcal{C}(\text{Ext}(B, \mathbb{R}(\varepsilon))_{w_{\varepsilon}}, \gamma(\varepsilon)).$$

Note that $x \in \lim_{\varepsilon} A_{\varepsilon} \subset A$.

By Remark 1, $\text{Ext}(B, \mathbb{R}(\varepsilon))$ is a semi-algebraically connected component of $\text{Ext}(S_{G<a}, \mathbb{R}(\varepsilon))$ which implies that A_{ε} is a semi-algebraically connected component of $\text{Ext}(S, \mathbb{R}(\varepsilon))_{w_{\varepsilon}}$. By Property (3) and Remark 1, $\text{Ext}(S^0, \mathbb{R}(\varepsilon))_{w_{\varepsilon}} \cap A_{\varepsilon} \neq \emptyset$. Then, since $\text{Ext}(S^0, \mathbb{R}(\varepsilon))_{w_{\varepsilon}} \cap A_{\varepsilon}$ is bounded over $\mathbb{R}$, $\lim_{\varepsilon} (\text{Ext}(S^0, \mathbb{R}(\varepsilon))_{w_{\varepsilon}} \cap A_{\varepsilon})$ is a non-empty subset of $S_w^0 \cap A$.

Now connect x to a point in $x' \in S_w^0$ by a semi-algebraic path whose image is contained in $A \subset \overline{B}_w \subset (\overline{B} \setminus B) \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$ such that x' is a minimizer of G on A . If $G(x') < b$, take $z = x'$. Otherwise, replacing x by x' if necessary we can assume that $x \in S^0$ as announced.

There are four cases, namely

- 1. $x \in \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{M}^0$;
- 2. $x \notin \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{M}^0$ and $\mathcal{C}(S_{G=b}^0, x) \not\subset \overline{B}$;
- 3. $x \notin \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{M}^0$, $\mathcal{C}(S_{G=b}^0, x) \subset \overline{B}$ and $b \in \mathcal{D}^0$;
- 4. $x \notin \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{M}^0$, $\mathcal{C}(S_{G=b}^0, x) \subset \overline{B}$ and $b \notin \mathcal{D}^0$;

that we consider now.

- 1. $x \in \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{M}^0$:

Define $w = \pi_{[1, \ell]}(x)$, and note that $S_y \subset (S^0 \cup S^1)$. Since $x \in \overline{B}$, and B is bounded, $w \in \pi_{[1, \ell]}(\overline{B}) = \pi_{[1, \ell]}(\overline{B})$. Now let $\varepsilon > 0$ be an infinitesimal. By applying the curve selection lemma to the set B and $x \in \overline{B}$, we obtain that there exists $x_{\varepsilon} \in \text{Ext}(B, \mathbb{R}(\varepsilon)^k)$ with $\lim_{\varepsilon} x_{\varepsilon} = x$, $G(x_{\varepsilon}) < G(x)$ and $x \in \lim_{\varepsilon} \text{Ext}(S, \mathbb{R}(\varepsilon))_{w_{\varepsilon}}$, where $w_{\varepsilon} = \pi_{[1, \ell]}(x_{\varepsilon})$. By Property 3 and Remark 1 we have that $\text{Ext}(S^0, \mathbb{R}(\varepsilon))_{w_{\varepsilon}}$ is non-empty, and contains a minimizer of G over $\mathcal{C}(\text{Ext}(S, \mathbb{R}(\varepsilon)^k)_{w_{\varepsilon}}, x_{\varepsilon})$. Let

$$x'_{\varepsilon} \in \text{Ext}(S^0, \mathbb{R}(\varepsilon))_{w_{\varepsilon}} \cap \mathcal{C}(\text{Ext}(B, \mathbb{R}(\varepsilon))_{w_{\varepsilon}}, x_{\varepsilon})$$

be such a minimizer and let $x' = \lim_{\varepsilon} x'_{\varepsilon}$. Notice that $G(x_{\varepsilon}) < G(x)$. Since $\lim x_{\varepsilon} = x$ and $\lim_{\varepsilon} \mathcal{C}(\text{Ext}(B, R\langle \varepsilon \rangle)_{w_{\varepsilon}}, x_{\varepsilon})$ is semi-algebraically connected,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon} \mathcal{C}(\text{Ext}(B, R\langle \varepsilon \rangle)_{w_{\varepsilon}}, x_{\varepsilon}) \subset \mathcal{C}(\overline{B}_w, x).$$

Now choose a semi-algebraic path γ_1 connecting x to x' inside $\mathcal{C}(\overline{B}_w, x)$ (and hence inside $S^0 \cup S^1$ since $\mathcal{C}(\overline{B}_w, x) \subset S_w \subset S^0 \cup S^1$), and a semi-algebraic path $\gamma_2(\varepsilon)$ joining x' to x'_{ε} inside $\text{Ext}(S^0, R\langle \varepsilon \rangle)$. The concatenation of $\gamma_1, \gamma_2(\varepsilon)$ gives a semi-algebraic path γ having the required property, after replacing ε in $\gamma_2(\varepsilon)$ by a small enough positive element of $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Now take $z = \gamma_2(t)$.

2. $x \notin \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{M}^0$ and $\mathcal{C}(S_{G=b}^0, x) \not\subset \overline{B}$:

There exists $x' \in \mathcal{C}(S_{G=b}^0, x)$, $x' \notin \overline{B}$ and a semi-algebraic path $\gamma: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(S_{G=b}^0, x)$, with $\gamma(0) = x$, $\gamma(1) = x'$. Since $x' \notin \overline{B}$, it follows from Lemma 10 2) that for $t_1 = \max \{0 \leq t < 1 \mid \gamma(t) \in \overline{B}\}$, $\gamma(t_1) \in \mathcal{M}$. We can now connect x to a point in $z \in B \cap S^0$ by a semi-algebraic path inside $\overline{B} \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$ using (1).

3. $x \notin \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{M}^0$, $\mathcal{C}(S_{G=b}^0, x) \subset \overline{B}$ and $b \in \mathcal{D}^0$:

Since $b \in \mathcal{D}^0$ by Property 4 (b) there exists $x' \in \mathcal{C}(S_{G=b}^0, x) \cap \mathcal{M}^0$. Thus, there exists a semi-algebraic path connecting x to $x' \in \mathcal{M}_0$ with image contained in $\overline{B} \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$. We can now connect x' to a point in $z \in B \cap S^0$ by a semi-algebraic path inside $\overline{B} \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$ using (1).

4. $x \notin \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{M}^0$, $\mathcal{C}(S_{G=b}^0, x) \subset \overline{B}$ and $b \notin \mathcal{D}^0$:

Since $b \notin \mathcal{D}_0$, for all $a < b$ such that $[a, b] \cap \mathcal{D}_0 = \emptyset$, $\mathcal{C}(S_{a \leq G \leq b}^0, x)_{G=b} = \mathcal{C}(S_{G=b}^0, x)$ and $\mathcal{C}(S_{a \leq G \leq b}^0, x)_{G=a} \neq \emptyset$ by Property 4 (c). Let $x' \in \mathcal{C}(S_{a \leq G \leq b}^0, x)_{G=a}$. We can choose a semi-algebraic path $\gamma: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(S_{a \leq G \leq b}^0, x)$ with $\gamma(0) = x$, $\gamma(1) = x'$. Let $t_1 = \max \{0 \leq t < 1 \mid \gamma(t) \in S_{G=b}^0\}$. Then, either $\gamma(t_1) \in \mathcal{M}$ and we can connect $\gamma(t_1)$ to a point in $B \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$ by a semi-algebraic path inside $\overline{B} \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$ using (1). Otherwise, by Lemma 10 (2 b), for all small enough $r > 0$, $B_k(\gamma(t_1), r) \cap C_{G < b}$ is non-empty and contained in B . Then, there exists $t_2 \in (t_1, 1]$ such that $z = \gamma(t_2) \in B \cap S^0$, and the semi-algebraic path $\gamma|_{[0, t_2]}$ gives us the required path in this case.

Taking x and x' in $\overline{B} \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$, they can be connected to points z and z' in $B \cap S_0$ by semi-algebraic path γ and γ' inside $\overline{B} \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$ such that, without loss of generality, $G(z) = G(z') = a$. Using $\text{GCP}(a)$, we conclude that $\text{GCP}(b)$ holds.

Proof of (b) We have to prove that $C \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$ is semi-algebraically connected.

Let x and x' be in $C \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$. We prove that it is possible to connect them by a semi-algebraic path inside $C \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$.

Since we suppose that $\dim(C) > 0$, $C_{G < b}$ is non-empty by Lemma 10 (2). Using Lemma 10 (2.c), let B_i (resp. B_j) be a semi-algebraically connected component of $C_{< b}$ such that $x \in \overline{B}_i$ (resp. $x' \in \overline{B}_j$).

If $i = j$, x and x' both lie in $\overline{B}_i \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$ which is semi-algebraically connected by (a). Hence, they can be connected by a semi-algebraically connected path in $\overline{B}_i \cap (S^0 \cup S^1) \subset C \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$.

So let us suppose that $i \neq j$. Note that:

- by Lemma 10 (2.a), $\overline{B}_i \cap \mathcal{M}$ and $\overline{B}_j \cap \mathcal{M}$ are not empty,
- by (a) $\overline{B}_i \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$ and $\overline{B}_j \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$ are semi-algebraically connected,
- by definition of $S^0 \cup S^1$, $\mathcal{M} \subset S^0 \cup S^1$.

Then, one can connect x (resp. x') to a point in $\overline{B}_i \cap \mathcal{M}$ (resp. $\overline{B}_j \cap \mathcal{M}$), so that one can suppose without loss of generality that $x \in \overline{B}_i \cap \mathcal{M}$ and $x' \in \overline{B}_j \cap \mathcal{M}$.

Let $\gamma: [0, 1] \rightarrow C$ be a semi-algebraic path that connects x to x' , and let $I = \gamma^{-1}(C \cap \mathcal{M})$ and $H = [0, 1] \setminus I$.

Since $\mathcal{M}$ is finite, we can assume without loss of generality that I is a finite set of points, and H is a union of a finite number of open intervals.

Since $\gamma(I) \subset \mathcal{M} \subset S^0 \cup S^1$, it suffices to prove that if t and t' are the end points of an interval in H , then $\gamma(t)$ and $\gamma(t')$ are connected by a semi-algebraic path inside $C \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$.

Notice that $\gamma((t, t')) \cap \mathcal{M} = \emptyset$, so that $\gamma(t)$ and $\gamma(t')$ belong to the same $\overline{B}_\ell$ by Lemma 10.2 b) $\gamma(t')$ both lie in $\overline{B}_\ell \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$ and that $\overline{B}_\ell \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$ is semi-algebraically connected by (a). Consequently, $\gamma(t)$ and $\gamma(t')$ can be connected by a semi-algebraic path in $\overline{B}_\ell \cap (S^0 \cup S^1) \subset C \cap (S^0 \cup S^1)$. $\square$

4 Deformation to the special case

In this section we explain how to use a deformation to reach the special situation described in Section 3.

Notation 18. For any $d \geq 0$, we denote

$$G_d := 1 + \sum_{i=1}^k i X_i^d. \quad (2)$$

$\square$

4.1 A deformation of several equations to general position

In this subsection we discuss how to deform a given system of equation, following an idea introduced in [11], so that the number of critical points of a certain well chosen polynomial G is guaranteed to be finite.

Notation 19. Let $Q \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$, $b = (b_1, \dots, b_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$, and $d \geq 0$. Let ζ be a new variable. We denote

$$\text{Def}(Q, \zeta, b, d) = (1 - \zeta)Q^2 - \zeta(1 + b_1 X_1^d + \dots + b_k X_k^d). \quad (3)$$

$\square$

A matrix B such that every $i \times i$ sub-matrix of B has rank i can be used to define a deformation of a finite set of polynomials with good genericity properties.

Notation 20. Let $m \geq 0$, $B = (b_{i,j})_{0 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq k} \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+1) \times k}$, such that every $j \times j$ sub-matrix of B with $1 \leq j \leq m+1$, has rank j , and $b_0 = (1, 2, \dots, k)$. For $i = 0, \dots, m$, let $b_i = (b_{i,1}, \dots, b_{i,k})$ denote the i -th row of B .

Note that

$$G_d = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^k b_{0,j} X_j^d.$$

Moreover, let $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, \dots, P_m\} \subset \mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$, and $\bar{\zeta} = (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m)$ new variables. We denote by $\text{Def}(\mathcal{P}, \bar{\zeta}, B, d)$ the equations

$$\text{Def}(P_1, \zeta_1, b_1, d), \dots, \text{Def}(P_m, \zeta_m, b_m, d).$$

$\square$

A version of the following proposition and its proof appears in [11]. We include it here for the sake of completeness.

Proposition 21. *Let $0 \leq \ell \leq k$, and $d > 2 \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} \deg(P_i)$. Then, for each $w \in \mathbb{R}^\ell$, and $\bar{\zeta} = (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m) \in (\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})^m$, $\text{Def}(\mathcal{P}, \bar{\zeta}, B, d)(w, \cdot)$ is in general position with respect to $G_d(w, \cdot)$.*

Proof Fix $w \in \mathbb{R}^\ell$, and $\bar{\zeta} \in (\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})^m$. We prove that $\text{Crit}(\text{Def}(\mathcal{P}, \bar{\zeta}, B, d)(w, \cdot), G)$ is finite (possibly empty).

Consider the following system of bi-homogeneous equations defining a sub-variety $W \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k-\ell} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^{k-p}$:

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{Def}(P_i, \zeta_i, b_i, d)(w, \cdot))^h &= 0, i = 1, \dots, m \\ \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i \frac{\partial(\text{Def}(P_i, \zeta_i, b_i, d)(w, \cdot))^h}{\partial X_j} &= \lambda_0 \frac{\partial G_d(w, \cdot)^h}{\partial X_j}, j = \ell + 1, \dots, k. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

It is clear from the definition of $\text{Crit}(\text{Def}(\mathcal{P}, \bar{\zeta}, B, d)(w, \cdot), G_d)$ that $\text{Crit}(\text{Def}(\mathcal{P}, \bar{\zeta}, B, d)(y, \cdot), G_d)$ is contained in the real affine part of $\pi(W)$, and thus in order to prove that $\text{Crit}(\text{Def}(\mathcal{P}, \bar{\zeta}, B, d)(y, \cdot), G_d)$ is finite (possibly empty), it suffices to show that the complex projective variety $\pi(W)$ is zero-dimensional or empty. So, we prove that the projective variety $\pi(W) \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^m$ has an empty intersection with the hyperplane at infinity defined by $X_0 = 0$,

Substituting, $X_0 = 0$ in the system (4), we get,

$$\zeta_i(b_{i,\ell+1}X_{\ell+1}^d + \dots + b_{i,k}X_k^d) = 0, i = 1, \dots, m, \quad (5)$$

$$d \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \zeta_i \lambda_i b_{i,j} - \lambda_0 b_{0,j} \right) X_j^{d-1} = 0, j = \ell + 1, \dots, k. \quad (6)$$

There are two cases to consider.

Case 1. $m \geq k - \ell$: In this case, since the matrix of coefficients in the first set of equations

$$\begin{pmatrix} b_{1,\ell+1} & \cdot & \cdot & b_{1,k} \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ b_{m,\ell+1} & \cdot & \cdot & b_{m,k} \end{pmatrix}$$

has rank $k - \ell$ which follows from the given property of the matrix B , we get that $X_{\ell+1} = \dots = X_k = 0$, which is impossible.

Case 2. $m < k - \ell$: Consider the second set of equations (5) involving the Lagrangian variables $\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_m$. Since, the matrix B has the property that every $(m + 1) \times (m + 1)$ sub-matrix has rank $(m + 1)$, we have for every choice $J \subset [\ell + 1, k]$, $\text{card}(J) = m + 1$, the system of equations

$$\sum_{i=1}^p \zeta_i \lambda_i b_{i,j} - \lambda_0 b_{0,j} = 0, j \in J$$

has an empty solution in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^m$, and hence at least $k - m - \ell$ amongst the variables $X_{\ell+1}, \dots, X_k$ must be equal to 0. Suppose that $X_{m+\ell+1} = \dots = X_k = 0$. Now, from the property that the all $m \times m$ sub-matrices of B have full rank we obtain that the only solution to system (5) with $X_{m+\ell+1} = \dots = X_k = 0$, is the one with $X_{\ell+1} = \dots = X_k = 0$, which is impossible.

This proves that in both cases the projective variety $\pi(W) \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^m$ has an empty intersection with the hyperplane at infinity defined by $X_0 = 0$, and hence $\pi(W)$ is zero-dimensional or empty which finishes the proof.

□

4.2 G -special values

In this subsection we generalize the notion of special values introduced in [1] to define special values with respect to a polynomial G . The original definition is recovered by taking $G = X_1$. These special values are used to ensure good connectivity properties in the case of basic closed semi-algebraic sets. The polynomials defining them are not necessarily in general position with respect to G .

In the definition of G -special values we are going to replace a given polynomial Q by $\text{Def}(Q, \zeta, b, d)$ where $b = (1, \dots, 1)$. In order to shorten notation, we will henceforth denote by $\text{Def}(Q, \zeta, d)$ the polynomial $\text{Def}(Q, \zeta, b, d)$, when $b = (1, \dots, 1)$.

Definition 22. Let $Q, G \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$, such that $\text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k)$ bounded, and let $d \geq 2 \deg(Q) + 2$. A (G, d) -special value of $\text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k)$ is a $c \in \mathbb{R}$, such that there exists $y \in \text{Zer}(\text{Def}(Q, \zeta, d), \mathbb{R}\langle \zeta \rangle^k)$, with $\lim_{\zeta} G(y) = c$, $\lim_{\zeta} g(y) = 0$, and y a local minimum of g on $\text{Zer}(\text{Def}(Q, \zeta, d), \mathbb{R}\langle \zeta \rangle^k)$ where

$$g(X) = 1 - \langle U(X), N(X) \rangle^2 \quad (7)$$

and

$$U(X) = \frac{\text{grad}(G)(X)}{\|\text{grad}(G)(X)\|}, \quad (8)$$

$$N(X) = \frac{\text{grad}(\text{Def}(Q, \zeta, d))(X)}{\|\text{grad}(\text{Def}(Q, \zeta, d))(X)\|}. \quad (9)$$

□

Remark 23. When d is fixed and clear from context we will refer to (G, d) -special values as G -special values instead. □

Definition 24. Let $F, G \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$ such that $\text{Zer}(F, \mathbb{R}^k)$ is bounded, $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$ a finite family, $d = 2 \max(\deg(F), \max_{P \in \mathcal{Q}} \deg(P)) + 2$. We say that c is a G -special value of the pair $(F, \mathcal{Q})$, if there exists $\mathcal{Q}' \subset \mathcal{Q}$, such that c is a (G, d) -special value of $\text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k)$, where $Q = F^2 + \sum_{P \in \mathcal{Q}'} P^2$. □

The property of G -special values used in the paper is the following result. Its proof is postponed to Section 7.

Proposition 25. Let $F \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$ such that $\text{Zer}(F, \mathbb{R}^k)$ is bounded, $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$ a finite family, and $S = \text{Bas}(\{F\}, \mathcal{Q})$, and $G \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$ such that $\text{grad}(G)(x) \neq 0$ for any $x \in S$. Then, the

1. the set $\mathcal{D}$ of G -special values of the pair $(F, \mathcal{Q})$ is finite;
2. for every interval $[a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $c \in [a, b]$, with $\{c\} \supset \mathcal{D} \cap [a, b]$, if D is a semi-algebraically connected component of $S_{a \leq G \leq b}$, then $D_{G=c}$ is a semi-algebraically connected component of $S_{G=c}$.

4.3 Construction of the deformation to the special case

Our aim in this subsection is to associate to a basic semi-algebraic set S a deformation $\tilde{S}$ of S , and a special (cf. Definition 12) tuple $(\tilde{S}, \tilde{\mathcal{M}}, \ell, \tilde{S}^0, \mathcal{D}^0, \mathcal{M}^0)$.

4.3.1 Deformation of S to $\tilde{S}$

We first fix some more notation.

Notation 26. Let $\mathcal{H} = (h_{ij})_{0 \leq i \leq N, 0 \leq j \leq k}$, be an $N = (k + \log_2(k - 1) + 1) \times k$ matrix with integer entries defined by $h_{i,j} = j^{i+1}$ and for each $i, 0 \leq i \leq N, d \geq 0$, let

$$H_{i,d} = h_{i,0} + \sum_{j=1}^k h_{ij} X_j^d.$$

Notice that by construction of $\mathcal{H}$,

$$G_d = H_{0,d}. \quad \square$$

Notation 27. Given a finite list of variables $\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_t$, we denote by $R\langle \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_t \rangle$ the field $R\langle \zeta_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \zeta_t \rangle$ and for any $\xi \in R\langle \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_t \rangle$ bounded over $R\langle \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_i \rangle$, $i < t$, we denote by $\lim_{\zeta_{i+1}}(\xi)$ the element $(\lim_{\zeta_{i+1}} \circ \cdots \circ \lim_{\zeta_t})(\xi)$ of $R\langle \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_i \rangle$. $\square$

Notation 28. Let $\mathcal{P} \subset R[X_1, \dots, X_k], \mathcal{Q} = \{Q_1, \dots, Q_q\} \subset R[X_1, \dots, X_k]$ be finite sets of polynomials, with degrees at most d , and let $1 \leq p \leq k$. Let

$$P_1^* = (1 - \zeta) \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P^2 + \zeta(X_{p+1}^{2d} + \dots + X_k^{2d} + X_{p+1}^2 + \dots + X_k^2)$$

and

$$P_i^* = \frac{\partial P_1}{\partial X_{p+i}}, 2 \leq i \leq k - p,$$

and define

$$\mathcal{P}^* = \{P_1^*, \dots, P_{k-p}^*\}.$$

For $1 \leq i \leq k - p$, let

$$\tilde{P}_i = (1 - \varepsilon) P_i^* - \varepsilon H_{i,2d},$$

and for $1 \leq j \leq q$, let

$$\tilde{Q}_j = (1 - \delta) Q_j + \delta H_{k-p+j,2d}.$$

Finally define

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}} = \{\tilde{P}_1, \dots, \tilde{P}_{k-p}\},$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Q}} = \{\tilde{Q}_1, \dots, \tilde{Q}_q\}. \quad \square$$

Proposition 29. Let $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}$ as above and suppose that $S = \text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$ is bounded, and moreover, for each $y \in R^p$, $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}, R^k)_y$ is a finite number of points (possibly empty). Let $\tilde{S} = \text{Bas}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}) \subset R\langle \zeta, \varepsilon, \delta \rangle^k$. Then,

$$S = \lim_{\zeta} (\tilde{S}).$$

Proof . It is clear that $\lim_{\zeta} (\tilde{S}) \subset S$. We now prove that $S \subset \lim_{\zeta} (\tilde{S})$. Let $x = (y, z) \in S$, where $y \in R^p$ and $z \in R^{k-p}$. For each (of the finitely many) $z \in R^{k-p}$ such that $x = (y, z) \in S$, there exists a bounded semi-algebraically connected component C_z of the non-singular hypersurface $\text{Zer}(P_1^*(y, \cdot), R\langle \zeta \rangle^{k-p})$ such that $\lim_{\zeta} (C_z) = z$.

Now, the system $\mathcal{P}^*(y, \cdot)$ has only simple zeros in $R\langle \zeta \rangle^{k-p}$ (see [2] Proposition 12.44) and contains the non-empty set of X_{p+1} -extremal points of C_z . Let $z' \in R\langle \zeta \rangle^{k-p}$ be an X_{p+1} -extremal point of C_z . Then, since z' is a simple zero of the system $\mathcal{P}^*(y, \cdot)$, there must exist $z'' \in \text{Zer}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, R\langle \zeta, \varepsilon, \delta \rangle^{k-p})$ such that $\lim_{\varepsilon} (z'') = z'$. Moreover, it is clear that $x'' = (y, z'') \in \tilde{S}$ and that $\lim_{\zeta} (x'') = x$ which finishes the proof. $\square$

4.3.2 General position and definition of $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$

Let $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$ be finite sets of polynomials, $1 \leq p \leq k$, such that $S = \text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}) \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ is of dimension at most p , and such that for each $y = (y_1, \dots, y_p) \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}(y, \cdot), \mathbb{R}^{k-p})$ is zero-dimensional or empty.

Let

$$\tilde{S} = \text{Bas}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}) \subset \mathbb{R}\langle \zeta, \varepsilon, \delta \rangle^k$$

following Notation 28.

Proposition 30. *For every $\ell \leq p$ and for every $w \in \mathbb{R}\langle \zeta, \varepsilon, \delta \rangle^\ell$, $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(w, -), \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}(w, -)$ is in general position with respect to $G_{2d}(w, -)$, with $d \geq \max_{P \in \mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{Q}} \deg(P)$.*

Proof Follows from Definition 7 and Proposition 21 noting that $\varepsilon, \delta \neq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}\langle \zeta, \varepsilon, \delta \rangle$. $\square$

Corollary 31. *The set $\tilde{\mathcal{M}} = \text{Cr}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}, G_{2d})$ is finite.*

4.3.3 Definition of $\tilde{S}^0$

Notation 32. Let $G \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$ and $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, \dots, P_m\} \subset \mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$ be a finite family of polynomials.

Let $0 \leq \ell \leq k$ and consider the system of equations $\text{CritEq}_\ell(\mathcal{P}, G)$

$$\begin{aligned} P_j &= 0, j = 1, \dots, m \\ \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \frac{\partial P_j}{\partial X_i} - \lambda_0 \frac{\partial G}{\partial X_i} &= 0, i = \ell + 1, \dots, k \\ \sum_{j=0}^m \lambda_j^2 - 1 &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

The set $\text{Crit}_\ell(\mathcal{P}, G) \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ is the projection on $\mathbb{R}^k$ of $\text{Zer}(\text{CritEq}_\ell(\mathcal{P}, G), \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1})$.

Note that for every $w \in \mathbb{R}^\ell$,

$$\text{Crit}_\ell(\mathcal{P}, G)_w = \text{Crit}(\mathcal{P}(w, \cdot), G(w, \cdot)).$$

$\square$

Notation 33. With the same choice of $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}, d, p, \tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}, \ell$ as above, let $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}' \subset \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$. Define

$$\tilde{S}^0(\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}') = \text{Cr}_\ell(\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \cup \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}', G_{2d}) \cap \tilde{S}$$

$$\tilde{S}^0 = \bigcup_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}' \subset \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}} \tilde{S}^0(\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}').$$

$\square$

Proposition 34. *For each $w \in \mathbb{R}\langle \zeta, \varepsilon, \delta \rangle^\ell$:*

1. $\tilde{S}_w^0$ is a finite set;
2. $\tilde{S}_w^0$ meets every semi-algebraically connected component of $\tilde{S}_w$, and contains for every semi-algebraically connected component C of $\tilde{S}_w$ a minimizer of G_{2d} over C .

Proof 1. is immediate from Corollary 26.

2. follows from the fact for each semi-algebraically connected component C of $\tilde{S}_w$, there exists some $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}'$ such that the minimizer of G_{2d} over C is a local minimizer $x \in (\text{Zer}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \cup \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}', \mathbb{R}\langle \zeta, \varepsilon, \delta \rangle))_w$ of G_{2d} over $(\text{Zer}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \cup \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}', \mathbb{R}\langle \zeta, \varepsilon, \delta \rangle))_w$ and then x clearly belongs to $\text{Cr}_\ell(\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \cup \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}', G) \cap \tilde{S}$. Since, $\tilde{S}_w$ is bounded, every semi-algebraically connected component C of $\tilde{S}_w$ must contain a minimizer of G_{2d} over C , and hence $\tilde{S}_w^0$ meets every semi-algebraically connected component of $\tilde{S}_w$. $\square$

4.3.4 Definition of $\mathcal{D}^0$ and $\mathcal{M}^0$

Notation 35. Using Notation 23 and Notation 29, let

$$\tilde{S} = \text{Bas}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}),$$

$$F = \prod_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}' \subset \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}} F(\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}'),$$

where

$$F(\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}') = \sum_{P \in \text{CrEq}_\ell(\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \cup \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}', G_{2d})} P^2.$$

Let $G = G_{2d}$. We define $\mathcal{D}^0$ as the set G -special values of the pair $(F, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}})$ (cf. Definition 24) considering F and all the polynomials in $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$ as elements of $\mathbb{R}[\zeta, \varepsilon, \delta][X_1, \dots, X_k, \lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{k-p}]$. $\square$

Remark 36. The set $\tilde{S}^0$ defined in Notation 33 is equal to the projection of $\text{Bas}(\{F\}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}})$ to $\mathbb{R}\langle\zeta, \varepsilon, \delta\rangle$. Note that $\mathcal{D}^0$ are the G -special values of the pair $(F, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}})$ and thus satisfy the properties of Proposition 25 with respect to the level sets of the polynomial G restricted to $\text{Bas}(\{F\}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}) \subset \mathbb{R}\langle\zeta, \varepsilon, \delta\rangle^k \times \mathbb{R}\langle\zeta, \varepsilon, \delta\rangle^{k-p+1}$. In fact the same properties of $\mathcal{D}^0$ also holds for $\tilde{S}^0$ as well (see Lemma 38, part (a), below). $\square$

Notation 37. For any closed and bounded semi-algebraic subset $S \subset \mathbb{R}^k$, we denote by $\text{Samp}(S)$ some finite subset of S which meets every semi-algebraically connected component of S . $\square$

Let $\mathcal{M}^0 = \text{Samp}(\bigcup_{c \in \mathcal{D}^0} \tilde{S}_{G=c})$ be a finite set of points meeting every semi-algebraically connected component of $\bigcup_{c \in \mathcal{D}^0} \tilde{S}_{G=c}$.

Lemma 38. *The sets $\mathcal{D}^0$ and $\mathcal{M}^0$ have the following properties:*

- a) *for every interval $[a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}\langle\zeta, \varepsilon, \delta\rangle$ and $c \in [a, b]$, with $\{c\} \supset \mathcal{D}^0 \cap [a, b]$, if D is a semi-algebraically connected component of $(\tilde{S}^0)_{a \leq G \leq b}$, then $D_{G=c}$ is a semi-algebraically connected component of $(\tilde{S}^0)_{G=c}$;*
- b) *$\mathcal{M}^0$ meets every semi-algebraically connected component of $(\tilde{S}^0)_{G=a}$ for all $a \in \mathcal{D}^0$.*

Proof a). Notice that $\mathcal{D}^0$ is the finite set of G -special values of the pair $(F, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}})$, and hence using part 3) of Proposition 25 we have that for every interval $[a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}\langle\zeta, \varepsilon, \delta\rangle$ and $c \in [a, b]$, with $\{c\} \supset \mathcal{D}^0 \cap [a, b]$, if D is a semi-algebraically connected component of $(\text{Bas}(\{F\}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}))_{a \leq G \leq b}$, then $D_{G=c}$ is a semi-algebraically connected component of $(\text{Bas}(\{F\}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}))_{G=c}$.

To finish the proof observe that $\tilde{S}^0$ is the image of $\text{Bas}(\{F\}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}) \subset \mathbb{R}\langle\zeta, \varepsilon, \delta\rangle^k \times \mathbb{R}\langle\zeta, \varepsilon, \delta\rangle^{k-p+1}$ under projection to $\mathbb{R}\langle\zeta, \varepsilon, \delta\rangle^k$, and the fibers of this projection are intersections of linear subspaces with $S^{k-1}(0, 1)$ and the polynomial G is independent of the λ 's. Hence, the semi-algebraically connected components of $(\tilde{S}^0)_{a \leq G \leq b}$ as well as $(\tilde{S}^0)_{G=c}$, are in correspondence with those of $(\text{Bas}(\{F\}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}))_{a \leq G \leq b}$ and $(\text{Bas}(\{F\}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}))_{G=c}$ respectively.

b). Clear from the definition of $\mathcal{M}^0$. $\square$

4.3.5 Special property

With the above definitions, we have the two following results

Proposition 39. *The tuple $(\tilde{S}, \tilde{\mathcal{M}}, \ell, \tilde{S}^0, \mathcal{D}^0, \mathcal{M}^0)$ is special (cf. Definition 12).*

Proof Follows from Lemma 38 and Definition 12. $\square$

Corollary 40. *For every $\mathcal{N} \supset \pi_{[1, \ell]}(\tilde{\mathcal{M}} \cup \mathcal{M}_0)$, the semi-algebraic set $\tilde{S}^0 \cup (\tilde{S})_{\mathcal{N}}$ has good connectivity property with respect to $\tilde{S}$.*

4.3.6 Definition of $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\mathcal{A}^0$

Since we have replaced S by $\tilde{S}$, we need to construct finite sets of points on $\tilde{S}$ ensuring connectivity. The finite set of points $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} \subset \tilde{S}$ defined below will serve this purpose (see Proposition 44).

Notation 41. We associate to two closed and bounded semi-algebraic sets $S_1, S_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ a finite set of points $\text{MinDi}(S_1, S_2) \subset S_1$ defined as follows. Let M be the set of local minimizers of the polynomial function $F(X, Y) = \sum_{i=1}^k (X_i - Y_i)^2$ on the set $S_1 \times S_2$ and let $\pi_1, \pi_2: \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ be the projections on the first and second components respectively. Let

$$\text{MinDi}(S_1, S_2) = \pi_1(\text{Samp}(M)) \cup \pi_2(\text{Samp}(M))$$

using Notation 37. $\square$

Proposition 42. *Let $T \subset \mathbb{R}\langle\zeta\rangle^k$ be a closed semi-algebraic set bounded over $\mathbb{R}$, and $x \in \lim_{\zeta}(T)$. Then, $\text{MinDi}(T, \{x\}) \neq \emptyset$, and $x \in \lim_{\zeta}(\text{MinDi}(T, \{x\}))$.*

Proof Let C be the semi-algebraically connected component of $\lim_{\zeta}(T)$ containing x . Then, there exists semi-algebraically connected components $C_1, \dots, C_m$ of T , such that $C = \bigcup_{i=1}^m \lim_{\zeta}(C_i)$. Hence, there exists $i, 1 \leq i \leq m$, such that $x \in \lim_{\zeta}(C_i)$. Since, C_i is bounded over $\mathbb{R}$, the subset $M_{i,x} \subset C_i$ of points which achieve the minimum distance from x to C_i is non-empty. Every semi-algebraically connected component of $M_{i,x}$ is a semi-algebraically connected component of the set $M_x \subset T$ of points which achieve the minimum distance from x to T . Hence $M_{i,x}$ contains one point, $\tilde{x}$, which is included in $\text{MinDi}(T, \{x\})$. It is now clear that $\text{MinDi}(T, \{x\}) \neq \emptyset$ and that $x = \lim_{\zeta}(\tilde{x}) \in \lim_{\zeta}(\text{MinDi}(T, \{x\})) \neq \emptyset$. $\square$

Proposition 43. *Let $T_1, T_2 \subset \mathbb{R}\langle\zeta\rangle^k$ be closed semi-algebraic sets bounded over $\mathbb{R}$. Then, for every $\tilde{C}, \tilde{D}$ semi-algebraically connected components of T_1 and T_2 respectively, such that $\lim_{\zeta}(\tilde{C}) \cap \lim_{\zeta}(\tilde{D})$ is non-empty, $\lim_{\zeta}(\tilde{C} \cap \text{MinDi}(T_1, T_2)) \cap \lim_{\zeta}(\tilde{D} \cap \text{MinDi}(T_1, T_2))$ is non-empty, and meets every semi-algebraically connected component of $\lim_{\zeta}(\tilde{C}) \cap \lim_{\zeta}(\tilde{D})$.*

Proof Let M denote the semi-algebraic subset of $\mathbb{R}\langle\zeta\rangle^k \times \mathbb{R}\langle\zeta\rangle^k$ consisting of the local minimizers of the polynomial function $F(X, Y) = \sum_{i=1}^k (X_i - Y_i)^2$ on $T_1 \times T_2$. Also, note that the function F is proportional to the square of the distance to the diagonal $\Delta \subset \mathbb{R}\langle\zeta\rangle^k \times \mathbb{R}\langle\zeta\rangle^k$.

Let B be a semi-algebraically connected component of $\lim_{\zeta}(\tilde{C}) \cap \lim_{\zeta}(\tilde{D})$. Notice that $(B \times B) \cap \Delta$ is a semi-algebraically connected component of $(\lim_{\zeta}(\tilde{C}) \times \lim_{\zeta}(\tilde{D})) \cap \Delta$. Let $(\tilde{u}_0, \tilde{v}_0) \in \tilde{C} \times \tilde{D}$ such that $\lim_{\zeta}(\tilde{u}_0) = \lim_{\zeta}(\tilde{v}_0) \in B$. Notice that $\lim_{\zeta}(F(\tilde{u}_0, \tilde{v}_0)) = F(\lim_{\zeta}(\tilde{u}_0), \lim_{\zeta}(\tilde{v}_0)) = 0$, and hence $F(\tilde{u}_0, \tilde{v}_0)$ is infinitesimally small. Let

$$U = \{(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) \in \tilde{C} \times \tilde{D} \mid F(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) < F(\tilde{u}_0, \tilde{v}_0)\}.$$

Since the image under $\lim_\zeta$ of a bounded, semi-algebraically connected set is semi-algebraically connected (see Proposition 12.43 in [2]), for any semi-algebraically connected component V of U , $\lim_\zeta(V)$ is either contained in $(B \times B) \cap \Delta$ or disjoint from $(B \times B) \cap \Delta$. Denote by U' the union of semi-algebraically connected components V of U such that $\lim_\zeta(V) \subset (B \times B) \cap \Delta$, and denote by $\overline{U'} \subset \tilde{C} \times \tilde{D}$ the closure of U' . If U' is empty then $(\tilde{u}_0, \tilde{v}_0)$ is a local minimizer of F on $\tilde{C} \times \tilde{D}$ and we are done. Otherwise, the minimum of F on $\overline{U'}$ is strictly smaller than $F(\tilde{u}_0, \tilde{v}_0)$, and it is realized at (say) $(\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{v}_1) \in U'$ since $F(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) = F(\tilde{u}_0, \tilde{v}_0)$ for all $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) \in \overline{U'} \setminus U'$, and we are done. $\square$

We now let $\mathcal{A} \subset S$ be a fixed finite set of points contained in S .

Let (using Notation 41)

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = \text{MinDi}(\tilde{S}, \mathcal{A}) \cup \text{MinDi}(\tilde{S}, \tilde{S}).$$

Proposition 44. *The finite set $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} \subset \tilde{S}$ has the following properties.*

1. $\lim_\zeta(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}) \supset \mathcal{A}$.
2. for every $\tilde{C}, \tilde{D}$ semi-algebraically connected components of $\tilde{S}$ such that $\lim_\zeta(\tilde{C}) \cap \lim_\zeta(\tilde{D})$ is non-empty, $\lim_\zeta(\tilde{C} \cap \tilde{\mathcal{A}}) \cap \lim_\zeta(\tilde{D} \cap \tilde{\mathcal{A}})$ is non-empty and meets every semi-algebraically connected component of $\lim_\zeta(\tilde{C}) \cap \lim_\zeta(\tilde{D})$.
3. $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ meets every semi-algebraically connected component of $\tilde{S}$.

Proof

1. Follows from Proposition 42 after observing that $\text{MinDist}(\tilde{S}, \mathcal{A}) = \bigcup_{x \in \mathcal{A}} \text{MinDi}(\tilde{S}, \{x\})$ (see Notation 41), and the fact that $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ contains $\text{MinDist}(\tilde{S}, \mathcal{A})$.
2. Follows directly from Proposition 43 with $T_1, T_2 = \tilde{S}$ and the fact that $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ contains $\text{MinDi}(\tilde{S}, \tilde{S})$.
3. It is a special case of 2, with $T_1, T_2 = \tilde{S}$ and $\tilde{C} = \tilde{D}$. $\square$

Let

$$\mathcal{N} = \pi_{[1, \ell]}(\tilde{\mathcal{M}} \cup \mathcal{M}_0 \cup \tilde{\mathcal{A}}), \quad (10)$$

and finally,

$$\mathcal{A}^0 = (\tilde{S}^0)_{\mathcal{N}}. \quad (11)$$

5 Critical points and minors

In the previous section, $\tilde{S}^0$ is described as the image of a projection applied to the basic semi-algebraic set $\text{Bas}(\{F\}, \tilde{Q})$ (see Remark 36). This means that we cannot hope to compute a roadmap of $\tilde{S}^0$ by a divide-and-conquer algorithm directly since the input to such an algorithm should be a basic semi-algebraic set. In this section, we give an alternative description of $\tilde{S}^0$ (see Proposition 48 below) as a (limit of) union of basic semi-algebraic sets which allows us to get past this problem.

5.1 Description of critical points

In the case when $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, \dots, P_m\}$ is in general position with respect to $G \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$, we can describe $\text{Crit}(\mathcal{P}, G) \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ as follows.

Define the jacobian matrix

$$\text{Jac} := \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial G}{\partial X_1} & \frac{\partial P_1}{\partial X_1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial P_m}{\partial X_1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial G}{\partial X_k} & \frac{\partial P_1}{\partial X_k} & \cdots & \frac{\partial P_m}{\partial X_k} \end{pmatrix}$$

whose rows are indexed by $[1, k]$ and columns by $[0, m]$.

For $J \subset [1, k]$ and $J' \subset [0, m]$, let $\text{Jac}(J, J')$ the matrix obtained from Jac by extracting the rows of number in J and the columns of numbers in J'

For each $0 \leq r \leq m$, and each $J \in \binom{k}{r}$, $J' \in \binom{[0, m]}{r}$, let

$$\text{jac}(J, J') = \det(\text{Jac}(J, J')).$$

For every $i \in [1, k] \setminus J$, and $i' \in [0, m] \setminus J'$, let

$$\text{Eq}(J, J') := \mathcal{P} \cup \bigcup_{i \in [1, k] \setminus J, i' \in [0, m] \setminus J'} \text{jac}(J \cup \{i\}, J' \cup \{i'\}),$$

and the finite constructible set

$$\text{Cons}(J, J') := \{x \in \text{Zer}(\text{Eq}(J, J'), \mathbb{R}\langle \zeta, \varepsilon, \delta \rangle^k) \mid \text{jac}(J, J')(x) \neq 0\}.$$

Proposition 45. *If $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, \dots, P_m\}$ is in general position with respect to $G \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$, the finite variety $\text{Crit}(\mathcal{P}, G)$ is the union of the various $\text{Cons}(J, J')$, $0 \leq r \leq m$, $J \in \binom{k}{r}$, $J' \in \binom{[0, m]}{r}$.*

Proof Follows from the description of obtained from Proposition 16 and Cramer's rule as follows.

We first prove that $\text{Crit}(\mathcal{P}, G)$ is contained in the union of the various $\text{Cons}(J, J')$, $0 \leq r \leq m$, $J \in \binom{k}{r}$, $J' \in \binom{[0, m]}{r}$. It follows from Definition 4 that each $x \in \text{Crit}(\mathcal{P}, G)$ is contained in the projection to $\mathbb{R}^k$ of the set of solutions to the system of equations, $\text{CritEq}(\mathcal{P}, G)$ (cf. Eqn. (1)).

Substituting, $X = x$ in the above system, we obtain the following system of homogeneous linear equations in $\lambda = (\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_m)$.

$$\lambda_0 \frac{\partial G}{\partial X_i}(x) + \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \frac{\partial P_j}{\partial X_i}(x) = 0, i = 1, \dots, k \quad (12)$$

Let the rank of the matrix of coefficients of the above system be r_x . Then, $r_x \leq m$, since there must exist a $\lambda = (\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_m)$ satisfying (12) and $\lambda \neq (0, \dots, 0)$ since it has to satisfy also the equation

$$\sum_{j=0}^m \lambda_j^2 - 1 = 0.$$

Then there exists $J \subset \binom{k}{r_x}$, $J' \subset \binom{[0, m]}{r_x}$ such that the $r_x \times r_x$ sub-matrix of the matrix of coefficients with rows indexed by J and columns indexed by J' has full rank and hence $\text{jac}(J, J')(x) \neq 0$. Then, clearly for every $i \in [1, k] \setminus J$, and $i' \in [0, m] \setminus J'$,

$$\text{jac}(J \cup \{i\}, J' \cup \{i'\})(x) = 0.$$

Hence, $x \in \text{Cons}(J, J')$ using the definition of the set $\text{Cons}(J, J')$ This completes the proof that $\text{Crit}(\mathcal{P}, G)$ is contained in union of the various $\text{Cons}(J, J')$, $0 \leq r \leq m$, $J \in \binom{k}{r}$, $J' \in \binom{[0, m]}{r}$.

To prove the reverse inclusion fix, r , $0 \leq r \leq m$, $J \in \binom{[k]}{r}$, $J' \in \binom{[0, m]}{r}$, and let $x \in \text{Cons}(J, J')$. Then, $\text{jac}(J, J')(x) \neq 0$, and for each $i \in [1, k] \setminus J$, and $i' \in [0, m] \setminus J'$, $\text{jac}(J \cup \{j\}, J' \cup \{i'\})(x) = 0$. We now show that there exists $\lambda = (\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_m)$ such that (x, λ) satisfy the system of equations (11). It follows from Cramer's rule that for each $i \in J$, the equation

$$\lambda_0 \frac{\partial G}{\partial X_i}(x) + \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \frac{\partial P_j}{\partial X_i}(x) = 0,$$

is satisfied after making the substitution

$$\lambda_j = - \sum_{j' \in J' \setminus \{j\}} \frac{\text{jac}(J, J' \setminus \{j\} \cup \{j'\})(x)}{\text{jac}(J, J')(x)} \lambda_{j'}. \quad (13)$$

for each $j \in J'$.

Moreover, substituting the expressions in (13) in the equations indexed by $i \in [1, k] \setminus J$, clearing the denominator $\text{jac}(J, J')(x)$, we have that coefficient of $\lambda_{i'}$ for $i' \in [0, m] \setminus J'$ equals $\text{jac}(J \cup \{i\}, J' \cup \{i'\})(x)$ and hence equal to 0. Thus, the equations indexed by $i \in [1, k] \setminus J$ in (11) are satisfied as well. Finally since, $r \leq m < m+1$, we can assume, that there exists $\lambda = (\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_m) \in \mathbb{R} \langle \zeta, \varepsilon, \delta \rangle^{m+1}$ with not all coordinates equal to 0, such that (x, λ) satisfy all but the last equation in (11), and it follows that there exists λ such that (x, λ) satisfy (11), and hence $x \in \text{Crit}(\mathcal{P}, G)$. This proves the reverse inclusion. $\square$

5.2 Description of $\tilde{S}^0$ using minors

Notation 46. Following Notation 28

- i. Let $\ell \leq p \leq k$, $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}' \subset \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \cup \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}' = \{F_1, \dots, F_m\}$.
- ii. Define the matrix

$$\text{Jac}(\ell, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}') := \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial G}{\partial X_{\ell+1}} & \frac{\partial F_1}{\partial X_{\ell+1}} & \cdots & \frac{\partial F_m}{\partial X_{\ell+1}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial G}{\partial X_k} & \frac{\partial F_1}{\partial X_k} & \cdots & \frac{\partial F_m}{\partial X_k} \end{pmatrix}$$

whose rows are indexed by $[\ell+1, k]$ and columns by $[0, m]$.

For each $\alpha = (\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}', r, J, J')$ with $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}' \subset \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$, $0 \leq r \leq m$, $J \in \binom{[\ell+1, k]}{r}$, $J' \in \binom{[0, m]}{r}$ denote by

$$\text{jac}(\alpha) := \det(\text{Jac}(\ell, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}')(J, J')).$$

Moreover, for each $i \in [\ell+1, k] \setminus J$, $i' \in [0, m] \setminus J'$, let

$$\text{jac}(\alpha, i, i') := \det(\text{Jac}(\ell, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}')(J \cup \{i\}, J' \cup \{i'\})).$$

Let

$$\mathcal{P}^0(\alpha) := \tilde{\mathcal{P}} \cup \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}' \cup \bigcup_{i \in [\ell+1, k] \setminus J, i' \in [0, m] \setminus J'} \{\text{jac}(\alpha, i, i')\}, \quad (14)$$

$$\mathcal{Q}^0(\alpha) := \tilde{\mathcal{Q}} \cup \{\text{jac}(\alpha)^2 - \gamma\} \quad (15)$$

- iii. Define

$$S^0(\alpha) = \text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}^0(\alpha), \mathcal{Q}^0(\alpha)).$$

$\square$

Notation 47. Fixing $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}, \ell$ with $0 \leq \ell \leq p \leq k$, we denote by $\mathcal{I}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}, \ell)$ the set of quadruples $\alpha = (\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}', r, J, J')$ with $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}' \subset \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}, 0 \leq r \leq m, J \in \binom{[\ell+1, k]}{r}, J' \in \binom{[0, m]}{r}$. $\square$

Proposition 48.

$$\tilde{S}^0 = \lim_{\gamma} \left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{I}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}, \ell)} S^0(\alpha) \right).$$

Proof We first prove that

$$\tilde{S}^0 = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{I}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}, \ell)} \{x \in \text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}^0(\alpha), \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}) \mid \text{jac}(\alpha)(x) \neq 0\}. \quad (16)$$

Notice that for each $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}' \subset \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}, \tilde{S}^0(\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}')$ is the set of G -critical points of $\text{Zer}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \cup \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}'(w, \cdot), \mathbb{R}\langle \zeta, \varepsilon, \delta \rangle^k)$ contained in $\tilde{S}$, as w varies over $\mathbb{R}\langle \zeta, \varepsilon, \delta \rangle^\ell$, and $\tilde{S}^0 = \bigcup_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}' \subset \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}} \tilde{S}^0(\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}')$. It follows from Proposition 45 that for each $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}' \subset \tilde{\mathcal{Q}},$

$$\tilde{S}^0(\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}') = \{x \in \text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}^0(\alpha), \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}) \mid \text{jac}(\alpha)(x) \neq 0\} \quad (17)$$

and this proves (16).

Noticing that all the sets $\{x \in \text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}^0(\alpha), \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}) \mid \text{jac}(\alpha)(x) \neq 0\}$ are bounded, and it follows from the definition of $\{x \in \text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}^0(\alpha), \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}) \mid \text{jac}(\alpha)(x) \neq 0\}$ and $S^0(\alpha)$ that

$$\lim_{\gamma} S^0(\alpha) = \overline{\{x \in \text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}^0(\alpha), \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}) \mid \text{jac}(\alpha)(x) \neq 0\}}. \quad (18)$$

Also, since $\tilde{S}^0$ is closed it follows from (17) that

$$\tilde{S}^0 = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{I}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}, \ell)} \overline{\{x \in \text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}^0(\alpha), \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}) \mid \text{jac}(\alpha)(x) \neq 0\}}.$$

The proposition now follows from (18). $\square$

Remark 49. Note that if the description of S does not involve any inequality, this is the first time that an inequality appears in the construction. $\square$

5.2.1 Definition of $\mathcal{A}^0(\alpha)$

It remains to define well chosen finite set of points ensuring good connectivity properties.

Notation 50. For each $\alpha \in \mathcal{I}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}, \ell)$, we denote (using Notation 41)

$$\mathcal{A}^0(\alpha) = \text{MinDi}(S^0(\alpha), \mathcal{A}^0) \cup \left(\bigcup_{\beta \in \mathcal{I}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}, \ell)} \text{MinDi}(S^0(\alpha), S^0(\beta)) \right).$$

$\square$

We have the following property of the finite sets $\mathcal{A}^0(\alpha), \alpha \in \mathcal{I}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}, \ell)$.

Proposition 51. For every α, β in $\mathcal{I}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}, \ell)$ the following are true.

1. $\bigcup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{I}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}, \ell)} \lim_{\gamma} (\mathcal{A}^0(\alpha)) \supset \mathcal{A}^0$.
2. For C and D semi-algebraically connected components (not necessarily distinct) of $S^0(\alpha)$ and $S^0(\beta)$ such that $\lim_{\gamma} (C) \cap \lim_{\gamma} (D)$ is non-empty, $\lim_{\gamma} (C \cap \mathcal{A}^0(\alpha)) \cap \lim_{\gamma} (D \cap \mathcal{A}^0(\beta))$ is non-empty and meets every semi-algebraically connected component of $\lim_{\gamma} (C) \cap \lim_{\gamma} (D)$.
3. $\mathcal{A}^0(\alpha) \subset S^0(\alpha)$ meets every semi-algebraically connected component of $S^0(\alpha)$.

Proof

1. Follows from Proposition 42.
2. Follows directly from Proposition 43.
3. It is a special case of 2. □

6 Divide and conquer algorithm

6.1 Tree constructed by the algorithm

Before giving the algorithm in full detail, we describe the tree constructed in the algorithm, using the objects constructed in the former two sections.

Notation 52. We consider an ordered domain D contained in a real closed field R . We denote by D_t the polynomial ring $D[\eta_1, \dots, \eta_t]$ and we denote by R_t the real closed field $R\langle\eta_1, \dots, \eta_t\rangle$ where $\eta_i = (\zeta_i, \varepsilon_i, \delta_i, \gamma_i)$. By convention $R_0 = R$ and $D_0 = D$. □

We start with a real algebraic variety $V = \text{Zer}(P, R^k)$ (assumed to be bounded), of dimension $\leq k - 1$ (assumed to be a power of 2 for simplicity), and suppose that $\mathcal{A} \subset V$ is a finite set of points meeting every semi-algebraically connected component of V . The algorithm constructs a rooted tree, $\text{Tree}(V)$, and in each node $\mathbf{n}$ of $\text{Tree}(V)$ associates a basic semi-algebraic set $\text{Bas}(\mathbf{n})$, as well as a finite set of points $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{n}) \subset \text{Bas}(\mathbf{n})$.

More precisely, we associate to the root, $\mathbf{r}$, of $\text{Tree}(V)$, the real algebraic variety $\text{Bas}(\mathbf{r}) = V$, set $s(\mathbf{r})$ to the empty string, and let the finite set of points $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{r}) = \mathcal{A}$.

At a general node $\mathbf{n}$ of $\text{Tree}(V)$ of level t there is a string $s(\mathbf{n}) \in \{0, 1\}^t$, and an associated basic semi-algebraic set $\text{Bas}(\mathbf{n}) = \{w(\mathbf{n})\} \times \text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{n}), \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{n})) \subset R_t^k$, with $\dim(\text{Bas}(\mathbf{n})) \leq (k - 1)/2^t$, $w(\mathbf{n}) \in R_t^{\text{Fix}(\mathbf{n})}$, with $\text{Fix}(\mathbf{n}) = \sum_{i=1}^t s(\mathbf{n})_i (k - 1)/2^i$, and a finite number of points $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{n})$ meeting every semi-algebraically connected components of S . We replace $\text{Bas}(\mathbf{n})$ by a semi-algebraic set $\widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n}) = \{w(\mathbf{n})\} \times \text{Bas}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}), \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathbf{n})) \subset R_t^k$ such that $\lim_{\zeta_i}(\widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})) = \text{Bas}(\mathbf{n})$ (see Notation 23) and define semi-algebraic subsets $\widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})^0, \widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})^1 = (\widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n}))_{\mathcal{N}}$ of $\widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})$, with $\dim(\widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})^0), \dim(\widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n}))_{\mathcal{N}} \leq (k - 1)/2^{t+1}$, and $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}, \mathcal{D}^0, \mathcal{M}^0$ (by the method described in sections 4.3.3 and 4.3.4, with $p = (k - 1)/2^t$, $\ell = p/2 = (k - 1)/2^{t+1}$) such that the tuple $(\widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n}), \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}, \ell, \widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})^0, \mathcal{D}^0, \mathcal{M}^0)$ is special (cf. Definition 12 and Proposition 39). We also define finite number of points $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\mathcal{A}^0$, as in Section 4.3.6.

For every $w \in \mathcal{N}$ we have a right child $\mathbf{m}$ of the node $\mathbf{n}$, with $s(\mathbf{m}) = (s(\mathbf{n}), 1)$, $w(\mathbf{m}) = (w(\mathbf{n}), w)$ and associated semi-algebraic set $\text{Bas}(\mathbf{m}) = \text{Ext}(\widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})_{w(\mathbf{m})}, R_t)$, and a finite set of points $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{m}) = \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{w(\mathbf{m})} \cup \mathcal{A}_{w(\mathbf{m})}^0$.

We do not have a good description of $\widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})^0 \subset R_t\langle\zeta_{t+1}, \varepsilon_{t+1}, \delta_{t+1}\rangle^k$ since it is defined as an image of a certain semi-algebraic set under a projection along certain Lagrangian variables. But we are able to identify (by the method of section 5.2, using Notation 47) a finite family $(\text{Bas}(\mathbf{n})^0(\alpha))_{\alpha \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{n})}$ of semi-algebraic subsets of $\text{Ext}(\widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})^0, R_{t+1})$, with each

$$\text{Bas}(\mathbf{n})^0(\alpha) = \{w(\mathbf{n})\} \times \text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}^0(\alpha), \mathcal{Q}^0(\alpha)) \subset R_{t+1}^k$$

such that

$$\bigcup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{n})} \lim_{\gamma_{t+1}} (\text{Bas}(\mathbf{n})^0(\alpha)) = \widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})^0$$

using Proposition 48, with $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{n}) = \mathcal{I}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}), \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathbf{n}), (k - 1)/2^{t+1})$ (see Notation 47).

For each $\alpha \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{n})$ we include a left child node $\mathbf{n}(\alpha)$, with $s(\mathbf{n}(\alpha)) = (s(\mathbf{n}), 0)$ $w(\mathbf{n}(\alpha)) = w(\mathbf{n})$ and associated semi-algebraic set $\text{Bas}(\mathbf{n}(\alpha)) = \text{Bas}(\mathbf{n})^0(\alpha)$, and we associate the set of points

$$\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{n}(\alpha)) = \mathcal{A}^0(\alpha)$$

using the definitions in Section 6.2.1.

To a node $\mathbf{n}$ of the tree $\text{Tree}(V)$ of level t , we associate a string $s(\mathbf{n})$ inductively as follows: $s(\mathbf{r})$ is the empty string, the type of a right child of $\mathbf{n}$ is $(s(\mathbf{n}), 1)$ and the type of a left child of $\mathbf{n}$ is $(s(\mathbf{n}), 0)$.

Proposition 53. *Let $\mathbf{n}$ be a node of the tree $\text{Tree}(V)$, with $\text{level}(\mathbf{n}) = t$, let $\text{Leav}(\mathbf{n})$ be the set of leaves of the sub-tree of $\text{Tree}(V)$ rooted at $\mathbf{n}$. The semi-algebraic set*

$$\bigcup_{\mathbf{m} \in \text{Leav}(\mathbf{n})} \lim_{\zeta_{t+1}} (\text{Bas}(\mathbf{m}))$$

contains $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{n})$ and has good connectivity property with respect to $\text{Bas}(\mathbf{n})$.

For the proof of Proposition 53, we are going to use a classical topology result in the semi-algebraic context.

Proposition 54. *Let $(C_i, D_i)_{i \in I}$ be a finite number of pairs of non-empty connected closed and bounded semi-algebraic sets such that $D_i \subset C_i$, $C = \bigcup_{i \in I} C_i$ is semi-algebraically connected, and, for each pair $(i, j) \in I \times I$, every semi-algebraically connected component of $C_i \cap C_j$ meets $D_i \cap D_j$. Then $D = \bigcup_{i \in I} D_i$ is semi-algebraically connected.*

Proof We give a homological proof. For any closed and bounded semi-algebraic set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^k$, we denote by $H^0(S)$ the $\mathbb{R}$ -vector space of locally constant functions on S . We have the following diagram of homomorphisms.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \ker(\phi) & \xrightarrow{i} & \bigoplus_{i \in I} H^0(C_i) & \xrightarrow{\phi} & \bigoplus_{i, j \in I} H^0(C_i \cap C_j) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \oplus_i r_i & & \downarrow \oplus_{i, j} r_{ij} \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \ker(\psi) & \xrightarrow{i} & \bigoplus_{i \in I} H^0(D_i) & \xrightarrow{\psi} & \bigoplus_{i, j \in I} H^0(D_i \cap D_j) \end{array}$$

In the above diagram ϕ and ψ are generalized restrictions and r_i, r_{ij} ordinary restriction homomorphisms. By a standard argument using the Mayer-Vietoris exact sequence, the two rows are exact and

$$\begin{aligned} \ker(\phi) &\cong H^0\left(\bigcup_{i \in I} C_i\right), \\ \ker(\psi) &\cong H^0\left(\bigcup_{i \in I} D_i\right). \end{aligned}$$

The hypothesis implies that the third vertical homomorphism is an isomorphism and the last vertical homomorphism is injective. Since the first vertical homomorphism is also trivially an isomorphism, it now follows from the Five Lemma that the second vertical homomorphism is surjective. Since, it is also clearly injective (by hypothesis), it follows that

$$H^0\left(\bigcup_{i \in I} C_i\right) \cong H^0\left(\bigcup_{i \in I} D_i\right).$$

□

Proof of Proposition 53.

Let

$$\text{Skel}(\mathbf{n}) = \bigcup_{\mathbf{p} \in \text{Leav}(\mathbf{n})} \text{Bas}(\mathbf{p}),$$

The proof is by induction on the level of $\mathbf{n}$ with the base case being when $\mathbf{n}$ is a leaf node. Suppose now that the proposition is true for all nodes with level $> t$.

Then, by induction hypothesis we can assume that for each child node $\mathbf{m}$ of $\mathbf{n}$, $\lim_{\zeta_{t+2}}(\text{Skel}(\mathbf{m}))$ has good connectivity property with respect to $\text{Bas}(\mathbf{m})$ and contains $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{m})$.

We now prove that $\lim_{\zeta_{t+1}}(\text{Skel}(\mathbf{n}))$ has good connectivity property with respect to $\text{Bas}(\mathbf{n})$. Let C be a semi-algebraically connected component of $\text{Bas}(\mathbf{n})$, and $E = C \cap \lim_{\zeta_{t+1}}(\text{Skel}(\mathbf{n}))$.

Note that $\text{Bas}(\mathbf{n}) = \lim_{\zeta_{t+1}}(\widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n}))$ by Proposition 29, and let $\tilde{C}_1, \dots, \tilde{C}_L$ be the semi-algebraically connected component of $\widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})$ such that $C \supset \lim_{\zeta_{t+1}}(\tilde{C}_i)$.

Since $\widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})^0 \cup \widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})^1$ has good connectivity property with respect to $\widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})$ by Corollary 40, for each $i, 1 \leq i \leq L$, we have that $D_i = \tilde{C}_i \cap (\widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})^0 \cup \widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})^1)$ is non-empty and semi-algebraically connected and is thus a semi-algebraically connected component of $\widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})^0 \cup \widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})^1$.

Let $\mathcal{D}_i$ be the finite family of semi-algebraic sets such that

- i. $\tilde{D} \in \mathcal{D}_i$ if and only if $\tilde{D}$ is a semi-algebraically connected component of some $\text{Bas}(\mathbf{m})$, where $\mathbf{m}$ is a child node of $\mathbf{n}$, and
- ii. $\lim_{\gamma_t}(\tilde{D}) \subset D_i$.

Let for each $\tilde{D} \in \mathcal{D}_i$, $\tilde{E} = \tilde{D} \cap \lim_{\zeta_{t+2}}(\text{Skel}(\mathbf{m}))$. Then, by the induction hypothesis applied to $\mathbf{m}$ each $\tilde{E}$ is non-empty and connected.

Consider two distinct elements $\tilde{D}$ and $\tilde{D}'$ of $\mathcal{D}_i$, associated to children nodes of $\mathbf{n}$, $\mathbf{m}$ and $\mathbf{m}'$. There are three cases to consider

1. $\mathbf{m}$ and $\mathbf{m}'$ are both left children, with $\text{Bas}(\mathbf{m}) = \widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n}(\alpha))^0$, $\text{Bas}(\mathbf{m}') = \widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n}(\beta))^0$. Consider a semi-algebraically connected component F of $\lim_{\gamma_{t+1}}(\tilde{D}) \cap \lim_{\gamma_{t+1}}(\tilde{D}')$. By Definition 5.2.1, $\lim_{\gamma_{t+1}}(\tilde{D} \cap \mathcal{A}^0(\alpha)) \cap \lim_{\gamma_{t+1}}(\tilde{D}' \cap \mathcal{A}^0(\beta))$ meets F . Since $\mathcal{A}^0(\alpha) = \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{m}) \subset \lim_{\zeta_{t+2}}(\text{Skel}(\mathbf{m}))$ and $\mathcal{A}^0(\beta) = \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{m}') \subset \lim_{\zeta_{t+2}}(\text{Skel}(\mathbf{m}'))$ by induction hypothesis, we conclude that F meets $\lim_{\gamma_{t+1}}(\tilde{E} \cap \mathcal{A}^0(\alpha)) \cap \lim_{\gamma_{t+1}}(\tilde{E}' \cap \mathcal{A}^0(\beta))$.

2. $\mathbf{m}$ is a left child and $\mathbf{m}'$ is a right child, with $\text{Bas}(\mathbf{m}) = \widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n}(\alpha))^0$, $\text{Bas}(\mathbf{m}') = \widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})_{w(\mathbf{m}')}^0$. Consider a semi-algebraically connected component F of $\lim_{\gamma_{t+1}}(\tilde{D}) \cap \lim_{\gamma_{t+1}}(\tilde{D}')$. Since $\lim_{\gamma_{t+1}}(\tilde{D}) \cap \lim_{\gamma_{t+1}}(\tilde{D}') \subset \mathcal{A}^0$, $F = \{x\}$ with $x \in \mathcal{A}_w^0$. Since $\mathcal{A}^0(\alpha) = \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{m}) \subset \lim_{\zeta_{t+2}}(\text{Skel}(\mathbf{m}))$ and $\mathcal{A}_w^0 \subset \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{m}') \subset \lim_{\zeta_{t+2}}(\text{Skel}(\mathbf{m}'))$ by induction hypothesis, we conclude that F meets $\lim_{\gamma_{t+1}}(\tilde{E} \cap \mathcal{A}^0(\alpha)) \cap \lim_{\gamma_{t+1}}(\tilde{E}' \cap \mathcal{A}_w^0)$.

3. $\mathbf{m}$ and $\mathbf{m}'$ are both right children of $\mathbf{n}$, such that $\text{Bas}(\mathbf{m}) = \widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})_{w(\mathbf{m})}$, with $w(\mathbf{m}) = (w(\mathbf{n}), w)$ and $\text{Bas}(\mathbf{m}') = \widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})_{w(\mathbf{m}')}^0$, with $w(\mathbf{m}') = (w(\mathbf{n}), w')$. Then $\widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})_{w(\mathbf{m})} \cap \widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})_{w(\mathbf{m}')}^0 = \emptyset$ and there is nothing to prove.

So, we can apply Proposition 54 to $(\lim_{\gamma_{t+1}}(\tilde{D}), \lim_{\gamma_{t+1}}(\tilde{E}))_{\tilde{D} \in \mathcal{D}_i}$, and we obtain that $E_i = \bigcup_{\tilde{D} \in \mathcal{D}_i} \lim_{\gamma_{t+1}}(\tilde{E})$ is non-empty and connected.

Now, consider $\tilde{C}_i$ and $\tilde{C}_{i'}$, and a semi-algebraically connected component F of $\lim_{\zeta_{t+1}}(\tilde{C}_i) \cap \lim_{\zeta_{t+1}}(\tilde{C}_{i'})$. By Section 4.3.6, let $\lim_{\gamma_{t+1}}(\tilde{C}_i \cap \tilde{\mathcal{A}}) \cap \lim_{\gamma_{t+1}}(\tilde{C}_{i'} \cap \tilde{\mathcal{A}})$ meets F . Let $x = (w(\mathbf{m}), z) \in \tilde{C}_i \cap \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ and $x' = (w(\mathbf{m}'), z') \in \tilde{C}_{i'} \cap \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ such that $\lim_{\zeta_{t+1}}(x) = \lim_{\zeta_{t+1}}(x') \in F$. Applying the induction hypothesis to the right child $\mathbf{m}$ defined by $\text{Bas}(\mathbf{m}) = \widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})_{w(\mathbf{m})}$, we have $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{w(\mathbf{m})} \subset \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{m}) \subset \lim_{\zeta_{t+1}}(\text{Skel}(\mathbf{m}))$, we conclude that $\lim_{\zeta_{t+1}}(x) \in \lim_{\zeta_{t+1}}(\tilde{E}_i \cap \mathcal{A}^0(\alpha)) \cap \lim_{\gamma_t}(\tilde{E}_{i'} \cap \mathcal{A}_w^0)$. Similarly, applying the induction hypothesis to the right child $\mathbf{m}'$ defined by $\text{Bas}(\mathbf{m}') = \widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})_{w(\mathbf{m}')}^0$, we have $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{w'} \subset \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{m}') \subset \lim_{\zeta_{t+1}}(\text{Skel}(\mathbf{m}'))$. We conclude that $\lim_{\zeta_t}(x) = \lim_{\zeta_t}(x') \in \lim_{\zeta_t}(E_i \cap \tilde{\mathcal{A}}) \cap \lim_{\zeta_t}(E_{i'} \cap \tilde{\mathcal{A}})$.

Applying again Proposition 54 to $(\lim_{\zeta_{t+1}}(\tilde{C}_i), \lim_{\zeta_{t+1}}(E_i))_{1 \leq i \leq L}$, we obtain that $E = \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq L} \lim_{\zeta_{t+1}}(E_i)$ is non-empty and connected. $\square$

With the same notation as in Proposition 53 we also have the following.

Proposition 55. *Let $\mathbf{n}$ be a node of the tree $\text{Tree}(V)$, with $\text{level}(\mathbf{n}) = t$, and let $\text{Leav}_0(\mathbf{n})$ be the set of leaves $\mathbf{m}$ of the sub-tree of $\text{Tree}(V)$ rooted at $\mathbf{n}$, such that $s(\mathbf{m}) = (s(\mathbf{n}), 0^{\log_2(k-1)-t})$. Then, the semi-algebraic set*

$$L = \bigcup_{\mathbf{m} \in \text{Leav}_0(\mathbf{n})} \lim_{\zeta_{t+1}}(\text{Bas}(\mathbf{m}))$$

has the property that for all $x \in R_t$, $L_{(w(\mathbf{n}), x)}$ meets every semi-algebraically connected component of $\text{Bas}(\mathbf{n})_{(w(\mathbf{n}), x)}$.

Proof The proof is by induction on $t = \text{level}(\mathbf{n})$. If $\mathbf{n}$ is a leaf node with $|s(\mathbf{n})| = 0$, then $\text{Leav}_0(\mathbf{n}) = \{\mathbf{n}\}$ and there is nothing to prove. Now assume that the proposition is true for all $\mathbf{n}'$, with $\text{level}(\mathbf{n}') > t$.

Note that the left children of $\mathbf{n}$ are precisely those children $\mathbf{m}$ of $\mathbf{n}$ with $s(\mathbf{m}) = (s(\mathbf{n}), 0)$, and these are in 1-1 correspondence with $\alpha \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{n})$. Let the left child corresponding to $\alpha \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{n})$ be denoted by $\mathbf{n}(\alpha)$.

We have the following claims, denoting $\text{Ext}(\widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})^0, R_{t+1})$ by $\widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})^0$ and $\text{Ext}(\widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n}), R_{t+1})$ by $\widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})$, with a slight abuse of notation.

1. For each $w \in R_{t+1}^\ell$, where $\ell = (k-1)/2^{t+1}$ (see Eqn. (19) above), $\widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})_{(w(\mathbf{n}), w)}^0$ meets every semi-algebraically connected component of $\widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})_{(w(\mathbf{n}), w)}$ (Proposition 34).

It follows immediately (since $\ell \geq 1$) that for each $x' \in R_{t+1}$, $\widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})_{(w(\mathbf{n}), x')}^0$ meets every semi-algebraically connected component of $\widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})_{(w(\mathbf{n}), x')}$.

2. Also, $\lim_{\zeta_{t+1}}(\widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})) = \text{Bas}(\mathbf{n}) \subset R_t^k$ (Proposition 29). It follows that for any $x \in R_t$, and C a semi-algebraically connected component of $\text{Bas}(\mathbf{n})_{(w(\mathbf{n}), x)}$, there exists $x' \in R_{t+1}$ with $\lim_{\zeta_{t+1}}(x') = x$, and a semi-algebraically connected component D of $\widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})_{(w(\mathbf{n}), x')}$ such that $\lim_{\zeta_{t+1}}(D) \subset C$.

3. Using Claim 1. there exists a semi-algebraically connected component D^0 of $\widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})_{(w(\mathbf{n}), x')}^0$ which is contained in D .

Now since,

$$\widetilde{\text{Bas}}(\mathbf{n})^0 = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{n})} \lim_{\gamma_{t+1}} \text{Bas}(\mathbf{n}(\alpha))$$

there exists a left child $\mathbf{n}(\alpha)$ of $\mathbf{n}$ and a semi-algebraically connected component $D_{\mathbf{n}(\alpha)}$ of $\text{Bas}(\mathbf{n}(\alpha))$ such that $\lim_{\gamma_{t+1}}(D_{\mathbf{n}(\alpha)}) \subset D^0$.

Noting that being the left child of $\mathbf{n}$, $\text{level}(\mathbf{n}(\alpha)) > \text{level}(\mathbf{n})$, and noting that the fact $s(\mathbf{n}(\alpha)) = (s(\mathbf{n}), 0)$ implies that $\text{Fix}(\mathbf{n}(\alpha)) = \text{Fix}(\mathbf{n})$, we can apply the induction hypothesis to obtain that $L'_{(w(\mathbf{n}), x')}$ meets $D_{\mathbf{n}(\alpha)}$, where

$$L' = \bigcup_{\mathbf{m} \in \text{Leav}_0(\mathbf{n}(\alpha))} \lim_{\zeta_{t+2}}(\text{Bas}(\mathbf{m})).$$

Now $\lim_{\zeta_{t+1}}(L') \subset L$, which implies that $\lim_{\zeta_{t+1}}(L'_{(w(\mathbf{n}), x')}) \subset L_{(w(\mathbf{n}), x)}$. Moreover, $L'_{(w(\mathbf{n}), x)} \cap D_{\mathbf{n}(\alpha)} \neq \emptyset$, $\lim_{\gamma_{t+1}}(D_{\mathbf{n}(\alpha)}) \subset D^0 \subset D$, and $\lim_{\zeta_{t+1}}(D) \subset C$. Together they imply that $L_{(w(\mathbf{n}), x)} \cap C \neq \emptyset$. $\square$

Proposition 56. *Let $\mathbf{n}$ be a node in $\text{Tree}(V)$ of level t , and $\mathbf{n}$ not a leaf node. Then, the set of points $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{n}) \subset R_t^k$, is contained in $\lim_{\zeta_{t+1}}(\bigcup_{\mathbf{m}} \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{m}))$, where the union is taken over all right children $\mathbf{m}$ of $\mathbf{n}$.*

Proof We have by Proposition 44 that

$$\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{n}) \subset \lim_{\zeta_{t+1}} (\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{n})). \quad (19)$$

By construction of $\text{Tree}(V)$ we also have that $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{n}) \supset \pi_{[1, \text{Fix}(\mathbf{n}) + \ell]}(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{n}))$ where $\ell = (k - 1)/2^{t+1}$. Moreover for each $(w(\mathbf{n}), w) \in \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{n})$, there is a right child $\mathbf{m}$ of $\mathbf{n}$, with $w(\mathbf{m}) = (w(\mathbf{n}), w)$, hence $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{n})_{w(\mathbf{m})} \subset \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{m})$. So finally,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{n}) = \bigcup_{\mathbf{m}} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{n})_{w(\mathbf{m})} \subset \bigcup_{\mathbf{m}} \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{m}) \quad (20)$$

where the union is taken over all right children $\mathbf{m}$ of $\mathbf{n}$. The proposition now follows from (19) and (20) above. $\square$

Theorem 57. *Let Leav be the set of leaf nodes of $\text{Tree}(V)$. Then, the semi-algebraic set*

$$\bigcup_{\mathbf{n} \in \text{Leav}} \lim_{\zeta_1} (\text{Bas}(\mathbf{n}))$$

contains $\mathcal{A}$ and satisfies the properties of a roadmap of V .

Proof The fact that $\mathcal{A}$ is contained in the set $\bigcup_{\mathbf{n} \in \text{Leav}} \lim_{\zeta_1} (\text{Bas}(\mathbf{n}))$ follows from the fact that $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{r})$ by construction, and Proposition 56. The roadmap property RM1 follows from Proposition 53, and RM2 follows from Proposition 55 noting that $\text{Fix}(\mathbf{r}) = 0$. $\square$

6.2 Preliminary definitions and algorithms for the divide step

In this subsection we will introduce certain notation, definitions and algorithms that will be used in the “divide” step of the divide-and-conquer algorithm presented in the next section. Recall that in the construction of the tree $\text{Tree}(V)$, at each node $\mathbf{n}$ of $\text{Tree}(V)$, some coordinates have been fixed and the basic semi-algebraic set $\text{Bas}(\mathbf{n})$ is contained in the fiber over the point $w(\mathbf{n})$ consisting of the fixed coordinates. We now describe how we represent algebraically the points that fix the fibers in our construction and also the necessary algorithms to compute these points. We refer the reader to [2] for any missing detail.

A root of a univariate polynomials is going to be described by a Thom encoding.

Notation 58. Let P be a univariate polynomial of degree p in $\mathbb{D}[X]$. We denote by $\text{Der}(P)$ the list $P, P', \dots, P^{(p)}$. Let $P \in \mathbb{D}[X]$ and $\sigma \in \{0, 1, -1\}^{\text{Der}(P)}$ a sign condition on the set $\text{Der}(P)$ of derivatives of P . The **Thom encoding** of a root x of P in $\mathbb{R}$ is equal to σ if the sign condition taken by the set $\text{Der}(P)$ at x coincides with σ . Note that two different roots of P have different Thom encodings (see [2] Proposition 2.28). $\square$

Because we need to fix successively blocks of coordinates of decreasing size, triangular Thom encodings appear naturally.

Definition 59. A triangular system of polynomials with variables $T = (T_1, \dots, T_t)$ is a tuple $\mathcal{T} = (F_1, \dots, F_t)$ where

$$F_i \in \mathbb{D}[T_1, \dots, T_i], 1 \leq i \leq t,$$

such that $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{T}, \mathbb{R}^t)$ is finite. A **triangular Thom encoding** specifying $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_t) \in \mathbb{R}^t$ is a pair $(\mathcal{T}, \tau)$ where $\mathcal{T}$ is a triangular system of polynomials and $\tau = \tau_1, \dots, \tau_t$ is a list of Thom encodings, such that τ_i is the Thom encoding of the real root θ_i of $F_i(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{i-1}, T_i)$, for $i = 1, \dots, t$. $\square$

Moreover, we need to describe points in the corresponding fibers, which is done using real univariate representation.

Definition 60. A **k -real univariate representation u over a triangular Thom encoding $\mathcal{T}, \tau$** specifying $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^t$ is of the form

$$u = (f(T, U), \sigma, F(T, U)),$$

where $f(T, U), F(T, U) = (f_0(T, U), \dots, f_k(T, U))$ is a $k+2$ -tuple of polynomials in $\mathbb{D}[T, U]$, such that $f(\theta, U)$ and $f_0(\theta, U)$ are co-prime, and σ is the Thom encoding of a real root x of $f(\theta, U)$. The **point associated** to u is the point

$$\left(\frac{f_1(\theta, x)}{f_0(\theta, x)}, \dots, \frac{f_k(\theta, x)}{f_0(\theta, x)} \right) \in \mathbb{R}^k.$$

For $1 \leq p \leq k$, we call the real univariate presentation $u_{\leq p} = (f(T, U), \sigma, F_{\leq p}(T, U))$ where $F_{\leq p}(T, U) = (f_0(T, U), \dots, f_p(T, U))$, over the initial real triangular Thom encoding $\mathcal{T}, \tau$ to be the **projection of u to the first p coordinates**. Geometrically this corresponds to forgetting the last $k-p$ coordinates of the associated point. $\square$

We now give a few auxiliary algorithms, the first one computes the limit of a Thom Encoding and is used in the determination of G -special values needed in our construction.

Notation 61. We denote by $\bar{\varepsilon} = (\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_t)$ and by $\mathbb{R}\langle \bar{\varepsilon} \rangle = \mathbb{R}\langle \varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_t \rangle$. For an element $f = \sum_{\alpha} c_{\alpha} \bar{\varepsilon}^{\alpha} \in \mathbb{D}[\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_t]$ we will denote by $o_{\bar{\varepsilon}}(f) = \alpha_0 \in \mathbb{N}^t$, such that $\bar{\varepsilon}^{\alpha_0}$ is the largest element of $\text{supp}(f) = \{\bar{\varepsilon}^{\alpha} \mid c_{\alpha} \neq 0\}$ in the unique ordering of the real closed field $\mathbb{R}\langle \bar{\varepsilon} \rangle$. For $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^t$, we denote $\alpha \geq \beta$, if $\bar{\varepsilon}^{\alpha} \geq \bar{\varepsilon}^{\beta}$. We denote as before $\lim_{\varepsilon_1}$ the map that takes elements of $\mathbb{R}\langle \bar{\varepsilon} \rangle$ which are bounded over $\mathbb{R}$ to $\mathbb{R}$, and which is defined as the composition $\lim_{\varepsilon_1} \circ \lim_{\varepsilon_2} \circ \dots \circ \lim_{\varepsilon_m}$. $\square$

Algorithm 1. (Limit of a Thom Encoding)

- **Input** Let $\bar{\varepsilon} = (\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_t)$ be infinitesimals, a Thom encoding $(f_{\bar{\varepsilon}}, \sigma_{\bar{\varepsilon}})$, $f_{\bar{\varepsilon}} \in \mathbb{D}[\bar{\varepsilon}, U]$, representing $x_{\bar{\varepsilon}} \in \mathbb{R}_t\langle \bar{\varepsilon} \rangle$ bounded over $\mathbb{R}$.
- **Output** a Thom encoding (f, σ) , $f \in \mathbb{D}[U]$, representing

$$x = \lim_{\varepsilon_1} (x_{\bar{\varepsilon}}) \in \mathbb{R}.$$

- **Complexity :** If D_1 (resp. D_2) is a bound on the degrees of the polynomials in $f_{\bar{\varepsilon}}$ with respect to U (resp. $\bar{\varepsilon}$) the number of arithmetic operations in $\mathbb{D}$ is bounded by $D_1^{O(1)} D_2^{O(t)}$.
- **Procedure :**
- **Step 1.** Replace (see Notation 61) $f_{\bar{\varepsilon}}$ by $\bar{\varepsilon}^{-o_{\bar{\varepsilon}}(f_{\bar{\varepsilon}})} f_{\bar{\varepsilon}}$. Denote by $f(T)$ the polynomial obtained by substituting successively ε_t by 0, and then ε_{t-1} by 0, and so on, and finally ε_1 by 0, in $f_{\bar{\varepsilon}}$.
- **Step 2.** Compute the set Σ of Thom encodings of roots of $f(T)$ using Algorithm 10.11 (Sign Determination) from [2].

- **Step 3.** Identify the Thom encoding σ using Algorithm 10.13 (Univariate Sign Determination) from [2], by checking whether a ball of infinitesimal radius δ ($1 \gg \delta \gg \bar{\varepsilon} > 0$) around the point x represented by the real univariate representation f , σ contains $x_{\bar{\varepsilon}}$.

Remark 62. From now on, our algorithms use several algorithms from [2] such as Algorithm 12.16 (Bounded Algebraic Sampling), Algorithm 14.9 (Global Optimization), Algorithm 15.2 (Curve Segments), Algorithm 11.19 (Restricted Elimination) with one important modification. Each of these algorithms described in [2] has an associated structure which is an ordered domain in which all computations (i.e arithmetic operations and sign evaluations) take place. In the calls to these algorithms in this paper, this ordered domain will be of the form $D_t[\theta]$, where $\theta \in \mathbb{R}_t^m$ is specified by a triangular Thom encoding $(\mathcal{T}, \tau)$. Each element of $D_t[\theta]$ is represented by some polynomial in $D_t[T_1, \dots, T_m] = D_t[T]$ and arithmetic operations are performed as ordinary polynomial arithmetic in the ring $D_t[T]$. For the evaluation of the sign of an element in $D_t[\theta]$ represented by a polynomial $f \in D_t[T]$ we also use [2], performing Algorithm 12.10 (Triangular Sign Determination) with input $f, \mathcal{T}, \tau$.

If the degree of the output (and of the intermediate computations) of a particular algorithm in [2] is bounded by some function $f(d, k, s)$ of the degree d , the number of variables k and the number of polynomials s , and if d', k', s' is a bound on the degree and number of variables of the input polynomials (considered as polynomials with coefficients in $D_t[\theta]$) in a call to that algorithm in this paper, then the degree bound of the output (and intermediate computations) is $O(f(d', k', s'))$ in the ring $D_t[\theta]$. But we want to evaluate the complexity in the ring D . So we take into account a bound D on the degrees in T, η of the input polynomials, and then the degrees in T, η of the output (and of the intermediate computations) are bounded by $O(D f(d', k', s'))$. Moreover, if the complexity of a particular algorithm in [2] is bounded by some function $F(d, k, s)$, then the cost of the call to that algorithm in this paper in $D[\theta]$, will be bounded by $F(d', k', s')$, while the cost of the call to that algorithm in this paper, i.e. the number of arithmetic operations and sign evaluations in D , will be bounded by $D^{O(m+t)} F(d', k', s')$.

These statements do not follow immediately from the complexity results on the algorithms given in [2]. It is necessary to inspect the algorithms in [2] carefully, noticing that they are all based on linear algebra subroutines and determinant computations. $\square$

We now describe an algorithm for computing the G -special values of an algebraic set (cf. Definition 24).

Algorithm 2. (G -Special Values over a Triangular Thom Encoding)

- **Input:** a triangular Thom encoding $(\mathcal{T}, \tau)$ with $\mathcal{T} \subset D_t[T]$, fixing a point $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $m \leq t$, and a polynomial $Q \in D_t[T, X_1, \dots, X_k]$, such that $\text{Zer}(Q(\theta, \cdot), \mathbb{R}^k)$ is bounded and another polynomial $G \in D_t[X_1, \dots, X_k]$.
- **Output:** a set of Thom encodings (f, σ) over $(\mathcal{T}, \tau)$ specifying a finite subset of $\mathbb{R}$ containing the G -special values of $\text{Zer}(Q(\theta, \cdot), \mathbb{R}^k)$.
- **Complexity:** $D^{O(t)} d^{O(k)}$ where D is a bound on the degree of $\mathcal{T}$ with respect to T, η and d is the degree of Q .
- **Procedure:**
- **Step 1.** Define

$$\begin{aligned} A &:= \|\text{grad}(G)\|^2 \|\text{grad}(\text{Def}(Q, \zeta, d))\|^2, \\ B &:= \langle \text{grad}(G), \text{grad}(\text{Def}(Q, \zeta, d)) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Denote by $\mathcal{Z}$ the algebraic set defined by the following set $\mathcal{P}$ of $k+1$ polynomial equations in the $k+2$ variables $(X_1, \dots, X_k, \lambda_0, \lambda_1, Z)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Def}(Q, \zeta, d) &= 0, \\ \lambda_0 A^2 \frac{\partial \text{Def}(Q, \zeta, d)}{\partial X_i} + \lambda_1 \left(A \frac{\partial B}{\partial X_i} - \frac{\partial A}{\partial X_i} B \right) &= 0, i = 1, \dots, k \\ \lambda_0^2 + \lambda_1^2 &= 0, \\ Z - G(X) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

- **Step 2.** Use Algorithm 12.16 (Bounded Algebraic Sampling) from [2] with ring $D_t[\theta, \zeta]$ and input $\mathcal{P}$ to find a set of real univariate representations over $(\mathcal{T}, \tau)$ with associated points meeting every semi-algebraically connected component of $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathbb{R}\langle \zeta \rangle^{k+3}$.
- **Step 3.** For each real univariate representation

$$(f, g_0, g_1, \dots, g_k, g_{\lambda_0}, g_{\lambda_1}, g_Z), \sigma$$

over $(\mathcal{T}, \tau)$ output in the previous step, where $f, g_0, g_1, \dots, g_k, g_{\lambda_0}, g_{\lambda_1}, g_Z \in D_t[T, \zeta, U]$, eliminating U from the equations

$$f(T, U), Z g_0(T, U) - g_Z(T, U)$$

obtain a Thom encoding $(A(T, \zeta, Z), \alpha)$ over $(\mathcal{T}, \tau)$ describing a point $a \in \mathbb{R}_t\langle \zeta \rangle$.

- **Step 4.** Compute a Thom encoding describing $\lim_{\zeta} (a)$ using Algorithm 1 (Limit of a Thom Encoding).

Proof of correctness. The correctness of Algorithm 2 is a consequence of the correctness of Algorithm 12.16 (Bounded Algebraic Sampling) and Algorithm 12.14 (Limits of bounded points) from [2] given the definition of G -special values (see Definition 22). $\square$

Proof of complexity. It follows from the complexity of Algorithm 12.16 (Bounded Algebraic Sampling) and Algorithm 12.14 (Limits of bounded points) from [2] and of Remark 62 that the complexity is bounded by $d^{O(k)} D^{O(m)}$. Moreover, the degrees in T, U of the polynomials appearing in the Thom encodings over $(\mathcal{T}, \tau)$ output is bounded by $D(d^{O(k)})$. $\square$

As mention earlier we will need to compute certain well chosen finite sets of points which correspond to points that minimize locally the distance between pairs of semi-algebraically connected components of some basic semi-algebraic sets described in the input. For technical reasons, we need such an algorithm in two different flavors. In the first algorithm (Algorithm 3) the input corresponds to a pair of basic semi-algebraic sets, while in the second algorithm (Algorithm 4) it is a basic semi-algebraic set and a point.

Algorithm 3. (Closest Pairs over a Triangular Thom Encoding)

- **Input:** a triangular Thom encoding $(\mathcal{T}, \tau), \mathcal{T} \subset D[T]$, fixing a point $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and finite subsets $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{Q}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{Q}_2 \subset D_t[T, X_1, \dots, X_k]$ such that $\text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}_1(\theta, \cdot), \mathcal{Q}_1(\theta, \cdot))$ and $\text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}_2(\theta, \cdot), \mathcal{Q}_2(\theta, \cdot))$ are bounded.
- **Output:** A finite set A of real univariate representations over $(\mathcal{T}, \tau)$ with associated points

$$\text{MinDi}(\text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}_1(\theta, \cdot), \mathcal{Q}_1(\theta, \cdot)), \text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}_2(\theta, \cdot), \mathcal{Q}_2(\theta, \cdot))).$$

- **Complexity:** Let $\text{card}(\mathcal{Q}_1), \text{card}(\mathcal{Q}_2) \leq \log(k)$, $\deg_X(\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{Q}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{Q}_2) \leq d$, $\deg_T(\mathcal{T}) \leq D$, and $\deg_T(\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{Q}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{Q}_2) \leq d$. Then, the complexity of the algorithm is bounded by $2^{\log^2(k)} d^{O(k)} D^{O(m+t)}$.

- **Procedure:**

- **Step 1.** Let $S \subset \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^k$ be the semi-algebraic sets defined by

$$S = \text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}_1(\theta, \cdot), \mathcal{Q}_1(\theta, \cdot)) \times \text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}_2(\theta, \cdot), \mathcal{Q}_2(\theta, \cdot)).$$

- **Step 2.** Let $F = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} (X_i - Y_i)^2$. Apply Algorithm 14.9 (Global Optimization) from [2] to the pair (S, F) with ring $\mathbb{D}_t[\theta]$ and project the output set of real univariate representations over $(\mathcal{T}, \tau)$ to the first k -coordinates as well as to the last k -coordinates.

Proof of correctness. The correctness of Algorithm 3 is a consequence of the correctness of Algorithm 14.9 (Global Optimization) from [2]. $\square$

Proof of complexity. It follows from the complexity of Algorithm 14.9 (Global Optimization) from [2] and Remark 62 that the complexity of Step 2 is bounded by $2^{\log^2(k)} d^{O(k)} D^{O(m)}$. Moreover, the degrees in T, U of the polynomials appearing in the real univariate representation output is bounded by $D(d^{O(k)})$. $\square$

Algorithm 4. (Closest Point over a Triangular Thom Encoding)

- **Input:** a triangular Thom encoding $(\mathcal{T}, \tau), \mathcal{T} \subset \mathbb{D}_t[T]$, fixing a point $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^m$, finite subsets $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{D}_t[T, X_1, \dots, X_k]$ with $\text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}(\theta, \cdot), \mathcal{Q}(\theta, \cdot))$ bounded and a real univariate representation $u = (g, \sigma, G)$ over $(\mathcal{T}, \tau)$ with associated point x .
- **Output:** A finite set A of real univariate representations over $(\mathcal{T}, \tau)$ with associated points $\text{MinDi}(\text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}(\theta, \cdot), \mathcal{Q}(\theta, \cdot)), \{x\})$.
- **Complexity:** Let $\text{card}(\mathcal{Q}) \leq \log(k)$, $\deg_X(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}) \leq d$, $\deg_T(\mathcal{T}) \leq D$, $\deg_{T,U}(u) \leq D$ and $\deg_T(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}) \leq d$. Then, the complexity of the algorithm is bounded by $2^{\log^2(k)} d^{O(k)} D^{O(m+t)}$.
- **Procedure:**
- **Step 1.** Let $S \subset \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^k$ be the semi-algebraic sets defined by

$$S = \text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}(\theta, \cdot), \mathcal{Q}(\theta, \cdot)) \times \{x\},$$

where, with $G = (g_0, \dots, g_k)$, the point x associated to u is defined by the

$$\sum_{i=1}^k (g_0(T, U)Y_i - g_i(T, U))^2.$$

- **Step 2.** Let $F = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} (X_i - Y_i)^2$. Apply Algorithm 14.9 (Global Optimization) from [2] with ring $\mathbb{D}[\theta, \theta_g]$ where (θ, θ_g) is associated to the triangular Thom encoding $((\mathcal{T}, g), (\tau, \sigma))$ and the pair (S, F) , and project the output set of real univariate representations over $((\mathcal{T}, g), (\tau, \sigma))$ to the first k -coordinates.
- **Step 3.** For each univariate representation $w = (h(T, U, V), \sigma_h, H(T, U, V))$ output in Step 2, use Algorithm 12.16 (Bounded Algebraic Sampling) from [2] with ring $\mathbb{D}[\theta]$ and the polynomials $\{g, h\}$ to obtain a set of real univariate representations $v = (e(T, T'), \sigma_e, E = (e_0, e_U, e_V))$. Substitute the rational functions $\frac{e_U}{e_0}, \frac{e_V}{e_0}$ for U, V in the real univariate representation w and output the resulting real univariate representation over $(\mathcal{T}, \tau)$.

Proof of correctness. The correctness of Algorithm 4 is a consequence of the correctness of Algorithm 14.9 (Global Optimization) and of Algorithm 12.16 (Bounded Algebraic Sampling) from [2]. $\square$

Proof of complexity. It follows from the complexity of Algorithm 14.9 (Global Optimization) from [2] and of Remark 62 that the complexity of Step 2 is bounded by $2^{\log^2(k)} d^{O(k)} D^{O(m)}$. Moreover, the degrees in T, U, V of the polynomials appearing in the real univariate representation w is bounded by $D (d^{O(k)})$. It follows also from the complexity of Algorithm 12.16 (Bounded Algebraic Sampling) from [2] and of Remark 62 that the degrees in T, T' of the e, E are bounded by $D^{O(1)} (d^{O(k)})$ and that the complexity of Step 4 is also bounded by $2^{\log^2(k)} d^{O(k)} D^{O(1)}$. $\square$

6.3 The Divide algorithm

Notation 63. For any string $s = (s_1, \dots, s_t) \in \{0, 1\}^t$ we denote

1. $\text{fix}(s) = \{i \mid s_i = 1\}$,
2. $|\text{fix}(s)| = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq t} s_i$,
3. $\text{Fix}(s) = \sum_{i=1}^t s_i (k-1)/2^i$. $\square$

Algorithm 5. (Divide)

- **Input:** A tuple $(s, (\mathcal{T}, \tau), \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}, A)$ where
 1. $s \in \{0, 1\}^t$.
 2. $(\mathcal{T}, \tau)$ is a triangular Thom encoding fixing $\theta \in \mathbb{R}_t^{|\text{fix}(s)|}$, with $\mathcal{T}$ a triangular system with variables $T_{\text{fix}(s)} = (T_{i_1}, \dots, T_{i_{|\text{fix}(s)|}})_{i_j \in \text{fix}(s)}$.
 3. $\mathcal{P} \subset D_t[T_{\text{fix}(s)}, X_{\text{Fix}(s)+1}, \dots, X_k]$ is a finite set of polynomials, and $\mathcal{Q} \subset D_t[T_{\text{fix}(s)}, X_{\text{Fix}(s)+1}, \dots, X_k]$ is a set $t - |\text{fix}(s)|$ polynomials, defining a semi-algebraic set $\text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}(\theta, \cdot), \mathcal{Q}(\theta, \cdot)) \subset \mathbb{R}_t^{k - \text{Fix}(s)}$ (cf. Notation 52).
 4. A is a finite set of real univariate representations over $\mathcal{T}$, with associated points $\mathcal{A} \subset S = \text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}(\theta, \cdot), \mathcal{Q}(\theta, \cdot))$, meeting every semi-algebraically connected component of S .
 5. $\dim(\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}(\theta, \cdot), \mathbb{R}_t^{k - \text{Fix}(s)})) \leq p = (k-1)/2^t$. More precisely, for every $z \in \mathbb{R}_t^p$, $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}(\theta, \cdot), \mathbb{R}_t^{k - \text{Fix}(s)})_z$ is a finite set (possibly empty).
- **Output:**

A tuple: $(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}, \tilde{A}, N, A^0, (\mathcal{P}^0(\alpha), \mathcal{Q}^0(\alpha), A^0(\alpha))_{\alpha \in \mathcal{I}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}, p/2)})$ with

 1. A finite set of polynomials $\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \subset D_t[\zeta_{t+1}, \varepsilon_{t+1}][T_{\text{fix}(s)}, X_{\text{Fix}(s)+1}, \dots, X_k]$, with $\text{card}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}) = k - \text{Fix}(s) - p$.
 2. A finite set of polynomials $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}} \subset D_t[\zeta_{t+1}, \varepsilon_{t+1}, \delta_{t+1}][T_{\text{fix}(s)}, X_{\text{Fix}(s)+1}, \dots, X_k]$, with $\text{card}(\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}) = \text{card}(\mathcal{Q}) = t - |\text{fix}(s)|$.
 3. A set of real univariate representations $\tilde{A}$ over $(\mathcal{T}, \tau)$, whose set of associated points is $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} \subset \tilde{S} = \text{Bas}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(\theta, \cdot), \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}(\theta, \cdot))$.
 4. A set N of real univariate representations, $u = (h, \sigma, H)$, over $(\mathcal{T}, \tau)$ with associated points $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathbb{R}_{t+1}^{p/2}$ (and new variable T_{t+1}).
 5. For each $u = (h, \sigma, H) \in N$ output in (4), a set of real univariate representations $A^0(u)$ over $((\mathcal{T}, h), (\tau, \sigma))$ describing $\theta' = (\theta, x_\sigma) \in \mathbb{R}_t^{\text{Fix}(s)+1}$ whose set of associated points is $\mathcal{A}^0(u) \subset \text{Bas}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_u(\theta', \cdot), \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_u(\theta', \cdot))$. We denote by $A^0 = \bigcup_{u \in N} A^0(u)$, and the corresponding set of associated points by $\mathcal{A}^0$.

6. For every $\alpha \in \mathcal{I}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}, p/2)$ (see Notation 47), $(\mathcal{P}^0(\alpha), \mathcal{Q}^0(\alpha), A^0(\alpha))$ with $\mathcal{P}^0(\alpha), \mathcal{Q}^0(\alpha) \subset D_{t+1}[T_{\text{fix}(s)}, X_{\text{Fix}(s)+1}, \dots, X_k]$, finite subsets with $\text{card}(\mathcal{Q}^0(\alpha)) = \text{card}(\mathcal{Q}) + 1$. $A^0(\alpha)$ is a set of real univariate representations over $\mathcal{T}$, whose set of associated points is $\mathcal{A}^0(\alpha) \subset S^0(\alpha) = \text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}^0(\alpha)(\theta, \cdot), \mathcal{Q}^0(\alpha)(\theta, \cdot))$.

The tuple $(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}, \tilde{A}, N, A^0, (\mathcal{P}^0(\alpha), \mathcal{Q}^0(\alpha), A^0(\alpha))_{\alpha \in \mathcal{I}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}, p/2)})$ satisfies the following properties, defining $\tilde{S}^0 = \lim_{\gamma_{t+1}} \left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{I}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}, p/2)} S^0(\alpha) \right)$,

1. $\lim_{\zeta_t}(\tilde{S}) = S$.
2. $\tilde{S}^0 \cup \tilde{S}_{\mathcal{N}}$ has good connectivity properties with respect to $\tilde{S}$.
3. $\dim(\tilde{S}^0) \leq p/2, \dim(\tilde{S}_{\mathcal{N}}) \leq p/2$.
4. $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = \text{MinDi}(\tilde{S}, \mathcal{A}) \cup \text{MinDi}(\tilde{S}, \tilde{S}), \mathcal{N} \supset \pi_{[\text{Fix}(s)+1, \text{Fix}(s)+p/2]}(\tilde{\mathcal{A}})$.
5. $\mathcal{A}^0 = \tilde{S}^0 \cap \tilde{S}_{\mathcal{N}}$.
6. $\mathcal{A}^0(\alpha) = \text{MinDi}(S^0(\alpha), \mathcal{A}^0) \cup \left(\bigcup_{\beta \in \mathcal{I}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}, \ell)} \text{MinDi}(S^0(\alpha), S^0(\beta)) \right)$.
7. Moreover, for every $\alpha \in \mathcal{I}$, $\mathcal{A}^0(\alpha) \subset S^0(\alpha)$ meets every semi-algebraically connected component of $S^0(\alpha)$ and for every α, β in $\mathcal{I}$, and C (resp. D) semi-algebraically connected components of $S^0(\alpha)$ (resp. $S^0(\beta)$) such that $\lim_{\gamma_{t+1}}(C) \cap \lim_{\gamma_{t+1}}(D)$ is non-empty, $\lim_{\gamma}(C \cap \mathcal{A}^0(\alpha)) \cap \lim_{\gamma_{t+1}}(D \cap \mathcal{A}^0(\beta))$ is non-empty and meets every semi-algebraically connected component of $\lim_{\gamma_{t+1}}(C) \cap \lim_{\gamma_{t+1}}(D)$.

• **Complexity:**

In order to simplify the complexity analysis, we are going to make the following assumptions as they are going to be satisfied for each call to this algorithm in the main algorithm. Let the triangular system $\mathcal{T}$ in the input be $\mathcal{T} = (F_1, \dots, F_{|\text{fix}(s)|})$, where for each $h, 1 \leq h \leq |\text{fix}(s)|$, $F_h \in D_t[T_{i_1}, \dots, T_{i_h}]$. Also denote $\eta = (\zeta_1, \varepsilon_1, \delta_1, \gamma_1, \dots, \zeta_t, \varepsilon_t, \delta_t, \gamma_t)$. Let $c > 0$ be a constant. We assume that:

1. $\deg_X(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}) \leq (2k)^t d$.
2. $\deg_{T_{\text{fix}(s)}}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}), \deg_{\eta}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}), \deg_{T_{\text{fix}(s)}}(F_h), \deg_{\eta}(F_h)$ are all bounded by $((2k)^t d)^{c k t}$.
3. The degrees in T_{t+1} of the polynomials (belonging to $D_t[T_{\text{fix}(s)}, T_{t+1}]$) appearing in the univariate representations A are also bounded by $((2k)^t d)^{c k t}$.

With the above assumption on the input parameters the output tuple $(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}, \tilde{A}, N, A^0, (\mathcal{P}^0(\alpha), \mathcal{Q}^0(\alpha), A^0(\alpha))_{\alpha \in \mathcal{I}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}, p/2)})$ satisfies the following, for c large enough.

1. $\deg_X(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}) \leq 2(2k)^t d$; $\deg_{T_{\text{fix}(s)}}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}), \deg_{\eta}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}) \leq 2((2k)^t d)^{c k t}$, and $\deg_{\eta_{t+1}}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}) = 1$.
2. The $\deg_X(\mathcal{P}^0(\alpha), \mathcal{Q}^0(\alpha)) \leq (2k)^t d k$; $\deg_{T_{\text{fix}(s)}}(\mathcal{P}^0(\alpha), \mathcal{Q}^0(\alpha)), \deg_{\eta}(\mathcal{P}^0(\alpha), \mathcal{Q}^0(\alpha)) \leq ((2k)^t d)^{c k t} k \leq ((2k)^{t+1} d)^{c k (t+1)}$.
3. The univariate representations in $\tilde{M}, D^0, M^0, \tilde{A}, N, A^0(\alpha)$ have degrees in the new variable T_{t+1} , as well as in η_{t+1} , bounded by $((2k)^{t+1} d)^{c k}$, and in $T_{\text{fix}(s)}, \eta$ have degrees at most $((2k)^{t+1} d)^{c k (t+1)}$.

The number of arithmetic operations in D is bounded by

$$(k^t d)^{O(t^2 k)}.$$

- **Procedure**

- **Step 1.** Define $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$ as in Notation 28.
- **Step 2.** Compute $\tilde{M}$ as follows. For each subset $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}' \subset \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \cup \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}' = \{F_1, \dots, F_m\}$, compute, using Algorithm 12.16 (Bounded Algebraic Sampling) from [2] in the ring $D_t[\theta]$, a finite set of real univariate representations, $\tilde{M}(\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}')$ over $(\mathcal{T}, \tau)$ whose associated points are the real solutions to the system

$$\text{CritEq}_{p/2}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(\theta, \cdot) \cup \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}'(\theta, \cdot), G)$$

and projecting the real univariate representations to the first k coordinates.

Let

$$\tilde{M} := \bigcup_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}' \subset \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}} \tilde{M}(\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}').$$

Note that the associated set of points, $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ of $\tilde{M}$, is the finite set of critical points of G on $\text{Bas}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(\theta, \cdot), \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}(\theta, \cdot))$.

- **Step 3.** Compute a set, D^0 , of Thom encodings over $(\mathcal{T}, \tau)$ as follows.

Let

$$F = \prod_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}' \subset \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}} F(\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}'),$$

where

$$F(\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}') = \sum_{P \in \text{CrEq}_t(\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \cup \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}', G)} P^2.$$

Compute using Algorithm 2 (G -Special Values), a set, D^0 , of Thom encodings over $(\mathcal{T}, \tau)$, whose set of associated values, $\mathcal{D}^0$, contain the G -special values of the pair $(F(\theta, \cdot), \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}(\theta, \cdot))$.

- **Step 4.** Compute M^0 as follows. For each $(h, \tau_h) \in D^0$, use Algorithm 12.16 (Bounded Algebraic Sampling) from [2] in the ring $D_t[\theta']$ (where θ' is specified by $\mathcal{T} \cup \{h(T_{\text{fix}(s)}, U)\}$, (τ, τ_h)) with input the set of polynomials $\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \cup \tilde{\mathcal{Q}} \cup \{G - U\}$, to obtain real univariate representations (f, σ_f, F) , where $f \in D_{t+1}[T_{\text{fix}(s)}, U, V]$. Use Algorithm 12.16 (Bounded Algebraic Sampling) from [2] in the ring $D_t[\theta]$ again with input $\{h, f\}$ to obtain a real univariate representation $u = (e, \tau_e, E)$ over $(\mathcal{T}, \tau)$ with $e \in D_{t+1}[T_{\text{fix}(s)}, T_{t+1}]$. Substitute the rational functions, in E corresponding to U, V into the polynomials in F to obtain F_u . Output, the resulting set of real univariate representations (e, τ_e, F_u) over $(\mathcal{T}, \tau)$.
- **Step 5.** Compute N as follows. Compute $\tilde{A}$ by applying Algorithm 3 (Closest Pairs over a Triangular Thom Encoding) with input $((\mathcal{T}, \tau), (\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}), (\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}))$, and Algorithm 4 (Closest Point over a Triangular Thom Encoding) with input $((\mathcal{T}, \tau), (\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}), u)$ for each $u \in A$. Keeping the first $p/2$ coordinates of these real univariate representations, obtain a set of real univariate representations, N , over $(\mathcal{T}, \tau)$, with associated set of points $\mathcal{N} = \pi_{[\text{Fix}(s)+1, \text{Fix}(s)+p/2]}(\tilde{\mathcal{M}} \cup \mathcal{M}^0 \cup \tilde{A})$. For each $w \in \mathcal{N}$, with corresponding real univariate representation (f, σ, F) , let $(\mathcal{T}_w, \tau_w)$ denote the real triangular Thom encoding $((\mathcal{T}, f), (\tau, \sigma))$.

- **Step 6.** Compute A^0 as follows. For each univariate representation $u = (e, \tau_e, E) \in N$, substitute the rational functions in u , for the block of variables $X_{\text{Fix}(s)+1}, \dots, X_{\text{Fix}(s)+p/2}$, in the polynomials $F, \tilde{Q}$ to obtain $F_u, \tilde{Q}_u$. Now apply Algorithm 12.16 (Bounded Algebraic Sampling) from [2] in the ring $D_t[\theta'']$ (where θ'' is specified by $((\mathcal{T}, e), (\tau, \tau_e))$) with input the polynomials $F_u, \tilde{Q}_u$, and project to the co-ordinates $X_{\text{Fix}(s)+p/2+1}, \dots, X_k$ to obtain $A^0(u)$.
- **Step 7.** For every $\alpha = (\tilde{Q}', r, J, J') \in \mathcal{I}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{Q}, p/2)$, compute

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}^0(\alpha) &:= \tilde{\mathcal{P}} \cup \tilde{Q}' \cup \bigcup_{i \in [\text{Fix}(s)+p/2+1, k] \setminus \text{fix}(s)} \{\text{jac}(\alpha, i)\}, \\ \mathcal{Q}^0(\alpha) &:= \tilde{Q} \cup \{\text{jac}(\alpha, i)^2 - \gamma\}. \end{aligned}$$

(see Notation 46).

- **Step 8.** Compute $A^0(\alpha)$ by applying for each $\beta \in \mathcal{I}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{Q}, p/2)$, Algorithm 3 (Closest Pairs over a Triangular Thom Encoding) with input $((\mathcal{T}, \tau), \mathcal{P}^0(\alpha), \mathcal{Q}^0(\alpha), \mathcal{P}^0(\beta), \mathcal{Q}^0(\beta))$ and Algorithm 4 (Closest Point over a Triangular Thom Encoding) with input $((\mathcal{T}, \tau), \mathcal{P}^0(\alpha), \mathcal{Q}^0(\alpha), u)$ for each $u \in A^0$ computed in Step 6.

Proof of correctness. The correctness of the algorithm follows from the correctness of the various algorithms called inside the algorithm, and Propositions 29, 39, 42, 43, and 45. $\square$

Proof of complexity.

We first prove that the degree bounds stated are true.

1. It is clear from Step 1 and Notation 28, that the degrees of the polynomials in $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ (respectively, $\tilde{Q}$) is at most twice the degrees of the polynomials in $\mathcal{P}$ (respectively, Q). It follows from the assumptions on the input that $\deg_X(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}), \deg_X(\tilde{Q}) \leq 2(2k)^t d$, and $\deg_{T_{\text{fix}(s)}}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}), \deg_{T_{\text{fix}(s)}}(\tilde{Q}), \deg_\eta(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}), \deg_\eta(\tilde{Q}) \leq 2((2k)^t d)^{c_k t}$. It also follows from Notation 28, that $\deg_{\eta_{t+1}}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}), \deg_{\eta_{t+1}}(\tilde{Q}) = 1$. This proves property (1) of the complexity estimate of the output.

2. Property (2) is an easy consequence of the degree bounds on $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ and $\tilde{Q}$ proved above in (1) and the definitions of $\mathcal{P}^0(\alpha)$ and $\mathcal{Q}^0(\alpha)$.

3. We now bound the degrees of the univariate representations in $\tilde{M}, D^0, M^0, \tilde{A}, N$. They have degrees in the new variable, as well as in η_{t+1} , bounded by $((2k)^{t+1} d)^{c_k}$, and in $T_{\text{fix}(s)}, \eta$ have degrees at most $((2k)^{t+1} d)^{c_k(t+1)}$.

i. The univariate representations in $\tilde{M}$ is obtained by applying Algorithm 12.16 (Bounded Algebraic Sampling) from [2] to the set of equations in $\text{CritEq}_{p/2}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \cup \tilde{Q}', G)$, for each subset $\tilde{Q}' \subset \tilde{Q}$, and then projecting the real univariate representations to the first k coordinates. The number of variables (including the Lagrangian variables λ_i 's) is at most $2k$. The degrees in X of the polynomials in $\text{CritEq}_\ell(\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \cup \tilde{Q}', G)$ is bounded by the degrees in X of the polynomials in $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ and $\tilde{Q}$ which is bounded by $2(2k)^t d$ (using the bounds in 1.), and the degrees in the Lagrangian variables is 1. The degrees in $T_{\text{fix}(s)}$, and η in $\text{CritEq}_{p/2}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \cup \tilde{Q}', G)$ is bounded by their degrees in $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ and $\tilde{Q}$ which are bounded by $2((2k)^t d)^{c_k t}$ (using the bounds in 1.). Finally, the degree in η_{t+1} of the polynomials in $\text{CritEq}_{p/2}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \cup \tilde{Q}', G)$ is at most 1. Now using the complexity analysis of Algorithm 12.16 (Bounded Algebraic Sampling) from [2], we get: a) the degree in the new variable T_{t+1} and the new infinitesimals η_{t+1} is bounded by

$$(2(2k)^t d)^{2c_1 k},$$

where $c_1 > 0$ is a constant; choosing c to be sufficiently large compared to c_1 ,

$$(2(2k)^t d)^{2c_1 k} \leq ((2k)^{t+1} d)^{c k}.$$

b) the degrees in $T_{\text{fix}(s)}$ and η , are bounded by

$$2((2k)^t d)^{c k t} (2(2k)^t d)^{2c_1 k} \leq ((2k)^{t+1} d)^{c k (t+1)},$$

given the choice of c .

ii. The real Thom encodings, $u \in D^0$, over $\mathcal{T}$ are computed using Algorithm 2 (G -Special Values), with the polynomial

$$F = \prod_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}' \subset \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}} F(\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}'),$$

as input, where

$$F(\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}') = \sum_{P \in \text{CrEq}_\ell(\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \cup \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}', G)} P^2.$$

The product is of size $2^{\text{card}(\tilde{\mathcal{Q}})} \leq 2^t \leq k$. Using, the facts noted about the degrees in the various variables of the polynomials in $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$ we obtain that the degree in X of F is bounded by $2^{t+1} (2k)^t d$. The degrees in the Lagrangian variables is bounded by 2^t . The degrees in $T_{\text{fix}(s)}$, and η are bounded by $2^{t+1} ((2k)^t d)^{c k t}$. Finally, the degree in η_{t+1} in F is at most 2^t . The number of variables is at most $2k$.

Using the complexity analysis of Algorithm 2 (G -Special Values) we get:

a) the degree in the new variable U is bounded by

$$(2^{t+1} (2k)^t d)^{2c_2 k}$$

where $c_2 > 0$ is a constant, while the degree in η_{t+1} is

$$2^t (2^{t+1} (2k)^t d)^{2c_2 k};$$

choosing c to be sufficiently large compared to c_2 , and noting that $2^t \leq k$,

$$2^t (2^{t+1} (2k)^t d)^{2c_2 k} \leq ((2k)^{t+1} d)^{c k}.$$

b) the degrees in $T_{\text{fix}(s)}$ and η are bounded by

$$2^{t+1} ((2k)^t d)^{c k t} (2^{t+1} (2k)^t d)^{2c_2 k} \leq ((2k)^{t+1} d)^{c k (t+1)},$$

given the choice of c .

iii. In Step 4 (computation of M^0 , the degrees of the polynomials in the univariate representation (f, σ_f, F) computed is bounded as follows.

a) the degree in the new variable V and η_{t+1} is bounded by

$$(2(2k)^t d)^{c_1(k+1)}$$

using the complexity of Algorithm 12.16 (Bounded Algebraic Sampling) from [2];

b) the degrees in $T_{\text{fix}(s)}$, and η are bounded by

$$2((2k)^t d)^{c k t} (2(2k)^t d)^{c_1(k+1)}.$$

Using again the complexity analysis of Algorithm 12.16 (Bounded Algebraic Sampling) from [2] we obtain that the degrees of the polynomials in u in the various variables are bounded as follows.

a) the degree in the new variable T_{t+1} and in η_{t+1} is bounded by

$$(\max(22^t (2^{t+1} (2k)^t d)^{2c_2 k}, 2(2(2k)^t d)^{c_1(k+1)}))^{2c_1} \leq ((2k)^{t+1} d)^{c k}$$

using the complexity of Algorithm 12.16 (Bounded Algebraic Sampling) from [2] and the degree bounds in U and V of the polynomials D^0 and f and choosing c sufficiently large. b) the degrees in $T_{\text{fix}(s)}$ and η are bounded by the maximum of the degrees in $T_{\text{fix}(s)}$, and η in the polynomials D^0 and f multiplied by $((2k)^{t+1}d)^{ck}$. It follows that these degrees are bounded by

$$((2k)^{t+1}d)^{ck(t+1)}.$$

iv. Using the complexity of Algorithm 3 (Closest Pairs over a Triangular Thom encoding), and Algorithm 4 (Closest Point over a Triangular Thom encoding)) and the degree estimates of $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$ and the univariate representations in A , we obtain that the degrees in the univariate representations in $\tilde{A}$ are bounded as follows.

a) the degree in the new variable T_{t+1} and η_{t+1} is bounded by

$$(2(2k)^t d)^{2c_1k},$$

where $c_1 > 0$ is a constant; and given the choice of c , we have that

$$(2(2k)^t d)^{2c_1k} \leq ((2k)^{t+1}d)^{ck}.$$

b) the degrees in $T_{\text{fix}(s)}$, and η , are bounded by

$$2((2k)^t d)^{ck} (2(2k)^t d)^{2c_1k} \leq ((2k)^{t+1}d)^{ck(t+1)},$$

given the choice of c .

Together, (i),(ii) (iii) and (iv) above imply that the univariate representations in $\tilde{M}, D^0, M^0, \tilde{A}, N$ have degrees in the new variable, as well as in T_{t+1}, η_{t+1} , bounded by $((2k)^{t+1}d)^{ck}$, and in $T_{\text{fix}(s)}, \eta$ have degrees at most $((2k)^{t+1}d)^{ck(t+1)}$. This is property (2) of the complexity of the output.

Using the bound on the degrees of F and the univariate representation in N obtained above, and the degree estimates of the output of Algorithm 12.16 (Bounded Algebraic Sampling) in [2], we get that the degrees of the polynomials appearing in A^0 in the new variable is bounded by

$$(2(2k)^t d)^{2c_1k} \leq ((2k)^{t+1}d)^{ck},$$

while the degrees in $T_{\text{fix}(s)}, \eta$, is bounded by

$$((2k)^{t+1}d)^{ck(t+1)} (2(2k)^t d)^{2c_1k} \leq ((2k)^{t+1}d)^{ck(t+1)}.$$

Finally, the degrees in T_{t+1}, η_{t+1} is bounded by

$$(2(2k)^t d)^{2c_1k} (2(2k)^t d)^{2c_1k} \leq ((2k)^{t+1}d)^{ck}.$$

The degree estimates on $A^0(\alpha)$ is now a consequence of the bounds on the degrees of $\mathcal{P}^0(\alpha)$, $\mathcal{Q}^0(\alpha)$ and A^0 proved above, and the complexity of Algorithm 3 (Closest Pairs over a Triangular Thom encoding), and Algorithm 4 (Closest Point over a Triangular Thom encoding)).

It follows from the complexity estimates of the algorithms used in various steps of the algorithm (namely, Algorithm 12.16 (Bounded Algebraic Sampling) in [2], Algorithm 14.9 (Global Optimization) in [2] with Remark 62 on the complexity of each ring operation, Algorithm 2 (G -Special Values), Algorithm 3 (Closest Pairs over a Triangular Thom encoding), and Algorithm 4 (Closest Point over a Triangular Thom encoding)), and the degree estimates proved above, that the complexity of the whole algorithm is bounded by $(k^t d)^{O(t^2 k)}$. $\square$

Remark 64. Notice that we never reduce any intermediate polynomial obtained in the computation, modulo $\mathcal{T}$, and that $(\mathcal{T}, \tau)$ is used only if the sign of an element of $D_t[\theta]$, represented by a polynomial, is required. As a result the degrees in the T 's and also in the infinitesimals occurring in $\mathcal{T}$, grow. We analyzed this growth carefully in the complexity analysis of Algorithm 5 (Divide). This is a point of difference between the algorithm presented in the current paper, and that in [3]. In the Baby-step Giant-step algorithm presented in [3] a process of pseudo-reduction was necessary since the degree growth would have spoiled the overall complexity of the algorithm. This phenomenon does not occur here because the number of different blocks of variables (and hence the size of the triangular systems) in the algorithm of this paper is much smaller ($O(\log(k))$) compared to $O(\sqrt{k})$ in the Baby-step Giant-step algorithm) and hence we can tolerate the growth in degree in the current paper without resorting to reducing in each step. This is fortunate, since pseudo-reduction is not anymore an option for us, as the growth in the degrees in the various infinitesimals in this divide-and-conquer approach would be unacceptable.

However, if we did not have any infinitesimal in our construction, it would be possible to modify Algorithm 5 (Divide) by reducing modulo $\mathcal{T}$ and the number of arithmetic operations in D would be bounded by $(k^t d)^{O(tk)}$. $\square$

6.4 Preliminaries to the main algorithm

After constructing the tree $\text{Tree}(V)$, we want to construct the roadmap of V by taking the limits of the basic semi-algebraic sets of dimension at most 1 associated to the leaves. Theorem 57 then guarantees the correctness of the algorithm. So, it is needed to compute limits of points and curve segments, which we describe now.

Algorithm 6. (Limit of a Bounded Point)

- **Input:** Let $\bar{\varepsilon} = (\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_t)$ be infinitesimals
 1. a Thom encoding $(f_{\bar{\varepsilon}}, \sigma_{\bar{\varepsilon}})$, $f_{\bar{\varepsilon}} \in D[\bar{\varepsilon}, U]$, representing $x_{\bar{\varepsilon}} \in R\langle \bar{\varepsilon} \rangle$ bounded over R .
 2. a real univariate representation $(g_{\bar{\varepsilon}}, \tau_{\bar{\varepsilon}}, G_{\bar{\varepsilon}})$ over $(f_{\bar{\varepsilon}}, \sigma_{\bar{\varepsilon}})$, where $g_{\bar{\varepsilon}}, G_{\bar{\varepsilon}} \subset D[\bar{\varepsilon}, U, V]$, representing a point $z_{\bar{\varepsilon}} \in R\langle \bar{\varepsilon} \rangle^p$ bounded over R .
- **Output:** a real univariate representation (g, τ, G) representing

$$z = \lim_{\varepsilon_1} (z_{\bar{\varepsilon}}) \in R^p.$$

- **Complexity:** If D_1 (resp. D_2) is a bound on the degrees of the polynomials in $f_{\bar{\varepsilon}}$, $g_{\bar{\varepsilon}}$ and $G_{\bar{\varepsilon}}$ with respect to V (resp. $\bar{\varepsilon}, U$), then D_1 (resp. D_2) is a bound on the degrees of the polynomials appearing in the output, and the number of arithmetic operations in D is bounded by $p^{O(1)} D_1^{O(1)} D_2^{O(t)}$.
- **Procedure:**
- **Step 1.** Using Algorithm 12.16 (Bounded Algebraic Sampling) from [2] in the ring $D[\bar{\varepsilon}]$ with input $\{f_{\bar{\varepsilon}}, g_{\bar{\varepsilon}}\}$ obtain a set of univariate representation $u = (h_{\bar{\varepsilon}}, H = (h_0, h_U, h_V))$. For each such u , substitute the rational function $\frac{h_U}{h_0}$ for U in $f_{\bar{\varepsilon}}$ and its derivatives with respect to U . Similarly, substitute the rational functions $\frac{h_U}{h_0}, \frac{h_V}{h_0}$ for U, V in $g_{\bar{\varepsilon}}$ and its derivatives with respect to V to obtain $f_{\bar{\varepsilon}, u}, g_{\bar{\varepsilon}, u}$ and $\text{Der}(f_{\bar{\varepsilon}})_u, \text{Der}(g_{\bar{\varepsilon}})_u$.

- **Step 2.** Using Algorithm 10.13 (Univariate Sign Determination) from [2] with input h_{ε} , $\text{Der}(h_{\varepsilon})$ and $\text{Der}(f_{\varepsilon})_u, \text{Der}(g_{\varepsilon})_u$, determine a real univariate representation $u = (h_{\varepsilon}, \tau'_{\varepsilon}, E = (h_0, h_U, h_V))$ whose associated point is $(u_{\varepsilon}, v_{\varepsilon})$ where u_{ε} is associated to the Thom encoding $(f_{\varepsilon}, \sigma_{\varepsilon})$ and v_{ε} is associated to the Thom encoding $(g_{\varepsilon}, \tau_{\varepsilon})$ over $(f_{\varepsilon}, \sigma_{\varepsilon})$. Substitute the rational functions $\frac{h_U}{h_0}, \frac{h_V}{h_0}$ for U, V in G_{ε} , to obtain $G_{\varepsilon,u}$ and replace $(g_{\varepsilon}, \tau_{\varepsilon}, G_{\varepsilon})$ by the new real univariate representation $(e, \tau_e, G_{\varepsilon,u})$, where $e \in D[\varepsilon, T]$.
- **Step 3.** Replace (see Notation 61) g_{ε} by $\varepsilon^{-o_{\varepsilon}(g_{\varepsilon})} g_{\varepsilon}$. Denote by $g(T)$ the polynomial obtained by substituting successively ε_t by 0, and then ε_{t-1} by 0, and so on, and finally ε_1 by 0, in g_{ε} . Similarly denote by $G(T)$ the polynomials obtained by substituting successively ε_t by 0, and then ε_{t-1} by 0, and so on, and finally ε_1 by 0, in G_{ε} .
- **Step 4.** Compute the set Σ of Thom encodings of roots of $g(T)$ using Algorithm 10.13 (Univariate Sign Determination) from [2]. Denoting by μ_{σ} the multiplicity of the root of $g(T)$ with Thom encoding σ , define G_{σ} as the $(\mu_{\sigma} - 1)$ -st derivative of G with respect to T .
- **Step 5.** Identify the Thom encoding σ and G_{σ} representing z using Algorithm 11.13 (Univariate Sign Determination) from [2], by checking whether a ball of infinitesimal radius δ ($1 \gg \delta \gg \varepsilon > 0$) around the point z represented by the real univariate representation g, σ, G_{σ} contains z_{ε} .

Definition 65.

Let $(g_1, \tau_1), (g_2, \tau_2)$ be Thom encodings above a Thom encoding (h, σ) . We denote by $z \in \mathbb{R}$ the point specified by (h, σ) , and by $(z, a), (z, b)$ the points specified by (g_1, τ_1) and (g_2, τ_2) .

A **curve segment representation** (u, ρ) on $(g_1, \tau_1), (g_2, \tau_2)$ over (h, σ) is:

- a parametrized univariate representation with parameters $(X_{\leq i})$ i.e.

$$u = (f(Z, X, U), f_0(Z, X, U), f_1((Z, X, U)), \dots, f_k((Z, X, U))) \subset D[Z, X, U],$$
- a sign condition ρ on $\text{Der}(f)$ such that for every $x \in (a, b)$ there exists a real root $u(x)$ of $f(z, x, U)$ with Thom encoding ρ and $f_0(z, x, u(x)) \neq 0$.

The **curve segment** associated to u, ρ is the semi-algebraic function v which maps a point x of (a, b) to the point of $\mathbb{R}^k$ defined by

$$v(x) = \left(x, \frac{f_1(z, x, u(x))}{f_0(z, x, u(x))}, \dots, \frac{f_k(z, x, u(x))}{f_0(z, x, u(x))} \right).$$

It is a continuous injective semi-algebraic function. □

6.5 Main algorithm

The description of the main algorithm will use the following notation.

Notation 66. A *node* $\mathbf{n}$ of level t is a tuple $(s(\mathbf{n}), \mathcal{T}(\mathbf{n}), W(\mathbf{n}), \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{n}), \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{n}), A(\mathbf{n}))$, where

1. $s(\mathbf{n}) \in \{0, 1\}^t$;
2. $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{n}), \tau(\mathbf{n}), W(\mathbf{n})$ is a block triangular system fixing a point $\theta(\mathbf{n}) \in \mathbb{R}_t^{|\text{fix}(\mathbf{n})|}$, and $w \in \mathbb{R}_t^{\text{Fix}(\mathbf{n})}$
3. $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{n}) \subset \mathbb{R}_t[T_{\text{fix}(\mathbf{n})}, X_{\text{Fix}(\mathbf{n})+1}, \dots, X_k]$ where we denote

$$\begin{aligned} \text{fix}(\mathbf{n}) &= \text{fix}(s(\mathbf{n})) \\ \text{Fix}(\mathbf{n}) &= \text{Fix}(s(\mathbf{n})). \end{aligned}$$

4. $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{n}) \subset \mathbb{R}_t[T_{\text{fix}(\mathbf{n})}, X_{\text{Fix}(\mathbf{n})+1}, \dots, X_k]$, $\text{card}(\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{n})) = t - |\text{fix}(\mathbf{n})|$;
5. $A(\mathbf{n})$ is a set of real univariate representations over $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{n})$, with associated points $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{n}) \subset \text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{n})(\theta(\mathbf{n}), \cdot), \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{n})(\theta(\mathbf{n}), \cdot))$ (see Notation 49 and Notation 63). $\square$

Algorithm 7. (Divide and Conquer Roadmap Algorithm for Bounded Algebraic Sets)

- **Input:** A polynomial $P \in \mathbb{D}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$, and $R \in \mathbb{D}$, $R > 0$, such that $\text{Zer}(P, \mathbb{R}^k) \subset \overline{B_k}(0, R)$, and a set A of real univariate representations with associated set of points $\mathcal{A} \subset \text{Zer}(P, \mathbb{R}^k)$.
- **Output:** a roadmap of $\text{Zer}(P, \mathbb{R}^k)$ containing $\mathcal{A}$.
- **Complexity:** Let $d = \deg(P)$ and that the degrees of the polynomials appearing in the real univariate representations in A be bounded by $O(d)^k$. The complexity is bounded by $(k^{\log(k)} d)^{O(k \log(k)^2)} = (kd)^{\tilde{O}(k)}$.
- **Procedure**
- **Step 0.** Make an initial change of coordinates by shifting the origin to $(R+1, 0, \dots, 0)$ and replace P by the polynomial $P(X_1 - (R+1), X_2, \dots, X_k)$, so that $0 \notin \text{Zer}(P, \mathbb{R}^k)$. We compute a roadmap of $\text{Zer}(P, \mathbb{R}^k)$ as follows.
- **Step 1.** Initialize $\mathbf{r}$ to be the node with
 1. $s(\mathbf{r}) = ()$;
 2. $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{r}), \tau(\mathbf{r}), W(\mathbf{r})$ is empty;
 3. $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{r}) = \{P\}$;
 4. $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{r}) = \emptyset$;
 5. $A(\mathbf{r}) = A$

Initialize the set $\text{Nodes} := \{\mathbf{r}\}$.

- **Step 2.** Repeat until the level of $\mathbf{n}$ equals $\log_2(k-1)$ for all $\mathbf{n} \in \text{Nodes}$;
 - Select $\mathbf{n} \in \text{Nodes}$, such that the level of $\mathbf{n}$ of $< \log_2(k-1)$.
 - Remove $\mathbf{n}$ from Nodes .
 - Call Algorithm 5 (Divide) with input $(s(\mathbf{n}), \mathcal{T}(\mathbf{n}), \tau(\mathbf{n}), \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{n}), \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{n}), A(\mathbf{n}))$.
 - For each α output by Algorithm 5 (Divide) add a node $\mathbf{m}$ to Nodes with
 1. $s(\mathbf{m}) = (s(\mathbf{n}), 0)$;
 2. $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{m}), \tau(\mathbf{m}) = \mathcal{T}(\mathbf{n}), \tau(\mathbf{n})$; $W(\mathbf{m}) = W(\mathbf{n})$;
 3. $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{m}) = \mathcal{P}^0(\alpha) \subset \mathbb{R}_{t+1}[T_{\text{fix}(\mathbf{n})}, X_{\text{Fix}(\mathbf{m})+1}, \dots, X_k]$,
 4. $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{m}) = \mathcal{Q}^0(\alpha) \subset \mathbb{R}_{t+1}[T_{\text{fix}(\mathbf{n})}, X_{\text{Fix}(\mathbf{m})+1}, \dots, X_k]$;
 5. $A(\mathbf{m}) = A^0(\alpha)$.
 - For each real univariate representation $u_w = (f_w, F_w)$, τ , in N , representing a point $w \in \mathcal{N}$, with $f_w, F_w \subset \mathbb{D}_t[T_{\text{fix}(\mathbf{n})}, T_{t+1}]$, output by the algorithm, add a node $\mathbf{m}$ to Nodes with
 1. $s(\mathbf{m}) = (s(\mathbf{n}), 1)$;
 2. $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{m}), \tau(\mathbf{m}) = (\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{n}), f_w), (\tau(\mathbf{n}), \tau)$; $W(\mathbf{m}) = (W(\mathbf{n}), u_w)$;
 3. $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{m}) = \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{n})_w \subset \mathbb{R}_t[T_{\text{fix}(\mathbf{m})}, X_{\text{Fix}(\mathbf{m})+1}, \dots, X_k]$;

4. $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{m}) = \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{n})_w \subset \mathbb{R}_t[T_{\text{fix}(\mathbf{m})}, X_{\text{Fix}(\mathbf{m})+1}, \dots, X_k];$
5. $A(\mathbf{m}) = A_w^0 \cup \tilde{A}_w.$

- **Step 3.** Define

$$\Gamma = \bigcup_{\mathbf{n} \in \text{Nodes}} \text{Bas}(\mathbf{n}).$$

Compute $\lim_{\varepsilon_0}(\Gamma)$ as follows.

- i. For each $\mathbf{n} \in \text{Nodes}$, let

$$F(\mathbf{n}) = \sum_{f \in \mathcal{T}(\mathbf{n})} f^2 \subset \mathbb{D}_{\log_2(k-1)}[T_{\text{fix}(\mathbf{n})}].$$

- ii. Compute using Algorithm 12.16 (Bounded Algebraic Sampling) from [2] in the ring $\mathbb{D}_{\log_2(k-1)}[\theta(\mathbf{n})]$ and $F(\mathbf{n})$ as input, and compute a real univariate representation $u_{\mathbf{n}} = (h_{\mathbf{n}}, \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}, H_{\mathbf{n}})$ whose associated point $w(\mathbf{n}) \in \mathbb{R}_{\log_2(k-1)}^{\text{Fix}(\mathbf{n})}$.
- iii. For every $\mathcal{Q}' \subset \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{n})$, apply Algorithm 15.2 (Curve Segments) from [2] with input the Thom encoding $(h_{\mathbf{n}}, \sigma_{\mathbf{n}})$ specifying $c_{\mathbf{n}} \in \mathbb{R}_{\log_2(k-1)}$ and the polynomial

$$G(\mathbf{n}) = \sum_{g \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{n})_{u_{\mathbf{n}}} \cup \mathcal{Q}'_{u_{\mathbf{n}}}} g^2 \subset \mathbb{D}_{\log_2(k-1)}[U, X_{\text{Fix}(\mathbf{n})+1}, \dots, X_k].$$

with parameter $X_{\text{Fix}(\mathbf{n})+1}$ to obtain a set, $\Gamma_{\mathbf{n}}$, of curve segments with associated sets contained in $\{w(\mathbf{n})\} \times \mathbb{R}_{\log_2(k-1)}^{k-\text{Fix}(\mathbf{n})}$. Subdivide the interval of definition of each curve segment into pieces above which the sign of $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{n})$ remains fixed on the curve segment, and retain only those contained $\text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{n}), \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{n}))$ using Algorithm 11.19 (Restricted Elimination) from [2].

- iv. Now apply Algorithm (Limit of a Curve) from [3] to the curve segments output in Step 3, with the following modifications : we use Algorithm 6 (Limit of a Bounded Point) instead of the corresponding Algorithm in [3] and replace the various instances of substituting ε by 0 by substituting successively η_t by 0, and then η_{t-1} by 0, and so on, and finally η_1 by 0,).

Complexity analysis

We first bound the total number of nodes created by the algorithm. Using the complexity analysis of Algorithm 5 (Divide) the number of right children of any node $\mathbf{n}$ in the tree is bounded by the degree of the univariate representations in N , which in turn is bounded by $(k^{\log k} d)^{O(k)}$. the number of left children is bounded by $k \times \text{card}(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{n}), \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{n}), (k-1)/2^{\text{level}(\mathbf{n})})) = O(1)^k$. Thus, the total number of children of a node is bounded by $(k^{\log k} d)^{O(k)}$, and since the tree has depth $\log_2(k-1)$ we get that the total number of nodes in the tree is at most $(k^{\log k} d)^{O(k \log k)}$.

Finally, again using the complexity of Algorithm 5 (Divide), the total cost of all the calls to Algorithm 5 (Divide) is $(k^{\log k} d)^{O(k \log^2 k)}$.

Remark 67. Note that in the above analysis of the degrees in the variables T 's and the infinitesimals η 's of the polynomials in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{n}), \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{n})$ depend on $s(\mathbf{n})$. It is instructive to work out the actual bound on the degrees in the following three cases:

1. $s(\mathbf{n}) = 0^t$: In this case, the polynomials in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{n}), \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{n})$ do not have any T 's in them, and the degrees in η is bounded by $O(k)^t d$. It is not difficult to see that the complexity of Algorithm 5 (Divide) at such a node is bounded by $d^{O(k)} k^{O(k t)} = d^{O(k)} k^{O(k \log k)}$.

2. $s(\mathbf{n}) = 1^t$: In this case, the degrees of the polynomials in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{n})$, $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{n})$ in T 's and η 's are bounded by $O(d)^{(k-1)/2^{t-1}}$. As a consequence, it is not difficult to see that the complexity of Algorithm 5 (Divide) at such a node is bounded by $d^{O(k)}k^{O(k \log k)}$.

If these were the only types of nodes in the tree computed by Algorithm 7 then we would obtain an algorithm with complexity $d^{O(k \log k)}k^{O(k \log^2 k)}$. In fact the complexity is worse and this is caused by paths in the tree which are away from the extreme left and right ones. For example consider a node $\mathbf{n}$ with level t , and with $s(\mathbf{n}) = 0101\dots$. The polynomials in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{n})$, $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{n})$ will depend on $T_2, T_4, \dots$ while since $\text{Free}(\mathbf{m}) \geq \frac{k}{2}$ for each node $\mathbf{m}$ along the path from the root to $\mathbf{n}$, the degrees in each of the T_{2^i} can only be bounded by $(k^i d)^{O(k^i)}$ and is thus $(k^t d)^{O(k^t)}$ in the worst case. As a result the complexity of the call to Algorithm 5 (Divide) at the node $\mathbf{n}$ can only be bounded by $(k^{\log k} d)^{O(k \log^2 k)}$ and this dominates the complexity of all calls to Algorithm 5 (Divide) in Algorithm 7.

Note that, as in Remark 64, if we did not have any infinitesimal in our construction, it would be possible to modify Algorithm 7 by reducing modulo $\mathcal{T}$ and the number of arithmetic operations in $\mathbb{D}$ would then be bounded by $(k^{\log(k)} d)^{O(\log(k)k)}$ and would be of the same order as the number of leaves of $\text{Tree}(V)$. The presence of infinitesimals (even one of them) in our construction makes the use of reduction modulo $\mathcal{T}$ impossible and leads to the complexity

$$(k^{\log(k)} d)^{O(\log(k)^2 k)}. \quad \square$$

We are now in a position to describe a divide-and-conquer algorithm for computing a G -roadmap of a general (i.e. possibly unbounded semi-algebraic set). The procedure of passing from the bounded case to the unbounded one is the same as that used in [1] as well as in [3]. We include it here for the sake of completeness.

We first need a notation.

Notation 68. Let $F \in \mathbb{D}[X]$ be given by $F = a_p X^p + \dots + a_q X^q$. We denote

$$c(P) = \left(\sum_{i=q}^p \left| \frac{a_i}{a_q} \right| \right)^{-1}. \quad \square$$

Algorithm 8. (Divide and Conquer Roadmap Algorithm for General Algebraic Sets)

- **Input:** A polynomial $P \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$, and a set A of real univariate representations with associated set of points $\mathcal{A} \subset \text{Zer}(P, \mathbb{R}^k)$.
- **Output:** a roadmap of $\text{Zer}(P, \mathbb{R}^k)$ containing $\mathcal{A}$.
- **Complexity:** Let $d = \deg(P)$ and that the degrees of the polynomials appearing in the real univariate representations in A be bounded by $O(d)^k$. Then, the complexity is bounded by $(k^{\log(k)} d)^{O(k \log^2 k)} = (k d)^{\tilde{O}(k)}$.
- **Procedure:**
- **Step 1.** Introduce new variables X_{k+1} and ε and replace P by the polynomial

$$P_\varepsilon = P^2 + \left(\varepsilon^2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} X_i^2 \right) - 1 \right)^2.$$

- **Step 2.** Replace A by A_ε , the set of real univariate representations representing the elements $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon$ of $\text{Zer}(P_\varepsilon, \mathbb{R}(\varepsilon)^k)$ above the points represented by $\mathcal{A}$ using Algorithm 12.16 (Bounded Algebraic Sampling) [2].

- **Step 3.** Call Algorithm 7 (Divide and Conquer Roadmap Algorithm for Bounded Algebraic Sets) with input P_ε, A , performing arithmetic operations in the domain $D[\varepsilon]$. The algorithm outputs a roadmap $\text{DCRM}(\text{Zer}(P_\varepsilon, \mathbb{R}\langle\varepsilon\rangle^{k+1}), \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon)$ composed of points and curves whose description involves ε .
- **Step 4.** Denote by $\mathcal{L}$ the set of polynomials in $D[\varepsilon]$ whose signs have been determined in the preceding computation and take

$$a = \min_{F \in \mathcal{L}} c(F)$$

using Notation 68.

Replace ε by a in the polynomial P_ε to get a polynomial P_a . Replace ε by a in the output roadmap to obtain a roadmap which when projected to $\mathbb{R}^k$ gives a roadmap of $\text{Zer}(P, \mathbb{R}^k) \cap \bar{B}_k(0, \frac{1}{a})$ containing the finite set of points $\mathcal{A}$.

- **Step 5.** In order to extend the roadmap outside the ball $\bar{B}_k(0, \frac{1}{a})$ collect all the points $(y_1, \dots, y_k, y_{k+1}) \in \mathbb{R}\langle\varepsilon\rangle^{k+1}$ in the roadmap $\text{DCRM}(\text{Zer}(P_\varepsilon, \mathbb{R}\langle\varepsilon\rangle^{k+1}), \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon)$ which satisfies $\varepsilon^2(y_1^2 + \dots + y_{k+1}^2) = 1$. Each such point is described by a real univariate representation involving ε . Add to the roadmap the curve segment obtained by first forgetting the last coordinate and then treating ε as a parameter which varies over $(0, a]$ to get a roadmap $\text{DCRM}(\text{Zer}(P, \mathbb{R}^k), \mathcal{A})$.

Complexity analysis. It is clear that the complexity is dominated by that of the third step.

Proof of correctness. The correctness follows from the correctness of Algorithm 7.

We have proved Theorem 2.

Proof of Theorem 3. Using Theorem 2, we have that x, y can be connected by a semi-algebraic path, consisting of at most $(k^{\log k} d)^{O(k \log k)}$ curve segments and, each curve segment has degree bounded by $(k^{\log k} d)^{O(k \log k)}$. It is clear that a curve segment of degree bounded by D meets a generic hyperplane in at most $O(D^2)$ points. It now follows immediately from the Cauchy-Crofton formula [14] that the length of each curve segment appearing in the path is bounded by $(k^{\log k} d)^{O(k \log k)}$, and finally that the total length of the path is also bounded by $(k^{\log k} d)^{O(k \log k)}$. $\square$

Bibliography

1. S. Basu, R. Pollack, and M.-F. Roy. Computing roadmaps of semi-algebraic sets on a variety. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 13(1):55–82, 2000.
2. S. Basu, R. Pollack, and M.-F. Roy. *Algorithms in real algebraic geometry*, volume 10 of *Algorithms and Computation in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006 (second edition). Revised version of the second edition online at <http://perso.univ-rennes1.fr/marie-francoise.roy/>.
3. S. Basu, M.-F. Roy, M. Safey El Din, and É. Schost. A baby step-giant step roadmap algorithm for general algebraic sets. *ArXiv e-prints*, January 2012.
4. J. Canny. *The Complexity of Robot Motion Planning*. MIT Press, 1987.
5. G. E. Collins. Quantifier elimination for real closed fields by cylindric algebraic decomposition. In *Second GI Conference on Automata Theory and Formal Languages*, volume 33 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 134–183, Berlin, 1975. Springer-Verlag.
6. D. D’Acunto and K. Kurdyka. Bounds for gradient trajectories and geodesic diameter of real algebraic sets. *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, 38(6):951–965, 2006.
7. Mohab Safey el Din and Eric Schost. A baby steps/giant steps probabilistic algorithm for computing roadmaps in smooth bounded real hypersurface. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 45(1):181–220, 2010.

8. M. Goresky and R. MacPherson. *Stratified Morse theory*, volume 14 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1988.
9. L. Gournay and J. J. Risler. Construction of roadmaps of semi-algebraic sets. *Appl. Algebra Eng. Commun. Comput.*, 4(4):239–252, 1993.
10. D. Grigoriev and N. Vorobjov. Counting connected components of a semi-algebraic set in subexponential time. *Comput. Complexity*, 2(2):133–186, 1992.
11. Gabriela Jeronimo, Daniel Perrucci, and Elias Tsigaridas. On the Minimum of a Polynomial Function on a Basic Closed Semialgebraic Set and Applications. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 23(1):241–255, 2013.
12. J. Milnor. On the Betti numbers of real varieties. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 15:275–280, 1964.
13. I. G. Petrovskiĭ and O. A. Oleĭnik. On the topology of real algebraic surfaces. *Izvestiya Akad. Nauk SSSR. Ser. Mat.*, 13:389–402, 1949.
14. L. Santalo. *Integral Geometry and Geometric Probability*. Cambridge University Press, 2nd edition, 2002.
15. J. Schwartz and M. Sharir. On the piano movers' problem ii. general techniques for computing topological properties of real algebraic manifolds. *Adv. Appl. Math.*, 4:298–351, 1983.
16. R. Thom. Sur l'homologie des variétés algébriques réelles. In *Differential and Combinatorial Topology (A Symposium in Honor of Marston Morse)*, pages 255–265. Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, N.J., 1965.

7 Auxiliary proofs

7.1 Proof of properties of G -critical values

Proposition 69. *Let $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$ be finite sets of polynomials and let $G \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$. Also, suppose that $(a, b) \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $G(\text{Crit}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}, G)) \cap (a, b)$ is empty. Then, for any $c \in (a, b)$, the semi-algebraic set $\text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})_{a < G < b}$ is semi-algebraically homeomorphic to $\text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})_{G=c}$. In particular, for each semi-algebraically connected component C of $\text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})_{a < G < b}$, $C_{G=c}$ is non-empty and semi-algebraically connected.*

Proof We prove the proposition only in the case $\mathbb{R} = \mathbb{R}$. The general case follows from a standard transfer argument that we omit. The condition that $G(\text{Crit}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}, G)) \cap (a, b)$ implies that $\text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})_{a < G < b}$ is a Whitney-stratified set with stratas $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}', \mathbb{R}^k)_{a < G < b}$, $\mathcal{Q}' \subset \mathcal{Q}$, where the dimension of $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}', \mathbb{R}^k)_{a < G < b}$ is equal to $k - (\text{card}(\mathcal{P}) + \text{card}(\mathcal{Q}))$ is non-empty. The proposition now follows from a basic result in stratified Morse theory (see for example, Theorem SMT Part A in [8]). $\square$

Proof of Lemma 9 Let x and y be two points of $C_{G \leq a}$ and $\gamma: [0, 1] \rightarrow C$ be a semi-algebraic path connecting x to y inside C . We want to prove that there is a semi-algebraic path connecting x to y inside $C_{G \leq a}$.

If $\text{Im}(\gamma) \subset C_{G \leq a}$ there is nothing to prove.

If $\text{Im}(\gamma) \not\subset C_{G \leq a}$,

$$\exists c \in \mathbb{R}, \forall a < d < c, \text{Im}(\gamma) \cap S_{G=d} \neq \emptyset.$$

Let ε be a positive infinitesimal. Then

$$\text{Ext}(\gamma([0, 1]), \mathbb{R}\langle \varepsilon \rangle) \cap \text{Ext}(S, \mathbb{R}\langle \varepsilon \rangle)_{G=a+\varepsilon} \neq \emptyset$$

using [2, Proposition 3.17].

Since

$$\{u \in [0, 1] \subset \mathbb{R}\langle \varepsilon \rangle \mid \text{Ext}(\gamma, \mathbb{R}\langle \varepsilon \rangle)(u) \in \text{Ext}(S, \mathbb{R}\langle \varepsilon \rangle)_{G < a+\varepsilon}\}$$

and

$$\{u \in [0, 1] \subset \mathbb{R}\langle \varepsilon \rangle \mid \text{Ext}(\gamma, \mathbb{R}\langle \varepsilon \rangle)(u) \in \text{Ext}(S, \mathbb{R}\langle \varepsilon \rangle)_{[a+\varepsilon \leq G \leq b]}\}$$

are semi-algebraic subsets of $[0, 1] \subset \mathbb{R}\langle \varepsilon \rangle$ there exists by [2, Corollary 2.79] a finite partition $\mathfrak{P}$ of $[0, 1] \subset \mathbb{R}\langle \varepsilon \rangle$ such that for each open interval (u, v) of $\mathfrak{P}$, $\text{Ext}(\gamma, \mathbb{R}\langle \varepsilon \rangle)(u, v)$ is either contained in $\text{Ext}(S, \mathbb{R}\langle \varepsilon \rangle)_{G < a+\varepsilon}$, or in $\text{Ext}(S, \mathbb{R}\langle \varepsilon \rangle)_{[a+\varepsilon \leq G \leq b]}$, with $\gamma(u)$ and $\gamma(v)$ in $C_{G=a+\varepsilon}$.

If $\text{Ext}(\gamma, \mathbb{R}\langle \varepsilon \rangle)(u, v)$ is contained in $\text{Ext}(S, \mathbb{R}\langle \varepsilon \rangle)_{[a+\varepsilon \leq G \leq b]}$, we can replace γ by a semi-algebraic path $\gamma'_{[a,b]}$ connecting $\gamma(u)$ to $\gamma(v)$ inside $C_{G < a+\varepsilon}$. Note that there is no critical point of G in $\text{Ext}(S, \mathbb{R}\langle \varepsilon \rangle)_{[a+\varepsilon \leq G \leq b]}$ by [2, Proposition 3.17].

By Proposition 69, if D is a semi-algebraically connected component of $\text{Ext}(S, \mathbb{R}\langle \varepsilon \rangle)_{a+\varepsilon \leq G \leq b}$, $D_{G=a+\varepsilon}$ is a semi-algebraically connected component of $\text{Ext}(S, \mathbb{R}\langle \varepsilon \rangle)_{G=a+\varepsilon}$.

Construct a semi-algebraic path γ' from x to x' inside $C_{G \leq a+\varepsilon}$, obtained by concatenating pieces of γ inside $\text{Ext}(S, \mathbb{R}\langle \varepsilon \rangle)_{G < a+\varepsilon}$ and the paths $\gamma'_{(u,v)}$ connecting $\gamma(u)$ to $\gamma(v)$ for (u, v) such that $\text{Ext}(\gamma, \mathbb{R}\langle \varepsilon \rangle)(u, v) \subset \text{Ext}(S, \mathbb{R}\langle \varepsilon \rangle)_{a+\varepsilon \leq G \leq b}$. Note that such a semi-algebraically connected path γ' is closed and bounded. Applying [2, Proposition 12.43], $\lim_{\varepsilon}(\gamma'([0, 1]))$ is semi-algebraically connected, contains x and x' and is contained in $\lim_{\varepsilon}(C_{G \leq a+\varepsilon}) = C_{G \leq a}$. This is enough to prove the lemma. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 10

Part 1 follows immediately from Proposition 69. We now prove Part 2. Since $\mathcal{M}$ is finite, there is a point $x \in C_{G=b}$ which is not a critical point of G on S . Let $\mathcal{P}_x = \{P \in \mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{Q} \mid P(x) = 0\}$. Then, since x is not a G -critical point of $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}_x, \mathbb{R}^k)$, it follows that $T_x \text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}_x, \mathbb{R}^k)$ is not tangent to the level surface of G defined by $G = b$, and hence for $\varepsilon > 0$ infinitesimal, $B_k(x, \varepsilon)_{G < b} \cap T_x \text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}_x, \mathbb{R}\langle \varepsilon \rangle^k)$ is not empty (where $B_k(x, r)$ is the k -dimensional open ball of center x and radius r), and hence $B_k(x, \varepsilon)_{G < b} \cap \text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}_x, \mathbb{R}\langle \varepsilon \rangle^k)$ is not empty either. Let $y \in B_k(x, \varepsilon)_{G < b} \cap \text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}_x, \mathbb{R}\langle \varepsilon \rangle^k)$. Then, since $\lim_{\varepsilon} y = x$ and $y \in \text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}_x, \mathbb{R}\langle \varepsilon \rangle^k)$, we have that for each polynomial $P \in \mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{Q}$, $P(x)$ and $P(y)$ have the same signs, and hence $y \in S$. Moreover, since S is closed and $\lim_{\varepsilon} y = x \in C$, we have that $y \in \text{Ext}(C, \mathbb{R}\langle \varepsilon \rangle^k)$. Now using the transfer principle it follows $C_{G < b}$ is non-empty.

Part 2) a) and 2 b) are immediate consequences of Proposition 69.

We prove 2) c). Clearly, $\cup_{i=1}^r \overline{B_i} \subset C$. Suppose that $x \in C \setminus \cup_{i=1}^r \overline{B_i}$. For $r > 0$ and small enough, $B_k(x, r) \cap C_{G < b} = \emptyset$. Note that $G(b) = b$, since otherwise x belongs to $C_{G < b}$, and thus to one of the B_i 's.

Applying Proposition 69, we deduce from the fact that $B_k(x, r) \cap C_{G < b} = B_k(x, r)_{G < b} \cap C = \emptyset$ that x is a G -critical point of $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}_x, \mathbb{R}^k)$. In other words $x \in \mathcal{M}$. But since by assumption $\mathcal{M}$ is finite, this implies that $C \setminus \cup_{i=1}^r \overline{B_i}$ is a finite set. Since C is semi-algebraically connected and of positive dimension, $C \setminus \cup_{i=1}^r \overline{B_i}$ must be empty. $\square$

7.2 Proofs of properties of G -special values

In the following we are going to assume that $0 \notin \text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k)$, and in particular that assume that $\text{grad}(G)$ does not vanish at any point of $\text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k)$ for $G = G_d$.

With the same notation as in Definition 22 we have the following proposition.

Proposition 70. *If $\text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k)$ is bounded, $v \in \mathbb{R}$, and suppose that $x \in \text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k)_{G=v}$ such that $\text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k) \cap B(x, \varepsilon)_{G < v}$ is empty for some positive ε . Then v is a (G, d) -special value of $\text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k)$ for any $d \geq 2\deg(Q) + 2$.*

Proof The proposition is an immediate consequence of the following two lemmas. $\square$

Lemma 71. *Let $x \in \text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k)_{G=v}$ such that $\text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k) \cap B_k(x, \varepsilon)_{G < v}$ is empty for some positive $\varepsilon < 1$, then there is a point $y \in \text{Zer}(\text{Def}(Q, \zeta, d), \mathbb{R}\langle \zeta \rangle^k) \cap B_k(x, \varepsilon)$ for which $\lim_\zeta (G(y)) = v$ and $\lim_\zeta (g(y)) = 0$.*

Lemma 72. *If y is a point of $\text{Zer}(\text{Def}(Q, \zeta, d), \mathbb{R}\langle \zeta \rangle^k)$ at which $\lim_\zeta (G(y)) = v$ and $\lim_\zeta (g(y)) = 0$ then v is a (G, d) -special value of $\text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k)$ for any $d \geq 2 \deg(Q) + 2$.*

Proof of Lemma 71: We first prove the statement in the case $\mathbb{R} = \mathbb{R}$. A standard transfer argument (which we omit) then extends it to all real closed fields.

If there is a G -critical value of

$$\text{Zer}(\text{Def}(Q, \zeta, d), \mathbb{R}\langle \zeta \rangle^k)$$

infinitesimally close to v , we are done. Otherwise, suppose that there is no G -critical value of $\text{Zer}(\text{Def}(Q, \zeta, d), \mathbb{R}\langle \zeta \rangle^k)$ in an interval $(v - b, v + b) \subset \mathbb{R}\langle \zeta \rangle$ with $b \in \mathbb{R}$. We can suppose without loss of generality that $b > \varepsilon$.

We argue by contradiction and suppose that for every $y \in \text{Zer}(\text{Def}(Q, \zeta, d), \mathbb{R}\langle \zeta \rangle^k)$ such that

$$\lim_\zeta (G(y)) = v,$$

$g(y)$ is not infinitesimal.

Let $y \in \text{Zer}(\text{Def}(Q, \zeta, d), \mathbb{R}\langle \zeta \rangle^k)_{G \leq v}$ be such that $\lim_\zeta y = x$. Such a y must exist, since otherwise there is a G -critical value of $\text{Zer}(\text{Def}(Q, \zeta, d), \mathbb{R}\langle \zeta \rangle^k)$ in an infinitesimal neighborhood of v . Then, there exists $t_0 > 0$, and a semi-algebraic curve $\lambda: [0, t_0] \rightarrow \text{Zer}(\text{Def}(Q, t_0, d), \mathbb{R}^k)_{G \leq v}$ such that $\lambda(0) = x$, and $\text{Ext}(\gamma, \mathbb{R}\langle \zeta \rangle)(\zeta) = y$.

Let $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $0 < a < 1$, such that $g(z) > a$ for all

$$z \in \text{Zer}(\text{Def}(Q, \zeta, d), \mathbb{R}\langle \zeta \rangle^k)_{G \leq v}.$$

Let $U' = \{t \in \mathbb{R} \mid g_t > a \text{ on } \text{Zer}(\text{Def}(Q, t, d), \mathbb{R}^k) \cap B(x, \varepsilon)_{G \leq v}\}$.

Let U'' be the set of $t \in \mathbb{R}$ such that there is no G -critical value of $\text{Zer}(\text{Def}(Q, t, d), \mathbb{R}^k)$ in $(v - b, v + b)$ and $U = U' \cap U''$. The set U is semi-algebraic and its extension to $\mathbb{R}\langle \zeta \rangle$ contains ζ . Thus, it contains an interval $(0, t'_0)$ with $t'_0 < t_0$.

For $t \in (0, t_0)$, let $y_t = \lambda(t) \in \text{Zer}(\text{Def}(Q, t, d), \mathbb{R}^k) \cap B(x, \varepsilon)_{G \leq v}$.

Consider the curve γ_t on $\text{Zer}(\text{Def}(Q, t, d), \mathbb{R}^k)$ through y_t which at each of its points is tangent to the gradient of G on $\text{Zer}(\text{Def}(Q, t, d), \mathbb{R}^k)$. The gradient of G on $\text{Zer}(\text{Def}(Q, t, d), \mathbb{R}^k)$ at a point $z \in \text{Zer}(\text{Def}(Q, t, d), \mathbb{R}^k)$ is proportional to

$$V_t(z) = U(z) - \langle U(z), N_t(z) \rangle N_t(z), \quad (21)$$

where

$$N_t(z) = \frac{\text{grad}(\text{Def}(Q, t, d))(z)}{\|\text{grad}(\text{Def}(Q, t, d))(z)\|}.$$

Let $\theta_1(z)$ be the angle between the vectors $V_t(z)$ and $U(z)$, and $\theta_2(z)$ the angle between $U(z)$ and $N_t(z)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \cos(\theta_1(z)) &= \frac{\langle V_t(z), U(z) \rangle}{\|V_t(z)\|}, \\ \cos(\theta_2(z)) &= \langle U(z), N_t(z) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $g_t(z) = \sin^2(\theta_2(z))$, and hence using the fact that $g_t(z) > a > 0$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |\sin(\theta_2(z))| &> a^{\frac{1}{2}} > 0, \\ |\cos(\theta_2(z))| &< (1 - a)^{\frac{1}{2}} < 1. \end{aligned}$$

Now using the fact that $V_t(z)$ is perpendicular to $N_t(z)$ we get

$$|\tan(\theta_1(z))| < \left(\frac{1-a}{a}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Thus, after possibly switching the sign of $V_t(z)$ we can assume that

$$0 \leq \tan(\theta_1(z)) < \left(\frac{1-a}{a}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty,$$

and hence

$$\cos(\theta_1(z)) > \alpha = a^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (22)$$

Let $\theta(z, x)$ be the angle between the vectors $V_t(z)$ and $U(x)$, and let $\theta'(z, x)$ be the angle between the vectors $U(z)$ and $U(x)$. The triangle inequality now yields

$$(1 - \cos(\theta_1(z)))^{\frac{1}{2}} + (1 - \cos(\theta'(z, x)))^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq (1 - \cos(\theta(z, x)))^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (23)$$

Also, observe that given any $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, $0 < \beta < 1$, there exists $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\beta) \in \mathbb{R}$, $\varepsilon(\beta) > 0$, such that for all $z \in B_k(x, \varepsilon)$,

$$\cos(\theta'(z, x)) > \beta. \quad (24)$$

Applying inequalities (7) and (9) in Eqn. (8) we obtain

$$\cos(\theta(z, x)) \geq (\alpha + \beta) - 2(1 - \alpha)^{\frac{1}{2}}(1 - \beta)^{\frac{1}{2}} - 1.$$

Choosing $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, sufficiently close to 1 we obtain that $\cos(\theta(z, x))$ is bounded away from zero by a positive constant (independent of z), and hence $\theta(z, x) < \frac{\pi}{2} - c$ for some $c > 0$. Hence, the vector $V_t(z)$ belongs to the cone $\mathcal{C}_t$ where

$$\mathcal{C}_t = \mathcal{C} + y_t$$

where

$$\mathcal{C} = \{v \mid \text{angle between } v \text{ and } U(x) \text{ is } < \pi/2\}.$$

It follows that the curve γ_t is completely contained in $\mathcal{C}_t$. Since there is no critical value of G on $\text{Zer}(\text{Def}(Q, t, d), \mathbb{R}^k)$ in $(v - b, v + b)$, the curve γ_t is defined over $(v - b, v + b)$ and thus meets $S^{k-1}(x, \varepsilon) \cap \mathcal{C}_t$ for all small enough $t > 0$.

Since $\mathcal{C}_t \cap S^{k-1}(x, \varepsilon) \cap \text{Zer}(\text{Def}(Q, t, d), \mathbb{R}^k) \neq \emptyset$ is true for every $t \in (0, t_0)$ it follows that

$$\mathcal{C} \cap S^{k-1}(x, \varepsilon) \cap \text{Zer}(\text{Def}(Q, \zeta, d), \mathbb{R}\langle \zeta \rangle^k) \neq \emptyset.$$

Thus, taking $\lim_{\zeta}$ of the point so obtained, $B(x, \varepsilon)_{G < v} \cap \text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k) \neq \emptyset$, which is a contradiction. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 72 : We first prove the statement in the case $\mathbb{R} = \mathbb{R}$. A standard transfer argument (which we omit) then extends it to all real closed fields.

Let y be given by our hypothesis, i.e. $\lim_{\zeta}(G(y)) = v$, $\lim_{\zeta}(g(y)) = 0$. We let C be the bounded semi-algebraically connected component of $\text{Zer}(\text{Def}(Q, \zeta, d), \mathbb{R}\langle \zeta \rangle^k)$ containing y .

First observe that, since C is bounded over $\mathbb{R}$ there exists a constant $B > 0$, $B \in \mathbb{R}$, $\text{grad}(G)(x) < B$ for all $x \in C$. Let $G(y) = w$. Then g attains its minimum on $C_{G=w}$ at some point $z \in C_{G=w}$. Let t be this minimum. It is clear that t is infinitesimal.

Consider the set $A = \{w \mid \min_{C_{G=w}}(g) \leq t\}$. This set A is closed, bounded, semi-algebraic, and thus a union of closed intervals $[a_1, b_1] \cup \dots \cup [a_h, b_h]$ with $a_i \leq b_i < a_{i+1}$. Let $[a_i, b_i] = [a, b]$ be the interval containing w .

We now prove that a and b are infinitesimally close (and hence also to w).

The main idea is that $g(x)$ for $x \in C$ measures the angle between the unit normal to the hypersurface C and the unit gradient vector of G , and this is very close to 0 for all x lying on the images of the curves γ_j defined below. Since G is a polynomial defined over $\mathbb{R}$, C is bounded over $\mathbb{R}$, the gradient of G is also bounded over $\mathbb{R}$ on C and hence G cannot change by a non-infinitesimal amount on the image of γ_j .

According to Theorem 5.46 [2] (Semi-algebraic triviality), there exists a finite family of smooth semi-algebraic curves $(\gamma_j: (\alpha_j, \beta_j) \rightarrow C_{\alpha_j \leq G \leq \beta_j})_{j \in J}$ parametrized by open segments (α_j, β_j) covering (a, b) (with the exception of a finite number of points) such that $g(\gamma_j(s)) \leq t$, for all $s \in (\alpha_j, \beta_j)$. For $s \in (\alpha_j, \beta_j)$, let $x(s) = \gamma_j(s)$ and $T_j(s) = (T_{j,1}(s), \dots, T_{j,k}(s))$ the unit tangent vector to γ_j at x .

After sub-dividing the curve γ_j into a finite number of pieces such that for each piece there exists an index i , $1 \leq i \leq k$, such that the magnitude of the i -th component of the unit tangent vector at all points on this piece is at least $k^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. We now assume without loss of generality that

$$|T_{j,1}(\gamma_j(s))| \geq k^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (25)$$

and also that the curve γ_j is parametrized by the X_1 co-ordinate.

If $\langle U(x(s)), N(x(s)) \rangle \geq 0$, applying the triangle inequality to $N(x(s)) - U(x(s))$, $T_j(x(s)) - U(x(s))$, $N(x(s)) - T_j(x(s))$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \langle U(x(s)), T_j(x(s)) \rangle)^{\frac{1}{2}} &\geq 1 - (1 - \langle U(x(s)), N(x(s)) \rangle)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ &\geq 1 - g(x(s))^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq 1 - t^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives after squaring both sides

$$\langle U(x(s)), T_j(x(s)) \rangle \leq 1 - \left(1 - t^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^2 = t^{1/2}(2 - t^{1/2}).$$

We also have from the triangle inequality

$$(1 - \langle U(x(s)), T_j(x(s)) \rangle)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq 1 + (1 - \langle U(x(s)), N(x(s)) \rangle)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq 1 + t^{1/2}$$

and hence

$$-(t + 2t^{1/2}) \leq \langle U(x(s)), T_j(x(s)) \rangle.$$

Thus,

$$-t^{1/2}(2 + t^{1/2}) \leq \langle U(x(s)), T_j(x(s)) \rangle \leq t^{1/2}(2 - t^{1/2}),$$

and it follows that

$$|\langle \text{grad}(G)(x(s)), T_j(x(s)) \rangle| \leq B t^{1/2}(2 + t^{1/2}). \quad (26)$$

Otherwise, if $\langle U(x(s)), N(x(s)) \rangle < 0$, repeat the same argument after replacing N by $-N$, and obtain also (26).

Let y (resp. z) be the left (resp. right) end points of the curve γ_j . Note that $G(y) = \alpha_j < \beta_j = G(z)$. Then, by the mean value theorem we have that there exists $s \in (y_1, z_1)$ such that

$$|G(y_1) - G(z_1)| = (\beta_j - \alpha_j) = |y_1 - z_1| \left\| \frac{\langle \text{grad}(G)(\gamma_j(s)), T_j(\gamma_j(s)) \rangle}{T_{j,1}(\gamma_j(s))} \right\|.$$

It follows from inequalities (10) and (11) that

$$0 < (\beta_j - \alpha_j) \leq B k^{\frac{1}{2}} |y_1 - z_1| t^{1/2}(2 + t^{1/2}).$$

Since, $|y_1 - z_1|$ is bounded over $\mathbb{R}$, and t is infinitesimal we obtain that $(\beta_j - \alpha_j)$ is infinitesimal, and hence a and b are infinitesimally close.

Now take u and u' so that $b_{i-1} < u < a = a_i \leq b = b_i < u' < a_{i+1}$ with u and u' infinitesimally close to w . The minimum of g on $C_{u \leq G \leq u'}$ occurs in $C_{u < G < u'}$ since it is smaller at $C_{G=w}$ than its minimum both on $C_{G=u}$ and $C_{G=u'}$. It follows that v is a G -special value on $\text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k)$. $\square$

The proof of Proposition 25 will use the notion of G -pseudo-critical values of a real algebraic set defined as follows.

Definition 73. Let $Q, G \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$, and suppose that $d \geq 2\deg(Q) + 2$. If x is a G -critical point of $\text{Zer}(\text{Def}(Q, \zeta, d), \mathbb{R}\langle \zeta \rangle^k)$ which is bounded over $\mathbb{R}$, then we call $y = \lim_{\zeta} x$ a (G, d) -pseudo-critical point of $\text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k)$, and $G(y)$ a (G, d) -pseudo-critical value of $\text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k)$. $\square$

Remark 74. It follows immediately from Definition 73 and Definition 22 that a (G, d) -pseudo-critical value of $\text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k)$ is automatically a (G, d) -special value of $\text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k)$. $\square$

Proposition 75. Let $Q, G \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$, and suppose that $\text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k)$ is bounded and $d \geq 2\deg(Q) + 2$. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be the set of (G, d) -pseudo-critical values of $\text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k)$. Then, for every interval $[a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $c \in [a, b]$, with $\{c\} \supset \mathcal{D} \cap [a, b]$, if C is a semi-algebraic connected component of $\text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k)_{a \leq G \leq b}$, then $C_{G=c}$ is a semi-algebraically connected component of $\text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k)_{G=c}$.

The proof uses the following lemma.

Lemma 76. Let X_{k+1} be a new variable, and let $\text{Def}_+(Q, \zeta, d) \in \mathbb{R}\langle \zeta \rangle[X_1, \dots, X_k]$ be defined by

$$\text{Def}_+(Q, \zeta, d) = X_{k+1}^2 - \text{Def}(Q, \zeta, d).$$

Then, the (G, d) -critical points of $\text{Zer}(Q, \zeta, d)$ are the projections on the first k -coordinates of the (G, d) -critical points of $\text{Def}_+(Q, \zeta, d)$, while the (G, d) -critical values of $\text{Zer}(Q, \zeta, d)$ are the same as the (G, d) -critical values of $\text{Def}_+(Q, \zeta, d)$. Moreover, the algebraic set $\text{Zer}(\text{Def}_+(Q, \zeta, d), \mathbb{R}\langle \zeta \rangle^k)$ has the property that for every semi-algebraically connected component D of $\text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k)_{a \leq G \leq b}$, there exists a semi-algebraically connected component D' of $\text{Zer}(\text{Def}_+(Q, \zeta, d), \mathbb{R}\langle \zeta \rangle^k)_{a \leq G \leq b}$, such that $\lim_{\zeta} D' = D$.

Proof The first part is obvious from the definition of $\text{Def}_+(Q, \zeta, d)$. We now prove the second part. The proof is adapted from the proof of Lemma 15.6 [2].

Let $y = (y_1, \dots, y_k)$ be a point of $\text{Ext}(D, \mathbb{R}\langle \zeta \rangle)$. Then, $\text{Def}(Q, \zeta, d)(y) < 0$. Thus, there exists a unique point $(y, f(y))$ in $\text{Zer}(\text{Def}_+(Q, \zeta, d), \mathbb{R}\langle \zeta \rangle^{k+1})$ for which $f(y) > 0$ and the mapping f is semi-algebraically continuous. Moreover for every z in D , $\text{Def}(Q, \zeta, d)(z)$ is infinitesimal, and hence $f(z) \in \mathbb{R}\langle \zeta \rangle$ is infinitesimal over $\mathbb{R}$. So, $\lim_{\zeta} (z, f(z)) = (z, 0)$. Fix $x \in D$ and denote by D' the semi-algebraically connected component of $\text{Zer}(\text{Def}_+(Q, \zeta, d), \mathbb{R}\langle \zeta \rangle^{k+1})$ containing $(x, f(x))$. Since $\lim_{\zeta} (D')$ is semi-algebraically connected (Proposition 12.43, [2]), contained in $\text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k)$, and contains x , it follows that $\lim_{\zeta} (D') \subset D$. Since f is semi-algebraic and continuous, and D is semi-algebraically path connected, for every z in D , the point $(z, f(z))$ belongs to the semi-algebraically connected component D' of $\text{Zer}(\text{Def}_+(Q, \zeta, d), \mathbb{R}\langle \zeta \rangle^{k+1})$ containing $(x, f(x))$. Since $\lim_{\zeta} (z, f(z)) = (z, 0)$, we have $\lim_{\zeta} (D') = D \times \{0\}$. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 75. The proof is very similar to that of Proposition 15.4 in [2]. By Lemma 76, there exists D' , a semi-algebraically connected component of $\text{Zer}(\text{Def}_+(Q, \zeta, d), R(\zeta)^{k+1})_{[a,b]}$ such that $D \times \{0\} = \lim_{\zeta} (D')$. Since $[a, b] \setminus \{c\}$ contains no G -pseudo-critical value, there exists an infinitesimal $\delta > 0$ such that the G -critical values on $\text{Zer}(\text{Def}_+(Q, \zeta, d), R(\zeta)^{k+1})$ in the interval $[a, b]$, if they exist, lie in the interval $[c - \delta, c + \delta]$.

We claim that $D'_{c-\delta \leq G \leq c+\delta}$ is semi-algebraically connected.

Let x, y be any two points in $D'_{c-\delta \leq G \leq c+\delta}$. We show that there exists a semi-algebraic path connecting x to y lying within $D'_{c-\delta \leq G \leq c+\delta}$. Since, D' itself is semi-algebraically connected, there exists a semi-algebraic path, $\gamma: [0, 1] \rightarrow D'$, with $\gamma(0) = x, \gamma(1) = y$, and $\gamma(t) \in D', 0 \leq t \leq 1$. If $\gamma(t) \in D'_{c-\delta \leq G \leq c+\delta}$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$, we are done. Otherwise, the semi-algebraic path γ is the union of a finite number of closed connected pieces γ_i lying either in $D'_{a \leq G \leq c-\delta}, D'_{c+\delta \leq G \leq b}$ or $D'_{c-\delta \leq G \leq c+\delta}$.

By Lemma 9 the semi-algebraically connected components of $D'_{G=c-\delta}$ (resp. $D'_{G=c+\delta}$) are in 1-1 correspondence with the connected components of $D'_{a \leq G \leq c-\delta}$ (resp. $D'_{c+\delta \leq G \leq b}$) containing them. Thus, we can replace each of the γ_i lying in $D'_{a \leq G \leq c-\delta}$ (resp. $D'_{c+\delta \leq G \leq b}$) with endpoints in $D'_{G=c-\delta}$ (resp. $D'_{G=c+\delta}$) by another segment with the same endpoints but lying completely in $D'_{G=c-\delta}$ (resp. $D'_{G=c+\delta}$). We thus obtain a new semi-algebraic path γ' connecting x to y and lying inside $D'_{c-\delta \leq G \leq c+\delta}$.

It is clear that $\lim_{\zeta} (D'_{c-\delta \leq G \leq c+\delta})$ coincides with $D_{G=c}$. Since $D'_{c-\delta \leq G \leq c+\delta}$ is bounded, $D_{G=c}$ is semi-algebraically connected by Proposition 12.43 in [2]. $\square$

Let C be a semi-algebraically connected component of $S_{a \leq G \leq v}$ and let $B_1, \dots, B_h$ be the semi-algebraically connected components of $C_{a \leq G < v}$.

Lemma 77. *If $\bar{B}_1 \cap \bar{B}_2 \neq \emptyset$, then v is a (G, d) -pseudo-critical value on S .*

Proof: Suppose that $\bar{B}_1 \cap \dots \cap \bar{B}_I \neq \emptyset$ and that $1, \dots, I$ is a maximal family with this property. Let x be a point of this intersection. Clearly, x belongs to the boundary of S and the set $\mathcal{P}_x \subset \mathcal{P}$ of polynomials in $\mathcal{P}$ that vanish at x is not empty. According to Theorem 5.46 [2] (Semi-algebraic triviality) there is $w \in [a, v)$ such that $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}_x, R^k)_{w \leq G < v}$ is semi-algebraically homeomorphic to $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}_x, R^k)_{G=w} \times [w, v)$ and $C_{w \leq G < v}$ is semi-algebraically homeomorphic to $C_{G=w} \times [w, v)$. Note that $C_{w \leq G < v}$ is not semi-algebraically connected. Let D be the connected component of $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}_x, R^k)_{w \leq G \leq v}$ containing x .

We consider two cases according to whether or not $D_{G=w}$ is empty:

If $D_{G=w}$ is empty, then v is an (G, d) -pseudo-critical value on $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}_x, R^k)$ by Proposition 75 and we have already noted that (G, d) -pseudo-critical values are (G, d) -special values (Remark 74).

If $D_{G=w}$ is not empty, then some semi-algebraically connected component of $C_{a \leq G < v}$ intersects $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}_x, R^k)$ in any neighborhood of x . Suppose, without loss of generality that it is B_1 . Consider a maximal subset of $\mathcal{P}$, say $\mathcal{P}'_x$, such that $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}'_x, R^k)$ intersects B_2 in any neighborhood of x . The set $\mathcal{P}'_x$ is non-empty and contained in $\mathcal{P}_x$. According to Theorem 5.46 [2] (Semi-algebraic triviality) there is a $w' \geq w$ such that $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}'_x, R^k)_{w' \leq G < v}$ is semi-algebraically homeomorphic to $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}'_x, R^k)_{G=w'} \times [w', v)$. Let Z be the connected component of $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}'_x, R^k)_{w' \leq G \leq v}$ containing x . By the maximality of $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}'_x, R^k)$, there is a connected component Z_1 of $Z_{w' \leq G < v}$ contained in $B_2_{w' \leq G < v}$. Since $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}_x, R^k) \subset \text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}'_x, R^k)$ and $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}_x, R^k)_{w' \leq G < v}$ meets B_1 , $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}'_x, R^k)_{w' \leq G < v}$ is not semi-algebraically connected. We conclude by Proposition 75 that v is a (G, d) -pseudo-critical value on $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}'_x, R^k)$ and hence by Remark 74 is also a (G, d) -special value on $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}'_x, R^k)$. $\square$

We are now ready for the proof of Proposition 25.

Proof of Proposition 25.

Let us prove part 1. Let D be a semi-algebraically connected component of S . Then, D contains a semi-algebraically connected component of some algebraic set $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{Q}', \mathbb{R}^k)$ for some $\mathcal{Q}' \subset \mathcal{Q}$ (using Proposition 13.1 in [2]). Since the set (G, d) -pseudo-critical points of $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{Q}', \mathbb{R}^k)$ is contained in the set of (G, d) -pseudo-critical points of $\text{Bas}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$, Part 1) follows from Part 2) of Proposition 75.

We now prove Part 2). Suppose that $C_{G=v}$ is empty. We take $d \in [a, b]$ such that $C_{G=d}$ is non-empty and suppose that $v < d$ (the case $v > d$ can be treated similarly). We obtain a contradiction by proving that there is a (G, d) -special value on S in $(v, d]$. Since the set $\{w \in (v, d] \mid C_{G=w} \neq \emptyset\}$ is a closed semi-algebraic subset of $[v, d]$, it contains a smallest such value, say u . Choose an $x \in C_{G=u}$. Since x belongs to the boundary of S , the set $\mathcal{P}_x$ of polynomials in $\mathcal{P}$ vanishing at x is non-empty. It is clear that $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}_x, \mathbb{R}^k) \cap B_k(x, \varepsilon)_{G < u} = \emptyset$ for ε small enough. Hence, by Proposition 70, u is an (G, d) -special value on $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}_x, \mathbb{R}^k)$.

Suppose now that $C_{G=v}$ is not semi-algebraically connected. Take $d \in [a, b]$ such that a semi-algebraically connected component of $C_{v \leq G \leq d}$ contains more than one connected semi-algebraically component of $C_{G=v}$ and suppose that $v < d$ (the case $v > d$ can be treated similarly). We obtain a contradiction by proving that there is a (G, d) -special value on S in $(v, d]$. Since the set of $w \in (v, d]$ for which $C_{v \leq G \leq w}$ contains more than one semi-algebraically connected component of $C_{G=v}$ is a closed semi-algebraic subset of $[v, b]$ by Theorem 5.46 [2] (Semi-algebraic triviality), it contains a smallest such value, say u .

Consider a connected component B of $C_{v \leq G \leq u}$ containing more than one semi-algebraically connected component of $C_{G=u}$. Let $B_1, \dots, B_h$ be the connected components of $C_{v \leq G < u}$ contained in B , and let B_0 be the set of $x \in B_{G=u}$ such that $B_k(x, \varepsilon)_{G < u} \cap C = \emptyset$ for $\varepsilon > 0$ and small enough. Clearly, $B = B_0 \cup \overline{B_1} \cup \dots \cup \overline{B_h}$.

We now prove that u is an (G, d) -special value on S whether or not $B_0 = \emptyset$.

If B_0 is non-empty, choose an $x \in B_0$ and let $\mathcal{P}_x$ be the set of polynomials in $\mathcal{P}$ vanishing at x . Then $B_k(x, \varepsilon)_{G < u} \cap \text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}_x, \mathbb{R}^k)$ is empty and it follows from Proposition 70 that u is an (G, d) -special value on $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}_x, \mathbb{R}^k)$.

Alternatively, if B_0 is empty we may assume, without loss of generality, that $\overline{B_1} \cap \overline{B_2} \neq \emptyset$. Thus by Lemma 77, u is an (G, d) -pseudo-critical value, hence a G -special value of S (by Remark 74). $\square$

Acknowledgments. The first author was partially supported by NSF grant CCF-0915954.