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ABSTRACT. Let $\mathbb{R}$ be a real closed field. The problem of obtaining tight bounds on the Betti numbers of semi-algebraic subsets of $\mathbb{R}^k$ in terms of the number and degrees of the defining polynomials has been an important problem in real algebraic geometry with the first results due to Oleinik and Petrovskii, Thom and Milnor. These bounds are all exponential in the number of variables $k$. Motivated by several applications in real algebraic geometry, as well as in theoretical computer science, where such bounds have found applications, we consider in this paper the problem of bounding the equivariant Betti numbers of symmetric algebraic and semi-algebraic subsets of $\mathbb{R}^k$. We obtain several asymptotically tight upper bounds. In particular, we prove that if $S \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ is a semi-algebraic subset defined by a finite set of $s$ symmetric polynomials of degree at most $d$, then the sum of the $S_k$-equivariant Betti numbers of $S$ with coefficients in $\mathbb{Q}$ is bounded by $(skd)^{O(d)}$. Unlike the classical bounds on the ordinary Betti numbers of real algebraic varieties and semi-algebraic sets, the above bound is polynomial in $k$ when the degrees of the defining polynomials are bounded by a constant. As an application we improve the best known bound on the ordinary Betti numbers of the projection of a compact semi-algebraic set improving for any fixed degree the best previously known bound for this problem due to Gabrielov, Vorobjov and Zell. As another application of our methods we obtain polynomial time (for fixed degrees) algorithms for computing the generalized Euler-Poincaré characteristic of semi-algebraic sets defined by symmetric polynomials. This is in contrast to the best complexity of the known algorithms for the same problem in the non-symmetric situation, which is singly exponential. This singly exponential complexity for the latter problem is unlikely to be improved because of hardness result ($\#P$-hardness) coming from discrete complexity theory.

1. Introduction

The problem of bounding the Betti numbers of semi-algebraic sets defined over the real numbers has a long history, and has attracted the attention of many researchers – starting from the first results due to Oleinik and Petrovskii, [31], followed by Thom [39], Milnor [29]. Aside from their intrinsic mathematical interest from the point of view of real algebraic geometry, these bounds have found applications in diverse areas – most notably in discrete and computational geometry (see for example [8]), as well as in theoretical computer science [44, 30, 12]. Very recently, studying the probability distribution of these numbers for randomly chosen real varieties have also become an important topic of research [22].

In this paper we study the topological complexity of real varieties, as well as semi-algebraic sets, which have symmetry. We will see below that the ordinary Betti numbers of symmetric semi-algebraic sets can be (asymptotically) as large as in the general non-symmetric case. So studying the growth of Betti numbers of symmetric semi-algebraic sets is not very interesting on its own. However, for symmetric semi-algebraic sets it is natural to consider their equivariant Betti numbers. The equivariant Betti numbers (with coefficients in a field of characteristic
0) equals in this case the Betti numbers of their orbit spaces – and here some interesting structure emerges. For instance, unlike in the non-equivariant situation the behavior of these equivariant Betti numbers of real and complex varieties drastically differ from each other. Moreover, in both cases the higher dimensional equivariant cohomology groups vanish – and the dimension of vanishing only depends on the degrees of the polynomials defining the variety, and is independent of the dimension of the ambient space. To our knowledge quantitative studies on the topology of symmetric semi-algebraic sets, in particular obtaining tight bounds on their equivariant Betti numbers, have not been undertaken previously. We prove asymptotically tight bounds on the equivariant Betti numbers of symmetric semi-algebraic sets and give several applications of our results, as well as our techniques for proving them.

Let $\mathbb{R}$ be a real closed field which is fixed for the remainder of the paper, and let $\mathbb{C}$ denote the algebraic closure of $\mathbb{R}$.

1.1. Motivations. There are several different motivations behind studying the equivariant Betti numbers of symmetric semi-algebraic sets. One motivation comes from computational complexity theory. It is a well known phenomenon that the worst case topological complexity of a class of semi-algebraic sets reflects the computational hardness of testing whether a given set in this class is non-empty, as well as computing topological invariants such as the Betti numbers of such sets. For instance, it is an NP-hard problem (in the Blum-Shub-Smale model) to decide if a given real algebraic variety $V \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ defined by one polynomial equation of degree at most 4 is empty or not [14]. The Betti numbers of such varieties can be exponentially large in $k$. In contrast, the same problem of deciding emptiness, as well as computing other topological invariants of real varieties defined by a fixed number of quadrics in $\mathbb{R}^k$ can be solved with polynomial complexity [1, 5]. The Betti numbers of such sets can also be bounded by a polynomial function of $k$ [2, 6]. This close connection between the worst case upper bound on the Betti numbers, and the algorithmic complexity of computing topological invariants, breaks down if one considers the class of “symmetric” real varieties. On one hand the topological complexity in terms of the Betti numbers of such sets can be as big as in the non-symmetric situation (see Example 1 below) . On the other hand, there exist algorithms whose complexity depend polynomially in the number of variables (for fixed degrees) for testing emptiness of such sets [40, 36]. This dichotomy suggests that perhaps the topological complexity of symmetric varieties, and semi-algebraic sets is better reflected by their equivariant Betti numbers rather than the ordinary ones. The results of the current paper (which show that the equivariant Betti numbers of real varieties and semi-algebraic sets are polynomially bounded for fixed degrees) agree with this intuition. We also note that studying the computational complexity of symmetric vs. non-symmetric versions of problems in linear algebra and algebraic geometry is an active field of research – see for example [26] for several results of this kind for computational problems involving high-dimensional tensors.

Our second motivation is more concrete and leads to an improvement in certain situations of an important result proved by Gabrielov, Vorobjov and Zell [21] who proved a bound on the ordinary Betti numbers of the image under projection of a semi-algebraic set, in terms of the number and degrees of polynomials defining the original set. The bound is obtained by bounding the dimensions of certain groups occurring as the $E_1$-term of a certain spectral sequence. It turns out that there is an action of the symmetric group on this spectral sequence, and quotienting out this action yields a better approximation to the homology groups of the image than the original spectral sequence. Our bound on the equivariant Betti numbers can
now be used to bound the dimension of this quotient object. We explain this consequence of our results in Section 1.6 below.

A final motivation is to understand whether symmetric semi-algebraic sets are algorithmically more tractable than general semi-algebraic sets. In particular, is it possible to obtain polynomial time (for fixed degree) algorithms for computing topological invariants such sets? We answer this in the affirmative for the problem of computing the generalized Euler-Poincaré characteristic (both the ordinary as well as the equivariant versions) of symmetric semi-algebraic sets. The problem of computing the generalized Euler-Poincaré characteristic is important in several applications both theoretical and practical. For example, such an algorithm is a key ingredient in computing the integral (with respect to the Euler-Poincaré measure) of constructible functions, and this latter problem has been of recent interest in several applications [3].

Before proceeding further we first fix some notation and recall some classical tight upper bounds on the Betti numbers of general (i.e. not necessarily symmetric) real (respectively complex) varieties, in terms of the degrees of the defining polynomials and the dimension of the ambient space. Obtaining such bounds has been an important area of research in quantitative real (respectively complex) algebraic geometry.

1.2. Topological complexity of complex varieties and real semi-algebraic sets.

Notation 1 For $P \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \ldots, X_k]$ (respectively $P \in \mathbb{C}[X_1, \ldots, X_k]$) we denote by $\text{Zer}(P, \mathbb{R}^k)$ (respectively $\text{Zer}(P, \mathbb{C}^k)$) the set of zeros of $P$ in $\mathbb{R}^k$ (respectively $\mathbb{C}^k$). More generally, for any finite set $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{R}[X_1, \ldots, X_k]$ (respectively $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{C}[X_1, \ldots, X_k]$), we denote by $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}, \mathbb{R}^k)$ (respectively $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}, \mathbb{C}^k)$) the set of common zeros of $\mathcal{P}$ in $\mathbb{R}^k$ (respectively $\mathbb{C}^m + k$).

Notation 2 For any finite family of polynomials $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{R}[X_1, \ldots, X_k]$, we call an element $\sigma \in \{0, 1, -1\}^\mathcal{P}$, a sign condition on $\mathcal{P}$. For any semi-algebraic set $Z \subset \mathbb{R}^k$, and a sign condition $\sigma \in \{0, 1, -1\}^\mathcal{P}$, we denote by $\text{Reali}(\sigma, Z)$ the semi-algebraic set defined by

$$\{ x \in Z \mid \text{sign}(P(x)) = \sigma(P), P \in \mathcal{P} \},$$

and call it the realization of $\sigma$ on $Z$. More generally, we call any Boolean formula $\Phi$ with atoms, $P\{=, >, <\}0, P \in \mathcal{P}$, to be a $\mathcal{P}$-formula. We call the realization of $\Phi$, namely the semi-algebraic set

$$\text{Reali}(\Phi, \mathbb{R}^k) = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^k \mid \Phi(x) \},$$

a $\mathcal{P}$-semi-algebraic set. Finally, we call a Boolean formula without negations, and with atoms $P\{\geq, \leq\}0, P \in \mathcal{P}$, to be a $\mathcal{P}$-closed formula, and we call the realization, $\text{Reali}(\Phi, \mathbb{R}^k)$, a $\mathcal{P}$-closed semi-algebraic set.

Notation 3 For any finite family of polynomials $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{R}[X_1, \ldots, X_k]$, we denote by

$$\text{SIGN}(\mathcal{P}) \subset \{0, 1, -1\}^\mathcal{P}$$

the set of all realizable sign conditions for $\mathcal{P}$ over $\mathbb{R}^k$.

Notation 4 For any semi-algebraic set or a complex variety $X$, and a field of coefficients $\mathbb{F}$, we will denote by $H^i(X, \mathbb{F})$ the $i$-th cohomology groups of $X$ with coefficients in $\mathbb{F}$, and by $b_i(X, \mathbb{F}) = \dim \mathbb{F}H^i(X, \mathbb{F})$. Note that defining the cohomology groups of semi-algebraic sets over arbitrary (possibly non-archimedean) real closed fields require some care, and we refer
the reader to [10, Chapter 6] for details. Roughly speaking, for a closed and bounded semi-algebraic set \( S \), \( H^i(S, \mathbb{F}) \) is defined as the \( i \)-th simplicial cohomology group associated to a semi-algebraic triangulation of \( S \). For a general semi-algebraic set \( S \), \( H^i(S, \mathbb{F}) \) is defined as the \( i \)-th cohomology group of a closed and bounded semi-algebraic replacement of \( S \), which is semi-algebraically homotopy equivalent to it. This definition is clearly invariant under semi-algebraic homotopy equivalences, and coincides with ordinary singular cohomology groups for semi-algebraic sets defined over \( \mathbb{R} \).

The following classical result, which gives an upper bound on the Betti numbers of a real variety in terms of the degree of the defining polynomial and the number of variables, is due to Oleinik and Petrovskii [31], Thom [39] and Milnor [29].

**Theorem 1** [31, 39, 29] Let \( Q \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \ldots, X_k] \) be a polynomial with \( \deg(Q) \leq d \). Then, for any field of coefficients \( \mathbb{F} \),
\[
\sum_{i \geq 0} b_i \left( \text{Zer} \left( Q, \mathbb{R}^k \right), \mathbb{F} \right) \leq d(2d - 1)^{k-1}.
\]

By separating the real and imaginary parts of complex polynomials and taking their sums of squares, one obtains as an immediate corollary:

**Corollary 1** Let \( Q \subset \mathbb{C}[X_1, \ldots, X_k] \) be a finite set of polynomials with \( \deg(Q) \leq d, Q \in \mathbb{Q} \). Then, for any field of coefficients \( \mathbb{F} \),
\[
\sum_{i \geq 0} b_i \left( \text{Zer} \left( Q, \mathbb{C}^k \right), \mathbb{F} \right) \leq 2d(4d - 1)^{2k-1}.
\]

In the semi-algebraic case, we have the following bounds.

**Theorem 2** [29] Let \( S \subset \mathbb{R}^k \) be a basic closed semi-algebraic set defined by \( P_1 \geq 0, \ldots, P_s \geq 0 \), and the degree of each \( P_i \) is bounded by \( d \). Then, for any field of coefficients \( \mathbb{F} \),
\[
\sum_{i \geq 0} b_i (S, \mathbb{F}) \leq sd(2sd - 1)^{k-1}.
\]

**Theorem 3** [10, 20] Let \( \mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{R}[X_1, \ldots, X_k] \) be a finite family of polynomials with \( \deg(P) \leq d \) for each \( P \in \mathcal{P} \), and \( \text{card}(\mathcal{P}) = s \). Let \( S \) be a \( \mathcal{P} \)-closed semi-algebraic set. Then, for any field of coefficients \( \mathbb{F} \),
\[
\sum_{i \geq 0} b_i (S, \mathbb{F}) \leq \sum_{i=0}^k \sum_{j=1}^{k-i} \binom{s}{j} 6^j d(2d - 1)^{k-1}.
\]

If \( T \) is a \( \mathcal{P} \)-semi-algebraic set then, for any field of coefficients \( \mathbb{F} \),
\[
\sum_{i \geq 0} b_i (T, \mathbb{F}) \leq \sum_{i=0}^k \sum_{j=1}^{k-i} \left( 2s^2 + 1 \right) 6^j d(2d - 1)^{k-1}.
\]

We refer the reader to [8] for a survey of other known results in this direction. Even though the bounds in the case of real varieties often differ in important respects, the upper bounds on the Betti numbers in both the real and complex case share the feature that they depend exponentially in the dimension of the ambient space, and if the dimension of the ambient space is fixed, of being polynomial in the degrees of the defining polynomials.
1.3. **Topological complexity of symmetric varieties.** Another area of research with a long history is the action of groups on varieties. Suppose $G$ is a compact group acting on a real or complex variety $V$. If the action is sufficiently nice then the space of orbits is again a variety in the complex case and a semi-algebraic set in the real case. Studying the topology of such orbit spaces is a very natural and well studied problem. We approach it in this paper from a quantitative point of view, and consider the problem of proving tight upper bounds on the Betti numbers of the orbit space in terms of the degrees of the defining polynomials of $V$.

In this paper we study exclusively the orbit spaces of the symmetric group, $\mathfrak{S}_k$, or products of symmetric groups, acting in the standard way on finite dimensional real or complex vectors spaces by permuting coordinates. These orbit spaces were described (semi-)algebraically in the fundamental papers of Procesi [32], and Procesi and Schwarz [33]. Subsequently, symmetric group actions in the context of real algebraic geometry and optimization were studied by several authors (see for example [36, 40, 41, 42, 28, 13]). We will see that the behavior in terms of topological complexity of the real and complex orbit spaces differ substantially (unlike in the non-symmetric situation discussed above).

**Notation 5** Let $k = (k_1, \ldots, k_\omega) \in \mathbb{Z}^\omega_{>0}$, with $k = \sum_{i=1}^\omega k_i$, and let $X$ be a semi-algebraic subset of $\mathbb{R}^k$ or a constructible subset of $\mathbb{C}^k$, such that the product of symmetric groups $\mathfrak{S}_k = \mathfrak{S}_{k_1} \times \cdots \times \mathfrak{S}_{k_\omega}$ act on $X$ by independently permuting each block of coordinates. We will denote by $X/\mathfrak{S}_k$ the orbit space of this action. If $\omega = 1$, then $k = k_1$, and we will denote $\mathfrak{S}_k$ simply by $\mathfrak{S}_k$.

We recall first the definition of *equivariant cohomology groups* of a $G$-space for an arbitrary compact Lie group $G$. For $G$ any compact Lie group, there exists a *universal principal $G$-space*, denoted $EG$, which is contractible, and on which the group $G$ acts freely on the right. The *classifying space* $BG$, is the orbit space of this action, i.e. $BG = EG/G$.

**Definition 1** (Borel construction) Let $X$ be a space on which the group $G$ acts on the left. Then, $G$ acts diagonally on the space $EG \times X$ by $g(z, x) = (z \cdot g^{-1}, g \cdot x)$. For any field of coefficients $\mathbb{F}$, the $G$-equivariant cohomology groups of $X$ with coefficients in $\mathbb{F}$, denoted by $H^*_G(X, \mathbb{F})$, is defined by $H^*_G(X, \mathbb{F}) = H^*(EG \times X/G, \mathbb{F})$.

It is well known (see for example [34]) that when a group $G$ acts on a topological space $X$, with finite isotropy groups, and $\mathbb{F}$ is a field of characteristic 0, then there is an isomorphism $H^*(X/G, \mathbb{F}) \cong H^*_G(X, \mathbb{F})$.

**Notation 6** For any $\mathfrak{S}_k$ symmetric semi-algebraic subset $S \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ with $k = (k_1, \ldots, k_\omega) \in \mathbb{Z}^\omega_{>0}$, with $k = \sum_{i=1}^\omega k_i$, and any field $\mathbb{F}$, we denote

$$b^i_{\mathfrak{S}_k}(S, \mathbb{F}) = b_i(S/\mathfrak{S}_k, \mathbb{F}),$$

$$b_{\mathfrak{S}_k}(S, \mathbb{F}) = \sum_{i \geq 0} b^i_{\mathfrak{S}_k}(S, \mathbb{F}),$$

$$b(S, \mathbb{F}) = \sum_{i \geq 0} b_i(S, \mathbb{F}),$$

$$\chi(S, \mathbb{F}) = \sum_{i \geq 0} (-1)^i b_i(S, \mathbb{F}),$$

$$\chi_{\mathfrak{S}_k}(S, \mathbb{F}) = \sum_{i \geq 0} (-1)^i b^i_{\mathfrak{S}_k}(S, \mathbb{F}).$$
Remark 1 Let $k = (k_1, \ldots, k_\omega) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^\omega$, with $k = \sum_{i=1}^\omega k_i$, and let $V \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ be a real variety symmetric with respect to the action of $\mathfrak{S}_k$ permuting each block of $k_i$ coordinates independently. Suppose that $V$ is defined by a finite set $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{R}[X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(\omega)}]$ of non-negative polynomials which are not necessarily symmetric with respect to each block $X^{(i)}$. Then, there exists $P_{\text{symm}} \in \mathbb{R}[X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(\omega)}]$, such that $P_{\text{symm}}$ is symmetric in each block $X^{(i)}$, $\deg(P_{\text{symm}}) \leq \max_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \deg(P)$, and $V = \text{Zer}(P_{\text{symm}}, \mathbb{R}^k)$. More precisely, for each $P \in \mathcal{P}$, and each $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_\omega) \in \mathfrak{S}_k$, let

$$P^\sigma = P(\sigma_1(X^{(1)}), \ldots, \sigma_\omega(X^{(\omega)})),$$

where $\sigma_i(X^{(i)}) = \sigma_i(X_1^{(i)}, \ldots, X_{k_i}^{(i)})$ for each $i, 1 \leq i \leq \omega$. Then, $P^\sigma$ is also non-negative over $\mathbb{R}^k$, and $\deg(P^\sigma) = \deg(P)$. Now letting

$$P_{\text{symm}} = \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}, \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k} P^\sigma$$

we have that $P_{\text{symm}} \in \mathbb{R}[X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(\omega)}]$, $V = \text{Zer}(P_{\text{symm}}, \mathbb{R}^k)$, $P_{\text{symm}}$ is non-negative over $\mathbb{R}^k$, $\deg(P_{\text{symm}}) \leq \max_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \deg(P)$, and moreover $P_{\text{symm}}$ is symmetric in each block of variables $X^{(i)}$.

Notice that the corresponding statement is not always true over $\mathbb{C}$. For example, let $k = (k)$, and consider the symmetric variety $V_\mathbb{C} = \text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}, \mathbb{C}^k)$ defined by

$$\mathcal{P} = \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq k} \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^d (X_i - j) \right\},$$

with $d \leq k$.

Note that each polynomial in $\mathcal{P}$ is of degree $d$, but not symmetric. Now, $b_0(V_\mathbb{C}/\mathfrak{S}_k, \mathbb{Q}) = (\Theta(k))^d$ (see Example 1 below). On the other hand we show (see Theorem 5 below) that for any symmetric variety $V_\mathbb{C} \subset \mathbb{C}^k$ defined by polynomials of degree at most $d \leq k$,

$$b_0(V_\mathbb{C}/\mathfrak{S}_k, \mathbb{Q}) \leq d^{O(d)}.$$

This leads to a contradiction for $k \gg d$. Thus, it is not possible to describe $V_\mathbb{C}$ by symmetric polynomials in $\mathbb{C}[X_1, \ldots, X_k]$ of degree $d$.

Now let $V = \text{Zer}(P, \mathbb{R}^k)$ be a variety that is invariant under the usual action of $\mathfrak{S}_k$ for some $k = (k_1, \ldots, k_\omega) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^\omega$, with $k = \sum_{i=1}^\omega k_i$. A fundamental result due to Procesi and Schwarz [33] states that the orbit space $V/\mathfrak{S}_k$ has the structure of a semi-algebraic set which has the following explicit description.

Notation 7 For each $k \geq 1, i \geq 0$, we will denote by $e_i^{(k)}(X_1, \ldots, X_k)$ the $i$-th elementary symmetric polynomial in $X_1, \ldots, X_k$, and denote by $\phi_k : \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}^k$, the map defined by $x \mapsto (e_1^{(k)}(x), \ldots, e_k^{(k)}(x))$. Similarly, for $k \geq 1, i \geq 0$, we denote

$$p_i^{(k)}(X_1, \ldots, X_k) = \sum_{j=1}^k X_j^i,$$

and denote by $\psi_k : \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}^k$, the map defined by $x \mapsto (p_1^{(k)}(x), \ldots, p_k^{(k)}(x))$. 
Corollary 2

1.4. More generally, for $k = (k_1, \ldots, k_\omega) \in \mathbb{Z}^\omega_+$, with $k = \sum_{i=1}^\omega k_i$, we will denote by $\phi_k : \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}^k$ (respectively $\psi_k : \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}^k$) the map defined by $(x^{(1)}, \ldots, x^{(\omega)}) \mapsto (\phi_{k_1}(x^{(1)}), \ldots, \phi_{k_\omega}(x^{(\omega)}))$ (respectively $(x^{(1)}, \ldots, x^{(\omega)}) \mapsto (\psi_{k_1}(x^{(1)}), \ldots, \psi_{k_\omega}(x^{(\omega)})))$.

Note that the Newton identities (see for example [10, page 103]) give expressions for each sequence of polynomials $(e_i^{(k)})_{1 \leq i \leq k}$ and $(p_i^{(k)})_{1 \leq i \leq k}$ in terms of the other. Moreover, for all $j \geq 0$, there exists uniquely defined polynomials $g_j^{(k)} \in \mathbb{Q}[Z_1, \ldots, Z_k]$ such that

$$p_j^{(k)}(X_1, \ldots, X_k) = g_j^{(k)}(p_1^{(k)}, \ldots, p_k^{(k)}).$$

In particular,

$$g_0^{(k)}(Z_1, \ldots, Z_k) = k,$$

$$g_j^{(k)}(Z_1, \ldots, Z_k) = Z_j, 1 \leq j \leq k.$$

**Notation 8** We denote by $\text{Hank}^{(k)}(Z_1, \ldots, Z_k) \in \mathbb{R}[Z_1, \ldots, Z_k]^{k \times k}$ the matrix defined by

$$(\text{Hank}^{(k)}(Z_1, \ldots, Z_k))_{i,j} = (ij)g_i^{(k)}(Z_1, \ldots, Z_k).$$

**Notation 9** For any real symmetric matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ we denote by $A \succeq 0$ the property that $A$ is positive semi-definite.

Now suppose that $k = (k_1, \ldots, k_\omega) \in \mathbb{Z}^\omega_+$, with $k = \sum_{i=1}^\omega k_i$, and $Q \in \mathbb{R}[X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(\omega)}]$, where each $X^{(i)}$ is a block of $k_i$ variables, and $Q$ is symmetric in each block $X^{(i)}$, with $\deg_{X^{(i)}}(Q) \leq d$ for each $i, 1 \leq i \leq \omega$. Then, using the fundamental theorem of symmetric polynomials, there exists a polynomial $F \in \mathbb{R}[Z^{(1)}, \ldots, Z^{(\omega)}]$, $\deg_{Z^{(i)}}(F) \leq d$, such that

$$Q(X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(\omega)}) = F(p_1^{(k_1)}(X^{(1)}), \ldots, p_d^{(k_1)}(X^{(1)}), \ldots, p_1^{(k_\omega)}(X^{(\omega)}), \ldots, p_d^{(k_\omega)}(X^{(\omega)})).$$

Let $V = \text{Zer}(Q, R^k)$, and let $\mathfrak{S}_k$ act on $V$ by permuting each block of coordinates $X^{(i)}, 1 \leq i \leq \omega$.

**Proposition 1** The quotient space $V/\mathfrak{S}_k$ is homeomorphic to the image $\psi_k(V)$.

**Theorem 4** [33] The image $\psi_k(V)$ is a basic closed semi-algebraic set described by

$$\psi_k(V) = \text{Zer}(F, R^k) \cap \left\{(z^{(1)}, \ldots, z^{(\omega)}) \in R^k \mid \text{Hank}^{(k_i)}(z^{(i)}) \succeq 0, 1 \leq i \leq \omega \right\}.$$

An immediate corollary to Theorem 4 is the following.

**Corollary 2** Let $S \subset R^k$ be the semi-algebraic set defined by $P \succeq 0$. Then,

$$\psi_k(S) = \text{Real}i(F \geq 0, R^k) \cap \left\{(z^{(1)}, \ldots, z^{(\omega)}) \in R^k \mid \text{Hank}^{(k_i)}(z^{(i)}) \succeq 0, 1 \leq i \leq \omega \right\}.$$

1.4. **Real and complex quotients.** In order to contrast the topological behavior of the quotient space of equivariant real and complex varieties, consider two finite sets of polynomials $\mathcal{P}_R \subset \mathbb{R}[X_1, \ldots, X_k]$ and $\mathcal{P}_C \subset \mathbb{C}[X_1, \ldots, X_k]$, symmetric in $X_1, \ldots, X_k$, and let $V_R = \text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}_R, R^k)$ and $V_C = \text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}_C, C^k)$. Let $\deg(P) \leq d \leq k$ for each $P \in \mathcal{P}_R \cup \mathcal{P}_C$. Let $\mathfrak{S}_k$ act on $V_R$ as well as $V_C$ by permuting the coordinates $X_1, \ldots, X_k$.

The quotient space $V_C/\mathfrak{S}_k$ is an algebraic subset of $\mathbb{C}^d$ in the following way. Recall that, for each $i \geq 0$, $e_i^{(k)} \in \mathbb{Z}[X_1, \ldots, X_k]$ denotes the $i$-th elementary symmetric polynomial. Then,
for each $P \in \mathcal{P}_C$, there exists a polynomial $G_P \in \mathbb{C}[Z_1, \ldots, Z_d]$ with $\deg(G_P) \leq d$, such that $P = G_P(e_1^{(k)}, \ldots, e_d^{(k)})$.

The quotient space, $V_C / \mathcal{G}_k$, is then homeomorphic to $\text{Zer}(\mathcal{G}, \mathbb{C}^d)$, where $\mathcal{G} = \bigcup_{P \in \mathcal{P}_C} \{G_P\}$. Applying Corollary 1 we obtain:

**Theorem 5** With the assumptions above, and for any field of coefficients $\mathbb{F}$, 

$$b(V_C / \mathcal{G}_k, \mathbb{F}) \leq 2d(4d - 1)^{2d - 1} = d^{O(d)}.$$ 

More generally, if $k = (k_1, \ldots, k_\omega) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^\omega$, with $k = \sum_{i=1}^{\omega} k_i$, $\mathcal{P}_C \subset \mathbb{C}[X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(\omega)}]$ where each $X^{(i)}$ is a block of $k_i$ variables, and each $P \in \mathcal{P}_C$ is symmetric independently in each block $X^{(i)}$. Suppose that $\deg(P) \leq d$. Denoting as above $V_C = \text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}_C, \mathbb{C}^k)$ we have:

**Theorem 6** For any field of coefficients $\mathbb{F}$, 

$$b(V_C / \mathcal{G}_k, \mathbb{F}) \leq 2d(4d - 1)^{2D - 1},$$ 

where $D = \sum_{i=1}^{\omega} \min(d, k_i)$. In particular, if $d \leq k_i$ for each $i, 1 \leq i \leq \omega$, 

$$b(V_C / \mathcal{G}_k, \mathbb{F}) \leq d^{O(\omega d)}.$$ 

**Proof.** For each $P \in \mathcal{P}_C$, by the fundamental theorem of symmetric functions, there exists $G_P \in \mathbb{C}[Z^{(1)}, \ldots, Z^{(d)}]$, where for each $i, 1 \leq i \leq \omega$, $Z^{(i)}$ is a block of $\ell_i = \min(k^{(i)}, d)$ variables, such that 

$$P(X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(\omega)}) = G_P(p_1^{(k_1)}(X^{(1)}), \ldots, p_{\ell_1}^{(k_1)}(X^{(1)}), \ldots, p_1^{(k_\omega)}(X^{(\omega)}), \ldots, p_{\ell_\omega}^{(k_\omega)}(X^{(\omega)})).$$ 

Now apply Theorem 5. \qed

This shows in particular, that in case $d \leq k_i$ for each $i$, the Betti numbers of the quotient space $V_C / \mathcal{G}_k$ can be bounded in terms of $d$ and $\omega$, independent of $k$.

In contrast, the space of orbits of the action of $\mathcal{G}_k$ on $V_R$ has the structure of a semi-algebraic (rather than an algebraic) set (see Proposition 1 above). It is also not possible to bound $b(V_R / \mathcal{G}_k, \mathbb{F})$ by a function of $\omega$ and $d$ independent of $k$ (similar to the complex case) as shown by the following example.

**Example 1** Let $k = (k)$, and 

$$P = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left( \prod_{j=1}^{d} (X_i - j) \right)^2.$$ 

Then $P$ is symmetric of degree $2d$. Let $V_R = \text{Zer}(\{P\}, \mathbb{R}^k)$. Then, $V_R / \mathcal{G}_k$ is zero-dimensional, and $b_0(V_R / \mathcal{G}_k, \mathbb{Q}) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{d} p(k, \ell)$, where $p(k, \ell)$ denotes the number of partitions of $k$ into $\ell$ parts. Hence (using Remark 2 below), 

$$b_0(V_R / \mathcal{G}_k, \mathbb{Q}) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{d} p(k, \ell) = (\Theta(k))^d.$$ 

Example 1 shows that there is a fundamental difference in the topological complexity of the orbit space in the complex and real case. In the complex case the topological complexity of the orbit space, $V_C / \mathcal{G}_k$, measured by the sum of the Betti numbers, is bounded by a function...
of $d$ independent of $k$ (for $k \geq d$). However, in the real case, the topology of the space of orbits, $V_{\mathbb{R}}/\mathfrak{S}_k$, can grow with $k$ for fixed $d$. However, it is still possible to bound the Betti numbers of the quotient $V_{\mathbb{R}}/\mathfrak{S}_k$ using the description of $V_{\mathbb{R}}/\mathfrak{S}_k$ given in Theorem 4, and the bound on the Betti numbers of basic closed semi-algebraic sets in Theorem 2. To do this notice that a symmetric matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ is positive semi-definite if and only if all its symmetric minors are non-negative. Thus, the description of the set $\psi_k (V_{\mathbb{R}})$ given by Eqn. (2) involves $2^k$ polynomials whose maximum degree equals

$$\deg(\det(\text{Hank}(^k(Z)))) \leq (2 + 4 + \cdots + (2k - 2)) = k(k - 1).$$

Applying Theorem 2 directly (and noting that $\deg(F) \leq k$ by hypothesis), we get for any field of coefficients $\mathbb{F}$,

$$\sum_{i \geq 0} b_i (\psi_k (V_{\mathbb{R}}), \mathbb{F}) \leq (2^k k(k - 1)d)(2^k + 1)(k - 1)d - 1)^k - 1$$

(3)

$$= (O(2^k kd))^k.$$

An alternative method for bounding the Betti numbers of $V_{\mathbb{R}}/\mathfrak{S}_k$ is to use the “descent spectral sequence” argument as in [21] (see also [27]). Using the fact that the map $\psi_k$ is proper, we have the inequality that for each $n \geq 0$,

$$b_n (\psi_k (V_{\mathbb{R}}), \mathbb{F}) \leq \sum_{p+q=n} b_q (V_{\mathbb{R}} \times \psi_k \cdot \cdots \times \psi_k V_{\mathbb{R}}, \mathbb{F}).$$

Using inequality (4) and the bound in Theorem 1 we obtain

$$\sum_{i \geq 0} b_i (\psi_k (V_{\mathbb{R}}), \mathbb{F}) \leq d^{O(k^2)},$$

(5)

which is again exponential in $k$ for any fixed $d$. It is also possible to obtain a bound of a similar shape using effective quantifier elimination to obtain a semi-algebraic description of $\psi_k (V_{\mathbb{R}})$, and then use known bounds on the Betti numbers of semi-algebraic sets [10], but this gives a bound having the same shape as the one in (5).

1.5. Main results. Before stating the main theorems of this paper we introduce some more notation.

**Notation 10** (Partitions) We denote by $\Pi_k$ the set of partitions of $k$, where each partition $\pi = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \ldots, \pi_{\ell}) \in \Pi_k$, where $\pi_1 \geq \pi_2 \geq \cdots \geq \pi_{\ell} \geq 1$, and $\pi_1 + \pi_2 + \cdots + \pi_{\ell} = k$. We call $\ell$ the length of the partition $\pi$, and denote length($\pi$) = $\ell$. For $\ell \geq 0$ we will denote

$$\Pi_{k,\ell} = \{\pi \in \Pi_k \mid \text{length}(\pi) \leq \ell\},$$

$$p(k, \ell) = \text{card}(\{\pi \in \Pi_k \mid \text{length}(\pi) = \ell\}).$$

More generally, for any tuple $k = (k_1, \ldots, k_\omega) \in \mathbb{Z}^\omega_{>0}$, we will denote by $\Pi_k = \Pi_{k_1} \times \cdots \times \Pi_{k_\omega}$, and for each $\pi = (\pi^{(1)}, \ldots, \pi^{(\omega)}) \in \Pi_k$, we denote by length($\pi$) = $\sum_{i=1}^{\omega} \text{length}(\pi^{(i)})$. We also denote for each $\ell = (\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_\omega) \in \mathbb{Z}^\omega_{>0}$,

$$|\ell| = \ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_\omega,$$

$$\Pi_{k,\ell} = \{\pi = (\pi^{(1)}, \ldots, \pi^{(\omega)}) \mid \pi^{(i)} \in \Pi_{k_i, \ell_i}, 1 \leq i \leq \omega\},$$

$$p(k, \ell) = \text{card}(\{\pi = (\pi^{(1)}, \ldots, \pi^{(\omega)}) \mid \text{length}(\pi^{(i)}) = \ell_i, 1 \leq i \leq \omega\}).$$
We prove the following theorem.

**Theorem 7** Let \( k = (k_1, \ldots, k_\omega) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^\omega \), with \( k = \sum_{i=1}^{\omega} k_i \). Let \( P \in \mathbb{R}[X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(\omega)}] \), where each \( X^{(i)} \) is a block of \( k_i \) variables, be a non-negative polynomial, such that \( V = \text{Zer}(P, \mathbb{R}^k) \) is invariant under the action of \( S_k \) permuting each block \( X^{(i)} \) of \( k_i \) coordinates. Let \( \deg_{X^{(i)}}(P) \leq d \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq \omega \). Then, for any field of coefficients \( F \),
\[
\text{b}(V/\mathfrak{S}_k, F) \leq \sum_{1 = (\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_\omega), 1 \leq \ell_i \leq \min(2d, k_i)} p(k, 1)d(2d - 1)^{|l|+1}.
\]
Moreover, for all \( i \geq \sum_{i=1}^\omega \min(2d, k_i) \)
\[
\text{b}_i(V/\mathfrak{S}_k, F) = 0.
\]
If for each \( i, 1 \leq i \leq \omega, 2d \leq k_i \), then
\[
\text{b}(V/\mathfrak{S}_k, F) \leq (k_1 \cdots k_\omega)^{2d}(O(d))^{2\omega d+1}.
\]
In particular,
\[
\text{b}_\mathfrak{S}_k(V, \mathbb{Q}) \leq \sum_{1 = (\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_\omega), 1 \leq \ell_i \leq \min(2d, k_i)} p(k, 1)d(2d - 1)^{|l|+1}.
\]

**Remark 2** For \( d = o(k^{1/3}) \), and \( k \gg 1 \), we have that \( p(k, d) \sim \frac{(k-1)}{d!} = (\Theta(k))^{d-1} \) [19]. Thus, in the special case, when \( \omega = 1, d = O(1) \), we have the following asymptotic (for \( k \gg 1 \)) form of the bound in Theorem 7,
\[
\text{b}(V/\mathfrak{S}_k, F) \leq O(k^{2d-1}).
\]

A special case of the theorem is of independent interest. Suppose that \( k = (1, \ldots, 1, k \underbrace{, \ldots, \ldots, ,}_{m} k) \), and \( 2 \leq d \leq k/2 \). Then, with the same notation as in Theorem 7 we have the following corollary.

**Corollary 3** The following bounds hold:
\[
\text{b}(V/\mathfrak{S}_k, F) \leq \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq 2d} p(k, \ell)d(2d - 1)^{m+\ell+1}.
\]
\[
= k^{2d}O(d)^{m+2d+1}.
\]
\[
\text{b}_\mathfrak{S}_k(V, \mathbb{Q}) \leq \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq 2d} p(k, \ell)d(2d - 1)^{m+\ell+1}.
\]
\[
= k^{2d}O(d)^{m+2d+1}.
\]

**Remark 3** Notice that for fixed \( m \) and \( d \) both bounds in Corollary 3 are polynomial in \( k \) compared to the bounds in the inequalities (3) and (5) above, where the dependence on \( k \) is singly exponential.

More generally, for symmetric semi-algebraic sets we have the following two theorems (for \( P \)-closed semi-algebraic and \( P \)-semi-algebraic sets, respectively).
Notation 11 Let \( k = (k_1, \ldots, k_\ell) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^\omega \), with \( k = \sum_{i=1}^\omega k_i \), and \( d \geq 1 \). We denote

\[
F(k, d) = \sum_{l=(\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_\ell), 1 \leq \ell_i \leq \min(2d, k_i)} p(k, 1)d(2d - 1)^{|l|+1}.
\]

Theorem 8 Let \( k = (k_1, \ldots, k_\ell) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^\omega \), with \( k = \sum_{i=1}^\omega k_i \), and let \( \mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{R}[X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(\omega)}] \) be a finite set of polynomials, where each \( X^{(i)} \) is a block of \( k^{(i)} \) variables, and such that each \( P \in \mathcal{P} \) is symmetric in each block of variables \( X^{(i)} \). Let \( S \subset \mathbb{R}^k \) be a \( \mathcal{P} \)-closed-semi-algebraic set. Suppose that \( \deg(P) \leq d \) for each \( P \in \mathcal{P} \), \( \text{card}(\mathcal{P}) = s \), and let \( D = D(k, d) = \sum_{i=1}^\omega \min(k_i, 5d) \). Then, for any field of coefficients \( F \),

\[
b(S/\mathcal{G}_k, F) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{D-1} \sum_{j=1}^{D-i} \binom{2s}{j} \sum_{\ell=1}^{4d} p(k, \ell) 2d(4d - 1)^{m+\ell+1}
\]

(where \( F \) is as in Notation 11), and moreover

\[
b_i(S/\mathcal{G}_k, F) = 0,
\]

for \( i \geq D \).

Remark 4 In the particular case, when \( \omega = 1, d = O(1) \), the bound in Theorem 8 takes the following asymptotic (for \( k \gg 1 \)) form.

\[
b(S/\mathcal{G}_k, F) \leq O(s^{5d} k^{4d-1}).
\]

The special case when \( k = (1, \ldots, 1, k) \) is particularly interesting, and we record the following corollary for future reference.

Corollary 4 Let \( k = (1, \ldots, 1, k) \), and let \( \mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{R}[Y_1, \ldots, Y_m, X_1, \ldots, X_k] \) be a finite set of polynomials, such that each \( P \in \mathcal{P} \) is symmetric in \( X_1, \ldots, X_k \). Let \( S \subset \mathbb{R}^{m+k} \) be a \( \mathcal{P} \)-closed-semi-algebraic set. Suppose that \( \deg(P) \leq d, d \geq 2 \), for each \( P \in \mathcal{P} \), and that \( \text{card}(\mathcal{P}) = s \). Then, for any field of coefficients \( F \),

\[
b(S/\mathcal{G}_k, F) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{m+5d-1} \sum_{j=1}^{m+5d-i} \binom{2s}{j} \sum_{\ell=1}^{4d} p(k, \ell) 2d(4d - 1)^{m+\ell+1}
\]

and moreover,

\[
b_i(S/\mathcal{G}_k, F) = 0,
\]

for \( i \geq m + 5d \).

For general \( \mathcal{P} \)-semi-algebraic sets we have:

Theorem 9 Let \( k = (k_1, \ldots, k_\omega) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^\omega \), with \( k = \sum_{i=1}^\omega k_i \), and let \( \mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{R}[X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(\omega)}] \) be a finite set of polynomials, where each \( X^{(i)} \) is a block of \( k^{(i)} \) variables, and such that each \( P \in \mathcal{P} \) is symmetric in each block of variables \( X^{(i)} \). Let \( S \subset \mathbb{R}^k \) be a \( \mathcal{P} \)-semi-algebraic set. Suppose
that \( \deg(P) \leq d \) for each \( P \in \mathcal{P} \), \( \text{card}(\mathcal{P}) = s \) and let \( D = D(k,d) = \sum_{i=1}^{s} \min(k_i,5d) \). Then, for any field of coefficients \( \mathbb{F} \), and \( 0 \leq i < D \),

\[
b(S/\mathfrak{S}_k, \mathbb{F}) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{D-1} \sum_{j=1}^{D-i} \binom{2(k+1)s}{j} 6^j F(k,2d)
\]

and

\[
b_i(S/\mathfrak{S}_k, \mathbb{F}) = 0,
\]

for \( i \geq D \).

**Remark 5** In the particular case, when \( \omega = 1 \), \( d = O(1) \), the bound in Theorem 9 takes the following asymptotic (for \( k \gg 1 \)) form.

\[
b(S/\mathfrak{S}_k, \mathbb{F}) \leq s^{5d} k^{O(d)}.
\]

**Remark 6** (Tightness) Example 1 shows that the sum of the equivariant Betti numbers of a symmetric real algebraic set \( V \subset \mathbb{R}^k \), defined by symmetric polynomials of degree at most \( d \) could be as large as \( k^{\Theta(d)} \). It is not too difficult to also to show that in the case of a symmetric \( \mathcal{P} \)-semi-algebraic set, the dependence on \( s = \text{card}(\mathcal{P}) \) can be of the order of \( s^{\Theta(d)} \) where \( d = \max_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \deg(P) \). Hence, the bounds in Theorems 7, 8 and 9 are asymptotically tight for fixed \( d \) and \( s,k \) large.

1.6. **An application in a non-equivariant setting.** As an application of Theorems 7 and Theorem 8, we obtain an improvement in certain situations of a result of Gabrielov, Vorobjov and Zell [21] bounding the Betti numbers of a semi-algebraic set described as the projection of another semi-algebraic set in terms of the description complexity of the pre-image. Note that this improvement is in a non-equivariant setting.

Let \( \mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{R}[Y_1, \ldots, Y_m, X_1, \ldots, X_k] \) be a family of polynomials and with \( \deg(P) \leq d, P \in \mathcal{P} \), \( \text{card}(\mathcal{P}) = s \). Let \( \pi : \mathbb{R}^{m+k} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m \) be the projection map to the first \( m \) co-ordinates, and let \( S \) be a bounded \( \mathcal{P} \)-closed semi-algebraic set. We consider the problem of bounding the Betti numbers of the image \( \pi(S) \). There are two different approaches. One can first obtain a semi-algebraic description of the image \( \pi(S) \) with bounds on the degrees and the number of polynomials appearing in this description and then apply known bounds on the Betti numbers of semi-algebraic sets in terms of these parameters. Another approach is to use the “descent spectral sequence” of the map \( \pi|_S \) which abuts to the cohomology of \( \pi(S) \), and bound the Betti numbers of \( \pi(S) \) by bounding the dimensions of the \( E_1 \)-terms of this spectral sequence. The second approach produces a slightly better bound. The following theorem whose proof uses the second approach appears in [21].

**Theorem 10** With the same notation as above,

\[
b(\pi(V), \mathbb{F}) = (O(sd))^{(k+1)m}.
\]

In the special case when \( k = 1 \), Theorem 10 implies that

\[
b(\pi(V), \mathbb{F}) = (O(sd))^{2m}.
\]

**Remark 7** Notice, that the coefficient 2 in the exponent in the bound above is present even if one uses the first approach of using effective quantifier elimination. In this case, the exponent \( 2m \) occurs due to the fact that the sub-resultants (with respect to the variable \( X_1 \)) of two
polynomials $P_1, P_2 \in \mathcal{P}$ can have degree as large as $d(d-1) = O(d^2)$ in the variables $Y_1, \ldots, Y_m$, and moreover the $O(s^2)$ such sub-resultants are used in the description of $\pi(S)$ (see for example the complexity analysis of Algorithm 14.1 in [10]). As a result the exponent in the bound on the Betti numbers of $\pi(S)$ obtained through this method is again $2m$. Note that the squaring of the degree and the number of polynomials involved are responsible for the doubly exponential complexity of quantifier elimination in the first order theory of real closed fields – and seems unavoidable if one wants to describe the image of a projection.

As a consequence of the main result of this paper, we obtain the following bound on the Betti numbers of the image under projection to one less dimension of real algebraic varieties, as well as of semi-algebraic sets (not necessarily symmetric).

**Theorem 11** Let $P \in \mathbb{R}[Y_1, \ldots, Y_m, X]$ be a non-negative polynomial and with $\deg(P) \leq d$. Let $V = \text{Zer}(P, \mathbb{R}^{m+1})$ be bounded, and $\pi : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ be the projection map to the first $m$ coordinates. For each $p, 0 \leq p < m$, let $k_p = (1, \ldots, 1, \underbrace{0, \ldots, 0}_{m}, p)$. Then,

$$b(\pi(V), \mathbb{F}) \leq \sum_{0 \leq p < m} F(k_p, d) = \left(\frac{m}{d}\right)^{2d} (O(d))^{m+2d+1}.$$ 

**Theorem 12** Let $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{R}[Y_1, \ldots, Y_m, X]$ be a family of polynomials and with $\deg(P) \leq d$, $P \in \mathcal{P}$, $\text{card}(\mathcal{P}) = s$. Further, let $S \subset \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded $\mathcal{P}$-closed semi-algebraic set, and $\pi : \mathbb{R}^{m+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ be the projection map to the first $m$ co-ordinates. Then,

$$b(\pi(S), \mathbb{F}) \leq \left(\frac{m}{d}\right)^{4d} (O(sd))^{m+5d+1}.$$ 

Theorems 11 and 12 yield better asymptotic bounds compared to the bound in (7) above, when $d$ is held fixed, and $m \rightarrow \infty$.

### 1.7. Algorithmic results

As a consequence of our methods we obtain new algorithms for computing the generalized Euler-Poincaré characteristic of semi-algebraic sets defined in terms of symmetric polynomials. These algorithms have complexity which is polynomial (for fixed degrees and the number of blocks) in the number of symmetric variables. Since for systems of equations with a finite set of solutions, the generalized Euler-Poincaré characteristic of the set of solutions coincides with its cardinality, it is easily seen that that computing the generalized Euler-Poincaré characteristic of the set of solutions of a polynomial system with a fixed degree bound is a $\#\mathbb{P}$-hard problem in general (i.e. in the non-symmetric situation). Thus, this problem is believed to be unlikely to admit a polynomial time solution.

The problem designing efficient algorithms for computing topological invariants – such as the Betti numbers as well as the Euler-Poincaré characteristic – has a long history. The first algorithms [37] used the technique of cylindrical algebraic decomposition and consequently had doubly exponential complexity. Algorithms for computing the zero-th Betti number (i.e. the number of semi-algebraically connected components) of semi-algebraic sets using the critical points method were discovered later [15, 24, 25, 7] and improving this complexity bound remains an active area of research even today. Later, algorithms with singly exponential complexity for computing the first Betti number [11], as well as the first few Betti numbers [4] were discovered. Algorithms with singly exponential complexity for computing the Euler-Poincaré characteristic are also known [9]. It remains an open problem to design an algorithm with
singly exponential complexity for computing all the Betti numbers of a given semi-algebraic set. Algorithms with polynomially bounded complexity for computing the Betti numbers of semi-algebraic sets are known in a few cases – for example, for sets defined by a few (i.e. any constant number of) quadratic inequalities [5],[6]. Also note that the problem of expressing the Euler-Poincaré characteristic of real algebraic varieties in terms of certain algebraic invariants of the polynomials defining the variety has been considered by several other authors (see for example [18] and [38]). But these studies do not take into account the computational complexity aspect of the problem.

In this paper we give (for any fixed degree bound $d$) a polynomial time algorithm for computing both the ordinary as well as the equivariant (generalized) Euler-Poincaré characteristics (see Definition 3 below) of algebraic as well as semi-algebraic sets defined by symmetric polynomials of degree at most $d$. We also allow the polynomials to depend non-symmetrically on some variables – and the complexity is exponential in the number of these non-symmetric variables.

The usual definition of the Euler-Poincaré characteristic of a semi-algebraic set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ is the alternating sum of the Betti numbers of $S$. More precisely,

**Definition 2** The Euler-Poincaré characteristic of a semi-algebraic set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ with coefficients in a field $\mathbb{F}$ is defined by

$$
\chi(S, \mathbb{F}) = \sum_i (-1)^i \dim_{\mathbb{F}} H_i(S, \mathbb{F}).
$$

For various applications it is the generalized Euler-Poincaré characteristic that is more useful. One reason behind its importance is that the generalized Euler-Poincaré characteristic of a semi-algebraic set $S$ is its image under the natural isomorphism taking the isomorphism class $[S]$ to its image in the Grothendieck group $K_0(\text{sa}_R)$ of semi-algebraic sets defined over $\mathbb{R}$ (see for example [17, Proposition 1.2.1]).

**Definition 3** The generalized Euler-Poincaré characteristic, $\chi^{\text{gen}}(S)$, of a semi-algebraic set $S$ is uniquely defined by the following properties [43]:

1. $\chi^{\text{gen}}$ is invariant under semi-algebraic homeomorphisms.
2. $\chi^{\text{gen}}$ is multiplicative, i.e. $\chi^{\text{gen}}(A \times B) = \chi^{\text{gen}}(A) \cdot \chi^{\text{gen}}(B)$.
3. $\chi^{\text{gen}}$ is additive, i.e. $\chi^{\text{gen}}(A \cup B) = \chi^{\text{gen}}(A) + \chi^{\text{gen}}(B) - \chi^{\text{gen}}(A \cap B)$.
4. $\chi^{\text{gen}}([0, 1]) = 1$.

**Notation 12** For any tuple $k = (k_1, \ldots, k_\omega) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^\omega$, with $k = \sum_{i=1}^\omega k_i$, and a semi-algebraic set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^k$, symmetric with respect to the action of $\mathfrak{S}_k$ permuting each block of $k_i$ coordinates for $1 \leq i \leq \omega$, we will denote by $\chi^{\text{gen}}_{\mathfrak{S}_k}(S) = \chi^{\text{gen}}(S/\mathfrak{S}_k) = \chi^{\text{gen}}(\phi_k(S))$.

We prove the following theorems.

**Theorem 13** Let $D$ be an ordered domain contained in a real closed field $\mathbb{R}$. Then, there exists an algorithm that takes as input:

1. a tuple $k = (k_1, \ldots, k_\omega) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^\omega$, with $k = \sum_{i=1}^\omega k_i$;
2. a polynomial $P \in D[\mathbf{X}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathbf{X}^{(\omega)}]$, where each $\mathbf{X}^{(i)}$ is a block of $k_i$ variables, and $P$ is symmetric in each block of variables $\mathbf{X}^{(i)}$.
and computes the generalized Euler-Poincaré characteristics
\[ \chi_{\text{gen}}(\text{Zer}(P, R^k)), \chi_{\text{gen}}(\text{Zer}(P, R^k)) \].

The complexity of the algorithm measured by the number of arithmetic operations in the
ring D (including comparisons) is bounded by \((\omega kd)^{(D(k,d))}\), where \(d = \deg(P)\) and \(D = \sum_{i=1}^{\omega} \min(k_i, 2d)\).

Notice that in case, \(\omega = 1\) and \(k = (k)\), the complexity is polynomial in \(k\) for fixed \(d\).

We have the following result in the semi-algebraic case.

**Theorem 14** Let \(D\) be an ordered domain contained in a real closed field \(\mathbb{R}\). Then, there exists an algorithm that takes as input:

1. a tuple \(k = (k_1, \ldots, k_\omega) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\), with \(k = \sum_{i=1}^{\omega} k_i\);
2. a set of \(s\) polynomials \(\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, \ldots, P_s\} \subset D[\mathbf{X}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathbf{X}^{(\omega)}]\), where each \(\mathbf{X}^{(i)}\) is a block of \(k_i\) variables, and each polynomial in \(\mathcal{P}\) is symmetric in each block of variables \(\mathbf{X}^{(i)}\) and of degree at most \(d\);
3. a \(\mathcal{P}\)-semi-algebraic set \(S\), described by

\[ S = \bigcup_{\sigma \in \Sigma} \text{Reali}(\sigma, \mathbb{R}^k) \],

where \(\Sigma \subset \{0, 1, -1\}^\mathcal{P}\);

and computes the generalized Euler-Poincaré characteristics \(\chi_{\text{gen}}(S), \chi_{\text{gen}}(S)\). The complexity of the algorithm measured by the number of arithmetic operations in the ring D (including comparisons) is bounded by

\[ \text{card}(\Sigma)^{(O(1))} + s^{D'(k,d)} k^{O(D'(k,d))} d^{O(D'(k,d)^2)} + (kD)^{(O(m + D))}, \]

where \(D = O(dD'(k,d)(\log d + \log s))\) and \(D' = \sum_{i=1}^{\omega} \min(k_i, 2d)\).

Notice that the complexity in the semi-algebraic case is still polynomial in \(k\) for fixed \(d\) and \(s\) in the special case when \(\omega = 1\), and \(k = (k)\).

**Remark 8** Another important point to note is that we give algorithms for computing both the ordinary as well as the equivariant Euler-Poincaré characteristics. For varieties or semi-algebraic sets defined by symmetric polynomials with degrees bounded by a constant, the ordinary Euler-Poincaré characteristic can be exponentially large in the dimension \(k\). Nevertheless, our algorithms for computing it have complexities which are bounded polynomially in \(k\) for fixed degree.

### 1.8. Outline of the proofs of the main theorems.

Most bounds on the Betti numbers of real algebraic varieties are usually proved by first making a deformation to a set defined by one inequality with smooth boundary and non-degenerate critical points with respect to some affine function. Furthermore, the new set is homotopy equivalent to the given variety and it thus suffices to bound the Betti numbers of its boundary (up to a multiplicative factor of 2). Finally, the last step is accomplished by bounding the number of critical points using the Bezout bound. The approach used in this paper for bounding the equivariant Betti numbers is somewhat similar. However, since the perturbation, as well as the Morse function both need to be equivariant, the choices are more restrictive (see Proposition 5 below). Additionally, the topological changes at the Morse critical points need to be analyzed more carefully (see
The main technical tool that makes the good dependence on the degree $d$ of the polynomial possible is the so called “half-degree principle” \cite{36, 40} (see Lemma 1 as well as Proposition 6 below), and this is what we use rather than the Bezout bound to bound the number of (orbits of) critical points. The semi-algebraic case as usual provides certain additional obstacles. We adapt the techniques developed in \cite[Chapter 7]{10} to the equivariant situation to reduce to the (equivariant) algebraic case. The main tool used here are certain inequalities coming from the Mayer-Vietoris exact sequence. Finally, for the proofs of Theorems 11 and 12 we extend to the equivariant setting the descent spectral sequence defined in \cite{21}. The role of the fibered join used in \cite{21} is now replaced by the fibered symmetric join (see Theorem 15 below). We prove the necessary topological properties of the symmetric join (see Lemma 10, Proposition 11 and Lemma 11 below). The proofs of Theorems 11 and 12 then consist of applying Theorems 7 and 8 to bound the $E_1$-term of this new spectral sequence defined in Theorem 15.

The algorithmic results for are proved using the fact that the techniques used to prove the bounds on the equivariant Betti numbers (including the equivariant deformation) are all completely effective. This makes possible the adaption of several non-equivariant algorithms from \cite{10} to the equivariant setting. The proofs of correctness of the algorithms described for computing the ordinary as well as the equivariant (generalized) Euler-Poincaré characteristics of algebraic as well as semi-algebraic sets (Algorithms 4,7 and 8) follow from the equivariant Morse lemmas (Lemmas 2 and 3 below). The complexity analysis follows from the complexities of similar algorithms in the non-equivariant case \cite{10}, but using the half-degree principle referred to above. In the design of Algorithms 4,7 and 8 we need to use several subsidiary algorithms which are adapted from the non-equivariant situation. An algorithm for computing the set of realizable sign conditions of a family of symmetric polynomial (Algorithm 5 below), whose complexity is polynomial in the dimension for fixed degree could be of independent interest.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall certain facts from real algebraic geometry and topology that are needed for the proofs of the main theorems. These include definitions of certain real closed extensions of the ground field $\mathbb{R}$ consisting of algebraic Puiseux series with coefficients in $\mathbb{R}$. We also recall some basic inequalities amongst the Betti numbers which are consequences of the Mayer-Vietoris exact sequence. In Section 3, we define certain equivariant deformations of symmetric varieties and prove some topological properties of these deformations, that mirror similar ones in the non-equivariant case. In Section 4 we prove the main theorems and in Section 5 we describe the algorithms for computing the Euler-Poincaré characteristics of symmetric semi-algebraic sets proving Theorem 13. Finally, we end with some open questions in Section 6.

2. Preliminaries

In this section we recall some basic facts about real closed fields and real closed extensions.

2.1. Real closed extensions and Puiseux series. We will need some properties of Puiseux series with coefficients in a real closed field. We refer the reader to \cite{10} for further details.

**Notation 13** For $\mathbb{R}$ a real closed field we denote by $\mathbb{R} \langle \varepsilon \rangle$ the real closed field of algebraic Puiseux series in $\varepsilon$ with coefficients in $\mathbb{R}$. We use the notation $\mathbb{R} \langle \varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_m \rangle$ to denote the real closed field $\mathbb{R} \langle \varepsilon_1 \rangle \langle \varepsilon_2 \rangle \cdots \langle \varepsilon_m \rangle$. Note that in the unique ordering of the field $\mathbb{R} \langle \varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_m \rangle$, $0 < \varepsilon_m \ll \varepsilon_{m-1} \ll \cdots \ll \varepsilon_1 \ll 1$. 

**Notation 14** For elements $x \in \mathbb{R}(\varepsilon)$ which are bounded over $\mathbb{R}$ we denote by $\lim_\varepsilon x$ to be the image in $\mathbb{R}$ under the usual map that sets $\varepsilon$ to 0 in the Puiseux series $x$.

**Notation 15** If $\mathbb{R}'$ is a real closed extension of a real closed field $\mathbb{R}$, and $S \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ is a semi-algebraic set defined by a first-order formula with coefficients in $\mathbb{R}$, then we will denote by $\text{Ext} (S, \mathbb{R}') \subset \mathbb{R}'^k$ the semi-algebraic subset of $\mathbb{R}^k$ defined by the same formula. It is well-known that $\text{Ext} (S, \mathbb{R}')$ does not depend on the choice of the formula defining $S$ [10].

**Notation 16** For $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $r > 0$, we will denote by $B_k(x, r)$ the open Euclidean ball centered at $x$ of radius $r$. If $\mathbb{R}'$ is a real closed extension of the real closed field $\mathbb{R}$ and when the context is clear, we will continue to denote by $B_k(x, r)$ the extension $\text{Ext} (B_k(x, r), \mathbb{R}')$. This should not cause any confusion.

2.2. **Tarski-Seidenberg transfer principle.** In some proofs involving Morse theory (see for example the proof of Lemma 3 below), where integration of gradient flows is used in an essential way, we first restrict to the case where integration of gradient flows is used in an essential way, we first restrict to the case $\mathbb{R}' = \mathbb{R}$. After having proved the result over $\mathbb{R}$, we use the Tarski-Seidenberg transfer theorem to extend the result to all real closed fields. We refer the reader to [10, Chapter 2] for an exposition of the Tarski-Seidenberg transfer principle.

2.3. **Mayer-Vietoris inequalities.** We need the following inequalities which follow from the Mayer-Vietoris exact sequence.

Let $S_1, \ldots, S_s \subset \mathbb{R}^k$, $s \geq 1$, be closed semi-algebraic sets of $\mathbb{R}^k$, contained in a closed semi-algebraic set $T$. For $1 \leq t \leq s$, let $S_{\leq t} = \bigcap_{1 \leq j \leq t} S_j$, and $S_{\leq t} = \bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq t} S_j$. Also, for $J \subset \{1, \ldots, s\}$, $J \neq \emptyset$, let $S_J = \bigcap_{j \in J} S_j$, and $S_J = \bigcup_{j \in J} S_j$. Finally, let $S^\emptyset = T$.

**Proposition 2**

**a)** For $0 \leq i$,

\begin{equation}
\begin{array}{l}
\quad b_i(S_{\leq s}, \mathbb{F}) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{i+1} \sum_{J \subset \{1, \ldots, s\} \atop \#(J) = j} b_{i-j+1}(S_J, \mathbb{F}). \\
\end{array}
\end{equation}

**b)** For $0 \leq i \leq k$,

\begin{equation}
\begin{array}{l}
\quad b_i(S_{\leq s}, \mathbb{F}) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{k-i} \sum_{J \subset \{1, \ldots, s\} \atop \#(J) = j} b_{i+j-1}(S_J, \mathbb{F}) + \binom{s}{k-i} b_k(S^\emptyset, \mathbb{F}). \\
\end{array}
\end{equation}

**Proof.** See [10, Proposition 7.33].

We also record another direct consequence of the Mayer-Vietoris exact sequence.

**Proposition 3** If $S_1, S_2$ are closed semi-algebraic sets, then for any field $\mathbb{F}$ and every $i \geq 0$,

\begin{align*}
\quad b_i(S_1, \mathbb{F}) + b_i(S_2, \mathbb{F}) & \leq b_i(S_1 \cup S_2, \mathbb{F}) + b_i(S_1 \cap S_2, \mathbb{F}), \\
\quad b_i(S_1 \cup S_2, \mathbb{F}) & \leq b_i(S_1, \mathbb{F}) + b_i(S_2, \mathbb{F}) + b_{i-1}(S_1 \cap S_2, \mathbb{F}), \\
\quad \chi(S_1 \cup S_2, \mathbb{F}) & = \chi(S_1, \mathbb{F}) + \chi(S_2, \mathbb{F}) - \chi(S_1 \cap S_2, \mathbb{F}).
\end{align*}
Proof. See [10, Proposition 6.44].

3. Equivariant deformation

In this section we define and prove properties of certain equivariant deformations of symmetric real algebraic varieties that will be a key ingredient in the proofs of the main theorems. These are adapted from the non-equivariant case (see for example [10]), but keeping everything equivariant requires additional effort.

Notation 17 For any \( P \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \ldots, X_k] \) we denote

\[
\text{Def}(P, \zeta, d) = P - \zeta \left( 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{k} X_i^d \right),
\]

where \( \zeta \) is a new variable.

Notice that if \( P \) is symmetric in \( X_1, \ldots, X_k \), so is \( \text{Def}(P, \zeta, d) \).

Proposition 4 Let \( k = (k_1, \ldots, k_\omega) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^\omega \), with \( k = \sum_{i=1}^\omega k_i \), and \( P \in \mathbb{R}[X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(\omega)}] \), where each \( X^{(i)} \) is a block of \( k_i \) variables, such that \( P \) is non-negative and symmetric in each block of variable \( X^{(i)} \). Let \( d \geq 0 \) be any even number. Also suppose that \( V = \text{Zer}(P, \mathbb{R}^k) \) is bounded. The variety \( \text{Ext}(V, \mathbb{R}^{(\zeta)^k}) \) is a semi-algebraic deformation retract of the (symmetric) semi-algebraic subset \( S \) of \( \mathbb{R}^{(\zeta)^k} \) defined by the inequality \( \text{Def}(P, \zeta, d) \leq 0 \), and hence is semi-algebraically homotopy equivalent to \( S \). Moreover, \( \phi_k(V) \) is semi-algebraically homotopy equivalent to \( \phi_k(S) \).

Proof. Recall that \( \mathbb{R}^{(\zeta)} \) is the field of algebraic Puiseux series in \( \zeta \) with coefficients in \( \mathbb{R} \). Now for any \( x \in \mathbb{R} \), and \( t \in [0, \zeta] \) let \( x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{(\zeta)} \) obtained by substituting \( t \) for \( \zeta \) in the Puiseux series for \( x \). Notice that \( x(t) \in \mathbb{R} \) for all \( t \in [0, \zeta] \) and \( x(0) \in \text{Ext}(V, \mathbb{R}^{(\zeta)^k}) \). Thus, we get a retraction

\[
S \times [0, \zeta] \to S \ni (x, t) \mapsto x(t)
\]

which is also symmetric. This proves the proposition. □

Definition 4 Let \( \pi \in \Pi_k \) where \( k = (k_1, \ldots, k_\omega) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^\omega \), with \( k = \sum_{i=1}^\omega k_i \). We associate to \( \pi \) a stratum, \( Z_\pi \), of \( \phi_k(\mathbb{R}^k) \) as follows. For \( 1 \leq i, j \leq k \), we denote by \( P_{i,j} \) the polynomial \( X_i - X_j \).

For \( 1 \leq i \leq \omega \), and \( 1 \leq j \leq \text{length}(\pi^{(i)}) \), let \( L_{\pi^{(i)}} \subset \mathbb{R}^k \) be defined by the equations

\[
X_{\pi_1^{(i)} + \cdots + \pi_{j-1}^{(i)} + 1} = \cdots = X_{\pi_1^{(i)} + \cdots + \pi_j^{(i)}},
\]

and let

\[
L_\pi = \bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq \omega} \bigcap_{1 \leq j \leq \text{length}(\pi^{(i)})} L_{\pi^{(i)}}.
\]

Let \( C_\pi \subset \mathbb{R}^k \) be defined by

\[
C_\pi = \left\{ x = (x^{(1)}, \ldots, x^{(\omega)}) \in \mathbb{R}^k \mid P_{\pi_1^{(1)} + \cdots + \pi_j^{(i)} + \pi_{j-1}^{(i)} + \cdots + \pi_{j}^{(i)}}(x^{(i)}) > 0, 1 \leq j < k, \pi_j^{(i)} = 1 \right\},
\]
and let $W_{\pi} \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ be defined by $W_{\pi} = L_{\pi} \cap C_{\pi}$, and finally

$$Z_{\pi} = \phi_k(W_{\pi}).$$

Note that $\phi_k|_{W_{\pi}} : W_{\pi} \rightarrow Z_{\pi}$ is a diffeomorphism. Given any symmetric semi-algebraic subset $S \subset \mathbb{R}^k$, and $\pi \in \Pi_k$, we will denote by

$$S_{\pi} = \phi_k(S) \cap Z_{\pi}.$$  

Notation 18 For any pair $(k,l)$, where $k = (k_1,\ldots,k_\omega) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^\omega$, $k = \sum_{i=1}^\omega k_i$, and $l = (\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_\omega)$, with $1 \leq \ell_i \leq k_i$, we denote by $A^l_k$ the subset of $\mathbb{R}^k$ defined by

$$A^l_k = \left\{ x = (x^{(1)},\ldots,x^{(\omega)}) \mid \text{card} \left( \bigcup_{j=1}^{k_i} \{x_{(i)}^j\} \right) = \ell_i \right\}.$$  

Proposition 5 Let $P \in \mathbb{R}[X_1,\ldots,X_k]$, and $d$ be an even number with $\deg(P) \leq d = p + 1$, with $p$ a prime. Let $F = e_1(X_1,\ldots,X_k)$ where $e_1$ denotes the first elementary symmetric polynomial. Let $V_\zeta = \text{Zer}(\text{Def}(P,\zeta,d),\mathbb{R}(\zeta)^k)$. Suppose also that $\gcd(p,k) = 1$. Then, the critical points of $F$ restricted to $V_\zeta$ are finite in number, and each critical point is non-degenerate.

Proof. The critical points of $F$ restricted to $V_\zeta$ are contained in the set of solutions in $\mathbb{P}_\mathbb{C}^k$ of the following system of homogeneous equations.

$$\frac{\partial \text{Def}(P,\zeta,d)^h}{\partial X_1} - \frac{\partial \text{Def}(P,\zeta,d)^h}{\partial X_2} = 0,$$

$$\vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots$$

$$\frac{\partial \text{Def}(P,\zeta,d)^h}{\partial X_1} - \frac{\partial \text{Def}(P,\zeta,d)^h}{\partial X_k} = 0.$$

A critical point $x = (x_1,\ldots,x_k) \in \mathbb{R}(\zeta)^k$ is non-degenerate if and only if the determinant of the Hessian matrix, $\text{Hess}(p)$, which is an $(k-1) \times (k-1)$ matrix defined by

$$\text{Hess}(x)_{i,j} = (\partial_1 - \partial_i) \circ (\partial_1 - \partial_j) \text{Def}(P,\zeta,d),$$

(where $\partial_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial X_i}$) is non-zero. In particular, being non-degenerate implies that a critical point is isolated. Thus, in order to prove the proposition, it suffices to prove that at each solution $\bar{x} = (x_0 : x_1 : \cdots : x_k)$ of the homogeneous system (16)

$$\det(\text{Hess}(x_1,\ldots,x_k)) \neq 0.$$
Let $\text{Def}(P, S_0, S_1, d)^h$ be the polynomial obtained from $\text{Def}(P, \zeta, d)^h$ by first replacing $\zeta$ by $S_1$ and then homogenizing with respect to $S_1$, and consider now the bi-homogeneous system

$$\frac{\partial \text{Def}(P, S_0, S_1, d)^h}{\partial X_1} - \frac{\partial \text{Def}(P, S_0, S_1, d)^h}{\partial X_2} = 0,$$

$$\frac{\partial \text{Def}(P, S_0, S_1, d)^h}{\partial X_1} - \frac{\partial \text{Def}(P, S_0, S_1, d)^h}{\partial X_k} = 0.$$

The set of solutions $(\bar{s}; \bar{x}) = ((s_0 : s_1); (x_0 : x_1 : \cdots : x_k)) \in \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^k$ of the above bi-homogeneous system at which $\det(\text{Hess}(\bar{s}; \bar{x})) = 0$ is Zariski closed in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^k \subset \mathbb{C}^2$, and hence, its projection to $\mathbb{P}^1 \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ is also Zariski closed, and thus is either finite or equal to $\mathbb{P}^1$. We prove that the projection does not contain the point $(0 : 1)$, and hence is finite. Thus, its complement contains an open interval to the right of 0 of the affine real line, and hence contains the infinitesimal $\zeta$ after extending the field to $\mathbb{R}(\zeta)$, which would prove the proposition.

We now prove the last claim. We obtain after substituting $s_0 = 0, s_1 = 1$ in (16) the following system

$$X_0^d + \sum_{i=1}^k X_i^d + \sum_{i=1}^m Y_i^d = 0,$$

$$X_1^{d-1} - X_2^{d-1} = 0,$$

$$\vdots \vdots \vdots$$

$$X_1^{d-1} - X_k^{d-1} = 0.$$

Notice that for any solution $p = (x_0 : x_1 : \cdots : x_k)$ to the system of equations (17) we must have that for $i = 2, \ldots, k$,

$$x_i = \omega_i x_1,$$

where each $\omega_i$ is a $p$-th root of unity (note that $p = d - 1$). Now the Hessian matrix, $\text{Hess}(S_0 : S_1; X_0 : \cdots : X_k)$ evaluated at any point $((0 : 1); \bar{x}) = ((0 : 1); x_0 : x_1 : \cdots : x_k)$ is given by

$$\text{Hess}((0 : 1); \bar{x}) = \begin{pmatrix}
    x_1^{d-2} + x_2^{d-2} & x_1^{d-2} & \cdots & x_1^{d-2} \\
    x_1^{d-2} & x_1^{d-2} + x_3^{d-2} & \cdots & x_1^{d-2} \\
    \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
    x_1^{d-2} & x_1^{d-2} & \cdots & x_1^{d-2} + x_k^{d-2}
\end{pmatrix}.$$

Noting that $x_1 \neq 0$, and substituting for the various $x_i, 2 \leq i \leq k$, using (18) we get that

$$\det(\text{Hess})((0 : 1); \bar{x}) = x_1^{(d-2)(k-1)} \left( \prod_{i=2}^k \omega_i^{d-2} \right) \left( 1 + \sum_{i=2}^k \omega_i^{d-2} \right).$$

Since $p$ is prime, the only integral relations between the $p$-th roots of unity are integer multiples of the relation

$$1 + \omega + \cdots + \omega^{p-1} = 0,$$
where $\omega$ is a primitive $p$-th root of unity. Since, $p$ does not divide $k$ by hypothesis, it follows that

$$1 + \sum_{i=2}^{k} \omega_i^{d-2} \neq 0$$

for any choice of the roots $\omega_i$. Hence, $\det((\text{Hess})(0:1; \bar{x})) \neq 0$. This finishes the proof. □

**Lemma 1** Let $k = (k_1, \ldots, k_\omega) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^\omega$, with $k = \sum_{i=1}^{\omega} k_i$, and let $Q \in \mathbb{R}[X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(\omega)}]$, where each $X^{(i)}$ is a block of $k_i$ variables, and such that $Q$ is non-negative over $\mathbb{R}^k$, and symmetric in each of the blocks $X^{(i)}$. Let $\deg(Q) \leq d$, $d$ an even number, and suppose that $\text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k)$ is a finite set of points. Then, for each $(x^{(1)}, \ldots, x^{(\omega)}) \in \text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k)$, we have that for each $i, 1 \leq i \leq \omega$, card$\left(\bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq k_i} \{x^{(i)}_j\}\right) \leq d/2$ (where $x^{(i)} = (x^{(i)}_1, \ldots, x^{(i)}_{k_i})$).

**Proof.** We assume without loss of generality that $i = \omega$, and let $Y$ denote the variables $(X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(\omega-1)})$. First notice that there exists polynomials $G_0, G_{d/2+1}, \ldots, G_d$ such that

$$Q = G_0(Y, e_1, \ldots, e_{d/2}) + \sum_{i=d/2+1}^{d} G_i(Y_1, \ldots, Y_m, e_1, \ldots, e_{d/2-i})e_i$$

where $e_i(X^{(\omega)})$ is the $i$-th elementary symmetric polynomial in $X^{(\omega)}$.

Let $p = (y, x^{(\omega)}) \in \text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k)$ such that $\ell = \ell(x^{(\omega)}) = \text{card} \left(\bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq k_\omega} \{x^{(\omega)}_j\}\right)$, where $x^{(\omega)} = (x^{(\omega)}_1, \ldots, x^{(\omega)}_{k_\omega})$, is maximum amongst all the points of the finite set $\text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k)$. The proof will be by contradiction. Suppose that $\ell > d/2$. There are two cases to consider.

1. $\ell = k$. Since the roots of a univariate polynomial depend continuously on the coefficients we have that there is an $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, such that for every $\xi = (\xi_0, \ldots, \xi_{k_\omega-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{k_\omega}$, with $|\xi| < \varepsilon_0$, the polynomial

$$f_\xi = \sum_{j=0}^{k_\omega-1} (-1)^{k_\omega-j}(e_{k-j}(x) + \xi_j)T^j + T^{k_\omega}$$

also has $k_\omega$ distinct real roots. Considering these $k_\omega$ real roots of $f_\xi$ as the $k_\omega$ components of a point $\theta(\xi) \in \mathbb{R}^{k_\omega}$ we get a continuous map $\theta : (-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0)^{k_\omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{k_\omega}$. Since all the roots are distinct, $\theta$ defines in fact a diffeomorphism. Clearly the set $T = \{y\} \times \theta(V_\xi)$

where $V_\xi = (-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0)^{k_\omega} \cap \{\xi \mid \xi_0 = \cdots = \xi_{d/2} = 0\}$ contains $p$. Notice that since $d/2 < k_\omega$, dimension of $V_\xi$ and hence that of $T$ is at least one. Now if $G_i(y, e_1(x^{(\omega)}), \ldots, e_{d/2}(x^{(\omega)})) = 0$ for all $i, d/2 + 1 \leq i \leq k_\omega$, then $T \subset \text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k)$ which contradicts the assumption that the dimension of $\text{dim} \text{Zer}(Q, \mathbb{R}^k) = 0$. Otherwise, if $G_i(y, e_1(x^{(\omega)}), \ldots, e_{d/2}(x^{(\omega)})) \neq 0$ for some $i, d/2 + 1 \leq i \leq k_\omega$, then supposing that $G_i(y, e_1(x^{(\omega)}), \ldots, e_{d/2}(x^{(\omega)})) > 0$ (respectively $G_i(y, e_1(x^{(\omega)}), \ldots, e_{d/2}(x^{(\omega)})) < 0$), and letting $\xi^i$ denote the $i$-th standard basis vector in $\mathbb{R}^{k_\omega}$, we get that $Q(y, \theta(-\varepsilon \cdot \xi^i)) < 0$ for all $\varepsilon, 0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ (respectively $-\varepsilon_0 < \varepsilon < 0$). This contradicts the fact that $Q$ is non-negative everywhere.
(2) \(d/2 < \ell < k_\omega\). In this case by Proposition 3.2 in [36] there exists a univariate polynomial
\[
g = \sum_{j=0}^{k_\omega - \ell} (-1)^{k_\omega - j} g_j T^j
\]
and for all \(\epsilon \neq 0\), with \(|\epsilon|\) small enough, the polynomial
\[
h_\epsilon = f_p + \epsilon g
\]
has all its roots real and moreover at least \(\ell + 1\) of them are distinct. Considering now these \(k\) real roots of \(h_\epsilon\) as the \(k\) components a point \(\theta(\epsilon) \in \mathbb{R}^{k_\omega}\), we obtain a continuous (non-constant) semi-algebraic curve \(\gamma : (-\epsilon_0, \epsilon_0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{k_\omega}\), such that. Note that the curve is non-constant since for all \(\epsilon \in (-\epsilon_0, \epsilon_0)\) with \(\epsilon \neq 0\), \(\theta(\epsilon)\) has strictly more distinct components than \(x^{(\omega)}\), and hence \(\theta(\epsilon) \neq x^{(\omega)}\). It follows that for each \(\epsilon \in (-\epsilon_0, \epsilon_0)\)
\[
Q(y, \gamma(\epsilon)) = \epsilon \left( \sum_{j=0}^{k_\omega - \ell} g_j G_{k_\omega - j}(y, e_1(x^{(\omega)}), \ldots, e_{d/2}(x^{(\omega)})) \right).
\]
There are again two cases. If \(\sum_{j=0}^{k_\omega - \ell} g_j G_{k_\omega - j}(y, e_1(x^{(\omega)}), \ldots, e_{d/2}(x^{(\omega)})) = 0\), then \(Q\) vanishes on \(\gamma((\epsilon_0, \epsilon_0))\), which contradicts the hypothesis that the zeros of \(Q\) are isolated. Otherwise, if \(\sum_{j=0}^{k_\omega - \ell} g_j G_{k_\omega - j}(y, e_1(x^{(\omega)}), \ldots, e_{d/2}(x^{(\omega)})) \neq 0\), then \(Q(y, \gamma(\epsilon)) \cdot Q(y, \gamma(-\epsilon)) < 0\), for every \(\epsilon \in (-\epsilon_0, \epsilon_0), \epsilon \neq 0\), and this contradicts the hypothesis that \(Q\) is non-negative everywhere.

\[\Box\]

**Proposition 6** Let \(k = (k_1, \ldots, k_\omega) \in \mathbb{Z}^\omega_{\geq 0}\), with \(k = \sum_{i=1}^\omega k_i\), and \(P \in \mathbb{R}[X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(\omega)}]\), where each \(X^{(i)}\) is a block of \(k_i\) variables, such that \(P\) is non-negative and symmetric in each block of variable \(X^{(i)}\) and \(\deg(P) \leq d\). Let \((X_1, \ldots, X_k)\) denote the set of variables \((X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(\omega)})\) and let \(F = e_1^{(k)}(X_1, \ldots, X_k)\). Suppose that the critical points of \(F\) restricted to \(V = \text{Zer}(P, \mathbb{R}^k)\) are isolated. Then, each critical point of \(F\) restricted to \(V\) is contained in \(A^1_k\) for some \(l = (\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_\omega)\) with each \(\ell_i \leq d\).

*Proof.* Let \((X_1, \ldots, X_k)\) denote the variables \((X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(\omega)})\). Let \(p = (x_1, \ldots, x_k)\) be a critical point of \(F\) restricted to \(V\). Then, \(p\) is an isolated zero (in fact a local minima) of the polynomial
\[
Q = P^2 + \sum_{i,j=1}^k \left( \frac{\partial P}{\partial X_i} - \frac{\partial P}{\partial X_j} \right)^2.
\]
Notice that \(Q\) is symmetric in each block of variables \(X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(\omega)}\) and \(\deg(Q) \leq 2d\). Now apply Lemma 1.

\[\Box\]

**Proposition 7** Let \(k = (k_1, \ldots, k_\omega) \in \mathbb{Z}^\omega_{\geq 0}\), with \(k = \sum_{i=1}^\omega k_i\), and let \(S \subset \mathbb{R}^k\) be a bounded symmetric basic closed semi-algebraic set defined by \(P \leq 0\), where \(P \in \mathbb{R}[X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(\omega)}]\) is symmetric in each block of \(k_i\) variables \(X^{(i)}\), and such that \(W = \text{Zer}(P, \mathbb{R}^k)\) is non-singular and bounded. Suppose that \(F = e_1(X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(\omega)})\) restricted to \(W\) has a finite number of
critical points, all of which are non-degenerate. Let \( C \) denote the finite set of critical points of \( F \) restricted to \( W \). Then, for any field of coefficients \( \mathbb{F} \),
\[
b(\phi_k(S), \mathbb{F}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{card}(\phi_k(C)).
\]
Moreover,
\[
b_i(\phi_k(S), \mathbb{F}) = 0
\]
for
\[
i \geq \max_{p \in C}(\text{length}(\pi(p))),
\]
where for each \( p \in C, \pi(p) \in \Pi_k \), is defined by \( p \in L_{\pi(p)} \).

For the proof of Proposition 7 we will need the following proposition and lemmas.

**Proposition 8** Let \( L \subset \mathbb{R}^k \) be the subspace defined by \( \sum_i X_i = 0 \), and \( \pi = (\pi^{(1)}, \ldots, \pi^{(\omega)}) \in \Pi_k \). Let for each \( i, 1 \leq i \leq \omega, \pi^{(i)} = (\pi^{(i)}_1, \ldots, \pi^{(i)}_{\ell_i}) \), and for each \( j, 1 \leq j \leq \ell_i \), let \( L_j^{(i)} \) denote the subspace \( L \cap L_{\pi^{(i)}_j} \) of \( L \), and \( M_j^{(i)} \) the orthogonal complement of \( L_j^{(i)} \) in \( L \). Let \( L_{\text{fixed}} = L \cap L_{\pi}, L'_{\text{fixed}} \subset L_{\text{fixed}} \) any subspace of \( L_{\text{fixed}} \), and \( I \subset \{(i, j) \mid 1 \leq i \leq \omega, 1 \leq j \leq \ell_i \} \). Then the following hold.

1. The dimension of \( L_{\text{fixed}} \) is equal to \( \sum_{i=1}^\omega \epsilon_i - 1 = \text{length}(\pi) - 1 \).
2. The product over \( i \in [1, \omega] \) of the subgroups \( \mathbb{G}_{\pi_1^{(i)}} \times \mathbb{G}_{\pi_2^{(i)}} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{G}_{\pi_{\ell_i}^{(i)}} \) acts trivially on \( L_{\text{fixed}} \).
3. For each \( i, j, 1 \leq i \leq \omega, 1 \leq j \leq \ell_i \), \( M_j^{(i)} \) is an irreducible representation of \( \mathbb{G}_{\pi_j^{(i)}} \), and the action of \( \mathbb{G}_{\pi_j^{(i')}} \) on \( M_j^{(i)} \) is trivial if \( (i, j) \neq (i', j') \).
4. There is a direct decomposition \( L = L_{\text{fixed}} \oplus \left( \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq \omega, 1 \leq j \leq \ell_i} M_j^{(i)} \right) \).
5. Let \( D \) denote the unit disc in the subspace \( L'_{\text{fixed}} \oplus \left( \bigoplus_{(i, j) \in I} M_j^{(i)} \right) \). Then, the space of orbits of the pair \((D, \partial D)\) under the action of \( \mathbb{G}_k \) is homotopy equivalent to \((*, *)\) if \( I \neq \emptyset \). Otherwise, the space of orbits of the pair \((D, \partial D)\) under the action of \( \mathbb{G}_k \) is homeomorphic to \((D, \partial D)\).

**Proof.** From the definition of \( L_{\text{fixed}} \) it is clear that
\[
\dim L_{\text{fixed}} = \left( k - 1 - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \omega, 1 \leq j \leq \ell_i} (\pi_j^{(i)} - 1) \right)
= \sum_{i=1}^\omega \ell_i - 1
= \text{length}(\pi) - 1,
\]
noting that for each \( i, 1 \leq i \leq \omega, \sum_{1 \leq j \leq \ell_i} \pi_j^{(i)} = k_i \), and \( \sum_{i=1}^\omega k_i = k \).

Parts (2) and (3) are now clear from the definition of the subspaces \( L_{\text{fixed}} \) and the subspaces \( M_j^{(i)} \). In order to prove part (4) notice that each \( M_j^{(i)} \) is orthogonal complement of \( L_j^{(i)} \) in \( L \), \( \dim L_j^{(i)} + \dim M_j^{(i)} = k - 1 \). Moreover, \( \dim L_j^{(i)} = k - 1 - (\pi_j^{(i)} - 1) = \)}
k − \pi_j^{(i)}. Hence, \dim M_j^{(i)} = \pi_j^{(i)} − 1. Now since L_{\text{fixed}} = \bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq \omega, 1 \leq j \leq t_i} L_j^{(i)}, it follows that the \(\sum_{1 \leq i \leq \omega, 1 \leq j \leq t_i} M_j^{(i)}\) is the orthogonal complement of \(L_{\text{fixed}}\) in \(L\). Hence, \(L = L_{\text{fixed}} \oplus \left(\sum_{1 \leq i \leq \omega, 1 \leq j \leq t_i} M_j^{(i)}\right)\), and hence \(\dim \left(\sum_{1 \leq i \leq \omega, 1 \leq j \leq t_i} M_j^{(i)}\right) = \dim L - \dim L_{\text{fixed}} = (k - 1) - \left(k - 1 - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \omega, 1 \leq j \leq t_i} \left(\pi_j^{(i)} - 1\right)\right) = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \omega, 1 \leq j \leq t_i} \left(\pi_j^{(i)} - 1\right) = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \omega, 1 \leq j \leq t_i} \dim M_j^{(i)}\). It follows, that \(\sum_{1 \leq i \leq \omega, 1 \leq j \leq t_i} M_j^{(i)} \cong \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq \omega, 1 \leq j \leq t_i} M_j^{(i)}\).

In order to prove part (5), first observe that the space of orbits of \(\partial D\) (respectively \(D\)) under the action of \(\mathfrak{S}_k\) is homeomorphic to \(\partial D/\prod_{(i,j) \in I} \mathfrak{S}_{\pi_j^{(i)}}\) (respectively \(D/\prod_{(i,j) \in I} \mathfrak{S}_{\pi_j^{(i)}}\)). Moreover, \(\partial D\) is equivariantly homeomorphic to the topological join of \(\partial D_{\text{fixed}}\) with the various \(\partial D_j^{(i)}, (i, j) \in I\) where \(D_{\text{fixed}}\) is the unit disc in \(L_{\text{fixed}}\), and for each \((i, j) \in I, D_j^{(i)}\) is the unit disc in the subspace \(M_j^{(i)}\). The subgroup \(\prod_{(i,j) \in I} \mathfrak{S}_{\pi_j^{(i)}}\) acts trivially on \(\partial D_{\text{fixed}}\), and it follows from part (3) of the proposition that for each \((i, j) \in I, \partial D_j^{(i)}/\prod_{(i,j) \in I} \mathfrak{S}_{\pi_j^{(i)}} \cong \partial D_j^{(i)}/\mathfrak{S}_{\pi_j^{(i)}}\).

Hence, we get that the quotient of the topological join of \(\partial D_{\text{fixed}}\) with the various \(\partial D_j^{(i)}, (i, j) \in I\) by \(\prod_{(i,j) \in I} \mathfrak{S}_{\pi_j^{(i)}}\) is homeomorphic to the topological join of \(\partial D_{\text{fixed}}\) with the various

\[\partial D_j^{(i)}/\mathfrak{S}_{\pi_j^{(i)}}, (i, j) \in I.\]

It follows from [35, Theorem 4.1.8] that each \(\partial D_j^{(i)}/\mathfrak{S}_{\pi_j^{(i)}}, (i, j) \in I\) is homeomorphic to \(D_j^{(i)}\) and hence homotopy equivalent to a point. The quotient of the disc \(D\) by \(\prod_{(i,j) \in I} \mathfrak{S}_{\pi_j^{(i)}}\) is clearly contractible. This proves both parts of (5).

The proof of Proposition 7 will now follow from the following two lemmas and Proposition 8. Following the same notation as in Proposition 7, and for any \(c \in \mathbb{R}\), let \(S_{\leq c}\) (respectively \(S_{\leq c}\)) denote the set \(S \cap F^{-1}((-\infty, c])\) (respectively \(S \cap F^{-1}(c)\)). Also, let \(c_1, \ldots, c_N\) be the finite set of critical values of \(F\) restricted to \(W\).

**Lemma 2** Then, for \(1 \leq i \leq N\), and for each \(c \in [c_i, c_{i+1})\), \(\phi_k(S_{\leq c})\) is semi-algebraically homotopy equivalent to \(\phi_k(S_{\leq c}).\)

**Proof.** The lemma is an equivariant version of the standard Morse Lemma A. It follows from the fact that the gradient flow, which gives a retraction of \(S_{\leq c}\) to \(S_{\leq c}\), is equivariant, and thus descends to give a retraction of \(\phi_k(S_{\leq c})\) to \(\phi_k(S_{\leq c}).\)

We also need the following equivariant version of Morse Lemma B.

**Lemma 3** Let \(v \in \mathbb{R}^k\) denote the vector \((1, \ldots, 1)\) and \(F\) a field. Let \((X_1, \ldots, X_k)\) denote the set of co-ordinates \((X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(\omega)})\).

(1) Suppose that for each critical point \(p \in W\), with \(F(p) = c\), \(\sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} \frac{\partial P}{\partial X_i}(p) > 0\). Then,

\[
b(\phi_k(S_{\leq c+t}), F) = b(\phi_k(S_{\leq c}), F)\]
for all small enough \( t > 0 \).

(2) Suppose that for each critical point \( p \in W \), with \( F(p) = c \), \( \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} \frac{\partial P}{\partial X_i}(p) < 0 \). Then, for

\[
\sum_{i,j \in I} b_i(\phi_k(S_{\leq t}), F) \leq b_i(\phi_k(S_{\leq c}), F) + 1
\]

for all small enough \( t > 0 \).

(3) Moreover, if \( p \in L_p \), for \( \pi \in \Pi_k \),

\[
b_i(\phi_k(S_{\leq t}), F) = b_i(\phi_k(S_{\leq c}), F)
\]

for all \( i \geq \text{length}(\pi) \).

Proof. We first prove the proposition for \( R = \mathbb{R} \).

(1) If \( \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} \frac{\partial P}{\partial X_i}(p) > 0 \), then \( S_{\leq t} \) retracts \( \mathcal{G}_k \)-equivariantly to a space \( S_{\leq c} \cup B A \) where the pair \( (A, B) = \prod_p (A_p, B_p) \), where the disjoint union is taken over the set critical points \( p \) with \( F(p) = c \), and each pair \( (A_p, B_p) \) is homeomorphic to the pair \( (D^i \times [0,1], \partial D^i \times [0,1] \cup D^i \times \{1\}) \). This follows from the basic Morse theory (see [10, Proposition 7.19]). Since the pair \( (D^i \times [0,1], \partial D^i \times [0,1] \cup D^i \times \{1\}) \) is homotopy equivalent to \((*, *)\), \( S_{\leq t} \) is homotopy equivalent to \( S_{\leq c} \), and it follows that \( \phi_k(S_{\leq t}) \) is homotopy equivalent to \( \phi_k(S_{\leq c}) \) as well, because of the fact that retraction of \( S_{\leq t} \) to \( S_{\leq c} \cup B A \) is chosen to be equivariant. The equality (21) then follows immediately.

(2) We now consider the case when \( \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} \frac{\partial P}{\partial X_i}(p) > 0 \). Let \( T_p W \) be the tangent space of \( W \) at \( p \). The translation of \( T_p W \) to the origin is then the linear subspace \( L \subset \mathbb{R}^k \) defined by \( \sum_i X_i = 0 \). Let \( L^+(p) \subset L \) and \( L^-(p) \subset L \) denote the positive and negative eigenspaces of the Hessian of the function \( e_k^{(p)} \) restricted to \( W \) at \( p \). Let \( \text{ind}^-(p) = \dim L^-(p) \), and let \( p \in L_{\pi} \) where \( \pi = (\pi^{(1)}, \ldots, \pi^{(\omega)}) \in \Pi_k \), for each \( 1 \leq i \leq \omega \), \( \pi^{(i)} = (\pi_{1}^{(i)}, \ldots, \pi_{\ell_i}^{(i)}) \in \Pi_{k_i} \). The subspaces \( L^+(p) \), \( L^-(p) \) are stable under the the natural action of the subgroup \( \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \omega, 1 \leq j \leq \ell_i} \mathcal{G}_{\pi^{(i)}} \) of \( \mathcal{G}_k \). For \( 1 \leq i \leq \omega, 1 \leq j \leq \ell_i \), let \( L_{j}^{(i)} \) denote the subspace \( L \cap L_{\pi^{(i)}}^{j} \) of \( L \), and \( M_{j}^{(i)} \) the orthogonal complement of \( L_{j}^{(i)} \) in \( L \). Let \( L_{\text{fixed}} = L \cap L_{\pi^{(i)}} \). It follows from Parts (2)-(4) of Proposition 8 that:

i For each \( i, j \), \( 1 \leq i \leq \omega, 1 \leq j \leq \ell_i \), \( M_{j}^{(i)} \) is an irreducible representation of \( \mathcal{G}_{\pi^{(i)}} \), and the action of \( \mathcal{G}_{\pi^{(i)}} \) on \( M_{j}^{(i)} \) is trivial if \( (i, j) \neq (i', j') \). Hence, for each \( i, j, 1 \leq i \leq \omega, 1 \leq j \leq \ell_i \), \( L^-(p) \cap M_{j}^{(i)} = 0 \) or \( M_{j}^{(i)} \).

ii The subgroup \( \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \omega, 1 \leq j \leq \ell_i} \mathcal{G}_{\pi^{(i)}} \) of \( \mathcal{G}_k \) acts trivially on \( L_{\text{fixed}} \).

iii There is an orthogonal decomposition \( L = L_{\text{fixed}} \oplus \left( \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq \omega, 1 \leq j \leq \ell_i} M_{j}^{(i)} \right) \).

It follows that

\[
L^-(p) = L_{\text{fixed}} \oplus \left( \bigoplus_{(i,j) \in I} M_{j}^{(i)} \right),
\]
where $L'_{\text{fixed}}$ is some subspace of $L_{\text{fixed}}$ and $I \subseteq \{(i,j) \mid 1 \leq i \leq \omega, 1 \leq j \leq \ell_i\}$.

It follows from the proof of Proposition 7.19 in [10] that for all sufficiently small $t > 0$ then $S_{\leq c+t}$ retracts $\mathfrak{S}_k$-equivariantly to a space $S_{\leq c} \cup_B A$ where the pair $(A, B) = \coprod_p (A_p, B_p)$, and the disjoint union is taken over the set critical points $p$ with $F(p) = c$, and each pair $(A_p, B_p)$ is homeomorphic to the pair $(\mathbf{D}^{\text{ind}^{-}(p)}, \partial \mathbf{D}^{\text{ind}^{-}(p)})$. It follows from the fact that the retraction mentioned above is equivariant that $\phi_k(S_{\leq c+t})$ retracts to a space obtained from $\phi_k(S_{\leq c})$ by gluing orbit $\mathfrak{s}_k \left( \coprod_p A_p \right)$ along orbit $\mathfrak{s}_k \left( \coprod_p B_p \right)$. Now there are the following cases to consider:

(a) $\text{ind}^{-}(p) = 0$. In this case orbit $\mathfrak{s}_k \left( \coprod_p A_p, \coprod_p B_p \right)$ is homotopy equivalent to $(\ast, \emptyset)$.

(b) $L^{-}(p) \subset L_{\text{fixed}}$ (i.e. $I = \emptyset$ in this case). In this case orbit $\mathfrak{s}_k \left( \coprod_p A_p, \coprod_p B_p \right)$ is homeomorphic to $(\mathbf{D}^{\text{ind}^{-}(p)}, \partial \mathbf{D}^{\text{ind}^{-}(p)})$ by part (5) of Proposition 8.

(c) Otherwise, there is a non-trivial action on $L^{-}(p)$ by the group $\coprod (i,j) \in I \mathfrak{s}_{\pi^{(i)}}$, and it follows from part (5) of Proposition 8 that in this case orbit $\mathfrak{s}_k \left( \coprod_p A_p, \coprod_p B_p \right)$ is homotopy equivalent to $(\ast, \ast)$.

The inequality (22) and the equality (23) both follow immediately from Proposition 3 (inequality (10)).

(3) Follows from part (2) above and the fact that $\dim L_{\text{fixed}} = \text{length}(\pi) - 1$, by part (1) of Proposition 8.

This finishes the proof in case $\mathbf{R} = \mathbb{R}$. The statement over a general real closed field $\mathbf{R}$ now follow by a standard application of the Tarski-Seidenberg transfer principle (see for example the proof of Theorem 7.23 in [10]).

Proof of Proposition 7. The proposition follows directly from Lemmas 2 and 3, after noting that at most half the critical values of $F$ satisfy condition (2) of Lemma 3.

We also have the following corollary giving an exact expression for the Euler-Poincaré characteristic of a symmetric semi-algebraic set defined by one polynomial inequality satisfying the same conditions as in Lemmas 2 and 3 above.

Corollary 5 Let $k = (k_1, \ldots, k_\omega) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, with $k = \sum_{i=1}^\omega k_i$, and let $S \subset \mathbf{R}^k$ be a bounded symmetric basic semi-algebraic set defined by $P \leq 0$, where $P \in \mathbf{R}[X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(\omega)}]$, each $X^{(i)}$ is a block of $k_i$ variables, and $P$ is symmetric in each block of variables $X^{(i)}$. Let $W = \text{Zer} \left( P, \mathbf{R}^k \right)$ be non-singular and bounded. Let $(X_1, \ldots, X_k)$ denote the variables $(X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(\omega)})$ and suppose that $F = e_1(X_1, \ldots, X_k)$ restricted to $W$ has a finite number of critical points, all of which are non-degenerate. Let $C$ be the finite set of critical points $p$ of $F$ restricted to $W$ such that $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} \frac{\partial P}{\partial X_i}(p) < 0$, and let $\text{Hess}(p)$ denote the Hessian of $F$ restricted to $W$ at $p$. Then, for any field of coefficients $\mathbb{F}$,

\begin{align}
\chi(S, \mathbb{F}) &= \sum_{\pi = (\pi^{(1)}, \ldots, \pi^{(\omega)}) \in \Pi_k} \sum_{p \in C \cap L_\pi} (-1)^{\text{ind}^{-}(\text{Hess}(p))} \binom{k_1}{\pi^{(1)}} \cdots \binom{k_\omega}{\pi^{(\omega)}}, \\
\chi_{\mathfrak{s}_k}(S, \mathbb{F}) &= \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_k} \sum_{p \in C \cap L_\pi, L^{-}(p) \subset L_{\text{fixed}}} (-1)^{\text{ind}^{-}(\text{Hess}(p))},
\end{align}

(where for $\pi = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_\ell) \in \Pi_k$, $\binom{k}{\pi}$ denotes the multinomial coefficient $\left( \frac{k}{\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_\ell} \right)$.)
Corollary 5 is illustrated by the following simple example.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.8\textwidth]{example.png}
\caption{Figure 1.}
\end{figure}

\textbf{Example 2} In this example, the number of blocks $\omega = 1$, and $k = k_1 = 2$. Consider the polynomial

$$P = (X_1^2 - 1)^2 + (X_2^2 - 1)^2 - \varepsilon,$$

for some small $\varepsilon > 0$. The sets $\text{Zer} \left( \bar{P}, \mathbb{R}^2 \right)$, and $S = \{ x \in \mathbb{R} \langle \zeta \rangle^2 \mid \bar{P} \leq 0 \}$, where $\bar{P} = \text{Def}(P, \zeta, 6)$ is shown in the Figure 1.

The polynomial $e_1(X_1, X_2) = X_1 + X_2$ has 16 critical points, corresponding to 12 critical values, $v_1 < \cdots < v_{12}$, on $\text{Zer} \left( \bar{P}, \mathbb{R} \langle \zeta \rangle^2 \right)$ of which $v_5$ and $v_9$ are indicated in Figure 1 using dotted lines. The corresponding indices of the critical points, the number of critical points for each critical value, the sign of the polynomial $\frac{\partial \bar{P}}{\partial X_1} + \frac{\partial \bar{P}}{\partial X_2}$ at these critical points, and the partition $\pi \in \Pi_2$ such that the corresponding critical points belong to $L_\pi$ are shown in
Table 1. The critical points corresponding to the shaded rows are the critical points where
\[
\left( \frac{\partial P}{\partial X_1} + \frac{\partial P}{\partial X_2} \right) < 0,
\]
and these are the critical points which contribute to the sums in Eqns. (24) and (25).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical values</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>sign ( \left( \frac{\partial P}{\partial X_1} + \frac{\partial P}{\partial X_2} \right) )</th>
<th>( \pi )</th>
<th>( L^{-}(p) )</th>
<th>( L_{\text{fixed}} )</th>
<th>( L^{-}(p) \subset L_{\text{fixed}} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( v_1 )</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(-1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v_2 )</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v_3 )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(-1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v_4 )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v_5 )</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(-1)</td>
<td>(1,1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v_6 )</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1,1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v_7 )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(-1)</td>
<td>(1,1)</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v_8 )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1,1)</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v_9 )</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(-1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v_{10} )</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v_{11} )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(-1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v_{12} )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.

It is now easy to verify using Eqns. (24) and (25) that,
\[
\chi \left( \text{Zer} \left( P, R^k \right), Q \right) = \chi(S, Q) = \chi \left( S, Q \right) = (-1)^0 \binom{2}{2} + (-1)^1 \binom{2}{2} + (-1)^0 \binom{2}{1,1} + (-1)^1 \binom{2}{1,1} + (-1)^0 \binom{2}{2} + (-1)^1 \binom{2}{2} = 1 - 1 + 2 - 2 + 1 - 1 = 0.
\]
\[
\chi_{s_2} \left( \text{Zer} \left( P, R^k \right), Q \right) = \chi_{s_2} \left( S, Q \right) = (-1)^0 + (-1)^0 + (-1)^1 + (-1)^0 = 2.
\]

4. PROOFS OF THE MAIN THEOREMS

We are now in a position to prove the main theorems.

Proof of Theorem 7. By Remark 1, we can assume without loss of generality that \( P \) is symmetric in each block of variables \( X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(\omega)} \). We first assume that \( \text{Zer} \left( P, R^k \right) \) is bounded. Let \( d' \) be the least even number such that \( d' > d = \deg(P) \) and such that \( d' - 1 \) is prime. By Bertrand’s postulate we have that \( d' \leq 2d \). Now, if \( p \) divides \( k \), replace \( P \) by the polynomial \( P + X_{k+1}^2 \), and let \( \omega' = \omega + 1 \), \( k' = k + 1 \), and \( k' = (k, 1) \). Otherwise, let \( \omega' = \omega + 1 \), \( k' = k \), and \( k' = (k, 0) \). In either case, we have that \( \gcd(p, k') = 1 \), and \( k' \leq k + 1 \).
Using Proposition 4,

\[ b(\phi_k(V), \mathbb{F}) = b(\phi_{k'}(S), \mathbb{F}) \]

where \( S \) is the semi-algebraic set defined by \( \text{Def}(P, \zeta, d') \leq 0 \). It now follows from Propositions 5, 6, 7, and Bezout’s bound that

\[ b(\phi_{k'}(S), \mathbb{F}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\pi=(\pi^{(1)}, \ldots, \pi^{(\omega')}) \in \Pi_{k'}, \text{length}(\pi) \leq d', 1 \leq i \leq \omega'} d'(d' - 1)^{\text{length}(\pi) - 1}. \]

For any \( n, m \geq 0 \), let \( p(n, m) \) denote the number of partitions of \( n \) into exactly \( m \) parts. By convention, we will assume \( p(0, 0) = 1 \).

After noting that using Bertrand’s postulate \( d' \leq 2d \), and using the fact that \( k' \leq k + 1 \), we obtain that in the bounded case,

\[ b(\phi_k(V), \mathbb{F}) \leq \sum_{\ell' = (\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_{\omega')}, 1 \leq \ell_i \leq \min(2d, k_i)} \omega' p(k', \ell')d(2d - 1)^{(|\ell'| - 1)} \]

Eqn. (6) follows from Eqn. (20) in Proposition 7.

To take of the possibly unbounded case we introduce a new variable \( Z \), and let

\[ \begin{align*}
P_1 &= P + \left(Z^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{k} X_i^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{m} Y_j^2 - \Omega^2\right)^2, \\
P_2 &= P + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k} X_i^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{m} Y_j^2 - \Omega^2\right)^2.
\end{align*} \]

Notice that, \( V_1 = \left(\text{Zer}\left(P_1, \mathbb{R}\langle \frac{1}{\Omega} \rangle^{k+1}\right)\right) \) is semi-algebraically homeomorphic to two homeomorphic copies of \( V_2 = \left(\text{Zer}\left(P_2, \mathbb{R}\langle \frac{1}{\Omega} \rangle^{k}\right)\right) \) glued along \( V \).

Using the fact that the map \( \phi_k \) is proper, it now follows from Proposition 3 (inequality (10)) that

\[ b(\phi_k(V), \mathbb{F}) \leq \frac{1}{2}(b(\phi_{(k,1)}(V_1), \mathbb{F}) + b(\phi_k(V_2), \mathbb{F})). \]

Noticing that both \( \text{Zer}\left(P_1, \mathbb{R}\langle \frac{1}{\Omega} \rangle^{k+1}\right) \) and \( \text{Zer}\left(P_2, \mathbb{R}\langle \frac{1}{\Omega} \rangle^{k}\right) \) are bounded, we can use the result from the bounded case and obtain in general that for \( d \geq 4 \),

\[ \begin{align*}
b(\phi_k(V), \mathbb{F}) &\leq \sum_{\ell' = (\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_{\omega'}), 1 \leq \ell_i \leq \min(2d, k_i)} (p(k', \ell'))d(2d - 1)^{|\ell'|} \\
&\leq \sum_{1 = (\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_{\omega}), 1 \leq \ell_i \leq \min(2d, k_i)} (p(k, 1))d(2d - 1)^{|1| + 1},
\end{align*} \]

where the last inequality follows from the fact that \( \omega' = \omega + 1 \), and \( k_{\omega'} = 1 \).

\[ \square \]

4.1. Proof of Theorem 8.

**Definition 5** For any finite family \( P \subset R[X_1, \ldots, X_k] \) and \( \ell \geq 0 \), we say that \( P \) is in \( \ell \)-general position with respect to a semi-algebraic set \( V \subset R^k \) if for any subset \( P' \subset P \), with \( \text{card}(P') > \ell \), \( \text{Zer}(P', V) = \emptyset \).
Let $k = (k_1, \ldots, k_\omega)$ with $k = \sum_{i=1}^\omega k_i$, and $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, \ldots, P_s\} \subset \mathbf{R}[X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(\omega)}]$ be a fixed finite set of polynomials where $X^{(i)}$ is a block of $k_i$ variables, and such that each $P_i$ is symmetric in each block $X^{(i)}$. Let $\deg(P_i) \leq d$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$. Let $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_s)$ be a tuple of new variables, and let $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon = \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq s} \{P_i \pm \varepsilon_i\}$. We have the following two lemmas.

**Lemma 4** Let

$$D'(k, d) = \sum_{i=1}^\omega \min(k_i, d).$$

The family $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon \subset \mathbf{R}'[X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(\omega)}]$ is in $D'$-general position for any semi-algebraic subset $Z \subset \mathbf{R}^k$ stable under the action of $S_k$, where $\mathbf{R}' = \mathbf{R}(\varepsilon)$.

**Proof.** For each $i, 1 \leq i \leq s$, let $F_i \in \mathbf{R}[Z^{(1)}, \ldots, Z^{(\omega)}]$, where each $Z^{(i)}$ is a block of $\ell_i = \min(k_i, d)$ variables such that

$$P_i = F_i((p_1^{(k_1)}(X^{(1)}), \ldots, p_{\ell_i}^{(k_1)}(X^{(1)})), \ldots, (p_1^{(k_\omega)}(X^{(\omega)}), \ldots, p_{\ell_i}^{(k_\omega)}(X^{(\omega)}))).$$

Clearly,

$$P_i \pm \varepsilon_i = F_i((p_1^{(k_1)}(X^{(1)}), \ldots, p_{\ell_i}^{(k_1)}(X^{(1)})), \ldots, (p_1^{(k_\omega)}(X^{(\omega)}), \ldots, p_{\ell_i}^{(k_\omega)}(X^{(\omega)}))) \pm \varepsilon_i.$$

Since no sub-collection of the polynomials $\bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq s} \{F_i \pm \varepsilon_i\}$ of cardinality at least

$$1 + \sum_{i=1}^\omega \min(k_i, d) = D' + 1$$

can have a common zero in $\mathbf{R}'^{D'}$, the lemma follows. \hfill \Box

Let $\Phi$ be a $\mathcal{P}$-closed formula, and let $S = \text{Real}(\Phi, V)$ be bounded over $\mathbf{R}$. Let $\Phi_\varepsilon$ be the $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon$-closed formula obtained from $\Phi$ by replacing for each $i, 1 \leq i \leq s$,

i. each occurrence of $P_i \leq 0$ by $P_i - \varepsilon_i \leq 0$, and
ii. each occurrence of $P_i \geq 0$ by $P_i + \varepsilon_i \geq 0$.

Let $\mathbf{R}' = \mathbf{R}(\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_s)$, and $S_\varepsilon = \text{Real}(\Phi_\varepsilon, \mathbf{R}')$.

**Lemma 5** For any $r > 0$, $r \in \mathbf{R}$, the semi-algebraic set $S = S \cap S_\varepsilon$ is contained in $S_\varepsilon$ in $B_k(0, r)$, and the inclusion $S \cap B_k(0, r), \mathbf{R}' \hookrightarrow S_\varepsilon \cap B_k(0, r)$ is a semi-algebraic homotopy equivalence. Moreover, $\text{Ext}(S \cap B_k(0, r), \mathbf{R}' / S_k \cap B_k(0, r)) / S_k \hookrightarrow \text{Ext}(S_\varepsilon \cap B_k(0, r)) / S_k$, and the inclusion $\text{Ext}(S_\varepsilon \cap B_k(0, r), \mathbf{R}' / S_k) \hookrightarrow \text{Ext}(S_\varepsilon \cap B_k(0, r)) / S_k$ is a semi-algebraic homotopy equivalence.

**Proof.** The proof is similar to the one of Lemma 16.17 in [10]. \hfill \Box

**Remark 9** In view of Lemmas 4 and 5 we can assume (at the cost of doubling the number of polynomials) after possibly replacing $\mathcal{P}$ by $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon$, and $\mathbf{R}$ by $\mathbf{R}(\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_s)$, that the family $\mathcal{P}$ is in $D'(k, d)$-general position.

Now, let $\delta_1, \cdots, \delta_s$ be new infinitesimals, and let $\mathbf{R}' = \mathbf{R}(\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_s)$.
Notation 19 We define $\mathcal{P}_{>i} = \{P_{i+1}, \ldots, P_s\}$ and

$$\Sigma_i = \{P_i = 0, P_i = \delta_i, P_i = -\delta_i, P_i \geq 2\delta_i, P_i \leq -2\delta_i\},$$

$$\Sigma_{\leq i} = \{\Psi \mid \Psi = \bigwedge_{j=1,\ldots,i} \Psi_j, \Psi_j \in \Sigma_i\}. $$

Note that for each $\Psi \in \Sigma_i$, $\text{Reali}(\Psi, \mathcal{R}(\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_i)^k)$ is symmetric with respect to the action of $\mathfrak{S}_k$ on the last $k$ coordinates, and for if $\Psi \neq \Psi', \Psi, \Psi' \in \Sigma_{\leq i}$,

$$\text{Reali}(\Psi, \mathcal{R}(\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_i)^k) \cap \text{Reali}(\Psi', \mathcal{R}(\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_i)^k) = \emptyset. \quad (26)$$

If $\Phi$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-closed formula, we denote

$$\text{Reali}_i(\Phi) = \text{Reali}\left(\Phi, \mathcal{R}(\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_i)^k\right),$$

and

$$\text{Reali}_i(\Phi \land \Psi) = \text{Reali}\left(\Psi, \mathcal{R}(\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_i)^k\right) \cap \text{Reali}_i(\Phi).$$

Finally, we denote for each $\mathcal{P}$-closed formula $\Phi$

$$b(\Phi / \mathfrak{S}_k, \mathbb{F}) = b\left(\text{Reali}\left(\Phi, \mathcal{R}_k^k\right) / \mathfrak{S}_k, \mathbb{F}\right).$$

The proof of the following proposition is very similar to Proposition 7.39 in [10] where it is proved in the non-symmetric case.

**Proposition 9** For every $\mathcal{P}$-closed formula $\Phi$

$$b(\Phi / \mathfrak{S}_k, \mathbb{F}) \leq \sum_{\Psi \in \Sigma_{\leq s}} b(\Psi / \mathfrak{S}_k, \mathbb{F}),$$

$$\text{Reali}_i(\Psi, \mathcal{R}_k^k) \subset \text{Reali}_i(\Phi, \mathcal{R}_k^k)$$

Proof. First observe that the orbit space of a disjoint union of symmetric sets is a disjoint union of the corresponding orbit spaces. The symmetric spaces $\text{Reali}(\Psi, \text{Ext}(V, \mathcal{R}'))$, $\Psi \in \Sigma_{\leq s}$ are disjoint by (26). The proof is now the same as the proof of Proposition 7.39 in [10]. $\square$

Let

$$D' = D'(k, d) = \sum_{i=1}^{\omega} \min(k_i, d),$$

$$D'' = D''(k, d) = \sum_{i=1}^{\omega} \min(k_i, 4d).$$

**Proposition 10** For $0 \leq i < D' + D''$,

$$\sum_{\Psi \in \Sigma_{\leq s}} b_i(\Psi / \mathfrak{S}_k, \mathbb{F}) \leq \sum_{j=0}^{D' + D'' - i} \binom{s}{j} 6^j F(k, 2d).$$

For $i \geq D' + D''$,

$$\sum_{\Psi \in \Sigma_{\leq s}} b_i(\Psi / \mathfrak{S}_k, \mathbb{F}) = 0.$$
We first prove the following lemmas. Let \( Q_i = P_i^2(P_i^2 - \delta_i^2)^2(P_i^2 - 4\delta_i^2). \)

For \( j \geq 1 \) let,

\[
V'_j = \text{Reali}\left( \bigvee_{1 \leq i \leq j} Q_i = 0, \mathbb{R}\langle \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_j \rangle^k \right),
\]

\[
W'_j = \text{Reali}\left( \bigvee_{1 \leq i \leq j} Q_i \geq 0, \mathbb{R}\langle \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_j \rangle^k \right).
\]

**Lemma 6** Let \( I \subset [1, s], \sigma = (\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_s) \in \{0, \pm 1, \pm 2\}^s \) and let \( \mathcal{P}_{I, \sigma} = \bigcup_{i \in I} \{P_i + \sigma_i \delta_i\}. \) Then, \( \text{Zer}(\mathcal{P}_{I, \sigma}, \mathbb{R}^t) = \emptyset, \) whenever \( \text{card}(I) > D'. \)

**Proof.** This follows from the fact that \( \mathcal{P} \) is in \( D' \)-general position by Remark 9. \( \square \)

**Lemma 7** For each \( i, 0 \leq i < D' + D'', \)

\[
b_i(V'_j / \mathbb{S}_k, \mathbb{F}) \leq (6^j - 1)F(k, 2d).
\]

For \( i \geq D' + D'', \)

\[
b_i(V'_j / \mathbb{S}_k, \mathbb{F}) = 0.
\]

**Proof.** The set \( \text{Reali}((P_j^2(P_j^2 - \delta_j^2)^2(P_j^2 - 4\delta_j^2) = 0), \mathbb{R}\langle \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_j \rangle^k) \) is the disjoint union of

\[
\text{Reali}(P_i = 0, \mathbb{R}\langle \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_j \rangle^k),
\]

\[
\text{Reali}(P_i = \delta_i, \mathbb{R}\langle \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_j \rangle^k),
\]

\[
\text{Reali}(P_i = -\delta_i, \mathbb{R}\langle \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_j \rangle^k),
\]

\[
\text{Reali}(P_i = 2\delta_i, \mathbb{R}\langle \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_j \rangle^k),
\]

\[
\text{Reali}(P_i = -2\delta_i, \mathbb{R}\langle \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_j \rangle^k).
\]

The set \( \text{Reali}((P_j^2(P_j^2 - \delta_j^2)^2(P_j^2 - 4\delta_j^2) = 0), \mathbb{R}\langle \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_j \rangle^{m+k}) / \mathbb{S}_k \) is the disjoint union of

\[
\text{Reali}(P_i = 0, \mathbb{R}\langle \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_j \rangle^k) / \mathbb{S}_k,
\]

\[
\text{Reali}(P_i = \delta_i, \mathbb{R}\langle \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_j \rangle^k) / \mathbb{S}_k,
\]

\[
\text{Reali}(P_i = -\delta_i, \mathbb{R}\langle \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_j \rangle^k) / \mathbb{S}_k,
\]

\[
\text{Reali}(P_i = 2\delta_i, \mathbb{R}\langle \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_j \rangle^k) / \mathbb{S}_k,
\]

\[
\text{Reali}(P_i = -2\delta_i, \mathbb{R}\langle \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_j \rangle^k) / \mathbb{S}_k.
\]

(27)

It follows from Proposition 2 that \( b_i(V'_j / \mathbb{S}_k, \mathbb{F}) \) is bounded by the sum for \( 1 \leq \ell \leq i + 1, \) of \( (i - \ell + 1) \)-th Betti numbers of all possible \( \ell \)-ary intersections amongst the sets listed in (27). It is clear that the total number of such non-empty \( j \)-ary intersections is at most \( \binom{5^j}{j}5^\ell. \)

It now follows from Theorem 7 applied to the non-negative symmetric polynomials \( P_i^2, (P_i + \delta_i)^2, (P_i + 2\delta_i)^2, \) and noting that the degrees of these polynomials are bounded by \( 2d, \) that

\[
b_i(V'_j / \mathbb{S}_k, \mathbb{F}) \leq \sum_{p=1}^{\min(i,D')} \binom{j}{p} 5^p F(k, 2d).
\]

To prove the vanishing of the higher Betti numbers, first observe that \( (i-\ell+1) \)-th Betti numbers of all possible \( \ell \)-ary intersections amongst the sets listed in (27) vanish for \( i - \ell + 1 > D'' \) using Theorem 7.
Also, notice that by Lemma 6 the \( \ell \)-ary intersections amongst the sets in (27) are empty for \( \ell > D' \). Together, these observations imply that

\[
 b_i(V_j'/\mathcal{S}_k, \mathbb{F}) = 0.
\]

for all \( i \geq D' + D'' \). To see this observe that if \( i \geq D' + D'' \), and \( \ell \leq D' \), then \( i - \ell + 1 \geq D'' + 1 \).

**Lemma 8** For \( 0 \leq i < D' + D'' \),

\[
 b_i(W_j'/\mathcal{S}_k, \mathbb{F}) \leq \sum_{p=1}^{\min(j,D')} \binom{j}{p} 5^p(F(k,2d)) + b_i\left( \mathbb{R}\langle \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_j \rangle^k / \mathcal{S}_k, \mathbb{F} \right).
\]

For \( i \geq D' + D'' \), \( b_i(W_j'/\mathcal{S}_k, \mathbb{F}) = 0 \).

**Proof.** Let

\[
 F = \text{Realize} \left( \bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq j} Q_i \leq 0 \lor \bigvee_{1 \leq i \leq j} Q_i = 0, \text{Ext}(Z, \mathbb{R}\langle \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_i \rangle) \right).
\]

Now, from the fact that

\[
 W_j' \cup F = \mathbb{R}\langle \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_j \rangle^k, W_j' \cap F = V_j',
\]

it follows immediately that

\[
 (W_j' \cup F)/\mathcal{S}_k = W_j'/\mathcal{S}_k \cup F/\mathcal{S}_k = \mathbb{R}\langle \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_j \rangle^k / \mathcal{S}_k,
\]

and

\[
 W_j'/\mathcal{S}_k \cap F/\mathcal{S}_k = (W_j' \cap F)/\mathcal{S}_k = V_j'/\mathcal{S}_k.
\]

Using Proposition 3 we get that

\[
 b_i(W_j'/\mathcal{S}_k, \mathbb{F}) \leq b_i((W_j' \cap F)/\mathcal{S}_k, \mathbb{F}) + b_i((W_j' \cup F)/\mathcal{S}_k, \mathbb{F})
 = b_i(V_j'/\mathcal{S}_k, \mathbb{F}) + b_i\left( \mathbb{R}\langle \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_j \rangle^k / \mathcal{S}_k, \mathbb{F} \right)
\]

We conclude using Lemma 7. \( \square \)

Now, let

\[
 S_i = \text{Realize} \left( P_i^2(P_i^2 - \delta_i^2)(P_i^2 - 4\delta_i^2) \geq 0, \text{Ext}(Z, \mathbb{R}\langle \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_i \rangle) \right), \quad 1 \leq i \leq s,
\]

and let \( S \) be the intersection of the \( S_i \) with the closed ball in \( \mathbb{R}\langle \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_s, \delta \rangle^k \) defined by

\[
 \delta^2 \left( \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} X_i^2 \right) \leq 1.
\]

Then, it is clear from Lemma 5 that

\[
 (28) \quad \sum_{\Psi \in \Sigma \leq s} b_i(\Psi/\mathcal{S}_k, \mathbb{F}) = b_i(S/\mathcal{S}_k, \mathbb{F}).
\]

**Proof of Proposition 10.** Using part (b) of Proposition 2 we get that

\[
 \sum_{\Psi \in \Sigma \leq s} b_i(\Psi/\mathcal{S}_k, \mathbb{F}) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{k-i} \sum_{J \subset \{1, \ldots, s\}} b_{i+j-1}(S^J/\mathcal{S}_k) + \binom{s}{k-i} b_k(S^0/\mathcal{S}_k).
\]
It follows from Lemma 8 that,

\[ b_{i+j-1}(S^J / \mathcal{G}_k) = 0, \]

when \( i + j - 1 \geq D' + D'' \), and otherwise,

\[ b_{i+j-1}(S^J) \leq \sum_{\ell=1}^{\min(j,D')} \binom{j}{\ell} 5^\ell F(k, 2d) + b_k \left( \mathbb{R}^k / \mathcal{G}_k, F \right). \]

Hence,

\[ \sum_{\Psi \in \Sigma_{\leq s}} b_i(\Psi / \mathcal{G}_k, F) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{D' + D'' - i} \sum_{J \subset \{1, \ldots, s\}, \#(J) = j} b_{i+j-1}(S^J / \mathcal{G}_k) + \binom{s}{k-i} b_k(S^0 / \mathcal{G}_k) \]

\[ \leq \sum_{j=1}^{D' + D'' - i} \binom{s}{j} \left( \sum_{p=1}^{\min(j,D')} \binom{j}{p} 5^p F(k, 2d) \right) \]

\[ \leq \sum_{j=1}^{D' + D'' - i} \binom{s}{j} 6^j F(k, 2d). \]

Finally, it is clear that

\[ \sum_{\Psi \in \Sigma_{\leq s}} b_i(\Psi / \mathcal{G}_k, F) = 0, \]

for \( i \geq D + D' \).

\[ \square \]

**Proof of Theorem 8.** We first consider the case in which for each \( i, 1 \leq i \leq \omega, 4d \leq k_i \). In this case,

\[ D(k, d) = D'(k, d) + D''(k, d), \]

and Theorem 8 follows from Propositions 9 and 10, recalling that the number of polynomials was doubled in order to put the family \( \mathcal{P} \) in \( D' \)-general position. In the general case, suppose without loss of generality that \( k_i \leq 4d \), for \( 1 \leq i \leq \omega' \leq \omega \), and \( k_i > 4d \) for \( i > \omega' \).

Let \( k' = (k_1, \ldots, k_{\omega'}) \), \( k = \sum_{i=1}^{\omega'} k_i \), and \( \pi : \mathbb{R}^k / \mathcal{G}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{k'} / \mathcal{G}_{k'} \) the projection map to the first \( k' \) coordinates. Then, for each \( \bar{y} \in \pi(S) / \mathcal{G}_{k'} \), we have by applying the special case of Theorem 8 already proved above that,

\[ b_i((S \cap \pi^{-1}(\bar{y}) / \mathcal{G}_k), F) = 0, \]

for \( i \geq \sum_{i=\omega'}^{\omega} \min(k_i, 4d) + \min(k_i, d) = 5(\omega - \omega')d \). Using the Leray spectral sequence of the map \( \pi \) it follows that

\[ b_i((S \cap \pi^{-1}(\bar{y}) / \mathcal{G}_k), F) = 0, \]

for \( i \geq k' + 5(\omega - \omega')d = D(k, d) \).

A similar argument proves that in Proposition 10 we can replace \( D' + D'' \) by \( D \) as well.

This proves the theorem in general.

\[ \square \]

**Proof of Corollary 4.** Follows directly from Theorem 8.

\[ \square \]
4.2. **Proof of Theorem 9.** In [20], Gabrielov and Vorobjov introduced a construction for replacing an arbitrary \( P \)-semi-algebraic set \( S \) by a certain \( P' \)-closed semi-algebraic set \( S' \) (for any given \( p \geq 0 \)), such that \( S \) and \( S' \) are \( p \)-equivalent. The family \( P'_p \) in their construction is given by

\[
P'_p = \bigcup_{P \in P} \bigcup_{0 \leq i \leq p} \{P \pm \varepsilon_i, P \pm \delta_i\},
\]

where the \( \varepsilon_i, \delta_i \) are infinitesimals.

Note that if \( P \subset \mathbb{R}[X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(\omega)}] \) is symmetric in each block of variables \( X^{(i)} \), then so is \( P' \), and if the degrees of the polynomials in \( P \) is bounded by \( d \), the same bound applies to \( P'_p \) as well. Furthermore, \( \text{card}(P'_p) = 2(p+1) \text{card}(P) \). It is an immediate consequence of the above result that \( S/\mathcal{S}_k \) is \( p \)-equivalent to \( S'/\mathcal{S}_k \) as well.

**Proof of Theorem 9.** Using the above construction, replace \( S \) by \( S'_k \), with \( p = k \). Then, apply Theorem 8. \( \square \)

4.3. **Proofs of Theorems 11 and 12.** We now prove Theorems 11 and 12 closely following the proof of Theorem 10 in [21]. We first need a few preliminary definitions and notation.

**Notation 20** We will denote by \( \Delta_p \), the standard \( p \)-dimensional simplex, namely

\[
\Delta_p = \{(s_0, \ldots, s_p) | s_0, \ldots, s_p \geq 0, s_0 + \cdots + s_p = 1\}.
\]

We also recall the definition of \((p+1)\)-fold join of a non-empty compact semi-algebraic set \( X \).

**Definition 6** Let \( X \) be a non-empty compact semi-algebraic set. Then the \((p+1)\)-fold join of \( X \) with itself is defined by

\[
J^{(p)}(X) = \frac{\bigwedge_{p+1} X \times \cdots \times X \times \Delta_p}{\sim},
\]

where the equivalence relation \( \sim \) is given by \((x_0, \ldots, x_p, (s_0, \ldots, s_p)) \sim (x'_0, \ldots, x'_p, (s'_0, \ldots, s'_p))\) if and only if \((s_0, \ldots, s_p) = (s'_0, \ldots, s'_p)\), and \( x_i = x'_i \) for all \( i \) such that \( s_i = s'_i \neq 0 \).

Observe that the symmetric group \( \mathfrak{S}_{p+1} \) acts naturally on \( J^{(p)}(X) \), by acting simultaneously on the product \( \bigwedge_{p+1} X \times \cdots \times X \) and \( \Delta_p \) i.e. for \( \pi \in \mathfrak{S}_{p+1} \),

\[
\pi \cdot (x_0, \ldots, x_p, (s_0, \ldots, s_p)) = (x_{\pi(0)}, \ldots, x_{\pi(p)}, (s_{\pi(0)}, \ldots, s_{\pi(p)})).
\]

**Notation 21** We denote by \( J^{(p)}_{\text{Sym}}(X) \) the quotient \( J^{(p)}(X)/\mathfrak{S}_{p+1} \).

**Notation 22** We denote for each \( p \geq 0 \), \( \text{Sym}^{(p)}(X) \) the \((p+1)\)-fold symmetric product of \( X \) i.e.

\[
\text{Sym}^{(p)}(X) = \frac{\bigwedge_{p+1} X \times \cdots \times X}{\mathfrak{S}_{p+1}}.
\]
For each \( p > 0 \) and \( 0 \leq i \leq p \), there are canonical injections \( \phi^{(p,i)} : J^{(p-1)}_{\text{symm}}(X) \rightarrow J^{(p)}_{\text{symm}}(X) \) defined by

\[
\phi^{(p,0)} \left( (x_0, \ldots, x_{p-1}, (s_0, \ldots, s_{p-1})) \right) = (x_0, \ldots, x_{p-1}, x_i (s_0, \ldots, s_{p-1}, 0)),
\]

\[
\phi^{(p,i)} \left( (x_0, \ldots, x_{p-1}, (s_0, \ldots, s_{p-1})) \right) = (x_0, \ldots, x_i, x_i, x_{i+1}, x_{p-1}, s'), \text{ for } 0 < i
\]

where

\[
s'_i = \frac{(s_0, \ldots, s_i, s_i, s_{i+1}, s_{p-1})}{s_0 + \cdots + s_i + s_i + s_{i+1} + s_{p-1}}.
\]

and \( x \) is any fixed element of \( X \) (the map does not depend on the choice of \( x \)).

**Lemma 9** The image \( \phi^{(p)}(J^{(p-1)}_{\text{symm}}(X)) \) is contractible inside \( J^{(p)}_{\text{symm}}(X) \).

**Proof.** For fixed \( x \in X \) and \( t \in [0, 1] \), let

\[
g_t((x_0, \ldots, x_p, x, (s_0, \ldots, s_{p-1}, 0))) = (x_0, \ldots, x_p, x, ((ts_0, ts_1, \ldots, ts_{p-1}, 1-t)).
\]

Now observe that, \( g_t \) is a continuous family of maps,

\[
g_1 = \text{Id}_{\phi^{(p)}(J^{(p-1)}_{\text{symm}}(X))},
\]

and \( g_0(\phi^{(p)}(J^{(p-1)}_{\text{symm}}(X)))) \) is a point. \( \square \)

**Definition 7** Let \( J_{\text{symm}}(X) = \lim_{p \to 0} J^{(p)}_{\text{symm}}(X) \) be the direct limit of the directed system defined by \( (\phi^{(p)} : J^{(p-1)}_{\text{symm}}(X) \rightarrow J^{(p)}_{\text{symm}}(X))_{p > 0} \).

It follows immediately from Lemma 9 that

**Lemma 10** For any non-empty compact semi-algebraic set, the space \( J_{\text{symm}}(X) \) is contractible.

Now suppose that \( X, Y \) are compact semi-algebraic sets and \( f : X \rightarrow Y \) a continuous surjection.

**Definition 8** For each \( p \geq 0 \), we denote by \( J_f^{(p)}(X) \) the \( p \)-fold fibered join of the map \( f \) defined by

\[
J_f^{(p)}(X) = \underbrace{X \times_f \cdots \times_f X \times \Delta_p} \sim, \text{ where the equivalence relation } \sim \text{ is given by } (x_0, \ldots, x_p, (s_0, \ldots, s_p)) \sim (x_0', \ldots, x_p', (s_0', \ldots, s_p')) \text{ if and only if } (s_0, \ldots, s_p) = (s_0', \ldots, s_p'), \text{ and } x_i = x'_i \text{ for all } i \text{ such that } s_i = s_i' \neq 0, \text{ and }
\]

\[
\underbrace{X \times_f \cdots \times_f X} \sim \{ (x_0, \ldots, x_p) | f(x_0) = \cdots = f(x_p) \}.
\]

**Notation 23** We denote by \( J_{f,\text{symm}}^{(p)}(X) \) (respectively \( \text{Sym}_{f,\text{symm}}^{(p)}(X) \)) the quotient \( J_f^{(p)}(X)/\mathbb{S}_{p+1} \) (respectively \( \underbrace{X \times_f \cdots \times_f X}/\mathbb{S}_{p+1} \) and \( J_{f,\text{symm}}(X) = \lim J_{f,\text{symm}}^{(p)}(X) \). Let

\[
\phi^{(p,\infty)} : J_{f,\text{symm}}^{(p)}(X) \hookrightarrow J_{f,\text{symm}}(X)
\]

denote the canonically defined (injective) map of \( J_{f,\text{symm}}^{(p)}(X) \) into \( J_{f,\text{symm}}(X) \).
Proposition 11 The induced surjection $J(f) : J_{f, \text{symm}}(X) \to Y$ is a homotopy equivalence.

Proof. For each $y \in Y$, $J(f)^{-1}(y) = J_{\text{symm}}(f^{-1}(y))$. By Lemma 10, $J_{\text{symm}}(f^{-1}(y))$ is contractible. The proposition now follows from the Vietoris-Begle theorem. □

Lemma 11 The pair $(J_{f, \text{symm}}^{(p)}(X), \phi^{(p)}(J_{f, \text{symm}}^{(p-1)}(X)))$ is homotopy equivalent to the pair $(S^p \times \text{Sym}^f_{(p)}(X), \{\ast\} \times \text{Sym}^f_{(p)}(X))$.

Proof. Clear from the definition of $J_{f, \text{symm}}^{(p)}(X)$, and the inclusion map $\phi^{(p)}$. □

Theorem 15 For any field of coefficients $\mathbb{F}$, there exists a spectral sequence converging to $H_*(Y, \mathbb{F})$ whose $E_1$-term is given by

\begin{equation}
E_1^{p,q} \simeq H_q(\text{Sym}^f_{(p)}(X), \mathbb{F}).
\end{equation}

(29)

Proof. The spectral sequence is the spectral sequence of the filtration

$\text{Im}(\phi^{(0,\infty)}) \subset \text{Im}(\phi^{(0,\infty)}) \subset \cdots \subset J_{f, \text{symm}}(X) \sim Y$

where the last homotopy equivalence is a consequence of Proposition 11. The isomorphism in (29) is a consequence of Lemma 11 after noticing that

$H_q(\text{Sym}^f_{(p)}(X), \mathbb{F}) \simeq H_{q-p}(S^p \times \text{Sym}^f_{(p)}(X), \{\ast\} \times \text{Sym}^f_{(p)}(X), \mathbb{F}), q \geq p,$

$H_q(\text{Sym}^f_{(p)}(X), \mathbb{F}) \simeq 0, q < p.$

□

Remark 10 Similar spectral sequences for finite maps have been considered by several other authors (see for example [27, 23]). The $E_1$-term of these spectral sequences involve the alternating cohomology of the fibered product, rather than the ordinary homology of the symmetric product as in Theorem 15. This distinction is important for us, as we can apply our bounds on the equivariant Betti numbers of symmetric semi-algebraic sets to bound the dimensions of the latter groups, but not those of the former.

Corollary 6 With the above notation and for any field of coefficients $\mathbb{F}$

$b(\pi(V), \mathbb{F}) \leq \sum_{0 \leq p < m} b(\text{Sym}^f_{(p)}(V), \mathbb{F}).$

Proof of Theorem 11. Apply Corollary 6 and Theorem 7. □

Proof of Theorem 12. Apply Corollary 6 and Theorem 8. □

5. Algorithms for Computing the (generalized) Euler-Poincaré Characteristic of Symmetric Semi-algebraic Sets

In this section we describe new algorithms for computing the (generalized) Euler-Poincaré characteristic of symmetric semi-algebraic subsets of $\mathbb{R}^k$. Unlike previously known algorithms for general (non-symmetric) semi-algebraic sets, these new algorithms have polynomial complexity as long as the degrees of the input symmetric polynomials defining the set is bounded.
by a constant. Note that for non-symmetric varieties the problem of computing the Euler-
Poincaré characteristic is easily seen to be \#P-hard and thus the existence of a polynomial
time algorithm for computing it is not considered as likely.

5.1. Mathematical Preliminaries. We recall the definition of the Borel-Moore homology
groups of locally closed semi-algebraic sets.

Definition 9 Let \( S \subset \mathbb{R}^k \) be a locally closed semi-algebraic set and let \( S_r = S \cap B_k(0, r) \). The \( p \)-th Borel-Moore homology group of \( S \) with coefficients in a field \( F \), denoted by \( H_{BM}^p(S, F) \), is defined to be the \( p \)-th simplicial homology group of the pair \((\overline{S_r}, \overline{S_r} \setminus S_r)\) with coefficients in \( F \), for large enough \( r > 0 \).

Notation 24 For any locally closed semi-algebraic set \( S \) we denote
\[
\chi_{BM}(S, F) = \sum_{i \geq 0} (-1)^i \dim_F H_{BM}^i(S, F).
\]

It follows immediately from the exact sequence of the homology of the pair \((\overline{S_r}, \overline{S_r} \setminus S_r)\) that

Proposition 12 If \( S \) is a locally closed semi-algebraic set then for all \( r > 0 \) large enough
\[
\chi_{BM}(S, \mathbb{Q}) = \chi(\overline{S_r}, \mathbb{Q}) - \chi(S \cap S^{k-1}(0, r), \mathbb{Q}).
\]

Proposition 13 If \( S \) is a locally closed semi-algebraic set, then
\[
\chi_{gen}(S) = \chi_{BM}(S, \mathbb{Q}).
\]

Proof. See [10]. □

The following proposition is an immediate consequence of Definition 9, Notation 24 and Propositions 12 and 13.

Proposition 14 Let \( S \subset \mathbb{R}^k \) be a closed semi-algebraic set. Then,
\[
\chi_{gen}(S) = \chi_{gen}(S \cap B_k(0, r)) - \chi_{gen}(S \cap S^{k-1}(0, r))
\]
for all large enough \( r > 0 \).

Proof. By the theorem on conical structure of semi-algebraic sets at infinity (see [10]) we have that \( S \) is semi-algebraically homeomorphic to \( S \cap B_k(0, r) \) for all large enough \( r > 0 \). Also, note that \( S \cap B_k(0, r) \) is a disjoint union of \( S \cap B_k(0, r) \) and \( S \cap S^{k-1}(0, r) \). The proposition follows from the additivity of \( \chi_{gen}(\cdot) \). □

Corollary 7 Let \( S \subset \mathbb{R}^k \) be a \( \mathcal{P} \)-closed semi-algebraic set. Let \( \Gamma \subset \{0, 1, -1\}^\mathcal{P} \) be the set of realizable sign conditions \( \gamma \) on \( \mathcal{P} \) such that \( \text{Reali}(\gamma, \mathbb{R}^k) \subset S \). Then,
\[
\chi_{gen}(S) = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \chi_{gen}(\text{Reali}(\gamma, \mathbb{R}^k)).
\]

Proof. Clear from the definition of the generalized Euler-Poincaré characteristic (Definition 3). □
We also recall some basic algorithms from [10] which we will need as subroutines in our algorithms.

5.2. Algorithmic Preliminaries. In this section we recall the input, output and complexities of some basic algorithms and also some notations from the book [10]. These algorithms will be the building blocks of our main algorithms described later.

Definition 10 Let \( P \in \mathbb{R}[X] \) and \( \sigma \in \{0,1,-1\}^{\text{Der}(P)} \), a sign condition on the set \( \text{Der}(P) \) of derivatives of \( P \). The sign condition \( \sigma \) is a Thom encoding of \( x \in \mathbb{R} \) if \( \sigma(P) = 0 \) and \( \text{Reali}(\sigma) = \{x\} \), i.e. \( \sigma \) is the sign condition taken by the set \( \text{Der}(P) \) at \( x \).

Notation 25 A \( k \)-univariate representation \( u \) is a \( k+2 \)-tuple of polynomials in \( \mathbb{R}[T] \),
\[
(u) = (f(T),g(T)), \text{with } g = (g_0(T),g_1(T),\ldots,g_k(T)),
\]
such that \( f \) and \( g_0 \) are co-prime. Note that \( g_0(t) \neq 0 \) if \( t \in \mathbb{C} \) is a root of \( f(T) \). The points associated to a univariate representation \( u \) are the points
\[
(x_u(t)) = \left( \frac{g_1(t)}{g_0(t)}, \ldots, \frac{g_k(t)}{g_0(t)} \right) \in \mathbb{C}^k
\]
where \( t \in \mathbb{C} \) is a root of \( f(T) \).

Let \( \mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{K}[X_1,\ldots,X_k] \) be a finite set of polynomials such that \( \text{Zer}(\mathcal{P},\mathbb{C}^k) \) is finite. The \( k+2 \)-tuple \( u = (f(T),g(T)) \), represents \( \text{Zer}(\mathcal{P},\mathbb{C}^k) \) if \( u \) is a univariate representation and
\[
\text{Zer}(\mathcal{P},\mathbb{C}^k) = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{C}^k \mid \exists t \in \text{Zer}(\mathcal{P},\mathbb{C}) \ x = x_u(t) \right\}.
\]
A real \( k \)-univariate representation is a pair \( u,\sigma \) where \( u \) is a \( k \)-univariate representation and \( \sigma \) is the Thom encoding of a root of \( f \), \( t_\sigma \in \mathbb{R} \). The point associated to the real univariate representation \( u,\sigma \) is the point
\[
x_u(t_\sigma) = \left( \frac{g_1(t_\sigma)}{g_0(t_\sigma)}, \ldots, \frac{g_k(t_\sigma)}{g_0(t_\sigma)} \right) \in \mathbb{R}^k.
\]

For the rest of this section we fix an ordered domain \( D \) contained in the real closed field \( \mathbb{R} \). By complexity of an algorithm whose input consists of polynomials with coefficients in \( D \), we will mean (following [10]) the maximum number of arithmetic operations in \( D \) (including comparisons) used by the algorithm for an input of a certain size.

We also recall from [10] the inputs, outputs and the complexities of the following algorithms.

Algorithm 1 (Algebraic Sampling)
- **Input:** a polynomial \( Q \in D[X_1,\ldots,X_k] \).
- **Output:** a set \( \mathcal{U} \) of real univariate representations of the form
  \[
  (f,g,\sigma), \text{with } (f,g) \in D[\varepsilon][T]^{k+2}.
  \]
The set of points associated to these univariate representations meets every semi-algebraically connected component of \( \text{Zer}(Q,\mathbb{R}(\varepsilon)^k) \).
- **Complexity:** \( d^{O(k)} \), where \( d \) is a bound on the degree of \( Q \).

Algorithm 2 (Univariate Sign Determination)
- **Input:** a non-zero univariate polynomial \( Q \) and a list \( \mathcal{P} \) of univariate polynomials with coefficients in \( D \). Let \( Z = \text{Zer}(Q,\mathbb{R}) \).
5.3. Computing the generalized Euler-Poincaré characteristic of symmetric real algebraic sets. We now describe our algorithm for computing the generalized Euler-Poincaré characteristic for real varieties, starting as usual with the bounded case. Notice, that for a closed and bounded semi-algebraic set $S$,

$$\chi^\text{gen}(S) = \chi(S, Q).$$

**Algorithm 3** (Generalized Euler-Poincaré for bounded symmetric algebraic sets)

- **Input:**
  1. A tuple $k = (k_1, \ldots, k_\omega) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^\omega$, with $k = \sum_{i=1}^\omega k_i$.
  2. A polynomial $P \in \mathbb{D}[X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(\omega)}]$, where each $X^{(i)}$ is a block of $k_i$ variables, and $P$ is symmetric in each block of variables $X^{(i)}$, and such that $\text{Zer}(P, R^k)$ is bounded and of degree at most $d$.

- **Output:** The generalized Euler-Poincaré characteristic $\chi^\text{gen}(\text{Zer}(P, R^k))$, and the generalized equivariant Euler-Poincaré characteristic $\chi^\text{gen}_{S_k}(\text{Zer}(P, R^k))$.

- **Procedure:**

  **Step 1:** Pick $d'$, such that $d \leq d' \leq 2d$, $d'$ even, and $d' - 1$ a prime number, by sieving through all possibilities, and testing for primality using the naive primality testing algorithm (i.e. testing for divisibility using the Euclidean division algorithm for each possible divisor).

  **Step 2:** If $d' - 1 \mid k$, then replace $P$ by $P + X_{k+1}^2$, $k$ by $k'$, and $k$ by $k + 1$.

  **Step 3:** Set $Q = \text{Def}(P, \zeta, d')$.

  **Step 4:** Set $\chi^\text{gen} \leftarrow 0, \chi^\text{gen}_{S_k} \leftarrow 0$.

  **Step 5:** For each $\ell = (\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_\omega), 1 \leq \ell_i \leq \min(k_i, d')$, and each $\pi = (\pi^{(1)}, \ldots, \pi^{(\omega)}) \in \Pi_{k, \ell}$, do the following. Let $I = \{(i, j) \mid 1 \leq i \leq \omega, 1 \leq j \leq \ell_i\}$.

  **Step 5.1:** Let $Z^{(1)}, \ldots, Z^{(\omega)}$ be new blocks of variables, where each $Z^{(i)} = (Z^{(i)}_1, \ldots, Z^{(i)}_{\ell_i})$ is a block of $\ell_i$ variables, and $Q_\pi \in \mathbb{D}[\zeta | Z^{(1)}, \ldots, Z^{(\omega)}]$ be the polynomial obtained from $Q$ by substituting in $Q$ for each $(i, j) \in I$ the variables $X_{\pi_1^{(i)} + \cdots + \pi_j^{(i)} + 1}^{(i)}, X_{\pi_1^{(i)} + \cdots + \pi_j^{(i)}}^{(i)}$ by $Z_j^{(i)}$.

  **Step 5.2:** Let

  $$Q_\pi := Q_\pi^2 + \sum_{(i, j), (i', j')} (\pi_j^{(i)} \frac{\partial Q_\pi}{\partial Z_j^{(i')}} - \pi_j^{(i')} \frac{\partial Q_\pi}{\partial Z_j^{(i')}})^2.$$

  **Step 5.3:** Using Algorithm 1 (Algebraic Sampling) compute a set $U_\pi$ of real univariate representations representing the finite set of points

  $$C = \text{Zer}(Q_\pi, R^{(\ast)^k}).$$

  **Step 5.4:** Let $\text{Hess}_\pi(Z^{(1)}, \ldots, Z^{(\omega)})$ be the symmetric matrix obtained by substituting for each $(i, j) \in I$ the variables $X_{\pi_1^{(i)} + \cdots + \pi_j^{(i)} + 1}^{(i)}, X_{\pi_1^{(i)} + \cdots + \pi_j^{(i)}}^{(i)}$
by $Z_j^{(i)}$ in the $(k-1) \times (k-1)$ matrix $H$ whose rows and columns are indexed by $[2, k]$, and which is defined by:

$$H_{i,j} = \frac{\partial^2 Q}{\partial (X_1 + X_i) \partial (X_1 + X_j)}, 2 \leq i, j \leq k.$$  

**Step 5.5:** For each point $p \in C$, represented by $u_p \in U_\pi$, compute using Algorithm 10.13 (Univariate Sign Determination) in [10], the sign of the polynomial $\sum_{(i,j) \in I} \frac{\partial Q_\pi}{\partial Z_j^{(i)}}$, as well as the index, $\text{ind}^- (\text{Hess}_\pi)$, at the point $p$.

**Step 5.6:** Using Gauss-Jordan elimination (over the real univariate representation $u_p$), and Algorithm 2 (Univariate Sign Determination) in [10], determine if the negative eigenspace, $L^- (\text{Hess}_\pi(p))$ of the symmetric matrix $\text{Hess}_\pi(p)$ is contained in the subspace $L$ defined by $\sum_{i=1}^k X_i = 0$.

**Step 5.7:** If $\sum_{(i,j) \in I} \frac{\partial Q_\pi}{\partial Z_j^{(i)}}(p) < 0$, then set

$$\chi_\text{gen} \leftarrow \chi_\text{gen} + (-1)^{\text{ind}^- (\text{Hess}_\pi(p))} \prod_{i=1}^\omega \left( \pi_1^{(i)}, \ldots, \pi_\ell_i^{(i)} \right).$$

**Step 5.8:** If $\sum_{(i,j) \in I} \frac{\partial Q_\pi}{\partial Z_j^{(i)}}(p) < 0$, and $L^- (\text{Hess}_\pi(p)) \subset L$, then set

$$\chi_{\text{gen} \mathbb{E}_k} \leftarrow \chi_{\text{gen} \mathbb{E}_k} + (-1)^{\text{ind}^- (\text{Hess}_\pi(p))}.$$  

**Step 6:** Output

$$\chi_\text{gen} \left( \text{Zer} \left( P, R^k \right) \right) = \chi_\text{gen},$$

$$\chi_{\text{gen} \mathbb{E}_k} \left( \text{Zer} \left( P, R^k \right) \right) = \chi_{\text{gen} \mathbb{E}_k}.$$  

**Proof of Correctness.** The correctness of the algorithm follows from Propositions 4, 6, 5, Corollary 5, as well as the correctness of Algorithms 1 (Algebraic Sampling) and 2 (Univariate Sign Determination).

**Complexity Analysis.** The complexity of Step 1 is bounded by $d^{O(1)}$. The complexities of steps 2,3 and step 5.1 are all bounded by $(\omega k)^{O(d)}$. Using the complexity analysis of Algorithm 1 (Algebraic Sampling), the complexity of Step 5.3 is bounded by $(\text{length}(\pi)d)^{O(\text{length}(\pi))}$. The number and the degrees of the real univariate representations output in Step 5.3 are bounded by $d^{O(\text{length}(\pi))}$ using the complexity analysis of Algorithm 2 (Univariate Sign Determination). Each arithmetic operation in the Gauss-Jordan elimination in Step 5.6 occurs in a ring $D[\zeta][T]/(f(T))$ (where $u_p = (f, g_0, \ldots, g_{\text{length} (\pi)}), \varrho_p$ with $\deg_{T, \zeta} (f) = d^{O(\text{length}(\pi))}$). The number of such operations in the ring $D[\zeta][T]/(f(T))$ is bounded by $(\text{length}(\pi) + k)^{O(1)}$. Thus, the total number of arithmetic operations in the ring $D$ performed in Step 5.6 is bounded by $(\text{length}(\pi)kd)^{O(\text{length}(\pi))}$. The number of iterations of Step 5 is bounded by the number of partitions $\pi \in \Pi_{k,1}$ with...
I = (ℓ₁, ..., ℓ₁), 1 ≤ ℓ₁ ≤ min(k, d'), 1 ≤ i ≤ ω, which is bounded by

\[ \sum_{I=(\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_\omega),1\leq \ell_i\leq \min(k_i,d')} p(k,I) = k^{O(D'(k,d))}. \]

Thus, the total complexity of the algorithm measured by the number of arithmetic operations
(including comparisons) in the ring D is bounded by \( (\omega kd)^{O(D'(k,d))} \).

**Algorithm 4 (Generalized Euler-Poincaré characteristic for symmetric algebraic sets)**

**Input:**
1. A tuple \( k = (k_1, \ldots, k_\omega) \in \mathbb{Z}^{\omega}_{>0} \), with \( k = \sum_{i=1}^{\omega} k_i \).
2. A polynomial \( P \in D[X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(\omega)}] \), where each \( X^{(i)} \) is a block of \( k_i \) variables, and \( P \) is symmetric in each block of variables \( X^{(i)} \), with \( \deg(P) = d \).

**Output:** The generalized Euler-Poincaré characteristic \( \chi^{\text{gen}}(\text{Zer}(P,R^k)) \), and the equivariant generalized Euler-Poincaré characteristic \( \chi^{\text{gen}}_{\mathcal{E}_{k'}}(\text{Zer}(P,R^k)) \).

**Procedure:**

**Step 1:** Let

\[ P_1 = P^2 + \left( X_{k+1}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{k} X_i^2 + -\Omega^2 \right)^2, \]
\[ P_2 = P^2 + \left( \sum_{i=1}^{k} X_i^2 - \Omega^2 \right)^2. \]

**Step 2:** Using Algorithm 3 with \( P_1 \) and \( P_2 \) as input compute:

\[ \chi^{(1)} = \chi^{\text{gen}}(\text{Zer}(P_1,R^{(1/\Omega)^{k+1}})), \]
\[ \chi^{(1)}_{\mathcal{E}_{k'}} = \chi^{\text{gen}}_{\mathcal{E}_{k'}}(\text{Zer}(P_1,R^{(1/\Omega)^{k+1}})), \]
\[ \chi^{(2)} = \chi^{\text{gen}}(\text{Zer}(P_2,R^{(1/\Omega)})), \]
\[ \chi^{(2)}_{\mathcal{E}_{k'}} = \chi^{\text{gen}}_{\mathcal{E}_{k'}}(\text{Zer}(P_2,R^{(1/\Omega)})), \]

where \( k' = (k,1) \).

**Step 3:** Output

\[ \chi^{\text{gen}}(\text{Zer}(P,R^k)) = \frac{1}{2}(\chi^{(1)} - \chi^{(2)}), \]
\[ \chi^{\text{gen}}_{\mathcal{E}_{k'}}(\text{Zer}(P,R^k)) = \frac{1}{2}(\chi^{(1)}_{\mathcal{E}_{k'}} - \chi^{(2)}_{\mathcal{E}_{k'}}). \]

**Proof of Correctness.** Since \( V = \text{Zer}(P,R^{m+k}) \) is closed, by Proposition 14 we have that

\[ \chi^{\text{gen}}(V) = \chi^{\text{BM}}(V,\mathbb{Q}) = \chi \left( \text{Ext}(V,R^{(1/\Omega)}) \cap \overline{B_k(0,\Omega)} \right) - \chi \left( \text{Ext}(V,R^{(1/\Omega)}) \cap S^{k-1}(0,\Omega) \right) \]
\[ = \chi \left( \text{Ext}(V,R^{(1/\Omega)}) \cap \overline{B_k(0,\Omega)} \right) - \chi^{(2)}. \]

Now \( \text{Zer}(P_1,R^{(1/\Omega)^{k+1}}) \) is semi-algebraically homeomorphic to two copies of \( \text{Ext}(V,R^{(1/\Omega)}) \cap \overline{B_k(0,\Omega)} \), glued along a semi-algebraically homeomorphic copy of \( \text{Ext}(V,R^{(1/\Omega)}) \cap S^{k-1}(0,\Omega) = ... \)
Zer \( (P_2, R(1/\Omega)^k) \), and the latter . It follows that,
\[
\chi_{\text{gen}} \left( \text{Zer} \left( P_1, R(1/\Omega)^{k+1} \right) \right) = \chi^{(1)} \\
= 2\chi \left( \text{Ext} (V, R(1/\Omega)) \cap B_k(0,\Omega) \right) - \chi_{\text{gen}} \left( \text{Zer} \left( P_2, R(1/\Omega)^k \right) \right)
\]
and hence
\[
(33) \quad \chi \left( \text{Ext} (V, R(1/\Omega)) \cap B_k(0,\Omega) \right) = \frac{1}{2} (\chi^{(1)} + \chi^{(2)}).
\]
It now follows from Eqns. (32) and (33) that
\[
\chi_{\text{gen}} (V) = \frac{1}{2} (\chi^{(1)} + \chi^{(2)}) - \chi^{(2)} \\
= \frac{1}{2} (\chi^{(1)} - \chi^{(2)}).
\]

The proof for the correctness of the computation of \( \chi_{\text{gen}}^S_k (V) \) is similar and omitted.

**Complexity analysis.** The complexity of the algorithm measured by the number of arithmetic operations (including comparisons) in the ring \( D \) is bounded by \( (\omega kd)^O(D'(k,d)) \). This follows directly from the complexity analysis of Algorithm 3.

**Proof of Theorem 13.** The correctness and the complexity analysis of Algorithm 4 prove Theorem 13. \( \square \)

### 5.4. Computing the (generalized) Euler-Poincaré characteristic of symmetric semialgebraic sets.

We now consider the problem of computing the (generalized) Euler-Poincaré characteristic of semialgebraic sets. We reduce the problem to computing the generalized Euler-Poincaré characteristic of certain symmetric algebraic sets for which we already have an efficient algorithm described in the last section. This reduction process follows very closely the spirit of a similar reduction that is used in an algorithm for computing the generalized Euler-Poincaré characteristic of the realizations of all realizable sign conditions of a family of polynomials given in [9] (see also [10]).

We first need an efficient algorithm for computing the set of realizable sign conditions of a family of symmetric polynomials which will be used later. The following algorithm can be considered as an equivariant version of a very similar algorithm – namely, Algorithm 13.1 (Computing Realizable Sign Conditions) in [10] – for solving the same problem in the non-equivariant case.

**Algorithm 5 (Computing Realizable Sign Conditions of Symmetric Polynomials)**

- **Input:**
  1. A tuple \( k = (k_1, \ldots, k_\omega) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^\omega \), with \( k = \sum_{i=1}^\omega k_i \).
  2. A set of \( s \) polynomials \( P = \{P_1, \ldots, P_s\} \subset D[X^{(1)}_1, \ldots, X^{(1)}_{\omega}] \), where each \( X^{(i)} \) is a block of \( k_i \) variables, and each polynomial in \( P \) is symmetric in each block of variables \( X^{(i)} \) and of degree at most \( d \).
- **Output:** \( \text{SIGN}(P) \).
- **Procedure:**
  1. **Step 1:** For each \( i, 1 \leq i \leq s \), \( P_i^* := \{P_i \pm \gamma \delta_i, P_i \pm \delta_i\} \).
  2. **Step 2:** For every choice of \( j \leq D'(k,d) = \sum_{i=1}^\omega \min(k_i,d) \) polynomials \( Q_{i_1} \in P_{i_1}^*, \ldots, Q_{i_j} \in P_{i_j}^* \), with \( 1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_j \leq s \) do the following:
Step 2.1: Let

\[ Q = Q_{i_1}^2 + \cdots + Q_{i_j}^2. \]

Step 2.2: For each \(1 = (\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_\omega), 1 \leq \ell_i \leq \min(k_i, d),\) and each partition \(\pi = (\pi^{(1)}, \ldots, \pi^{(\omega)}) \in \Pi_{k, l,}\) do the following. Let \(I = \{(i, j) \mid 1 \leq i \leq \omega, 1 \leq j \leq \ell_i\}.

Step 2.2.1: Let \(Z^{(1)}, \ldots, Z^{(\omega)}\) be new blocks of variables, where each \(Z^{(i)} = (Z^{(i)}_1, \ldots, Z^{(i)}_{\ell_i})\) is a block of \(\ell_i\) variables, and

\[ Q_\pi \in D[\ell][Z^{(1)}, \ldots, Z^{(\omega)}] \]

be the polynomial obtained from \(Q\) by substituting in \(Q\) for each \((i, j) \in I\) the variables \(X_{\pi^{(i)}_1 + \cdots + \pi^{(i)}_{\ell_i} + 1}, \ldots, X_{\pi^{(i)}_1 + \cdots + \pi^{(i)}_{\ell_i}}\) by \(Z^{(i)}_j\).

Step 2.2.2: Using Algorithm 1 (Algebraic Sampling) compute a set \(U_\pi\) of real univariate representations representing the finite set of points \(C \subset \text{Zer}(Q_\pi, R^{\ell length(\pi)}),\) where \(R' = R(\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_{\omega}, \gamma).\)

Step 2.2.3: For each point \(p \in C \subset \text{Zer}(Q_\pi, R^{\ell length(\pi)}),\) represented by \(u_p \in U_\pi,\) compute using Algorithm 2 (Univariate Sign Determination), the signs of the polynomials \(P_\pi = \{P_\pi \mid P \in P \setminus \{P_{i_1}, \ldots, P_{i_j}\}\}\) at the point \(p,\) where \(P_\pi \in R'[Z^{(1)}, \ldots, Z^{(\omega)}]\) is the polynomial obtained from \(P\) by substituting in \(P\) for each \((i, j) \in I\) the variables \(X_{\pi^{(i)}_1 + \cdots + \pi^{(i)}_{\ell_i} + 1}, \ldots, X_{\pi^{(i)}_1 + \cdots + \pi^{(i)}_{\ell_i}}\) by \(Z^{(i)}_j\). Let \(\sigma \in \{0, 1, -1\}^{P}\) be defined as follows:

\[ \sigma(P) = \text{sign}(P_\pi(p)) \text{ for } P \in P \setminus \{P_{i_1}, \ldots, P_{i_j}\}. \]

If \(P = P_i\) for \(i \in \{i_1, \ldots, i_j\},\) then

\[ \sigma(P) = +1 \text{ if } Q_i = P_i - \delta_i, \]
\[ = -1 \text{ if } Q_i = P_i + \delta_i, \]
\[ = 0 \text{ if } Q_i = P_i \pm \gamma \delta_i. \]

Step 2.2.4: \(\text{SIGN} := \text{SIGN} \cup \{\sigma\}.\)

Step 4: Output \(\text{SIGN}(P) = \text{SIGN}.\)

Proof of correctness. First observe that Lemma 4 which implies that the set \(\bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq s} P_i^*\) is in \(D'(k, d)\)-general position. Proposition 13.7 in [10] implies that the image under the \(\lim_\gamma\) map of any finite set of points meeting every semi-algebraically connected component of each algebraic set defined by polynomials \(Q_{i_1} \in P_{i_1}^*, \ldots, Q_{i_j} \in P_{i_j}^*, 1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_j \leq s,\) \(1 \leq j \leq D'(k, d),\) will intersect every semi-algebraically connected component of \(\text{Reali}(\sigma, R^k)\) for every \(\sigma \in \text{SIGN}(P).\) The correctness of the algorithm now follows from the correctness of Algorithms 1 (Algebraic Sampling) and 2 (Univariate Sign Determination).

Complexity analysis. The complexity of Step 2.1 measured by the number of arithmetic operations in the ring \(D[\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_\omega, \gamma]\) is bounded by \(O(D'(k, d)^{k+d})\). It follows from the complexity analysis of Algorithm 1 (Algebraic Sampling) that each call to Algorithm 1 (Algebraic Sampling) in Step 2.2.2 requires \(d^{O(length(\pi))}\) arithmetic operations in the ring \(D[\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_\omega, \gamma].\) The number and degrees of the real univariate representations \(u_p\) output in Step 2.2.2 is
bounded by \( d^{O(D'(k,d))} \). Using the complexity analysis of Algorithm 2 (Univariate Sign Determination), each call to Algorithm 2 (Univariate Sign Determination) in Step 2.2.3 requires \( d^{O(\|\pi\|)} \) arithmetic operations in the ring \( \mathbb{D}[\varepsilon_1, \delta_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_s, \delta_s, \varepsilon] \). The complexity of the algorithm measured by the number of arithmetic operations in the ring \( \mathbb{D}[\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_s, \gamma] \) is bounded by

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{D'(k,d)} 2^j \binom{s}{j} \left( d^{O(D'(k,d))} + O \left( D'(k,d) \binom{k + d}{k} \right) \right)
\]

noting that \( \|\pi\| \leq D'(k,d) \). However, notice that in each call to Algorithm 1 (Algebraic Sampling) in Step 2.2.2 and also in the calls to Algorithm 2 (Univariate Sign Determination) in Step 2.2.3, the arithmetic is done in a ring \( \mathbb{D} \) adjoined with \( \omega(\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{S}) \) in Step 2.2.2 and also in the calls to Algorithm 2 (Univariate Sign Determination) in Step 2.2.3, the arithmetic is done in a ring \( \mathbb{D} \) adjoined with \( O(D'(k,d)) \) infinitesimals. Hence, the total number of arithmetic operations in \( \mathbb{D} \) is bounded by

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{D'(k,d)} 2^j \binom{s}{j} \left( d^{O(D'(k,d)^2)} + O \left( D'(k,d) \binom{k + d}{k} \right) \right) = s^{D'(k,d)} d^{O(D'(k,d)^2)}.
\]

The total number of real univariate representations produced in Step 2.2.2 is bounded by

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{D'(k,d)} 2^j \binom{s}{j} d^{O(D'(k,d))} = s^{D'(k,d)} d^{O(D'(k,d))}.
\]

Their degrees are bounded by \( d^{O(D'(k,d))} \). Thus, the total number of real points associated to these univariate representations, and hence also \( \text{card}(\text{SIGN}(\mathbb{P})) \) is \( s^{D'(k,d)} d^{O(D'(k,d))} \).

The complexity analysis of Algorithm 5 yields the following purely mathematical result.

**Proposition 15** Let \( k = (k_1, \ldots, k_\omega) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^\omega \), with \( k = \sum_{i=1}^{\omega} k_i \), and let \( \mathbb{P} = \{P_1, \ldots, P_\omega\} \subset \mathbb{R}[X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(\omega)}] \) be a finite set of polynomials, where each \( X^{(i)} \) is a block of \( k_i \) variables, and each polynomial in \( \mathbb{P} \) is symmetric in each block of variables \( X^{(i)} \). Let \( \text{card}(\mathbb{P}) = s \), and \( \max_{P \in \mathbb{P}} \deg(P) = d \). Then,

\[
\text{card}(\text{SIGN}(\mathbb{P})) = s^{D'(k,d)} d^{O(D'(k,d))},
\]

where \( D'(k,d) = \sum_{i=1}^{\omega} \min(k_i, d) \).

In particular, if for each \( i, 1 \leq i \leq \omega, d \leq k_i \), then \( \text{card}(\text{SIGN}(\mathbb{P})) \) can be bounded independent of \( k \).

**Notation 26** Given \( P \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \ldots, X_k] \), we denote

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Reali}(P = 0, S) &= \{x \in S \mid P(x) = 0\}, \\
\text{Reali}(P > 0, S) &= \{x \in S \mid P(x) > 0\}, \\
\text{Reali}(P > 0, S) &= \{x \in S \mid P(x) < 0\},
\end{align*}
\]

and \( \chi^{\text{gen}}(P = 0, S), \chi^{\text{gen}}(P > 0, S), \chi^{\text{gen}}(P < 0, S) \) the Euler-Poincaré characteristics of the corresponding sets. The Euler-Poincaré-query of \( P \) for \( S \) is

\[
\text{EuQ}(P, S) = \chi^{\text{gen}}(P > 0, S) - \chi^{\text{gen}}(P < 0, S).
\]
If $P$ and $S$ are symmetric we denote by $\chi_{\mathcal{S}_k}^{\text{gen}}(P = 0, S), \chi_{\mathcal{S}_k}^{\text{gen}}(P > 0, S), \chi_{\mathcal{S}_k}^{\text{gen}}(P < 0, S)$ the Euler-Poincaré characteristics of the corresponding sets. The equivariant Euler-Poincaré-query of $P$ for $S$ is

$$\text{EuQ}_{\mathcal{S}_k}(P, S) = \chi_{\mathcal{S}_k}^{\text{gen}}(P > 0, S) - \chi_{\mathcal{S}_k}^{\text{gen}}(P < 0, S).$$

Let $\mathcal{P} = P_1, \ldots, P_s$ be a finite list of polynomials in $\mathbb{R}[X_1, \ldots, X_k]$.

Let $\sigma$ be a sign condition on $\mathcal{P}$. The realization of the sign condition $\sigma$ over $S$ is defined by

$$\text{Reali}(\sigma, S) = \{ x \in S \mid \bigwedge_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \text{sign}(P(x)) = \sigma(P) \},$$

and its generalized Euler-Poincaré characteristic is denoted $\chi_{\mathcal{S}_k}^{\text{gen}}(\sigma, S)$. Similarly, if $P$ and $S$ are symmetric with respect to $\mathcal{S}_k$ for some $k = (k_1, \ldots, k_\omega) \in \mathbb{Z}_0^{\omega}$, the equivariant Euler-Poincaré characteristic of $\text{Reali}(\sigma, S)$ is denoted $\chi_{\mathcal{S}_k}^{\text{gen}}(\sigma, S) := \chi_{\mathcal{S}_k}^{\text{gen}}(\phi_k(\text{Reali}(\sigma, S)), \mathbb{Q})$.

**Notation 27** Given a finite family $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{R}[X_1, \ldots, X_k]$ we denote by $\chi_{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{gen}}(\sigma)$ the list of generalized Euler-Poincaré characteristics $\chi_{\mathcal{S}_k}^{\text{gen}}(\sigma) = \chi_{\mathcal{S}_k}^{\text{gen}}(\text{Reali}(\sigma, \mathbb{R}^k))$ for $\sigma \in \text{SIGN}(\mathcal{P})$.

Given $\alpha \in \{0, 1, 2\}^P$, we write $\sigma^\alpha$ for $\prod_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sigma(\alpha(P))$, and $P^\alpha$ for $\prod_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P^{\alpha(P)}$, with $\sigma \in \{0, 1, -1\}^P$. When $\text{Reali}(\sigma, Z) \neq \emptyset$, the sign of $P^\alpha$ is fixed on $\text{Reali}(\sigma, Z)$ and is equal to $\sigma^\alpha$ with the understanding that $0^0 = 1$.

We order the elements of $\mathcal{P}$ so that $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, \ldots, P_s\}$. We order $\{0, 1, 2\}^P$ lexicographically. We also order $\{0, 1, -1\}^P$ lexicographically (with $0 < 1 < -1$).

Given $A = \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m$, a list of elements of $\{0, 1, 2\}^P$ with $\alpha_1 <_{\text{lex}} \ldots <_{\text{lex}} \alpha_m$, we define

$$\mathcal{P}^A = \mathcal{P}^{\alpha_1}, \ldots, \mathcal{P}^{\alpha_m},$$

$$\text{EuQ}(\mathcal{P}^A, S) = \text{EuQ}(\mathcal{P}^{\alpha_1}, S), \ldots, \text{EuQ}(\mathcal{P}^{\alpha_m}, S).$$

Given $\Sigma = \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n$, a list of elements of $\{0, 1, -1\}^P$, with $\sigma_1 <_{\text{lex}} \ldots <_{\text{lex}} \sigma_n$, we define

$$\text{Reali}(\Sigma, S) = \text{Reali}(\sigma_1, Z), \ldots, \text{Reali}(\sigma_n, Z),$$

$$\chi_{\mathcal{S}_k}^{\text{gen}}(\Sigma, S) = \chi_{\mathcal{S}_k}^{\text{gen}}(\sigma_1, Z), \ldots, \chi_{\mathcal{S}_k}^{\text{gen}}(\sigma_n, Z).$$

We denote by $\text{Mat}(A, \Sigma)$ the $m \times s$ matrix of signs of $\mathcal{P}^A$ on $\Sigma$ defined by

$$\text{Mat}(A, \Sigma)_{i,j} = \sigma_\alpha^\alpha_i.$$

**Proposition 16** If $\cup_{\sigma \in \Sigma} \text{Reali}(\sigma, S) = S$, then

$$\text{Mat}(A, \Sigma) \cdot \chi_{\mathcal{S}_k}^{\text{gen}}(\Sigma, S) = \text{EuQ}(\mathcal{P}^A, S).$$

**Proof.** See [10, Proposition 13.41].

We consider a list $A$ of elements in $\{0, 1, 2\}^P$ adapted to sign determination for $\mathcal{P}$ (see [10, Chapter 10]), i.e. such that the matrix of signs of $\mathcal{P}^A$ over $\text{SIGN}(\mathcal{P})$ is invertible. If $\mathcal{P} = P_1, \ldots, P_s$, let $\mathcal{P}_i = P_i, \ldots, P_s$, for $0 \leq i \leq s$. A method for determining a list $A(\mathcal{P})$ of elements in $\{0, 1, 2\}^P$ adapted to sign determination for $\mathcal{P}$ from $\text{SIGN}(\mathcal{P})$ is given in [10, Algorithm 10.12 (Family adapted to Sign Determination)].

We are ready for describing the algorithm computing the generalized Euler-Poincaré characteristic. We start with an algorithm for the Euler-Poincaré-query.

**Algorithm 6** (Euler-Poincaré-query)

- **Input:**

  -
Proof of correctness. The algebraic set $\text{Zer}(P)$ and the algebraic set defined by $(P, Q)$, where each $X^{(i)}$ is a block of $k_i$ variables, and $P, Q$ are symmetric in each block of variables $X^{(i)}$, and of degree at most $d$.

- **Output:** the Euler-Poincaré-queries

  \[
  \text{EuQ}(P, Z) = \chi^{\text{gen}}(P > 0, Z) - \chi^{\text{gen}}(P < 0, Z),
  \]

  \[
  \text{EuQ}_{\mathfrak{k}}(P, Z) = \chi^{\text{gen}}(P > 0, Z) - \chi^{\text{gen}}(P < 0, Z),
  \]

  where $Z = \text{Zer}(Q, R^k)$.

- **Complexity:** $(\omega d)O(D'(k, d))$, where $D'(k, d) = \sum_{i=1}^{\omega} \min(k_i, d)$.

- **Procedure:**

  **Step 1:** Introduce a new variable $X_{k+1}$, and let

  \[
  Q_+ = Q^2 + (P - X^2_{k+1})^2,
  \]

  \[
  Q_- = Q^2 + (P + X^2_{k+1})^2.
  \]

  **Step 2:** Using Algorithm 4 compute $\chi^{\text{gen}}(\text{Zer}(Q_+, R^{k+1}))$, $\chi^{\text{gen}}_{\mathfrak{k}}(\text{Zer}(Q_+, R^{k+1}))$, and $\chi^{\text{gen}}(\text{Zer}(Q_-, R^{k+1}))$, $\chi^{\text{gen}}_{\mathfrak{k}}(\text{Zer}(Q_-, R^{k+1}))$.

  **Step 3:** Output

  \[
  (\chi^{\text{gen}}(\text{Zer}(Q_+, R^{k+1})) - \chi^{\text{gen}}(\text{Zer}(Q_-, R^{k+1}))) / 2,
  \]

  \[
  (\chi^{\text{gen}}_{\mathfrak{k}}(\text{Zer}(Q_+, R^{k+1})) - \chi^{\text{gen}}_{\mathfrak{k}}(\text{Zer}(Q_-, R^{k+1}))) / 2.
  \]

Proof of correctness. The algebraic set $\text{Zer}(Q_+, R^{k+1})$ is semi-algebraically homeomorphic to the disjoint union of two copies of the semi-algebraic set defined by $(P > 0) \land (Q = 0)$, and the algebraic set defined by $(P = 0) \land (Q = 0)$. Hence, using Corollary 7, we have that

\[
2\chi^{\text{gen}}(P > 0, Z) = \chi^{\text{gen}}(\text{Zer}(Q_+, R^{k+1})) - \chi^{\text{gen}}(\text{Zer}((Q, P), R^k)),
\]

\[
2\chi^{\text{gen}}_{\mathfrak{k}}(P > 0, Z) = \chi^{\text{gen}}_{\mathfrak{k}}(\text{Zer}(Q_+, R^{k+1})) - \chi^{\text{gen}}_{\mathfrak{k}}(\text{Zer}((Q, P), R^k)).
\]

Similarly, we have that

\[
2\chi^{\text{gen}}(P < 0, Z) = \chi^{\text{gen}}(\text{Zer}(Q_-, R^{k+1})) - \chi^{\text{gen}}(\text{Zer}((Q, P), R^k)),
\]

\[
2\chi^{\text{gen}}_{\mathfrak{k}}(P < 0, Z) = \chi^{\text{gen}}_{\mathfrak{k}}(\text{Zer}(Q_-, R^{k+1})) - \chi^{\text{gen}}_{\mathfrak{k}}(\text{Zer}((Q, P), R^k)).
\]

Complexity analysis. The complexity of the algorithm is $(\omega d)O(D'(k, d))$ using the complexity analysis of Algorithm 4.

We are now ready to describe our algorithm for computing the Euler-Poincaré characteristic of the realizations of sign conditions.

**Algorithm 7** (Generalized Euler-Poincaré Characteristic of Sign Conditions)

- **Input:**

  1. A tuple $k = (k_1, \ldots, k_\omega) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^\omega$, with $k = \sum_{i=1}^{\omega} k_i$.
  2. A set of $s$ polynomials $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, \ldots, P_s\} \subset \mathbb{D}[X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(\omega)}]$, where each $X^{(i)}$ is a block of $k_i$ variables, and each polynomial in $\mathcal{P}$ is symmetric in each block of variables $X^{(i)}$ and of degree at most $d$.

- **Output:** the lists $\chi^{\text{gen}}(\mathcal{P})$, $\chi^{\text{gen}}_{\mathfrak{k}}(\mathcal{P})$.

- **Procedure:**
Step 1: Let \( \mathcal{P} = \{ P_1, \ldots, P_s \} \), \( P_i = \{ P_1, \ldots, P_1 \} \). Compute \( \text{SIGN}(\mathcal{P}) \) using Algorithm 5 (Sampling).

Step 2: Determine a list \( A(\mathcal{P}) \) adapted to sign determination for \( \mathcal{P} \) on \( Z \) using Algorithm 10.12 (Family adapted to Sign Determination) in [10].

Step 3: Define \( A = A(\mathcal{P}) \), \( M = M(\mathcal{P}^A, \text{SIGN}(\mathcal{P})) \).

Step 4: Compute \( \text{EuQ}(\mathcal{P}^A) \), \( \text{EuQ}_{\mathbb{S}_k}(\mathcal{P}^A) \) using repeatedly Algorithm 6 (Euler-Poincaré-query).

Step 5: Using

\[
M \cdot \chi_{\text{gen}}(\mathcal{P}, \mathbb{Q}) = \text{EuQ}(\mathcal{P}^A),
\]

\[
M \cdot \chi_{\mathbb{S}_k}^\text{gen}(\mathcal{P}, \mathbb{Q}) = \text{EuQ}_{\mathbb{S}_k}(\mathcal{P}^A).
\]

and the fact that \( M \) is invertible, compute \( \chi_{\text{gen}}(\mathcal{P}, \chi_{\mathbb{S}_k}^\text{gen}(\mathcal{P})) \).

**Proof of correctness.** The correctness follows from the correctness of Algorithm 5 and the proof of correctness of the corresponding algorithm (Algorithm 13.5) in [10].

**Complexity analysis.** The complexity analysis is very similar to that of Algorithm 13.5 in [10]. The only difference is the use of the bound on \( \text{card}(\mathcal{P}) \) afforded by Proposition 15 in the symmetric situation instead of the usual non-symmetric bound. By Proposition 15

\[
\text{card}(\text{SIGN}(\mathcal{P})) \leq s^{D'(k,d)}d^O(D'(k,d)),
\]

where \( D'(k,d) = \sum_{i=1}^\omega \min(k_i, d) \). The number of calls to to Algorithm 6 (Euler-Poincaré-query) is equal to \( \text{card}(\text{SIGN}(\mathcal{P})) \). The calls to Algorithm 6 (Euler-Poincaré-query) are done for polynomials which are products of at most

\[
\log(\text{card}(\text{SIGN}(\mathcal{P}))) = O(D'(k, d)(\log d + \log s))
\]

products of polynomials of the form \( P \) or \( P^2, P \in \mathcal{P} \) by Proposition 10.71 in [10], hence of degree bounded by \( D = O(dD'(k, d)(\log d + \log s)) \). Using the complexity analysis of Algorithm 5 (Sampling) and the complexity analysis of Algorithm 6 (Euler-Poincaré-query), the number of arithmetic operations is bounded by

\[
s^{D'(k,d)}k^{O(D'(k,d))}d^O(D'(k,d)^2) + (kD)^O(m+D),
\]

and where \( D'(k,d) = \sum_{i=1}^\omega \min(k_i, d) \) and \( D = O(dD'(k, d)(\log d + \log s)) \). The algorithm also involves the inversion matrices of size \( s^{D'(k,d)}d^O(D'(k,d)) \) with integer coefficients.

**Algorithm 8 (Computing generalized Euler-Poincaré characteristic of semi-algebraic sets)**

- **Input:**
  1. A tuple \( \mathbf{k} = (k_1, \ldots, k_\omega) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^\omega \), with \( k = \sum_{i=1}^\omega k_i \).
  2. A set of \( s \) polynomials \( \mathcal{P} = \{ P_1, \ldots, P_s \} \subset \mathbb{D}[\mathbf{X}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathbf{X}^{(\omega)}] \), where each \( \mathbf{X}^{(i)} \) is a block of \( k_i \) variables, and each polynomial in \( \mathcal{P} \) is symmetric in each block of variables \( \mathbf{X}^{(i)} \), and of degree at most \( d \).
  3. A \( \mathcal{P} \)-semi-algebraic set \( S \), described by

\[
S = \bigcup_{\sigma \in \Sigma} \text{Reali} \left( \sigma, \mathbb{R}^k \right),
\]

where \( \Sigma \subset \{0,1,-1\}^\mathcal{P} \) of sign conditions on \( \mathcal{P} \).

- **Output:** \( \chi_{\text{gen}}(S) \) and \( \chi_{\mathbb{S}_k}^\text{gen}(S) \).

- **Procedure:**
Step 1: Compute using Algorithm 5 the set \( \text{SIGN}(\mathcal{P}) \).

Step 2: Identify \( \Gamma = \text{SIGN}(\mathcal{P}) \cap \Sigma \).

Step 3: Compute using Algorithm 4, \( \chi^\text{gen}(\mathcal{P}), \chi^\text{gen}\mathcal{S}_k(\mathcal{P}) \).

Step 4: Compute using \( \chi^\text{gen}(\mathcal{P}), \chi^\text{gen}\mathcal{S}_k(\mathcal{P}) \), and \( \Gamma \),

\[
\chi^\text{gen}(S) = \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma} \chi^\text{gen}(\sigma), \\
\chi^\text{gen}_{\mathcal{S}_k}(S) = \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma} \chi^\text{gen}_{\mathcal{S}_k}(\sigma).
\]

Proof of correctness. The correctness of Algorithm 8 follows from the correctness of Algorithms 5 and 7, and the additive property of the generalized Euler-Poincaré characteristic (see Definition 3).

Complexity analysis. The complexity is dominated by Step 3, and is thus bounded by

\[
\text{card}(\Sigma)^{O(1)} + s^{D'(k,d)}k^{O(D'(k,d))}d^{O(D'(k,d)^2)} + (kD)^{O(m+D)},
\]

where

\[
D = O(dD'(k, d)(\log d + \log s)).
\]

6. Conclusions and Open Problems

In this paper we have proved asymptotically tight upper bounds on the equivariant Betti numbers of symmetric real semi-algebraic sets. These bounds are exponential in the degrees of the defining polynomials, and also in the number of non-symmetric variables, but polynomial in the remaining parameters (unlike bounds in the non-equivariant case which are exponential in the number of variables). We list below several open questions and topics for future research.

It would be interesting to extend the results in the current paper to multi-symmetric semi-algebraic sets, where the symmetric group acts by permuting blocks of variables with block sizes \( > 1 \). As an immediate application we will obtain extensions of Theorems 11 and 12 to the case where the projection is along more variables than one.

Another interesting problem is to prove that the vanishing of the equivariant cohomology groups in Theorems 7 occurs for dimension \( \geq d \) (rather than \( 2d \)). Similarly, in Corollary 4 we conjecture that the equivariant cohomology groups vanish in dimensions greater than \( m + d \) (rather than \( m + 5d \)).

In cite [16] the authors define a certain algebraic structure called FI-modules. For a finitely generated FI-module \( V \) over a field \( \mathbb{F} \) of char 0, for each \( n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \) there exists an \( \mathbb{F} \)-vector space \( V_n \), the authors prove that the dimension of \( V_n \) is a polynomial in \( n \) for all sufficiently large \( n \) (see [16] for the necessary definitions). Amongst the primary examples of FI-modules are certain sequences of \( \mathfrak{S}_n \)-representations, and as a consequence of the above result their dimensions can be expressed as a polynomial in \( n \). Our polynomial bounds on the \( \mathfrak{S}_n \)-equivariant Betti numbers of sequences of symmetric semi-algebraic sets (for example, consider the sequence of real algebraic varieties defined by the sequence elementary symmetric polynomials \( e_d^{(n)} \) of degree \( d \) for some fixed \( d \)) suggest a connection with the theory of FI-modules. It would be interesting to explore this possible connection.

As mentioned in the Introduction, bounds on the non-equivariant Betti numbers of semi-algebraic sets have found applications in theoretical computer science, for instance in proving
lower bounds for testing membership in semi-algebraic sets in models such as algebraic computation trees. In this context it would be interesting to investigate if the equivariant Betti numbers can be used instead – for example in proving lower bounds for membership testing in symmetric semi-algebraic sets in an algebraic decision tree model where the decision tree is restricted to use only symmetric polynomials.

Finally, we have left open the problem of designing efficient (i.e. polynomial time for fixed degree) algorithms for computing the individual Betti numbers of symmetric varieties. In particular, we conjecture that for every fixed $d$, there exists a polynomial time algorithm for computing the individual Betti numbers (both ordinary and equivariant) of any symmetric variety described by a real symmetric polynomial given as input.
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