arXiv:2106.11290v1 [math.OC] 21 Jun 2021

Improving the constant in Nesterov's $\frac{\pi}{2}$-theorem

Roland Hildebrand *

June 22, 2021

Abstract

One of the hard optimization problems that has a semi-definite relaxation with quantitative bound on the approximation error is the maximization of a convex quadratic form on the hypercube. The relaxation not only yields an upper bound on the optimal value, but its solution can be used to construct random sub-optimal solutions of the original problem whose expected value is not less than $\frac{2}{\pi}$ times the value of the relaxation. This constant cannot be improved globally. More precisely, for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a problem instance for which the ratio of the two values in question is larger than $\frac{\pi}{2} - \epsilon$. However, if a given problem instance is considered, then the relaxation yields a concrete solution which may result in a much better ratio. In this contribution we present an improved, explicit bound depending on the rank of the solution. We consider also the problem of maximization of a convex hermitian quadratic form on the complex poly-disc. In this case a bound on the approximation error is given by the $\frac{4}{\pi}$-theorem of Ben-Tal, Nemirovski, and Roos. The derivation of a rank-dependent improved bound is similar to the real case. In the complex case we provide explicit expressions in the form of an infinite series and conjecture a closed-form expression.

1 Introduction and main result

Semi-definite relaxations are a widely used instrument to approximately solve hard optimization problems. Sometimes the relaxation comes along with a quantitative performance guarantee. One example is the maximization of a convex quadratic form A on the hypercube $[-1,1]^n$, whose approximation error is bounded by virtue of the $\frac{\pi}{2}$-theorem of Y. Nesterov [8]. Let us describe the content of this theorem.

Let

$$\alpha_{opt} = \max\{x^T A x \mid x \in [-1,1]^n\} = \max\{\langle A, X\rangle \mid X \succeq 0,\ \text{diag } X = \mathbf{1},\ \text{rk } X = 1\} \tag{1}$$

be the optimal value of the maximization problem, where $\mathbf{1}$ is the all-ones vector, A is a non-zero positive semi-definite (PSD) real symmetric matrix of size n, $X \succeq 0$ means that X is PSD, and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the Frobenius scalar product in the corresponding matrix space. The semi-definite relaxation consists in dropping the rank constraint in (1). Let

$$\alpha_{SR} = \max\{\langle A, X\rangle \mid X \succeq 0,\ \text{diag } X = \mathbf{1}\} \tag{2}$$

be its optimal value, and X^*_{SR} its solution.

The latter can be used to generate sub-optimal random solutions of original problem (1), as follows. Let $k = \text{rk } X^*_{SR}$, and let $X^*_{SR} = \Phi\Phi^T$ be a factorization, with factor $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times k}$. Let further $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$ be a normally distributed random vector in $\mathbb{R}^k$ with zero mean and unit covariance matrix. Define a random vertex of the hypercube by $x_\xi = \text{sgn}[\Phi\xi]$, where here and in the sequel the notation $f[X]$ means that the function f is applied element-wise to the object X. Then the expectation of the value of A on this vertex is given by

$$\mathbb{E}_\xi \left(x_\xi^T A x_\xi\right) = \left\langle A, \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin[X^*_{SR}] \right\rangle.$$

Developing the function $t \mapsto \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin t$ into the Taylor series $\frac{2}{\pi} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{(2l-1)!!}{(2l)!!} \frac{t^{2l+1}}{2l+1}$ and taking into account that element-wise integer powers of PSD matrices are PSD, we obtain by retaining only the first term in

*Univ. Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, Grenoble INP, LJK, 38000 Grenoble, France (roland.hildebrand@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr).

the series that

$$\mathbb{E}_\xi(x_\xi^T A x_\xi) \geq \left\langle A, \frac{2}{\pi} X_{SR}^* \right\rangle = \frac{2}{\pi}\alpha_{SR}.$$

Thus we obtain the inequality chain

$$0 < \frac{2}{\pi}\alpha_{SR} \leq \mathbb{E}_\xi(x_\xi^T A x_\xi) \leq \alpha_{opt} \leq \alpha_{SR}.$$

The upper bound $\frac{\pi}{2}$ on the ratio $\frac{\alpha_{SR}}{\mathbb{E}_\xi(x_\xi^T A x_\xi)}$ has essentially been shown in [9] by studying the Grothendieck inequality for PSD coefficient matrices. It was observed in [7] that it cannot be improved, in the sense that for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a matrix $A \succeq 0$ of some size $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\frac{\alpha_{SR}}{\mathbb{E}_\xi(x_\xi^T A x_\xi)} > \frac{\pi}{2} - \epsilon$. This does not mean, however, that a better relative approximation cannot be obtained for a concrete problem instance or class of instances.

Suppose, e.g., that the solution of the relaxation turned out to be of rank 1, $X_{SR}^* = x_* x_*^T$ for some vector $x_* \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then the random vector ξ in the construction provided in Nesterov's $\frac{\pi}{2}$-theorem reduces to a scalar, and the factor Φ can be chosen equal to x_*. Therefore $x_\xi = \pm x_*$ with probability 1, and $x_\xi^T A x_\xi = x_*^T A x_* = \alpha_{SR}$. In this case the ratio $\frac{\alpha_{SR}}{\mathbb{E}_\xi(x_\xi^T A x_\xi)}$ equals 1, and x_* is guaranteed to be a solution of original problem (1).

It is plausible that the lower the rank of the obtained solution X_{SR}^*, the better will be the quality of the approximation. In this contribution we prove the following quantitative version of this statement.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume above notations, in particular, let k be the rank of a solution X_{SR}^* of semi-definite relaxation* (2) *of problem* (1)*. Then the ratios $\frac{\alpha_{SR}}{\mathbb{E}_\xi(x_\xi^T A x_\xi)} \geq \frac{\alpha_{SR}}{\alpha_{opt}}$ are upper bounded by the constant*

$$\gamma_k = \begin{cases} 1, & k = 1; \\ \frac{2^{k-3}\sqrt{\pi}\,\Gamma(\frac{k-1}{2})\,\Gamma^2(\frac{k+1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{k}{2}+1)\,\Gamma(k-1)}, & k \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

In particular, for problems of matrix size n we have the a priori bound

$$\frac{\alpha_{SR}}{\alpha_{opt}} \leq \gamma_{\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{8n+1}-1}{2} \rfloor}.$$

We have the asymptotics $\gamma_k \approx \frac{\pi}{2}\left(1 - \frac{1}{2k}\right)$ for large k. For small k we obtain the values in the following table.

k	γ_k exact	γ_k numerical
1	1	1.0000
2	$\pi^2/8$	1.2337
3	$4/3$	1.3333
4	$9\pi^2/64$	1.3879
5	$64/45$	1.4222
6	$75\pi^2/512$	1.4457

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is based on a characterization of positivity preserving functions, which has already been employed to prove better bounds on the kissing number in [1].

In Section 2 we provide necessary results from harmonic analysis, while in Section 3 we prove Theorem 1.1. In Section 4 we consider the complex hermitian analog of problem (1) and relaxation (2), for which similar rank-dependent bounds are derived. These improve the unconditionally valid bound derived in [2].

2 Positivity preserving functions

In the sequel, X shall denote a real symmetric PSD matrix with unit diagonal. Clearly the elements of such a matrix are contained in the interval $[-1, 1]$.

We shall say that a function $f : [-1,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ *preserves the positivity* of X if $f[X] \succeq 0$. Nesterov's $\frac{\pi}{2}$-theorem is based on the fact that the function $f(t) = \frac{2}{\pi}(\arcsin t - t)$ preserves the positivity of every PSD matrix X with unit diagonal, due to the nonnegativity of the coefficients in the Taylor expansion of this function. The following result by Schoenberg states that this condition is also necessary [10].

Lemma 2.1. *Let $f : [-1,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ be continuous. Then f preserves the positivity of every PSD matrix with unit diagonal if and only if it is analytic, its Taylor series converges in the open unit disc, and all Taylor coefficients are nonnegative.*

This condition can be obtained as a limit of nonnegativity conditions on coefficients in expansions of f with respect to systems of orthogonal polynomials.

Definition 2.2. Denote by $C_l^{(\alpha)}(t)$ the *Gegenbauer polynomial* of degree l with parameter $\alpha > -\frac{1}{2}$, i.e., the orthogonal polynomial of degree l on $[-1,1]$ with respect to the weight $w_\alpha(t) = (1-t^2)^{\alpha-1/2}$.

Note that the weight function is even, and therefore the polynomials $C_l^{(\alpha)}(t)$ are either even or odd, depending on the parity of l.

Every measurable function $f : [-1,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying the condition $\int_{-1}^{1} f(t)^2 w_\alpha(t)\,dt < +\infty$ can be expanded into a series $f(t) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} c_l^\alpha(f) C_l^{(\alpha)}(t)$, where the coefficients are computed according to

$$c_l^\alpha(f) = \left\langle f, C_l^{(\alpha)} \right\rangle_\alpha = \int_{-1}^{1} f(t) C_l^{(\alpha)}(t) w_\alpha(t)\,dt.$$

Here $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\alpha$ is the scalar product in the corresponding weighted L^2-space.

We have the following result [10].

Lemma 2.3. *Let $f : [-1,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ be continuous, $k \geq 2$ an integer, and set $\alpha = \frac{k}{2} - 1$. Then f preserves the positivity of every PSD matrix with unit diagonal and of rank not exceeding k if and only if the Gegenbauer series of f has only nonnegative coefficients $c_l^\alpha(f)$. In this case the series is converging absolutely and uniformly.*

It can be observed that appropriate multiples of the Gegenbauer polynomials $C_l^{(\alpha)}(t)$ tend to the monomial t^l as $\alpha \to +\infty$, formally yielding Lemma 2.1 in the limit.

We shall briefly describe the background of Lemma 2.3, based on an account of harmonic analysis on homogeneous spaces in [6, Section 8]. The matrix $X_{SR}^* = \Phi\Phi^T$ can be seen as the Gramian of the rows ϕ_i of Φ. Since X_{SR}^* has unit diagonal, the ϕ_i are elements of the sphere $S^{k-1} = SO(k)/SO(k-1)$. The group $SO(k)$ acts on the homogeneous space S^{k-1}, and the stabilizer of ϕ_i is isomorphic to $SO(k-1)$. The scalar product $(X_{SR}^*)_{ij} = \langle \phi_i, \phi_j \rangle$ then depends only on the orbit of ϕ_j with respect to the action of the stabilizer. In this way, the elements of X_{SR}^* can be identified with orbits in the double coset space $SO(k-1)\backslash SO(k)/SO(k-1)$. The action of $SO(k)$ on S^{k-1} induces a linear representation of $SO(k)$ in the infinite-dimensional function space $L^2(S^{k-1})$, which decomposes into a direct product of an infinite number of irreducible components. The Gegenbauer polynomials then arise as those functions in these components which depend only on the orbit with respect to the action of $SO(k-1)$ on S^{k-1}, the *zonal spherical functions* on S^{k-1}. The weight w_α with respect to which they are orthogonal is generated on orbit space by the Haar measure on S^{k-1}, the latter defining also the weight of the scalar product in $L^2(S^{k-1})$. Analogs of Lemma 2.3 are valid for a large class of homogeneous spaces G/H.

3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Let us first make the following trivial observation, following immediately from Lemma 2.3.

Corollary 3.1. *Let $f : [-1,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ be continuous and preserving the positivity of every PSD matrix with unit diagonal. Then all Gegenbauer coefficients $c_l^\alpha(f)$ are nonnegative for every integer or half-integer value $\alpha \geq 0$.* □

In particular, the function $f(t) = \frac{2}{\pi}\arcsin t$ has nonnegative Gegenbauer coefficients for every $\alpha = \frac{k}{2} - 1$, $k \geq 2$ integer. Note that the linear Gegenbauer polynomial $C_1^{(\alpha)}$ is odd, and therefore proportional to the function $g(t) = t$, i.e., $C_1^{(\alpha)}(t) = \beta \cdot g(t)$ for some $\beta > 0$. Define γ_k as the minimal real number γ such that the difference $f(t) - \gamma^{-1} g(t)$ has nonnegative Gegenbauer coefficients with respect to the system $\left\{ C_l^{(k/2-1)} \right\}_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$.

Lemma 3.2. *Assume above notations. Then for $k \geq 2$ integer we have*

$$\gamma_k = \frac{\langle g, g\rangle_\alpha}{\langle f, g\rangle_\alpha} = \frac{\pi}{2}\frac{\int_{-1}^1 t^2\,(1-t^2)^{(k-3)/2}\,dt}{\int_{-1}^1 t\,(1-t^2)^{(k-3)/2}\,\arcsin t\,dt} = \frac{\pi}{2}\frac{\int_0^1 t^2\,(1-t^2)^{(k-3)/2}\,dt}{\int_0^1 t\,(1-t^2)^{(k-3)/2}\,\arcsin t\,dt}$$
$$= \frac{2^{k-3}\sqrt{\pi}\,\Gamma(\frac{k-1}{2})\,\Gamma^2(\frac{k+1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{k}{2}+1)\,\Gamma(k-1)}.$$

Proof. We have $f(t) - \gamma^{-1}g(t) = f(t) - \frac{1}{\beta\gamma}C_1^{(\alpha)}(t)$. All Gegenbauer coefficients except c_1^α of this function coincide with those of f and are hence nonnegative by Corollary 3.1, while the coefficient c_1^α equals $c_1^\alpha(f) - \frac{1}{\beta\gamma}$ and is nonnegative if and only if

$$\gamma \geq \frac{1}{\beta c_1^\alpha(f)} = \frac{c_1^\alpha(g)}{c_1^\alpha(f)} = \frac{\left\langle g, C_1^{(\alpha)}\right\rangle_\alpha}{\left\langle f, C_1^{(\alpha)}\right\rangle_\alpha} = \frac{\langle g, g\rangle_\alpha}{\langle f, g\rangle_\alpha},$$

which proves that γ_k equals the first and second expressions in the lemma. Since the integrands in both integrals are even, we may replace the interval of integration by $[0, 1]$, yielding the third expression.

For $k \geq 2$ we have by [4, 3.2511] that

$$\int_0^1 t^2\,(1-t^2)^{(k-3)/2}\,dt = \frac{1}{2}B\left(\frac{3}{2}, \frac{k-1}{2}\right) = \frac{1}{2}\frac{\Gamma(\frac{3}{2})\Gamma(\frac{k-1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{k+2}{2})} = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}\Gamma(\frac{k-1}{2})}{4\Gamma(\frac{k}{2}+1)},$$

where $B(x, y) = \frac{\Gamma(x)\Gamma(y)}{\Gamma(x+y)}$ denotes the Beta function.

On the other hand, for $k \geq 2$ we have

$$\int_0^1 t\,(1-t^2)^{(k-3)/2}\,\arcsin t\,dt = \int_0^{\pi/2} u\,\sin u\,\cos^{k-2} u\,du = \frac{\pi}{2^k}\Gamma(k-1)\frac{\psi(\frac{k+1}{2}) - \psi(\frac{k-1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{k+1}{2})\Gamma(\frac{k-1}{2})} = \frac{\pi\Gamma(k-1)}{2^k\Gamma^2(\frac{k+1}{2})}$$

by the change of variables $u = \arcsin t$ and by [4, 8.321]. Here $\psi(x) = \frac{\Gamma'(x)}{\Gamma(x)}$ is the Euler psi function obeying the relation $\psi(x+1) - \psi(x) = \frac{1}{x}$ [4, 8.3651].

The last expression in the lemma now easily follows. □

By definition of γ_k and by virtue of Lemma 2.3 the function $t \mapsto \frac{2}{\pi}\arcsin t - \gamma_k^{-1}t$ preserves the positivity of every PSD matrix X with unit diagonal and rank not exceeding k. It follows that for every $A \succeq 0$ of appropriate size we have

$$\left\langle A, \frac{2}{\pi}\arcsin[X]\right\rangle \geq \gamma_k^{-1}\langle A, X\rangle,$$

and the first part of Theorem 1.1 follows for $k \geq 2$. For $k = 1$ this part is trivial and has been shown already in Section 1.

We now need the following result. Let $\mathcal{S}^n$ be the space of real symmetric matrices of size n and $\mathcal{S}^n_+$ the cone of PSD matrices in this space.

Lemma 3.3. *The extremal points of the set $\mathcal{SR} = \{X \in \mathcal{S}^n_+ \mid \operatorname{diag} X = \mathbf{1}\}$ have rank not exceeding $\lfloor\frac{\sqrt{8n+1}-1}{2}\rfloor$.*

Proof. The set $\mathcal{SR}$ can be represented as an intersection $\mathcal{S}^n_+ \cap \mathcal{L}$, where $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{S}^n$ is the affine subspace of matrices with unit diagonal. Note that $\dim \mathcal{L} = \dim \mathcal{S}^n - n$.

Let $\hat{X}$ be an extreme point of $\mathcal{SR}$, and let F be its minimal face in the cone $\mathcal{S}^n_+$. Then $\dim F = \frac{k(k+1)}{2}$, where $k = \operatorname{rk}\hat{X}$. The minimal face of $\hat{X}$ in $\mathcal{SR}$ is given by the intersection $F \cap \mathcal{L}$ and has dimension zero by extremality of $\hat{X}$. It follows that

$$0 = \dim(F \cap \mathcal{L}) \geq \dim F + \dim \mathcal{L} - \dim \mathcal{S}^n = \frac{k(k+1)}{2} - n, \tag{3}$$

which yields the inequality $\frac{k(k+1)}{2} \leq n$ and after resolution with respect to k further $k \leq \frac{\sqrt{8n+1}-1}{2}$. The proof is completed by the observation that k is an integer. □

Semi-definite relaxation (2) determines the optimal value α_{SR} as the maximum of a linear functional over the convex set $\mathcal{SR}$. Since the latter is compact, the maximum is attained at an extreme point $\hat{X}^*$ of $\mathcal{SR}$, let its rank be k. Note that this point does not need to coincide with the solution actually found when solving the relaxation numerically, it suffices that $\hat{X}^*$ is itself a solution. We then get

$$\frac{\alpha_{SR}}{\alpha_{opt}} \le \frac{\alpha_{SR}}{\mathbb{E}_\xi(x_\xi^T A x_\xi)} \le \gamma_k \le \gamma_{\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{8n+1}-1}{2} \rfloor},$$

where the random hypercube vertex x_ξ is constructed as in Section 1, but using the extreme solution $\hat{X}^*$. Here the first inequality follows from the obvious relation $\alpha_{opt} \ge \mathbb{E}_\xi(x_\xi^T A x_\xi)$, the second one from the first part of Theorem 1.1, and the third one from Lemma 3.3. This proves the second part of Theorem 1.1.

4 Complex case

In this section we sketch how to obtain the values of the constants γ_k when the maximization in (1) is over the poly-disc $D^n \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ instead of the hypercube $[-1,1]^n \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, where $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ is the closed unit disc. Here A is a complex hermitian PSD form, and the function to maximize is x^*Ax, with the star denoting the complex conjugate transpose. The proof of Theorem 1.1 can be adapted with straightforward substitutions.

Given a complex hermitian solution of the relaxation (2), we may factorize it as $X_{SR} = \Phi\Phi^*$. A sub-optimal random solution of the original problem is constructed element-wise by $(x_\xi)_j = \frac{(\Phi\xi)_j}{|(\Phi\xi)_j|}$, where $j = 1, \dots, n$, and $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$ is a complex Gaussian random vector of size $k = \operatorname{rk} X_{SR}$ with zero mean and unit covariance matrix.

Then we have $\mathbb{E}_\xi\left(x_\xi^* A x_\xi\right) = \langle A, f[X_{SR}]\rangle$, where $f : D \to \mathbb{C}$ is given by the expression

$$f(z) = z \cdot \int_0^{\pi/2} \frac{\cos^2 t}{\sqrt{1-|z|^2\sin^2 t}}\, dt = \frac{z}{2} B\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}\right) F\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}; 2; |z|^2\right) = \frac{\pi z}{4} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{(2j-1)!!}{(2j)!!}\right)^2 \frac{|z|^{2j}}{j+1}.$$

Here the first equality is due to [3, Lemma 2.1], see also [5, Lemma 3.2], the second one due to [4, 3.6712], and the third one rephrases the definition of the hypergeometric function F.

Instead of Lemma 2.3 one has to use its analog for the homogeneous space $U(k)/U(k-1)$, the sphere of unit norm vectors in $\mathbb{C}^k$. The double coset space $U(k-1)\backslash U(k)/U(k-1)$ can be identified with the unit disc D, and the zonal spherical functions are the *generalized Zernike polynomials*, a system of orthogonal polynomials on D with weight function $w_k(z) = (1-|z|^2)^{k-2}$, $k \ge 2$. Denote the corresponding hermitian scalar product by $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_k$. With $g(z) = z$ we then obtain as in the proof of Lemma 3.2

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_k^{\mathbb{C}} = \frac{\langle g, g\rangle_k}{\langle f, g\rangle_k} &= \frac{4}{\pi} \frac{\int_D \bar{z} \cdot z \cdot (1-|z|^2)^{k-2}\, |dz|}{\int_D \bar{z} \cdot \left(z \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{(2j-1)!!}{(2j)!!}\right)^2 \frac{|z|^{2j}}{j+1}\right) \cdot (1-|z|^2)^{k-2}\, |dz|} \\
&= \frac{4}{\pi} \frac{2\pi \int_0^1 r^3 (1-r^2)^{k-2}\, dr}{2\pi \int_0^1 r^3 (1-r^2)^{k-2} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{(2j-1)!!}{(2j)!!}\right)^2 \frac{r^{2j}}{j+1}\, dr} = \frac{4}{\pi} \frac{\frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 u(1-u)^{k-2}\, du}{\frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 u(1-u)^{k-2} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{(2j-1)!!}{(2j)!!}\right)^2 \frac{u^j}{j+1}\, du} \\
&= \frac{4}{\pi} \frac{B(2, k-1)}{\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{(2j-1)!!}{(2j)!!}\right)^2 \frac{1}{j+1} B(j+2, k-1)} = \frac{4}{\pi} \frac{1}{\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{(2j-1)!!}{(2j)!!}\right)^2 \frac{k!j!}{(k+j)!}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here $|dz| = 2\pi r\, dr$ denotes the usual Lebesgue measure on the unit disc D, $r = |z|$, $u = r^2$, and $B(a,b) = \int_0^1 u^{a-1}(1-u)^{b-1}\, du = \frac{\Gamma(a)\Gamma(b)}{\Gamma(a+b)}$ is again the Beta function.

Finally, the dimension of the space of complex hermitian matrices of size k equals k^2, and instead of (3) we obtain the inequality $k^2 \le n$. This yields the following result.

Theorem 4.1. *Assume above notations, in particular, let k be the rank of a solution X_{SR} of semi-definite relaxation (2) of the maximization problem $\max_{x \in D^n} x^*Ax$ over the complex poly-disc, where $A \succeq 0$ is*

complex hermitian. Then the ratio $\frac{\alpha_{SR}}{\mathbb{E}_\xi(x_\xi^* A x_\xi)}$ *is upper bounded by the constant*

$$\gamma_k^{\mathbb{C}} = \frac{4/\pi}{\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{(2j-1)!!}{(2j)!!}\right)^2 \frac{k!j!}{(k+j)!}}.$$

In particular, for problems of matrix size n *we have the a priori bound*

$$\frac{\alpha_{SR}}{\alpha_{opt}} \leq \gamma_{\lfloor\sqrt{n}\rfloor},$$

where α_{opt} *is the optimal value of the original problem.*

For $k \to \infty$ the constants $\gamma_k^{\mathbb{C}}$ tend to the bound $\frac{4}{\pi}$ derived in [2]. Numerical evaluation of the series appearing in the expression for $\gamma_k^{\mathbb{C}}$ leads to the conjecture

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{(2j-1)!!}{(2j)!!}\right)^2 \frac{k!j!}{(k+j)!} = \frac{1}{\pi k} \left(\frac{(2k)!!}{(2k-1)!!}\right)^2, \qquad k \in \mathbb{N}_+.$$

Assuming this conjecture, we obtain the following table for small values of k.

k	$\gamma_k^{\mathbb{C}}$ exact (conjectured)	$\gamma_k^{\mathbb{C}}$ numerical
1	1	1.0000
2	9/8	1.1250
3	75/64	1.1719
4	1225/1024	1.1963
5	19845/16384	1.2112
6	160083/131072	1.2213

References

[1] Christine Bachoc and Frank Vallentin. New upper bounds for kissing numbers from semidefinite programming. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 21(3):909–924, 2008.

[2] Aharon Ben-Tal, Arkadi Nemirovski, and Cornelis Roos. Extended matrix cube theorems with applications to μ-theory in control. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 28(3):497–523, 2003.

[3] Shmuel Friedland, Lek-Heng Lim, and Jinjie Zhang. An elementary and unified proof of Grothendieck's inequality. *L'Enseignement Mathématique*, 64(2):327–351, 2018.

[4] I.S. Gradshteyn and I.M. Ryzhik. *Table of Integrals, Series and Products*. Academic Press, 2007.

[5] Uffe Haagerup. A new upper bound for the complex Grothendieck constant. *Israel J. Math.*, 60:199–224, 1987.

[6] Vladimir F. Molchanov. *Harmonic analysis on homogeneous spaces*, volume 59 of *Encyclopaedia of mathematical sciences*, chapter I, pages 1–136. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1995.

[7] Arkadi Nemirovski. Advances in convex optimization: Conic programming. In *Proc. International Congress of Mathematicians, Madrid 2006*, pages 413–444, 2007.

[8] Yurii Nesterov. Semidefinite relaxation and nonconvex quadratic optimization. *Optim. Methods Softw.*, 9(1–3):141–160, 1998.

[9] Ronald E. Rietz. A proof of the Grothendieck inequality. *Israel J. Math.*, 19:271–276, 1974.

[10] Isaac Jacob Schoenberg. Positive definite functions on spheres. *Duke Math. J.*, 9:96–108, 1942.