

# ON THE ABSENCE OF UNIFORM DENOMINATORS IN HILBERT'S 17TH PROBLEM

BRUCE REZNICK

ABSTRACT. Hilbert showed that for most  $(n, m)$  there exist psd forms  $p(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  of degree  $m$  which cannot be written as a sum of squares of forms. His 17th problem asked whether, in this case, there exists a form  $h$  so that  $h^2p$  is a sum of squares of forms; that is,  $p$  is a sum of squares of rational functions with denominator  $h$ . We show that, for every such  $(n, m)$  there does not exist a single form  $h$  which serves in this way as a denominator for *every* psd  $p(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  of degree  $m$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $H_d(\mathbb{R}^n)$  denote the set of real homogeneous forms of degree  $d$  in  $n$  variables (“ $n$ -ary  $d$ -ics”). By identifying  $p \in H_d(\mathbb{R}^n)$  with the  $N = \binom{n+d-1}{n-1}$ -tuple of its coefficients, we see that  $H_d(\mathbb{R}^n) \approx \mathbb{R}^N$ . Suppose  $m$  is an even integer. A form  $p \in H_m(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is called *positive semidefinite* or *psd* if  $p(x_1, \dots, x_n) \geq 0$  for all  $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Following [1], we denote the set of psd forms in  $H_m(\mathbb{R}^n)$  by  $P_{n,m}$ . Since  $P_{n,m}$  is closed under addition and closed under multiplication by positive scalars, it is a convex cone. In fact,  $P_{n,m}$  is a *closed* convex cone: if  $p_n \rightarrow p$  coefficient-wise, and each  $p_n$  is psd, then so is  $p$ . A psd form is called *positive definite* or *pd* if  $p(x_1, \dots, x_n) = 0$  implies  $x_j = 0$  for  $1 \leq j \leq n$ . The pd  $n$ -ary  $m$ -ics are the interior of the cone  $P_{n,m}$ .

A form  $p \in H_m(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is called a *sum of squares* or *sos* if it can be written as a sum of squares of polynomials; that is,  $p = \sum_k h_k^2$ . It is easy to show in this case that each  $h_k \in H_{m/2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . Again following [1], we denote the set of sos forms in  $H_m(\mathbb{R}^n)$  by  $\Sigma_{n,m}$ . Clearly,  $\Sigma_{n,m}$  is a convex cone; less obviously, it is a closed cone, a result due to R. M. Robinson [20].

In light of the inclusion  $\Sigma_{n,m} \subseteq P_{n,m}$ , let  $\Delta_{n,m} = P_{n,m} \setminus \Sigma_{n,m}$ . It was well-known by the late 19th century that  $P_{n,m} = \Sigma_{n,m}$  when  $m = 2$  or  $n = 2$ . In 1888, Hilbert proved [8] that  $\Sigma_{3,4} = P_{3,4}$ ; more specifically, every  $p \in P_{3,4}$  can be written as the sum of three squares of quadratic forms. (An elementary proof, with “five” squares is in [2, pp.16-17]; for modern expositions of Hilbert’s proof, see [24] and [21].) Hilbert also proved in [8] that the preceding are the *only* cases for which  $\Delta_{n,m} = \emptyset$ . That is,

*Date:* May 12, 2003.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 11E10, 11E25, 11E76, 12D15, 14P99.

This material is based in part upon work of the author, supported by the USAF under DARPA/AFOSR MURI Award F49620-02-1-0325. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of these agencies.

if  $n \geq 3$  and  $m \geq 6$  or  $n \geq 4$  and  $m \geq 4$ , then there exist psd forms  $n$ -ary  $m$ -ics that are not sos.

In 1893, Hilbert [9] generalized his three-square result for  $P_{3,4}$  to ternary forms of higher degree. Suppose  $p \in P_{3,m}$  with  $m \geq 6$ . Then there exist  $p_1 \in P_{3,m-4}$  and  $h_{1k} \in H_{m-2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq 3$ , so that

$$p_1 p = h_{11}^2 + h_{12}^2 + h_{13}^2.$$

(Hilbert's proof seems to be non-constructive, and lacks a modern exposition. In the very recent paper [10], de Klerk and Pasechnik discuss the implementation of an algorithm to find  $p_1$  so that  $p_1 p$  is sos, though not necessarily as a sum of *three* squares. This paper uses Hilbert's result without giving an independent proof.)

If  $m = 6$  or  $8$ , then  $p_1$  is a sum of three squares of forms, and hence (as Landau later noted [11]), the four-square identity implies that  $p_1^2 p = p_1(p_1 p)$  is the sum of four squares of forms. If  $m \geq 10$ , then the argument can be applied to  $p_1$ : there exists  $p_2 \in P_{3,m-8}$  with  $p_2 p_1 = h_{21}^2 + h_{22}^2 + h_{23}^2$ . Thus, if  $m = 10$  or  $12$  (so that  $P_{3,m-8} = \Sigma_{3,m-8}$ ), then  $(p_1 p_2)^2 p = p_2(p_2 p_1)(p_1 p)$  is the sum of four squares of forms. An easy induction shows that there exists  $q \in H_t(\mathbb{R}^3)$  with  $t = \lfloor \frac{(m-2)^2}{8} \rfloor$  so that  $q^2 p$  is the sum of four squares of forms.

Hilbert's 17th Problem asked whether this generalizes to  $n > 3$  variables; that is, if  $p \in P_{n,m}$ , must there exist some form  $q$  so that  $q^2 p$  is sos? Artin proved that there must be, in a way that gives no information about  $q$ . Much more on the history of this subject can be found in the survey paper [19].

This discussion leads to two closely related questions. Suppose  $p \in P_{n,m}$ . Can we *find* a form  $h$  such that  $hp$  is sos? Can we *find* a form  $q$  so that  $q^2 p$  is sos? If we've answered the second, we've answered the first. Conversely, if  $p \neq 0$  is psd and  $hp$  is sos, then  $h$  is psd. But it needn't be sos; indeed, a trivial answer to the first question is to take  $h = p$ . Stengle proved [23] that if  $p(x, y, z) = x^3 z^3 + (y^2 z - x^3 - z^2 x)^2$ , then  $p^{2s+1} \in \Delta_{3,6(2s+1)}$  for every integer  $s$ . That is,  $p^{2s-1} \cdot p$  is sos, but  $p^{2s} \cdot p$  is not. Choi and Lam showed [1] that for  $S \in \Delta_{3,6}$  (see (3) below), the product  $S(x, y, z)S(x, z, y)$  is actually sos.

The author gratefully acknowledges correspondence with Chip Delzell, Pablo Parrilo, Vicki Powers, Marie-Françoise Roy and Claus Scheiderer. Their suggestions have made this a better paper.

## 2. WHAT IS KNOWN ABOUT THE DENOMINATOR

The first concrete result about a denominator in Hilbert's 17th Problem was found by Pólya [16]. He showed that if  $f \in H_d(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is positive on the unit simplex  $\{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \mid x_j \geq 0, \sum x_j = 1\}$ , then for sufficiently large  $N$ ,  $(\sum_j x_j)^N f$  has positive coefficients. Replacing each  $x_j$  by  $x_j^2$ , we see that if  $p \in H_{2d}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is an even positive definite form, then  $(\sum_j x_j^2)^N p$  is a sum of even monomials with positive coefficients, and so, as it stands, is a sum of squares of monomials. Taking even  $N$ , we see that  $q = (\sum_j x_j^2)^{N/2}$  is a denominator for  $p$ . Habicht [6] generalized Pólya's

proof to give an alternate solution to Hilbert's 17th Problem for pd forms; however,  $h$  is not readily constructible and in general is no longer a power of  $\sum x_j^2$ . Except for one example, Pólya did not attempt to determine an explicit value of  $N$ . A good exposition of the theorems of Pólya and Habicht can be found in [7].

For positive definite  $p \in P_{n,m}$ , let

$$\epsilon(p) := \frac{\inf\{p(u) : u \in S^{n-1}\}}{\sup\{p(u) : u \in S^{n-1}\}}$$

measure how "close"  $p$  is to having a zero. The author [18] showed that if

$$N \geq \frac{nm(m-1)}{(4 \log 2)\epsilon(p)} - \frac{n+m}{2},$$

then  $(\sum_j x_j^2)^N p$  is a sum of  $(m+2N)$ -th powers of linear forms, and so is sos. A similar lower bound has been shown to apply in Pólya's case, one which goes to infinity as  $p$  approaches the boundary of  $P_{n,m}$ . (See papers by de Loera and Santos [12] and by Powers and the author [17].)

The restriction to positive definite forms is necessary. There exist psd forms  $p$  in  $n \geq 4$  variables so that, if  $h^2 p$  is sos, then  $h$  must have a specified zero. The existence of these unavoidable singularities, or so-called "bad points", insures that  $(\sum x_j^2)^r p$  can never be a sum of squares of forms for *any*  $r$ . Habicht's Theorem implies that no positive definite form can have a bad point. Bad points were first noted by Straus and have been extensively studied by Delzell; see, e.g. [4, 5].

### 3. RECENT RESULTS AND A NEW THEOREM

Scheiderer has shown in very recent work [22] that for  $p \in P_{3,m}$ , there exists  $N = N(p)$  so that  $(x^2 + y^2 + z^2)^N p(x, y, z)$  is sos; indeed,  $x^2 + y^2 + z^2$  can be replaced by any positive definite form. This is a strong refutation to the existence of bad points for ternary forms.

Also very recently, Lombardi and Roy [13] have constructed a quantitative version of the Positivstellensatz. A special case is that for fixed  $(n, m)$ , there exists  $d = d(n, m)$  so that if  $p \in P_{n,m}$ , there exists  $q \in H_d(\mathbb{R}^n)$  so that  $q^2 p$  is sos.

Suppose  $(n, m)$  is such that  $\Delta_{n,m} \neq \emptyset$ . Theorem 1 below states that there is no *single* form  $h$  so that, if  $p \in P_{n,m}$ , then  $hp$  is sos. Corollary 2 says that there is not even a *finite* set of forms  $\mathcal{H}$  so that, if  $p \in P_{n,m}$ , then there exists  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  so that  $hp$  is sos. In particular, there does not exist a finite set of denominators which apply to all of  $P_{n,m}$ . This result implies that  $N(p)$  in Scheiderer's theorem is not bounded as  $p$  ranges over  $P_{3,m}$ . It also implies that the denominators in the Lombardi-Roy theorem cannot be chosen from a finite, predetermined set.

The proof of the Theorem is elementary and relies on a few simple observations. If  $p \neq 0$  is psd and  $hp$  is sos, then  $h$  is psd. As previously noted,  $\Sigma_{n,m}$  is a closed cone for all  $(n, m)$ . This cone is invariant under the action of taking invertible linear changes of form. Thus, if  $h'$  is derived from  $h$  by such a linear change, and if  $hp$  is sos

for every  $p \in P_{n,m}$ , then so is  $h'p$ . Suppose  $\ell$  is a linear form,  $p = \sum_j g_k^2$  is sos, and  $\ell \mid p$ . Then  $\ell^2 \mid p$  and  $\ell \mid g_k$  for each  $k$ , and by induction,  $\ell^{2^s} \mid p \implies \ell^s \mid g_k$ . Thus, we can “peel off” squares of linear factors from any sos form; this is a common practice, dating back at least to [20, p. 267]. We use this observation in the contrapositive: if  $p \in \Delta_{n,m}$ , then  $\ell^{2^s}p \in \Delta_{n,m+2s}$ .

**Theorem 1.** *Suppose  $\Delta_{n,m} \neq \emptyset$ . Then there does not exist a non-zero form  $h$  so that if  $p \in P_{n,m}$ , then  $hp$  is sos.*

*Proof.* Suppose to the contrary that such a form  $h$  exists. Since  $h \neq 0$ , there exists a point  $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$  so that  $h(a) \neq 0$ . By making an invertible linear change of variables, we can take  $a = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$ . Thus, we may assume without loss of generality that  $h(x_1, 0, \dots, 0) = \alpha x_1^d$ , where  $\alpha > 0$  and  $d$  is even. In the sequel, we distinguish  $x_1$  from the other variables.

Choose  $p \in P_{n,m} \setminus \Sigma_{n,m}$ . Then

$$h(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)p(x_1, rx_2, \dots, rx_n)$$

is sos for every  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ . By making the change of variables  $x_i \rightarrow x_i/r$  for  $i \geq 2$ , we see that

$$h(x_1, r^{-1}x_2, \dots, r^{-1}x_n)p(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$$

is also sos. Since

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} h(x_1, r^{-1}x_2, \dots, r^{-1}x_n) = h(x_1, 0, \dots, 0) = \alpha x_1^d,$$

and since  $\Sigma_{n,m+d}$  is closed, it follows that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} h(x_1, r^{-1}x_2, \dots, r^{-1}x_n)p(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = \alpha x_1^d p(x_1, \dots, x_n)$$

is sos. Thus  $p$  is sos, a contradiction.  $\square$

The following elegant proof is due to Claus Scheiderer and is included with his permission; it supersedes the proof in an earlier version of this manuscript.

**Corollary 2.** *Suppose  $\Delta_{n,m} \neq \emptyset$ . Then there does not exist a finite set of non-zero forms  $\mathcal{H} = \{h_1, \dots, h_N\}$  with the property that, if  $p \in P_{n,m}$ , then  $h_k p$  is sos for some  $h_k \in \mathcal{H}$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $\mathcal{H}$  exists. For each  $k$ , there exists non-zero  $p \in \Delta_{n,m}$  so that  $h_k p$  is sos. (Otherwise, we may delete  $h_k$  harmlessly from  $\mathcal{H}$ .) Thus, each  $h_k$  is psd, and there exists a form  $q_k$  so that  $q_k^2 h_k$  is sos. Define  $h = \prod_k q_k^2 h_k$ . We now show that for every  $p \in P_{n,m}$ ,  $hp$  is sos: this contradicts the Theorem and proves the Corollary. By hypothesis, there exists  $h_j \in \mathcal{H}$  so that  $h_j p$  is sos. Thus,

$$hp = \left( \prod_{k \neq j} q_k^2 h_k \right) \cdot q_j^2 \cdot h_j p$$

is a product of sos factors, and so is sos.  $\square$

Finally, we know by Hilbert's theorem that for  $p \in P_{3,6}$ , there exists quadratic  $h$  so that  $hp \in \Sigma_{3,8}$ . The three simplest forms in  $\Delta_{3,6}$  are

$$(1) \quad M(x, y, z) = x^4y^2 + x^2y^4 + z^6 - 3x^2y^2z^2, \quad \text{due to Motzkin [14];}$$

Robinson's [20] simplification of Hilbert's construction

$$(2) \quad R(x, y, z) = x^6 + y^6 + z^6 - (x^4y^2 + x^2y^4 + x^4z^2 + x^2z^4 + y^4z^2 + y^2z^4) + 3x^2y^2z^2;$$

and

$$(3) \quad S(x, y, z) = x^4y^2 + y^4z^2 + z^4x^2 - 3x^2y^2z^2, \quad \text{due to Choi and Lam [1, 2].}$$

It is not too difficult to consider  $qM, qR, qS$  for  $q(x, y, z) = a^2x^2 + b^2y^2 + c^2z^2$ , and determine whether these are sos using the algorithm of [3] directly or its implementation in, e.g., [15].

Interestingly enough, these conditions are the same in each case: the forms are sos if and only if

$$2(a^2b^2 + a^2c^2 + b^2c^2) \geq a^4 + b^4 + c^4.$$

This expression factors rather neatly into:

$$(a + b + c)(a + b - c)(b + c - a)(c + a - b) \geq 0,$$

so if  $a \geq b \geq c \geq 0$  without loss of generality, the only non-trivial condition is that  $b + c \geq a$ ; that is, there is a (possibly degenerate) triangle with sides  $a, b, c$ . (Robinson [20, p. 273] has a superficially similar condition, but note that his multiplier is  $ax^2 + by^2 + cz^2$ .)

By specializing this result and scaling variables as in the proof of the theorem, we note that

$$(x^2 + y^2 + z^2)M(x, \lambda y, \lambda z), \quad (x^2 + y^2 + z^2)R(x, \lambda y, \lambda z), \quad (x^2 + y^2 + z^2)S(x, \lambda y, \lambda z)$$

are sos if and only if  $0 \leq \lambda \leq 2$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] Choi, M. D. and T. Y. Lam, *An old question of Hilbert*, Queen's Papers in Pure and Appl. Math. (Proceedings of Quadratic Forms Conference, Queen's University (G. Orzech ed.)), **46** (1976), 385–405.
- [2] Choi, M. D. and T. Y. Lam, *Extremal positive semidefinite forms*, Math. Ann., **231** (1977), 1–18.
- [3] Choi, M. D., T. Y. Lam and B. Reznick, *Sums of squares of real polynomials*, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., **58.2** (1995), 103–126.
- [4] Delzell, C. N., *Bad points for positive semidefinite polynomials*, Abstracts Amer. Math. Soc., **18** (1997), #926-12-174, 482.
- [5] Delzell, C. N., *Unavoidable singularities when writing polynomials as sums of squares of real rational functions*, in preparation.
- [6] Habicht, W., *Über die Zerlegung strikte definiten Formen in Quadrate*, Comment. Math. Helv., **12** (1940) 317–322.
- [7] Hardy, G. H., J. E. Littlewood and G. Pólya, *Inequalities*, Camb. U. Press, 2nd ed., 1967.

- [8] Hilbert, D., *Über die Darstellung definiter Formen als Summe von Formenquadraten*, Math. Ann. **32** (1888), 342–350; see Ges. Abh. 2, 154–161, Springer, Berlin, 1933, reprinted by Chelsea, New York, 1981.
- [9] Hilbert, D., *Über ternäre definite Formen*, Acta Math. **17** (1893) 169–197; see Ges. Abh. 2, 345–366, Springer, Berlin, 1933, reprinted by Chelsea, New York, 1981 .
- [10] de Klerk, E. and D. V. Pasechnik, *Products of positive forms, linear matrix inequalities, and Hilbert 17-th problem for ternary forms*, to appear in European J. of Oper. Res.
- [11] Landau, E., *Über die Darstellung definiter Funktionen durch Quadrate*, Math. Ann., **62** (1906), pp. 272–285; also in Collected Works, vol. 2, pp. 237–250, Thales-Verlag, Essen, 1986.
- [12] de Loera, J. A. and F. Santos, *An effective version of Pólya’s theorem on positive definite forms*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra, **108** (1996), 231–240. (See correction, same journal, **155** (2001), 309–310.)
- [13] Lombardi, H. and M.-F. Roy, *Elementary recursive degree bounds for Positivstellensatz*, in preparation.
- [14] Motzkin, T. S., *The arithmetic-geometric inequality*, pp. 205–224 in *Inequalities* (O. Shisha, ed.) Proc. of Sympos. at Wright-Patterson AFB, August 19–27, 1965 , Academic Press, New York, 1967; also in Theodore S. Motzkin: Selected Papers, Birkhäuser, Boston, (D. Cantor, B. Gordon and B. Rothschild, eds.).
- [15] Parrilo, P., *Structured semidefinite programs and semialgebraic methods in robustness and optimization*, Ph.D. thesis, Calif. Inst. of Tech., 2000.
- [16] Pólya, G., *Über positive Darstellung von Polynomen*, Vierteljschr. Naturforsch. Ges. Zürich, **73** (1928), 141–145; see Collected Papers, Vol. 2, pp. 309–313, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., London, 1974.
- [17] Powers, V. and B. Reznick, *A new bound for Pólya’s theorem with applications to polynomials positive on polyhedra*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **164** (2001), 221–229.
- [18] Reznick, B., *Uniform denominators in Hilbert’s Seventeenth Problem*, Math. Z., **220** (1995), 75–98.
- [19] Reznick, B., *Some concrete aspects of Hilbert’s 17th Problem*, Contemp. Math., **253** (2000), 251–272.
- [20] Robinson, R. M., *Some definite polynomials which are not sums of squares of real polynomials*, Izdat. “Nauka” Sibirsk. Otdel. Novosibirsk, (1973) pp. 264–282, (Selected questions of algebra and logic (a collection dedicated to the memory of A. I. Mal’cev), abstract in Notices AMS, **16** (1969), p. 554.
- [21] Rudin, W., *Sums of squares of polynomials*, Amer. Math. Monthly, **107** (2000), 813–821.
- [22] Scheiderer, C., *Sums of squares on compact real algebraic surfaces*, in preparation.
- [23] Stengle, G., *Integral solution of Hilbert’s seventeenth problem*, Math. Ann. **246** (1979/1980), 33–39.
- [24] Swan, R.G., *Hilbert’s theorem on positive ternary quartics*, Contemp. Math. **272** (2000), 287–292.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN, URBANA, IL 61801

*E-mail address:* reznick@math.uiuc.edu