

A REAL STABLE EXTENSION OF THE VÁMOS MATROID POLYNOMIAL

SAM BURTON, CYNTHIA VINZANT, AND YEWON YOUM

ABSTRACT. In 2004, Choe, Oxley, Sokal and Wagner established a tight connection between matroids and multiaffine real stable polynomials. Recently, Brändén used this theory and a polynomial coming from the Vámos matroid to disprove the generalized Lax conjecture. Here we present a 10-element extension of the Vámos matroid and prove that its basis generating polynomial is real stable (*i.e.* that the matroid has the half-plane property). We do this via large sums of squares computations and a criterion for real stability given by Wagner and Wei. Like the Vámos matroid, this matroid is not representable over any field and no power of its basis generating polynomial can be written as the determinant of a linear matrix with positive semidefinite Hermitian forms.

1. INTRODUCTION

In 2004, Choe, Oxley, Sokal and Wagner [3] showed that the support of any homogeneous multiaffine real stable polynomial is the set of bases of some matroid. One multiaffine stable polynomial that has been especially important in the connections between this theory and other fields has been the basis generating polynomial of the Vámos matroid V_8 , given by

$$(1) \quad f_8(x) = \sum_{B \in \binom{[8]}{4} \setminus H} \prod_{i \in B} x_i,$$

where $H = \{\{1, 2, 3, 4\}, \{1, 2, 5, 6\}, \{1, 2, 7, 8\}, \{3, 4, 5, 6\}, \{5, 6, 7, 8\}\}$. See Figure 1. Wagner and Wei [14] showed that this polynomial is real stable. Using the non-representability of the Vámos matroid, Brändén [2] showed that no power of f_8 can be written as the determinant of a linear matrix with positive semidefinite Hermitian forms, thus disproving the generalized Lax conjecture. Afterwards this polynomial f_8 has been used as test case for many conjectures concerning determinantal representability of real stable polynomials [6, 7, 9].

The aim of this paper is to introduce a family of matroids V_{2n} generalizing the Vámos matroid and show that the next member, V_{10} , of this family corresponds to a real stable polynomial. The proof uses similar techniques to [14] and relies on large sums of squares computations. Our main theorem can be stated as the following:




FIGURE 1. The rank-four Vámos matroids V_8 and V_{10} .

Theorem 1. *Let $\mathcal{B}$ consist of all subsets $B \subset \{1, \dots, 10\}$ of size $|B| = 4$ except for $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}, \{1, 2, 5, 6\}, \{1, 2, 7, 8\}, \{1, 2, 9, 10\}, \{3, 4, 5, 6\}, \{5, 6, 7, 8\}$, and $\{7, 8, 9, 10\}$. Then $\mathcal{B}$ is the collection of the bases of a matroid and its basis-generating polynomial*

$$f_{10}(x) = \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \prod_{i \in B} x_i \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_{10}]_4$$

is stable. That is, the rank-four matroid V_{10} with bases $\mathcal{B}$ has the half-plane property. Furthermore, like $f_8(x)$, no power of $f_{10}(x)$ has a definite determinantal representation.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we review the necessary definitions and background on matroids and real stable polynomials. We present a family of extensions V_{2n} of the Vámos matroid in Section 3, and in Section 4 we prove Theorem 1, namely that the basis generating polynomial of V_{10} is stable.

2. BACKGROUND

To begin, we go over some background material on matroid theory, multiaffine polynomials, and the relation between them.

2.1. Matroid Basics. Here we present some relevant definitions and concepts from the theory of matroids. For a more comprehensive take, we refer readers to [10].

Definition 2. A **matroid** $\mathbf{M}$ is an ordered pair $(E, \mathcal{I})$ consisting of a finite set E and a collection $\mathcal{I}$ of subsets of E having the following three properties:

- (1) $\emptyset \in \mathcal{I}$.
- (2) If $I \in \mathcal{I}$ and $I' \subseteq I$, then $I' \in \mathcal{I}$.
- (3) If I and I' are in $\mathcal{I}$ and $|I| < |I'|$, then there is an element e of $I' \setminus I$ such that $I \cup \{e\} \in \mathcal{I}$.

The members of $\mathcal{I}$ are the **independent sets** of M , and E is the **ground set** of M .

A maximal independent set in M is a **basis** of M . We denote the set of bases as $\mathcal{B}(M)$. All bases have the same size, which is called the **rank** of M and denoted $r(M)$. A matroid $(\{1, \dots, n\}, \mathcal{I})$ is **representable** over a field $\mathbb{F}$ if there exists vectors $v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathbb{F}^r$ so that the independent sets $\mathcal{I}$ are exactly those sets I for which the vectors $\{v_i : i \in I\}$ are independent. We say that two matroids $M = (E, \mathcal{I})$ and $M' = (E', \mathcal{I}')$ are **isomorphic** if there is a bijection $\pi : E \rightarrow E'$ for which $\mathcal{I}' = \{\pi(I) : I \in \mathcal{I}\}$.




FIGURE 2. The matroid of Example 3 and its deletion and contraction at $\{1\}$.

Let M be a matroid on E and $\mathcal{B}^*(M)$ be the collection $\{E \setminus B : B \in \mathcal{B}(M)\}$. Then $\mathcal{B}^*(M)$ is the set of bases of a matroid on E of rank $|E| - r(M)$, which we call the **dual** matroid of M and denote M^* . The **deletion** of $e \in E$ from matroid M is the matroid $M \setminus e$ on $E \setminus \{e\}$ with bases $\{B : B \in \mathcal{B} \text{ with } e \notin B\}$. The **contraction** of M by is given by $M/e = (M^* \setminus e)^*$.

We picture a rank- r matroid M as a collection of points in $(r - 1)$ -space and draw a hyperplane through collections of r elements that are dependent, *i.e.* not bases of M .

Example 3. Consider the rank-3 matroid $M(A)$ represented by the columns of the matrix

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} v_1 & v_2 & v_3 & v_4 & v_5 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Every size-three subset of $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ is a basis of $M = M(A)$ except for $\{1, 2, 4\}$ and $\{2, 3, 5\}$. Its deletion at $\{1\}$ is represented by the columns of the 3×4 matrix obtained by deleting the first column of A . The bases of $M \setminus 1$ are precisely those in $\mathcal{B}(M)$ that do not contain the element 1. That is, $\mathcal{B}(M \setminus 1) = \{\{2, 3, 4\}, \{2, 4, 5\}, \{3, 4, 5\}\}$. See Figure 2.

The bases of the contraction $M/1$ are the bases of M that contained the element 1 but with the 1 now removed. That is, $\mathcal{B}(M/1) = \{\{2, 3\}, \{2, 5\}, \{3, 4\}, \{3, 5\}, \{4, 5\}\}$. The matroid $M/1$ is represented by the columns of the 2×4 matrix obtained by deleting the first column v_1 of A and projecting the others onto $v_1^\perp$. This represents both $M \setminus 1$ and $M/1$:

$$M \setminus 1 \cong M \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad M/1 \cong M \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

◇

Another important example is the matroid represented by n *generic* vectors in $\mathbb{R}^r$.

Example 4. For any $r \leq n \in \mathbb{N}$, the **uniform matroid** of rank r on n elements, $U_{r,n}$, is the matroid on $\{1, \dots, n\}$ with independent sets $\mathcal{I} = \{I \subset E, |I| \leq r\}$. It indeed has rank r and its bases are the subsets of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ of size exactly r . Its deletion at any element e is isomorphic to $U_{r,n-1}$ and the contraction $U_{r,n}/e$ is isomorphic to $U_{r-1,n-1}$. ◇

2.2. Polynomials and real stability. To a matroid $M = (\{1, 2, \dots, n\}, \mathcal{I})$, we can associate its **basis generating polynomial**

$$f(M) = \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}(M)} \prod_{i \in B} x_i \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n].$$

This polynomial is homogeneous with degree equal to the rank of M . It is also **multiaffine**, meaning that every monomial is square free. The operations of deletion and contraction

correspond nicely to operations on the level of polynomials, namely restricting a variable to zero and taking a partial derivative. That is, for any $i \in M$.

$$f(M \setminus i) = (f(M))|_{x_i=0} \quad \text{and} \quad f(M/i) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} f(M).$$

We are particularly interested in when these polynomials are *stable*.

Definition 5. Let f be a real homogeneous polynomial in $\mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. We say that f is **stable** if for every choice of real vectors $v \in (\mathbb{R}_{>0})^n$ and $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the univariate polynomial $f(tv + w) \in \mathbb{R}[t]$ has only real roots. Equivalently, one can say that f has the **half-plane property** or that f is **strongly Rayleigh** [1].

We say that a matroid M has the **half-plane property** if the multiaffine polynomial $f(M)$ does. So a matroid M has the half-plane property if and only if $f(M)$ is stable.

Choe, Oxley, Sokal, and Wagner [3] show that if $f \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is homogeneous, multi-affine, and stable, then its *support* (the collection of $I \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$ for which the monomial $\prod_{i \in I} x_i$ appears in f) is the set of bases of a matroid. One important example of this phenomenon comes from representable matroids.

Example 6. Given positive semidefinite matrices $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{d \times d}$, the polynomial $f(x) = \det(x_1 A_1 + \dots + x_n A_n)$ is real stable (if it is not identically zero). To see this, let $A(x)$ denote $\sum_i x_i A_i$. For any $v \in (\mathbb{R}_{>0})^n$ and $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the matrix $A(v)$ will be positive definite and we can write $A(v) = UU^T$ for some real matrix U . Then

$$f(tv + w) = \det(tA(v) + A(w)) = \det(U)^2 \det(tI + U^{-1}A(w)U^{-T}).$$

For any $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the real symmetric matrix $U^{-1}A(w)U^{-T}$ has all real eigenvalues and thus all the roots of the polynomial $f(tv + w)$ are real. Furthermore, if the matrices A_i have rank-one, that is $A_i = v_i v_i^T$ for some vectors $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then $\det(\sum_i x_i A_i)$ can be written as

$$\det\left(\sum_i x_i v_i v_i^T\right) = \sum_{I \in \binom{[n]}{d}} \det(v_i : i \in I)^2 \prod_{i \in I} x_i.$$

This polynomial is multiaffine and its support will be the bases of the matroid represented by the the vectors $v_1, \dots, v_n$. $\diamond$

One can also obtain real stable polynomials by taking directional derivatives. For a homogeneous, stable polynomial $f \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and any $\lambda \in (\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})^n$, the polynomial $\sum_i \lambda_i \partial f / \partial x_i$ is stable as well [3, Prop. 2.8].

Example 7. For $r \leq n$, let $e_{r,n}(x)$ be the r th elementary symmetric function $\sum_{I \in \binom{[n]}{r}} \prod_{i \in I} x_i$. Clearly $e_{n,n}(x) = x_1 \cdots x_n$ is stable. This implies that $e_{r,n}(x) = (n-r) \sum_{i=1}^n \partial e_{r+1,n} / \partial x_i$ is stable for all r . Thus the uniform matroid $U_{r,n}$, whose basis generating polynomial is $e_{r,n}$, has the half-plane property. $\diamond$

In general, showing the real stability of a polynomial is difficult and not all stable polynomials come from determinants or derivatives. Similarly, the relationship between representability of a matroid and half-plane property is not very well understood. The Vámos matroid V_8 has the half-plane property but is not representable over any field. Moreover, not every matroid is the support of a real stable polynomial [1, Theorem 6.6]. For a large database of matroids and their status, see [4, Table 2.1].

In [1], Brändén gives a criterion for the real stability of multiaffine polynomials (and hence the half-plane property of matroid) using its Rayleigh differences. The **Rayleigh difference** of a polynomial f at $i, j \in [n]$ is

$$(2) \quad \Delta_{i,j}f = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} \cdot \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j} - f \cdot \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}.$$

An extension of Brändén's work is following characterization of stability in terms of Rayleigh differences, which appears as Theorem 3.1 of [13].

Theorem 8. *Let $f \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be a multiaffine polynomial with positive coefficients. The following are equivalent.*

- (1) f is stable.
- (2) For all $\{i, j\} \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$ and for all $a \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$, $\Delta_{i,j}f(a) \geq 0$.
- (3) Either $n = 1$ or there exist some pair of indices $\{i, j\} \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $f|_{x_i=0}$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}f$, $f|_{x_j=0}$, and $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}f$ are stable and for all $a \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$, $\Delta_{i,j}f(a) \geq 0$.

In the proof of Theorem 1, we will use the equivalence of (1) and (3) to build up a collection of stable polynomials, culminating in our desired polynomial f_{10} .

3. EXTENDED VÁMOS MATROIDS

The Vámos matroid V_8 is the rank-four matroid on eight elements whose bases consist of all 4-element subsets of $\{1, \dots, 8\}$ except for $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, $\{1, 2, 5, 6\}$, $\{1, 2, 7, 8\}$, $\{3, 4, 5, 6\}$, and $\{5, 6, 7, 8\}$. This matroid is not representable over any field [10, Example 2.1.25]. Wagner and Wei [14] showed that V_8 has the half-plane property, meaning that f_8 , its basis generating polynomial (1), is real stable. In 2011, Brändén [2] showed that no power of f_8 has a *definite determinantal representation*. That is, for every $k \geq 0$, the polynomial $(f_8)^k$ cannot be written as $\det(x_1 A_1 + \dots + x_8 A_8)$ with positive semidefinite matrices $A_1, \dots, A_8$. This was the first such example and disproved a conjecture of Helton and Vinnikov [5].

In order to show the real stability of f_8 , Wagner and Wei use Theorem 8 and write the Rayleigh difference $\Delta_{1,3}(f_8)$ as a sum of squares [14]. On the other hand, the Rayleigh difference $\Delta_{7,8}(f_8)$ is nonnegative but not a sum of squares. This can be used to verify that no power of f_8 has a definite determinantal representation [7, Ex 5.11].

Interestingly, there is evidence [6] that the polynomial f_8 does not provide a counterexample for a weaker generalization of the Lax conjecture. To investigate such conjectures further, it would be useful to have more real stable polynomials for which no power has a definite determinantal representation. We propose the following family of matroid polynomials.

Definition 9. For $n \geq 4$, let $\mathcal{H}_{2n}$ denote the collection of subsets of $\{1, \dots, 2n\}$ of the form

$$\{1, 2, 2k-1, 2k\} \text{ or } \{2k-1, 2k, 2k+1, 2k+2\} \text{ for } 2 \leq k \leq n.$$

We define the **$2n$ -Vámos matroid**, denoted V_{2n} , to be the rank-four matroid whose bases are all subsets $B \subset \{1, \dots, 2n\}$ with $|B| = 4$ except for $B \in \mathcal{H}_{2n}$. See Figure 1. We call its basis generating polynomial $f_{2n} = f(V_{2n})$.

Proposition 10. *The $2n$ -Vámos matroid defined above is indeed a matroid.*

Proof. We need a little more matroid notation. A **hyperplane** of a matroid $M = (E, \mathcal{I})$ is a subset $H \subset E$ of rank $r(M) - 1$ such that for any $i \in E \setminus H$, the rank of $E \cup \{i\}$ equals $r(M)$. An **m -partition** on the set E is a collection of subsets $\mathcal{T} = \{T_1, \dots, T_k\}$ such that

each member of $\mathcal{T}$ has at least m elements and each m element subset of E is contained in a unique T_i . Proposition 2.1.24 of [10] states that any m -partition of a set E is the collection of hyperplanes of a rank- $(m + 1)$ matroid on E .

Consider the union of $\mathcal{H}_{2n}$ and the collection of subsets $I \subset [n]$ of size three that are not contained in any element of $\mathcal{H}_{2n}$. This union forms a 3-partition of $[n]$ and thus it is the collection of hyperplanes of a rank-4 matroid. This matroid is exactly V_{2n} . $\square$

Every $2n$ -Vámos matroid has a minor isomorphic to V_8 , so for $n \geq 4$, V_{2n} is non-representable over any field. Similarly, for $n \geq 4$ the polynomials f_{2n} all have restrictions equal to f_8 , and so no power of f_{2n} has a definite determinantal representation. We hope that $\{f_{2n}\}$ gives a family of real stable polynomials with this property.

Conjecture 11. *For every $n \geq 4$, the matroid V_{2n} has the half-plane property.*

This holds for $n = 4$ (above) and $n = 5$ (Section 4). Numerical evidence suggests that V_{12} also has the half-plane property but larger computations become intractable. One promising approach is to use more refined sums of squares techniques, e.g. [11, Ex.7.5.2].

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

As discussed in Section 3, V_{2n} defines a matroid and no power of its basis generating polynomial f_{2n} has a definite determinantal representation. The remaining content of Theorem 1 is that the polynomial f_{10} is stable, or equivalently, the matroid V_{10} has the half-plane property, which we show in Lemma 5 below. To prove this we rely heavily on Theorem 8 and inductively show that certain derivatives and restrictions are stable. Recall that for a matroid M and its basis generating polynomial $f(M)$, derivation corresponds to matroid contraction ($\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} f(M) = f(M/i)$) and restriction corresponds to matroid deletion ($f(M)|_{x_i=0} = f(M \setminus i)$). We will show that certain deletions and contractions of V_{10} have the half-plane property.

We build off of known results for smaller matroids. Choe *et. al.* show that the following matroids have the half-plane property:

- any matroid of rank 2 [3, Corollary 5.5],
- any uniform matroid $U_{r,n}$, as in Example 7 or [3, Section 9],
- the 7-element matroids F_7^{-5} , F_7^{-6} , and its dual $(F_7^{-6})^*$ [3, A.2.2]. See Figure 3.




FIGURE 3. Some 7-element matroids with the half-plane property.

The other main component of the proof is using Theorem 8 and showing that certain Rayleigh differences (2) are nonnegative. In order to do this we write them as sums of squares. In particular, we find positive semidefinite *Gram* matrices for these polynomials.

For a polynomial $f \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, a **p.s.d. Gram representation** of f is a pair (m, G) of a vector m of monomials in $x_1, \dots, x_n$ and a real symmetric positive semidefinite matrix G for which $f = m^T G m$.

A p.s.d. Gram representation of f corresponds to a representation of f as a *sum of squares* and in particular implies that f is nonnegative on $\mathbb{R}^n$. To see this, note that we can factor the p.s.d. matrix as a sum of real rank-one matrices $G = \sum_i g_i g_i^T$. This writes f as a sum of the squares of the polynomials $g_i^T m$:

$$f = m^T G m = \sum_i m^T g_i g_i^T m = \sum_i (g_i^T m)^2.$$

After fixing the monomials m , the search for a positive semidefinite Gram matrix G is a *semidefinite program* and can be carried out numerically in **Matlab**. In order to find the p.s.d. Gram matrices in the appendix, we used the sums-of-squares optimization package **SOSTOOLS** [12] in **YALMIP** [8] and did some ad hoc rationalization in **Mathematica**. We verified that all of the resulting rational matrices are positive semidefinite by calculating (in exact arithmetic) their diagonal minors. These computations are available at <http://www-personal.umich.edu/~vinzant/SosVamosRayleighDifferences.nb>.

By finding p.s.d. Gram representations of various Rayleigh differences, we build up a collection of matroids with the half-plane property, ending with V_{10} . See Figure 4.




FIGURE 4. Some deletions and contractions of V_{10} with the half-plane property.

Lemma 1. *The matroid $V_{10} \setminus \{5, 7\}$ has the half-plane property.*

Proof. The contraction of $V_{10} \setminus \{5, 7\}$ by $\{1\}$ is isomorphic to the matroid F_7^{-5} and its contraction by $\{3\}$ is isomorphic to the matroid F_7^{-6} , both of which have the half-plane property. On the other hand, the deletion of $V_{10} \setminus \{5, 7\}$ at $\{1\}$ is isomorphic to the uniform matroid $U_{4,7}$ and the deletion of $V_{10} \setminus \{5, 7\}$ at $\{3\}$ is isomorphic to the matroid $(F_7^{-6})^*$, which also have the half-plane property. In the appendix, we give a p.s.d. Gram representation (m_1, G_1) of the Rayleigh difference $\Delta_{1,3}f(V_{10} \setminus \{5, 7\})$, showing it to be nonnegative on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Hence, by Theorem 8, $f(V_{10} \setminus \{5, 7\}) = f_{10}|_{x_5=x_7=0}$ is stable. $\square$

Lemma 2. *The matroid $V_{10}/5 \setminus 7$ has the half-plane property.*

Proof. All one-point contractions of $V_{10}/5 \setminus 7$ have rank 2 and therefore the half-plane property. The deletion of $V_{10}/5 \setminus 7$ at $\{1\}$ is isomorphic to F_7^{-6} and its deletion at $\{6\}$ is isomorphic to the uniform matroid $U_{3,7}$, both of which have the half-plane property. In the appendix, we give a p.s.d. Gram representation (m_2, G_2) of $\Delta_{1,6}f(V_{10}/5 \setminus 7)$, showing it to be nonnegative on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Thus by Theorem 8, $f(V_{10}/5 \setminus 7) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_5} f_{10}|_{x_7=0}$ is stable. $\square$

Lemma 3. *The matroid $V_{10}/5$ ($\cong V_{10}/7$) has the half-plane property.*

Proof. All one-point contractions of $V_{10}/5$ have rank 2 and so have the half-plane property. The one point deletion $V_{10}/5 \setminus 1$ is isomorphic to the matroid $V_{10}/5 \setminus 7$, and both have the half-plane property by Lemma 2. We write a p.s.d. Gram representation (m_3, G_3) of the Rayleigh difference $\Delta_{1,7}f(V_{10}/5)$ in the appendix, which proves it to be nonnegative. Using Theorem 8 with $i = 1, j = 7$, we see that $f(V_{10}/5) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_5} f_{10}$ is stable. $\square$

Lemma 4. *The matroid $V_{10} \setminus 5$ ($\cong V_{10} \setminus 7$) has the half-plane property.*

Proof. The one-point contraction $V_{10} \setminus 5/9$ is isomorphic to $V_{10} \setminus 5/7$, and both the half-plane property by Lemma 2. The one point deletion $V_{10} \setminus \{5, 9\}$ is isomorphic to $V_{10} \setminus \{5, 7\}$, and both have the half-plane property by Lemma 1. The Rayleigh difference $\Delta_{7,9}f(V_{10} \setminus 5)$ has a p.s.d. Gram representation (m_4, G_4) in the appendix, which shows it to be nonnegative. Using Theorem 8 with $i = 7, j = 9$, we see that $f(V_{10} \setminus 5) = f_{10}|_{x_5=0}$ is stable and $V_{10} \setminus 5$ has the half-plane property. $\square$

Lemma 5. *The matroid V_{10} has the half-plane property.*

Proof. The one-point contractions of V_{10} at 5 and 7 have the half-plane property by Lemma 3. The one point deletions $V_{10} \setminus 5$ and $V_{10} \setminus 7$ have the half-plane property by Lemma 4. Moreover, the pair (m_5, G_5) in the appendix is a p.s.d. Gram factorization of the Rayleigh difference $\Delta_{5,7}f_{V_{10}}$. Thus $\Delta_{5,7}f_{V_{10}}$ is a sum of squares and certifiably nonnegative. Again using Theorem 8 with $i = 5, j = 7$, we see that f_{10} is stable. $\square$

This concludes the proof of Theorem 1. The representations below are not unique and there may be other Gram representations that are more conducive to generalization. It would be interesting to find a family of p.s.d. Gram representations for Rayleigh differences that could be used to prove Conjecture 11.

Acknowledgements. We would like to thank David Speyer and Frank Permenter for helpful discussions. This paper started as a summer project for the University of Michigan REU Program, which supported Sam Burton and Yewon Youm. Cynthia Vinzant was supported by an NSF postdoc DMS-1204447.

REFERENCES

- [1] Petter Brändén. Polynomials with the half-plane property and matroid theory. *Adv. Math.*, 216(1):302–320, 2007.
- [2] Petter Brändén. Obstructions to determinantal representability. *Adv. Math.*, 226(2):1202–1212, 2011.
- [3] Young-Bin Choe, James G. Oxley, Alan D. Sokal, and David G. Wagner. Homogeneous multivariate polynomials with the half-plane property. *Adv. in Appl. Math.*, 32(1-2):88–187, 2004. Special issue on the Tutte polynomial.
- [4] Rafael S. González D’León. Representing matroids by polynomials with the half-plane property. Master’s thesis, Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden, 2009. Available online: http://www.math.miami.edu/~dleon/personal/rafaeldleon-master_thesis.pdf.
- [5] J. William Helton and Victor Vinnikov. Linear matrix inequality representation of sets. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 60(5):654–674, 2007.
- [6] Mario Kummer. A note on the hyperbolicity cone of the specialized Vámos polynomial. *arXiv:1306.4483*, 2013.
- [7] Mario Kummer, Daniel Plaumann, and Cynthia Vinzant. Hyperbolicity, interlacing, and sums of squares. *arXiv:1212.6696*, 2012.
- [8] Johan Löfberg. Pre- and post-processing sum-of-squares programs in practice. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 54(5):1007–1011, 2009.
- [9] Tim Netzer, Daniel Plaumann, and Andreas Thom. Determinantal representations and the Hermite matrix. *Michigan Math. J.*, 62(2):407–420, 2013.
- [10] James Oxley. *Matroid theory*, volume 21 of *Oxford Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, second edition, 2011.
- [11] Frank Permenter and Pablo Parrilo. Partial facial reduction: simplified, equivalent SDPs via approximations of the PSD cone. *arXiv:1408.4685*, 2014.
- [12] Stephen Prajna, Antonis Papachristodoulou, Peter Seiler, and Pablo A. Parrilo. SOSTOOLS and its control applications. In *Positive polynomials in control*, volume 312 of *Lecture Notes in Control and Inform. Sci.*, pages 273–292. Springer, Berlin, 2005.
- [13] David G. Wagner. Multivariate stable polynomials: theory and applications. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 48(1):53–84, 2011.
- [14] David G. Wagner and Yehua Wei. A criterion for the half-plane property. *Discrete Math.*, 309(6):1385–1390, 2009.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, ANN ARBOR, USA
E-mail address: sburto@umich.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, ANN ARBOR, USA
E-mail address: vinzant@umich.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, ANN ARBOR, USA
E-mail address: yyoun@umich.edu

A p.s.d. Gram representation of $\Delta_{1,7}(f(V_{10}/5) = \Delta_{1,7}(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_5} f_{10})$ is m_3, G_3 :

[illegible]

A p.s.d. Gram representation of $\Delta_{7,9}(f(V_{10} \setminus 5) = \Delta_{7,9}(f_{10}|_{x_5=0})$ is m_4, G_4 :

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_6x_8x_{10}, & x_4x_8x_{10}, & x_4x_6x_{10}, & x_4x_6x_8, & x_2x_8x_{10}, & x_2x_6x_{10}, & x_2x_6x_8, & x_2x_4x_{10}, & x_2x_4x_8 \\ x_2x_4x_6, & x_3x_8x_{10}, & x_3x_6x_{10}, & x_3x_6x_8, & x_3x_4x_{10}, & x_3x_4x_8, & x_3x_4x_6, & x_2x_3x_{10}, & x_2x_3x_8 \\ x_2x_3x_6, & x_2x_3x_4, & x_1x_8x_{10}, & x_1x_6x_{10}, & x_1x_6x_8, & x_1x_4x_{10}, & x_1x_4x_8, & x_1x_4x_6, & x_1x_2x_6 \\ x_1x_2x_4, & x_1x_3x_{10}, & x_1x_3x_8, & x_1x_3x_6, & x_1x_3x_4, & x_1x_2x_3 \end{pmatrix}^T$$

[illegible]

A p.s.d. Gram representation of $\Delta_{5,7}(f(V_{10}))$ is m_5, G_5 :

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_6x_8x_{10}, & x_4x_6x_8, & x_2x_6x_8, & x_6x_8x_9, & x_3x_6x_8, & x_1x_6x_8, & x_2x_4x_6, & x_1x_3x_6, & x_2x_3x_6, \\ x_1x_4x_6, & x_2x_8x_{10}, & x_1x_8x_9, & x_2x_8x_9, & x_1x_8x_{10}, & x_6x_9x_{10}, & x_3x_4x_8, & x_3x_8x_9, & x_4x_8x_{10}, \\ x_4x_8x_9, & x_3x_8x_{10}, & x_1x_4x_8, & x_2x_4x_8, & x_2x_3x_8, & x_1x_3x_8, & x_4x_6x_{10}, & x_3x_6x_{10}, & x_4x_6x_9, \\ x_3x_6x_9, & x_2x_6x_9, & x_1x_6x_9, & x_1x_6x_{10}, & x_2x_6x_{10}, & x_2x_4x_{10}, & x_2x_3x_9, & x_2x_4x_9, & x_2x_3x_{10}, \\ x_1x_4x_{10}, & x_1x_3x_9, & x_1x_4x_9, & x_1x_3x_{10}, & x_2x_9x_{10}, & x_1x_2x_{10}, & x_1x_9x_{10}, & x_1x_2x_9, & x_2x_3x_4, \\ x_1x_2x_4, & x_1x_3x_4, & x_1x_2x_3, & x_4x_9x_{10}, & x_3x_9x_{10}, & x_3x_4x_{10}, & x_3x_4x_9 \end{pmatrix}^T$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} A_5 & B_5^T \\ B_5 & C_5 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{where}$$

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]