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Abstract. Given two \((n+1) \times (n+1)\)-matrices \(A\) and \(B\) over a commutative ring, and some \(k \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n\}\), we consider the \(\binom{n}{k} \times \binom{n}{k}\)-matrix \(W\) whose entries are \((k+1) \times (k+1)\)-minors of \(A\) multiplied by corresponding \((k+1) \times (k+1)\)-minors of \(B\). Here we require the minors to use the last row and the last column (which is why we obtain an \(\binom{n}{k} \times \binom{n}{k}\)-matrix, not a \(\binom{n+1}{k+1} \times \binom{n+1}{k+1}\)-matrix). We prove that the determinant \(\det W\) is a multiple of \(\det A\) if the \((n+1, n+1)\)-th entry of \(B\) is 0. Furthermore, if the \((n+1, n+1)\)-th entries of both \(A\) and \(B\) are 0, then \(\det W\) is a multiple of \((\det A)(\det B)\). This extends a previous result of Olver and the author.
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1. Introduction

Let \(n\) and \(k\) be nonnegative integers, and let \(A = (a_{i,j})_{1 \leq i \leq n+1, 1 \leq j \leq n+1}\) be an \((n+1) \times (n+1)\)-matrix over some commutative ring. Let \(P_k\) be the set of all \(k\)-
element subsets of \{1,2,\ldots,n\}. For any such subset \(K \in P_k\), let \(K^+\) denote the subset \(K \cup \{n+1\}\) of \{1,2,\ldots,n+1\}. If \(U\) and \(V\) are two subsets of \{1,2,\ldots,n+1\}, then \(\text{sub}_{I^+}^V\) \(A\) shall denote the \(|U| \times |V|\)-submatrix of \(A\) containing only the entries \(a_{u,v}\) with \(u \in U\) and \(v \in V\). Let \(W_A\) be the \(P_k \times P_k\)-matrix whose \((I,J)\)-th entry (for all \(I \in P_k\) and \(J \in P_k\)) is

\[\det \left( \text{sub}_{I^+}^J A \right)\]

(Thus, the entries of \(W_A\) are all \((k+1) \times (k+1)\)-minors of \(A\) that use the last row and the last column.) A particular case of a celebrated result going back to Sylvester [Sylves51] (see [Prasol94, §2.7] or [Prasol15, Teorema 2.9.1] or [Mohr53] for modern proofs) then says that

\[\det (W_A) = a_{n+1,n+1}^p \cdot (\det A)^q, \quad \text{where } p = \binom{n-1}{k} \text{ and } q = \binom{n-1}{k-1}.\]

Now, consider a second \((n+1) \times (n+1)\)-matrix \(B = (b_{i,j})_{1 \leq i \leq n+1, 1 \leq j \leq n+1}\) over the same ring. Let \(W_{A,B}\) (later to be just called \(W\)) be the \(P_k \times P_k\)-matrix whose \((I,J)\)-th entry (for all \(I \in P_k\) and \(J \in P_k\)) is

\[\det \left( \text{sub}_{I^+}^J A \right) \cdot \det \left( \text{sub}_{I^+}^J B \right)\]

What can be said about \(\det (W_{A,B})\)? In general, very little\(^2\). However, under some assumptions, it splits off factors. Namely, we shall show (Theorem 2.1) that \(\det (W_{A,B})\) is a multiple of \(\det A\) if \(b_{n+1,n+1} = 0\). We shall then conclude (Theorem 2.2) that if both \(a_{n+1,n+1}\) and \(b_{n+1,n+1}\) are 0, then \(\det (W_{A,B})\) is a multiple of \((\det A)(\det B)\). In either case, the quotient (usually a much more complicated polynomial\(^3\)) remains mysterious; our proofs are indirect and reveal little about it. Our second result generalizes a curious property of \(\binom{n}{2} \times \binom{n}{2}\)-determinants [GriOlv18, Theorem 10] that arose from the study of the n-body problem (see Example 2.4 for details).
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1 This means a matrix whose rows and columns are indexed by the \(k\)-element subsets of \{1,2,\ldots,n\}. If you pick a total order on the set \(P_k\), then you can view such a matrix as an \(\binom{n}{k} \times \binom{n}{k}\)-matrix.

2 For example, if \(n = 3\) and \(k = 2\), then \(\det (W_{A,B})\) is an irreducible polynomial in the (altogether \(2(n+1)^2 = 32\)) variables \(a_{ij}\) and \(b_{ij}\) with 110268 monomials.

3 again irreducible in the case when \(n = 3\) and \(k = 2\)
2. The theorems

Let us first introduce the standing notations.

Let $\mathbb{K}$ be a commutative ring. If $a$ and $b$ are two elements of $\mathbb{K}$, then we write $a \mid b$ when $b$ is a multiple of $a$ (that is, $b \in \mathbb{K}a$).

If $m \in \mathbb{N}$, then $[m]$ shall mean the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$.

Fix an $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If $K$ is any subset of $[n]$, then $K^+ := \{ n+1 \}$ of $[n+1]$.

Fix $k \in \{0,1,\ldots,n\}$. Let $P_k$ be the set of all $k$-element subsets of $[n]$. This is a finite set; thus, any $P_k \times P_k$-matrix (i.e., any matrix whose rows and columns are indexed by $k$-element subsets of $[n]$) has a well-defined determinant. Such matrices appear frequently in classical determinant theory (see, e.g., the “$k$-th compound determinants” in [MuM60] and in [Prasol94, §2.6], as well as the related “Generalized Sylvester’s identity” in [Prasol94 §2.7] and [Prasol15 Teorema 2.9.1] and [Mohr53]).

If $A \in \mathbb{K}^{u \times v}$ is a $u \times v$-matrix, and if $I \subseteq [u]$ and $J \subseteq [v]$, then $\text{sub}_I^J A$ shall mean the submatrix of $A$ obtained by removing all rows whose indices are not in $I$ and removing all columns whose indices are not in $J$. (Rigorously speaking, if $A = (a_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq u, 1 \leq j \leq v}$ and $I = \{ i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_p \}$ and $J = \{ j_1 < j_2 < \cdots < j_q \}$, then $\text{sub}_I^J A = (a_{i_x j_y})_{1 \leq x \leq p, 1 \leq y \leq q}$.) When $|I| = |J|$, then the submatrix $\text{sub}_I^J A$ is square; its determinant $\text{det} \left( \text{sub}_I^J A \right)$ is called a minor of $A$.

Our main two results are the following:

**Theorem 2.1.** Let $A = (a_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq n+1, 1 \leq j \leq n+1} \in \mathbb{K}^{(n+1) \times (n+1)}$ and $B = (b_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq n+1, 1 \leq j \leq n+1} \in \mathbb{K}^{(n+1) \times (n+1)}$ be such that $b_{n+1,n+1} = 0$. Let $W$ be the $P_k \times P_k$-matrix whose $(I,J)$-th entry (for all $I \in P_k$ and $J \in P_k$) is

$$\text{det} \left( \text{sub}_I^J A \right) \text{det} \left( \text{sub}_I^J B \right).$$

Then, $A \mid \text{det} W$.

**Theorem 2.2.** Let $A = (a_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq n+1, 1 \leq j \leq n+1} \in \mathbb{K}^{(n+1) \times (n+1)}$ and $B = (b_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq n+1, 1 \leq j \leq n+1} \in \mathbb{K}^{(n+1) \times (n+1)}$ be such that $a_{n+1,n+1} = 0$ and $b_{n+1,n+1} = 0$. Define the $P_k \times P_k$-matrix $W$ as in Theorem 2.1. Then, $(\text{det} A) (\text{det} B) \mid \text{det} W$.

**Example 2.3.** For this example, set $k = 1$. Then, $P_k = P_1 = \{\{1\}, \{2\}, \ldots, \{n\}\}$.

Thus, the map

$$[n] \to P_k, \quad i \mapsto \{i\}$$

4Here, we are using the concepts of $P \times P$-matrices (where $P$ is a finite set) and their determinants. Both of these concepts are folklore; a brief introduction can be found in [Grinbe18 §1].
is a bijection. Use this bijection to identify the elements $1, 2, \ldots, n$ of $[n]$ with the elements \{1\}, \{2\}, \ldots, \{n\} of $P_k$. Thus, the $P_k \times P_k$-matrix $W$ in Theorem 2.1 becomes the $n \times n$-matrix

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\det \left( \text{sub}_{\{i\}+}^{\{j\}+} A \right) & \det \left( \text{sub}_{\{i\}+}^{\{j\}+} B \right) \\
= a_{ij}a_{n+1,n+1} - a_{i,n+1}a_{n+1,j} & = b_{ij}b_{n+1,n+1} - b_{i,n+1}b_{n+1,j} \\
\end{pmatrix}
\]

for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, $1 \leq j \leq n$.

This is the matrix obtained from $(a_{ij}a_{n+1,n+1} - a_{i,n+1}a_{n+1,j})_{1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq n}$ by multiplying the $i$-th row with $-b_{i,n+1}$ for all $i \in [n]$ and multiplying the $j$-th column with $b_{n+1,j}$ for all $j \in [n]$. Thus, the claim of Theorem 2.1 follows from the classical fact that

\[
det \left( (a_{ij}a_{n+1,n+1} - a_{i,n+1}a_{n+1,j})_{1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq n} \right) = a_{n+1,n+1}^{n-1} \cdot \det A.
\]

This fact is known as Chio pivotal condensation (see, e.g., [KarZha16, Theorem 0.1]), and is a particular case of Sylvester’s identity ([Praso94 §2.7]).

**Example 2.4.** For this example, set $k = 2$, and consider the situation of Theorem 2.1 again. Then, $P_k = P_2 = \{\{i,j\} \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq n\}$. If $\{i,j\} \in P_2$ and $\{k,l\} \in P_2$ satisfy $i < j$ and $k < l$, then the ($\{i,j\}, \{k,l\}$)-th entry of $W$ is

\[
\det \begin{pmatrix}
a_{ij} & a_{i,j+1} \\
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a_{ij} & a_{ij} & a_{i,j+1} \\
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} b_{ij} & b_{ij} & b_{i,j+1} \\
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} b_{ij} & b_{ij} & b_{i,j+1} \\
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

If we furthermore assume that

\[
a_{n+1,n+1} = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad a_{n+1,j} = a_{i,n+1} = 1 \quad \text{for all } i \in [n], \quad \text{and} \quad b_{n+1,j} = b_{i,n+1} = 1 \quad \text{for all } i \in [n],
\]

then the claim of Theorem 2.1 follows from the classical fact that

\[
det \left( (a_{ij}a_{n+1,n+1} - a_{i,n+1}a_{n+1,j})_{1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq n} \right) = a_{n+1,n+1}^{n-1} \cdot \det A.
\]
then this entry rewrites as

\[
\begin{vmatrix}
  a_{i,k} & a_{i,l} & 1 \\
  a_{j,k} & a_{j,l} & 1 \\
  1 & 1 & 0
\end{vmatrix}
\begin{vmatrix}
  b_{i,k} & b_{i,l} & 1 \\
  b_{j,k} & b_{j,l} & 1 \\
  1 & 1 & 0
\end{vmatrix}
\]

\[= a_{i,k} + a_{i,l} - a_{j,k} - a_{j,l} = b_{i,k} + b_{i,l} - b_{j,k} - b_{j,l}, \]

\[= (a_{i,k} + a_{i,l} - a_{j,k} - a_{j,l}) (b_{j,k} + b_{j,l} - b_{i,k} - b_{i,l}). \]

Hence, [GriOlv18, Theorem 10] can be obtained from Theorem 2.2 by setting \( k = 2 \) and \( A = C_S \) and \( B = C_T \) (and observing that the matrix \( W \) then equals to \( W_{S,T} \)).

3. The proofs

Our proofs of Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.2 will rely on some basic commutative algebra: the notion of a unique factorization domain ("UFD"); the concepts of coprime, prime and irreducible elements; the localization of a commutative ring at a multiplicative subset. This all appears in most textbooks on abstract algebra; for example, [Knapp16, Sections VIII.4 and VIII.10] is a good reference.

The content of a polynomial \( p \) over a UFD is defined to be the greatest common divisor of the coefficients of \( p \). For example, the polynomial \( 4x^2 + 6y^2 \in \mathbb{Z}[x, y] \) has content \( \gcd(4, 6) = 2 \). (Of course, in a general UFD, the greatest common divisor is defined only up to multiplication by a unit.) The following known facts are crucial to us:

**Proposition 3.1.** A polynomial ring over \( \mathbb{Z} \) in finitely many indeterminates is always a UFD.

*Proof of Proposition 3.1.* Proposition 3.1 appears, e.g., in [Knapp16, Remark after Corollary 8.21]. For a constructive proof of Proposition 3.1 we refer to [MiRiRu87, Chapter IV, Theorems 4.8 and 4.9] or to [Edward05, Essay 1.4, Corollary of Theorem 1 and Corollary 1 of Theorem 2].

**Proposition 3.2.** Let \( p \) be an irreducible element of a UFD \( \mathbb{K} \). Then, the quotient ring \( \mathbb{K}/(p) \) is an integral domain.

*Proof of Proposition 3.2.* First of all, we recall that any irreducible element of a UFD is prime (indeed, this follows from [Knapp16, Proposition 8.13]). Thus, the element \( p \) of \( \mathbb{K} \) is prime. Hence, [Knapp16, Proposition 8.14] shows that the ideal \( (p) \) of \( \mathbb{K} \) is prime. Therefore, the quotient ring \( \mathbb{K}/(p) \) is an integral domain. This proves Proposition 3.2.

\[\text{We call "multiplicative subset" what Knapp (in [Knapp16, Section VIII.10]) calls a "multiplicative system".}\]
We shall furthermore use the following properties of contents (whose proofs are easy):

**Proposition 3.3.** Let $\mathbb{U}$ be a UFD. Let $\mathbb{F}$ be the field of fractions of $\mathbb{U}$. Let $p \in \mathbb{U}[x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m]$ be a polynomial over $\mathbb{U}$. Assume that the content of $p$ is 1. Also assume that $p$ is irreducible when considered as a polynomial in $\mathbb{F}[x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m]$. Then, $p$ is also irreducible when considered as a polynomial in $\mathbb{U}[x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m]$.

**Proposition 3.4.** Let $\mathbb{U}$ be a UFD. Let $p, q \in \mathbb{U}[x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m]$ be two polynomials over $\mathbb{U}$. Assume that both $p$ and $q$ have content 1, and assume furthermore that $p$ and $q$ don’t have any indeterminates in common (i.e., there is no $i \in [m]$ such that $\deg_{x_i} p > 0$ and $\deg_{x_i} q > 0$). Then, $p$ and $q$ are coprime.

The next simple fact states that for any positive integer $n$, the determinant of the “generic $n \times n$-matrix” (i.e., of the $n \times n$-matrix whose $n^2$ entries are distinct indeterminates in a polynomial ring over $\mathbb{Z}$) is irreducible as a polynomial over $\mathbb{Z}$:

**Corollary 3.5.** Let $n$ be a positive integer. Let $\mathbb{G}$ be the polynomial ring $\mathbb{Z} \left[ a_{i,j} \mid (i, j) \in [n]^2 \right]$. Let $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{G}^{n \times n}$ be the $n \times n$-matrix $(a_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq n}$. Then, the element $\det \mathcal{A}$ of $\mathbb{G}$ is irreducible.

**Proof of Corollary 3.5.** A well-known fact (e.g., [DeKuRo78, Lemma 5.12]) shows that $\det \mathcal{A}$ is irreducible as an element of $\mathbb{Q} \left[ a_{i,j} \mid (i, j) \in [n]^2 \right]$. This yields (using Proposition 3.3) that $\det \mathcal{A}$ is irreducible as an element of $\mathbb{Z} \left[ a_{i,j} \mid (i, j) \in [n]^2 \right]$ as well, since the polynomial $\det \mathcal{A}$ has content 1. This proves Corollary 3.5. □

An element $a$ of a commutative ring $\mathbb{A}$ is said to be regular if every $b \in \mathbb{A}$ satisfying $ab = 0$ must satisfy $b = 0$. (Regular elements are also known as non-zero-divisors.) In a polynomial ring, each indeterminate is regular; hence, each monomial (without coefficient) is regular (since any product of two regular elements is regular). The following fact is easy to see:\footnote{We recall a few standard concepts from commutative algebra:

Let $\mathbb{K}$ be a commutative ring. A multiplicative subset of $\mathbb{K}$ means a subset $S$ of $\mathbb{K}$ that contains the unity $1_{\mathbb{K}}$ of $\mathbb{K}$ and has the property that every $a, b \in S$ satisfy $ab \in S$.

If $S$ is a multiplicative subset of $\mathbb{K}$, then the localization of $\mathbb{K}$ at $S$ is defined as follows: Let $\sim$ be the binary relation on the set $\mathbb{K} \times S$ defined by

$$((r, s) \sim (r’, s’)) \iff (t (rs’ - sr’) = 0 \text{ for some } t \in S).$$

Then, it is easy to see that $\sim$ is an equivalence relation. The set $\mathbb{L}$ of its equivalence classes $[(r, s)]$ can be equipped with a ring structure via the rules $[(r, s)] + [(r’, s’)] = [(rs’ + sr’, ss’)]$ and $[(r, s)] \cdot [(r’, s’)] = [(rr’, ss’)]$ (with zero element $[(0, 1)]$ and unity $[(1, 1)]$). The resulting ring $\mathbb{L}$ is commutative, and is known as the localization of $\mathbb{K}$ at $S$. (This generalizes the construction of $\mathbb{Q}$ from $\mathbb{Z}$ known from high school.)}

The next simple fact states that for any positive integer $n$, the determinant of the “generic $n \times n$-matrix” (i.e., of the $n \times n$-matrix whose $n^2$ entries are distinct indeterminates in a polynomial ring over $\mathbb{Z}$) is irreducible as a polynomial over $\mathbb{Z}$:

**Corollary 3.5.** Let $n$ be a positive integer. Let $\mathbb{G}$ be the polynomial ring $\mathbb{Z} \left[ a_{i,j} \mid (i, j) \in [n]^2 \right]$. Let $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{G}^{n \times n}$ be the $n \times n$-matrix $(a_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq n}$. Then, the element $\det \mathcal{A}$ of $\mathbb{G}$ is irreducible.

**Proof of Corollary 3.5.** A well-known fact (e.g., [DeKuRo78, Lemma 5.12]) shows that $\det \mathcal{A}$ is irreducible as an element of $\mathbb{Q} \left[ a_{i,j} \mid (i, j) \in [n]^2 \right]$. This yields (using Proposition 3.3) that $\det \mathcal{A}$ is irreducible as an element of $\mathbb{Z} \left[ a_{i,j} \mid (i, j) \in [n]^2 \right]$ as well, since the polynomial $\det \mathcal{A}$ has content 1. This proves Corollary 3.5. □

An element $a$ of a commutative ring $\mathbb{A}$ is said to be regular if every $b \in \mathbb{A}$ satisfying $ab = 0$ must satisfy $b = 0$. (Regular elements are also known as non-zero-divisors.) In a polynomial ring, each indeterminate is regular; hence, each monomial (without coefficient) is regular (since any product of two regular elements is regular). The following fact is easy to see:\footnote{We recall a few standard concepts from commutative algebra:

Let $\mathbb{K}$ be a commutative ring. A multiplicative subset of $\mathbb{K}$ means a subset $S$ of $\mathbb{K}$ that contains the unity $1_{\mathbb{K}}$ of $\mathbb{K}$ and has the property that every $a, b \in S$ satisfy $ab \in S$.

If $S$ is a multiplicative subset of $\mathbb{K}$, then the localization of $\mathbb{K}$ at $S$ is defined as follows: Let $\sim$ be the binary relation on the set $\mathbb{K} \times S$ defined by

$$((r, s) \sim (r’, s’)) \iff (t (rs’ - sr’) = 0 \text{ for some } t \in S).$$

Then, it is easy to see that $\sim$ is an equivalence relation. The set $\mathbb{L}$ of its equivalence classes $[(r, s)]$ can be equipped with a ring structure via the rules $[(r, s)] + [(r’, s’)] = [(rs’ + sr’, ss’)]$ and $[(r, s)] \cdot [(r’, s’)] = [(rr’, ss’)]$ (with zero element $[(0, 1)]$ and unity $[(1, 1)]$). The resulting ring $\mathbb{L}$ is commutative, and is known as the localization of $\mathbb{K}$ at $S$. (This generalizes the construction of $\mathbb{Q}$ from $\mathbb{Z}$ known from high school.)}
Proposition 3.6. Let $K$ be a commutative ring. Let $S$ be a multiplicative subset of $K$ such that all elements of $S$ are regular. Let $L$ be the localization of the ring $K$ at $S$. Then:

(a) The canonical ring homomorphism from $K$ to $L$ is injective. We shall thus consider it as an embedding.

(b) If $K$ is an integral domain, then $L$ is an integral domain.

(c) Let $a$ and $b$ be two elements of $K$. Then, we have the following logical equivalence:

$$ (a \mid b \text{ in } L) \iff (a \mid sb \text{ in } K \text{ for some } s \in S). $$

Matrices over arbitrary commutative rings can behave a lot less predictably than matrices over fields. However, matrices over integral domains still show a lot of the latter good behavior, such as the following:

Proposition 3.7. Let $P$ be a finite set. Let $M$ be an integral domain. Let $W \in M^{P \times P}$ be a $P \times P$-matrix over $M$. Let $u \in M^P$ be a vector such that $u \neq 0$ and $Wu = 0$. Here, $u$ is considered as a “column vector”, so that $Wu$ is defined by

$$ Wu = \left( \sum_{q \in P} w_{pq} u_q \right)_{p \in P}, $$

where $W = (w_{pq})_{(p,q) \in P \times P}$ and $u = (u_p)_{p \in P}$. Then, det $W = 0$.

Proof of Proposition 3.7. Let $m = |P|$. Then, we can view the $P \times P$-matrix $W$ as an $m \times m$-matrix (by “numerical reindexing”, as explained in [Grinb18, §1]), and we can view the vector $u$ as a column vector of size $m$. Let us do this from here on.

Let $\mathbb{F}$ be the quotient field of the integral domain $M$. Thus, there is a canonical embedding of $M$ into $\mathbb{F}$. Hence, we can view the matrix $W \in M^{m \times m}$ as a matrix over $\mathbb{F}$, and we can view the vector $u \in M^m$ as a vector over $\mathbb{F}$. Let us do so from here on. We are now in the realm of classical linear algebra over fields: The vector $u \in \mathbb{F}^m$ is nonzero (since $u \neq 0$) and belongs to the kernel of the $m \times m$-matrix $W \in \mathbb{F}^{m \times m}$ (since $Wu = 0$). Hence, the kernel of the matrix $W$ is nontrivial. In other words, this matrix $W$ is singular. Thus, det $W = 0$ by a classical fact of linear algebra. This proves Proposition 3.7.

Let us next recall an identity for determinants (a version of the Cauchy–Binet formula):

The element $[(r,s)]$ of $L$ is denoted by $r_s$. There is a canonical ring homomorphism from $K$ to $L$ that sends each $r \in K$ to $[(r,1)] = r_1 \in L$.

When all elements of the multiplicative subset $S$ are regular, the statement “$t (rs' - sr') = 0$ for some $t \in S$” in the definition of the relation $\sim$ can be rewritten in the equivalent (but much simpler) form “$rs' = sr'$” (which is even more reminiscent of the construction of $Q$).
Lemma 3.8. Let \( n \in \mathbb{N}, \ m \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( p \in \mathbb{N} \). Let \( A \in \mathbb{K}^{n \times p} \) be an \( n \times p \)-matrix. Let \( B \in \mathbb{K}^{p \times m} \) be a \( p \times m \)-matrix. Let \( k \in \mathbb{N} \). Let \( P \) be a subset of \( [n] \) such that \(|P| = k\). Let \( Q \) be a subset of \([m]\) such that \(|Q| = k\). Then,

\[
\det \left( \sub_{P}^{Q} (AB) \right) = \sum_{R \subseteq [p]; \ |R| = k} \det \left( \sub_{P}^{R} A \right) \cdot \det \left( \sub_{Q}^{R} B \right).
\]

Lemma 3.8 is [Grinbe17, Corollary 7.251] (except that we are using the notation \( \sub_{J}^{I} C \) for what is called \( \sub_{w(I)}^{w(J)} C \) in [Grinbe17]). It also appears in [Gantma00, Chapter I, (19)] (where it is stated using \( p \)-tuples instead of subsets). \(\square\)

The next lemma is just a particular case of Theorem 2.1, but it is a helpful stepping stone on the way to proving the latter theorem:

Lemma 3.9. Let \( A = (a_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq n+1, 1 \leq j \leq n+1} \in \mathbb{K}^{(n+1) \times (n+1)} \) and \( B = (b_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq n+1, 1 \leq j \leq n+1} \in \mathbb{K}^{(n+1) \times (n+1)} \) be such that \( b_{n+1,n+1} = 0 \). Assume further that

\[
a_{n+1,j} = 0 \quad \text{for all } j \in [n].
\]

Define the \( P_k \times P_k \)-matrix \( W \) as in Theorem 2.1. Then, \( \det A \mid \det W \).

The following proof is inspired by [GriOlv18, proof of Theorem 10].

Proof of Lemma 3.9 We WLOG assume that \( \mathbb{K} \) is the polynomial ring over \( \mathbb{Z} \) in \( n^2 + (n + 1) + \left( (n + 1)^2 - 1 \right) \) indeterminates

\[
a_{i,j} \quad \text{for all } i \in [n] \text{ and } j \in [n];
\]

\[
a_{i,n+1} \quad \text{for all } i \in [n+1];
\]

\[
b_{i,j} \quad \text{for all } i \in [n+1] \text{ and } j \in [n+1] \text{ except for } b_{n+1,n+1}.
\]

And, of course, we assume that the entries of \( A \) and \( B \) that are not zero by assumption are these indeterminates.\(\square\)

The ring \( \mathbb{K} \) is a UFD (by Proposition 3.1).

We WLOG assume that \( n > 0 \) (otherwise, the result follows from \( \det W = \det (0) = 0 \)).

The set \( P_k \) is nonempty (since \( k \in \{0,1,\ldots,n\} \)); thus, \(|P_k| \geq 1\).

Let \( \overline{A} \) be the \( n \times n \)-matrix \((a_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq n} \in \mathbb{K}^{n \times n}\). Then, because of (1), we have

\[
\det A = a_{n+1,n+1} \cdot \det \overline{A}
\]

These assumptions are legitimate, because if we can prove Lemma 3.9 under these assumptions, then the universal property of polynomial rings shows that Lemma 3.9 holds in the general case.
A double Sylvester determinant

A determinate); thus, its determinant \( \det \tilde{A} \) is an irreducible polynomial in the polynomial ring \( \mathbb{Z} \left[ a_{ij} \mid (i,j) \in [n]^2 \right] \) (by \cite{Grinbe17}, Theorem 6.43). Hence, \( \det \tilde{A} \) also is an irreducible polynomial in the ring \( \mathcal{K} \) (since \( \mathcal{K} \) differs from \( \mathbb{Z} \left[ a_{ij} \mid (i,j) \in [n]^2 \right] \) only in having more variables, which clearly cannot contribute any factors to \( \det \tilde{A} \)). Thus, Proposition 3.2 (applied to \( p = \det \tilde{A} \)) shows that the quotient ring \( \mathcal{K}/(\det \tilde{A}) \) is an integral domain.

Let \( M \) be the quotient ring \( \mathcal{K}/(\det \tilde{A}) \). Then, \( M \) is an integral domain (since \( \mathcal{K}/(\det \tilde{A}) \) is an integral domain). All monomials in the variables \( b_{i,j} \) (with \( (i,j) \neq (n + 1, n + 1) \)) are nonzero in \( M \). Likewise, \( a_{n+1,n+1} \neq 0 \) in \( M \).

Let \( w \) be the element \( \prod_{j \in [n]} b_{n+1,j} \in M \). (Strictly speaking, we mean the canonical projection of \( \prod_{j \in [n]} b_{n+1,j} \in \mathcal{K} \) onto the quotient ring \( M \).) Then, \( w \) is a nonzero element of the integral domain \( M \) (since \( b_{n+1,j} \neq 0 \) in \( M \) for all \( j \in [n] \)).

For each \( i \in [n] \), we define \( z_i \in M \) by \( z_i = \prod_{\substack{j \in [n]; \ j \neq i}} b_{n+1,j} \) (projected onto \( M \)). This is a nonzero element of \( M \). In \( M \), we have

\[
\prod_{j \in [n]; \ j \neq i} b_{n+1,j} z_i = b_{n+1} \prod_{j \in [n]; \ j \neq i} b_{n+1,j} = \prod_{j \in [n]} b_{n+1,j} = w
\]

for all \( i \in [n] \).

We need another piece of notation: If \( M \) is a \( p \times q \)-matrix, and if \( u \in [p] \) and \( v \in [q] \), then \( M_{\sim u, \sim v} \) denotes the \((p - 1) \times (q - 1)\)-matrix obtained from \( M \) by removing the \( u \)-th row and the \( v \)-th column.

The matrix \( A_{\sim 1, \sim (n+1)} \) has determinant 0 (because \( \prod \) shows that its last row consists of zeroes). In other words, \( \det \left( A_{\sim 1, \sim (n+1)} \right) = 0 \).

Also, due to \( \prod \), we see that each \( i \in [n] \) satisfies

\[
\det \left( A_{\sim 1, \sim i} \right) = a_{n+1,n+1} \cdot \det \left( \tilde{A}_{\sim 1, \sim i} \right)
\]

(by \cite{Grinbe17}, Theorem 6.43), applied to \( A_{\sim 1, \sim i} \) instead of \( A \), because the last row of the matrix \( A_{\sim 1, \sim i} \) is \((0, 0, \ldots, 0, a_{n+1,n+1})\).

For each \( i \in [n+1] \), we define an element \( u_i \in M \) by

\[
u_i = \begin{cases} 
    z_i (-1)^i \det \left( A_{\sim 1, \sim i} \right), & \text{if } i \in [n]; \\
1, & \text{if } i = n + 1.
\end{cases}
\]
All these \( n + 1 \) elements \( u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_{n+1} \) of \( \mathbb{M} \) are nonzero.\(^8\)

Let \( u = (u_j)_{j \in \mathbb{P}_k} \in \mathbb{M}^{\mathbb{P}_k} \) be the vector defined by

\[
u_j = \prod_{j \in I} u_j.
\]

Then, the entries of the vector \( u \) are nonzero (because they are products of the nonzero elements \( u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_{n+1} \) of the integral domain \( \mathbb{M} \)). Since the vector \( u \) has at least one entry (because \( |\mathbb{P}_k| \geq 1 \)), we thus conclude that \( u \neq 0 \).

Let \( \Delta \) be the diagonal matrix \( \Delta = \text{diag} \left( u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_{n+1} \right) \in \mathbb{M}^{(n+1) \times (n+1)} \).

Let \( x \in \mathbb{M}^{n+1} \) be the column vector defined by

\[
x = \begin{pmatrix} (-1)^1 \det(A_{\sim 1, \sim 1}), (-1)^2 \det(A_{\sim 1, \sim 2}), \ldots, (-1)^{n+1} \det(A_{\sim 1, \sim (n+1)}) \end{pmatrix}^T.
\]

Let \( (e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_{n+1}) \) be the standard basis of the free \( \mathbb{M} \)-module \( \mathbb{M}^{n+1} \). Thus, for any \( (n+1) \times (n+1) \)-matrix \( C \in \mathbb{M}^{(n+1) \times (n+1)} \) and any \( j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n+1\} \), we have

\[
(\text{the } j\text{-th column of the matrix } C) = Ce_j.
\]

Now, using Laplace expansion, it is easy to see that

\[
Ax = - \det A \cdot e_1.
\]

**Proof of (6):** Consider the adjugate \( \text{adj} A \) of the matrix \( A \). A standard fact ([Grinbe17](#) Theorem 6.100) says that \( A \cdot \text{adj} A = \det A \cdot I_{n+1} \). But the definition of \( \text{adj} A \) reveals that the first column of the matrix \( \text{adj} A \) is \(-x\). Hence, the first column of the matrix \( A \cdot \text{adj} A \) is \( A \cdot (-x) = -Ax \). On the other hand, the first column of the matrix \( A \cdot \text{adj} A \) is \( A \cdot e_1 \) (since \( A \cdot \text{adj} A = \det A \cdot I_{n+1} \)). Comparing the preceding two sentences, we conclude that \(-Ax = \det A \cdot e_1\), so that \( Ax = -\det A \cdot e_1 \). This proves (6).

Also, (5) (applied to \( C = B^T \) and \( j = n+1 \)) yields

\[
B^T e_{n+1} = \left( \text{the } (n+1)\text{-st column of the matrix } B^T \right) = (b_{n+1,1}, b_{n+1,2}, \ldots, b_{n+1,n+1})^T.
\]

---

\(^8\)Proof. Each \( i \in [n] \) satisfies

\[
u_i = z_i \begin{pmatrix} (-1)^i \det(A_{\sim i, \sim i}) \end{pmatrix}^{a_{n+1,1}} \begin{pmatrix} a_{n+1,1} \end{pmatrix}^{(\text{by (4)})} = \begin{pmatrix} z_i \end{pmatrix}^{a_{n+1,1}} \begin{pmatrix} (-1)^i \end{pmatrix}^{a_{n+1,1}} \begin{pmatrix} \det(A_{\sim i, \sim i}) \end{pmatrix}^{\begin{pmatrix} \# \text{ of smaller degree than } \det(A_{\sim i, \sim i}) \end{pmatrix}}{\begin{pmatrix} \neq 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{M} \end{pmatrix}}{\begin{pmatrix} \neq 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{M} \end{pmatrix}}{\begin{pmatrix} \neq 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{M} \end{pmatrix}}{\begin{pmatrix} \neq 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{M} \end{pmatrix}}{\begin{pmatrix} \neq 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{M} \end{pmatrix}}
\]

(since \( \mathbb{M} \) is an integral domain). Thus, \( u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_n \) are nonzero. Moreover, \( u_{n+1} \) is nonzero (since \( u_{n+1} = 1 \)). Thus, we are done.
Hence,

\[ \Delta B^T e_{n+1} = \Delta (b_{n+1,1}, b_{n+1,2}, \ldots, b_{n+1,n+1})^T \]
\[ = (u_1 b_{n+1,1}, u_2 b_{n+1,2}, \ldots, u_{n+1} b_{n+1,n+1})^T \]  

(since \( \Delta = \text{diag} (u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_{n+1}) \)).

Now, we claim that

\[ u_i b_{n+1,i} = w \cdot (-1)^i \det (A_{\sim 1,\sim i}) \quad \text{for each } i \in [n+1]. \]  

(8)

[Proof of (8): Let \( i \in [n+1] \). If \( i = n+1 \), then both sides of (8) are zero (because \( b_{n+1,n+1} = 0 \) and \( \det (A_{\sim 1,\sim (n+1)}) = 0 \)). If \( i \neq n+1 \), then \( i \in [n] \) and thus

\[ b_{n+1,i} = z_i (-1)^i \det (A_{\sim 1,\sim i}) \]
\[ = w \cdot (-1)^i \det (A_{\sim 1,\sim i}). \]

Hence, (8) is proven in both cases.]

Now, (7) becomes

\[ \Delta B^T e_{n+1} \]
\[ = (u_1 b_{n+1,1}, u_2 b_{n+1,2}, \ldots, u_{n+1} b_{n+1,n+1})^T \]
\[ = \left( w \cdot (-1)^1 \det (A_{\sim 1,\sim 1}), w \cdot (-1)^2 \det (A_{\sim 1,\sim 2}), \ldots, w \cdot (-1)^{n+1} \det (A_{\sim 1,\sim (n+1)}) \right)^T \]  

(by (8))

\[ = w \cdot \left( (-1)^1 \det (A_{\sim 1,\sim 1}), (-1)^2 \det (A_{\sim 1,\sim 2}), \ldots, (-1)^{n+1} \det (A_{\sim 1,\sim (n+1)}) \right)^T \]
\[ = w x. \]

Hence,

\[ A \Delta B^T e_{n+1} = A w x = w \cdot A x = -w \cdot \text{det } A \cdot e_1 \]
\[ = -w \cdot a_{n+1,n+1} \cdot \text{det } A \]
\[ = 0. \]

(since we are in M)

In other words, the \((n+1)\)-st column of the matrix \( A \Delta B^T \) is 0 (since the \((n+1)\)-st column of the matrix \( A \Delta B^T \) is \( A \Delta B^T e_{n+1} \) (by (5), applied to \( C = A \Delta B^T \) and \( j = n+1 \)).
Now, fix $I \in P_k$. Then, the last column of the matrix sub$_{I+}^{I+} (A \Delta B^T)$ is 0 (because this column is a piece of the $(n + 1)$-st column of the matrix $A \Delta B^T$, but as we have just shown the latter column is 0). Thus, det $\left(\text{sub}_{I+}^{I+} (A \Delta B^T)\right) = 0$.

But Lemma 3.8 (applied to $M, n + 1, n + 1, n + 1, \Delta B^T, k + 1, I+$ and $I+$ instead of $K, n, m, p, B, k, P$ and $Q$) yields
\[
\det \left(\text{sub}_{I+}^{I+} (A \Delta B^T)\right) = \sum_{R \subseteq [n+1]; |R| = k+1} \det \left(\text{sub}_{I+}^{I+} A\right) \det \left(\text{sub}_{R}^{I+} (\Delta B^T)\right).
\]

Comparing this with det $\left(\text{sub}_{I+}^{I+} (A \Delta B^T)\right) = 0$, we obtain
\[
0 = \sum_{R \subseteq [n+1]; |R| = k+1} \det \left(\text{sub}_{I+}^{I+} A\right) \det \left(\text{sub}_{R}^{I+} (\Delta B^T)\right).
\]

In the sum on the right hand side, all addends for which $n + 1 \notin R$ are zero (because if $R \subseteq [n + 1]$ satisfies $|R| = k + 1$ and $n + 1 \notin R$, then the last row of the matrix $\text{sub}_{R}^{I+} A$ consists of zeroes and therefore we have det $\left(\text{sub}_{R}^{I+} A\right) = 0$, and thus can be discarded. Hence, we are left with
\[
0 = \sum_{R \subseteq [n+1]; |R| = k+1; n + 1 \in R} \det \left(\text{sub}_{I+}^{I+} A\right) \det \left(\text{sub}_{R}^{I+} (\Delta B^T)\right).
\]

But the subsets $R$ of $[n + 1]$ satisfying $|R| = k + 1$ and $n + 1 \in R$ can be parametrized as $J+$ with $J$ ranging over $P_k$. Hence, this rewrites further as
\[
0 = \sum_{J \in P_k} \det \left(\text{sub}_{J+}^{I+} A\right) \det \left(\text{sub}_{J+}^{I+} (\Delta B^T)\right).
\]

It is easily seen that det $\left(\text{sub}_{J+}^{I+} (\Delta B^T)\right) = \det \left(\text{sub}_{I+}^{I+} B\right) u_J$ for each $J \in P_k$ (indeed, recall the definition of $\Delta$ and the fact that $u_{n+1} = 1$ and that det $\left(C^T\right) = \det C$ for each square matrix $C$). Thus, the above equality simplifies to
\[
0 = \sum_{J \in P_k} \det \left(\text{sub}_{J+}^{I+} A\right) \det \left(\text{sub}_{I+}^{I+} B\right) u_J.
\]

Now, forget that we fixed $I$. We thus have proven that
\[
0 = \sum_{J \in P_k} \det \left(\text{sub}_{J+}^{I+} A\right) \det \left(\text{sub}_{I+}^{I+} B\right) u_J. \tag{9}
\]

by (1), since $n + 1 \notin R$ but $n + 1 \in I+$
for each \( I \in P_k \). This rewrites as \( W u = 0 \) (indeed, the left hand side of (9) is the \( I \)-th entry of the zero vector 0, whereas the right hand side of (9) is the \( I \)-th entry of \( W u \)).

Now, consider the matrix \( W \) as a matrix in \( M^{P_k \times P_k} \). Then, Proposition 3.7 (applied to \( P = P_k \)) yields \( \det W = 0 \) in \( M \) (since \( u \neq 0 \) and \( W u = 0 \)). In view of the definition of \( M \), this rewrites as \( \text{det} A | \text{det} W \) in \( K \).

Let us consider the matrix \( W \) again as a matrix over \( K \). Each entry of \( W \) has the form \( \text{det} \left( \text{sub}_{I+}^{J+} A \right) \text{det} \left( \text{sub}_{I+}^{J+} B \right) \) for some \( I, J \in P_k \). Thus, all entries of \( W \) are multiples of \( a_{n+1,n+1} \) (since \( \text{det} \left( \text{sub}_{I+}^{J+} A \right) \) is a multiple of \( a_{n+1,n+1} \) for all \( I, J \in P_k \) \(^{10}\)). Hence, the determinant of \( W \) is a multiple of \( (a_{n+1,n+1})^{|P_k|} \), thus a multiple of \( a_{n+1,n+1} \) (since \( |P_k| \geq 1 \)). In other words, \( a_{n+1,n+1} | \text{det} W \) in \( K \).

Recall that \( K \) is a UFD. Also, the two polynomials \( a_{n+1,n+1} \) and \( \text{det} A \) in \( K \) both have content 1, and don’t have any indeterminates in common; thus, these two polynomials are coprime (by Proposition 3.4). Hence, any polynomial in \( K \) that is divisible by both \( a_{n+1,n+1} \) and \( \text{det} A \) must be divisible by the product \( a_{n+1,n+1} \cdot \text{det} A \) as well. Thus, from \( a_{n+1,n+1} | \text{det} W \) and \( \text{det} A | \text{det} W \), we obtain \( a_{n+1,n+1} \cdot \text{det} A | \text{det} W \). In view of (2), this rewrites as \( \text{det} A | \text{det} W \). This proves Lemma 3.9. \( \square \)

We shall now derive Theorem 2.2 from Lemma 3.9 following the same idea as in [Prasol94, §2.7] and [Prasol14, Teorema 2.9.1] and [Mohr53]:

**Proof of Theorem 2.1.** We WLOG assume that \( n > 0 \) (otherwise, the result follows from \( \text{det} W = \text{det} (0) = 0 \)).

We WLOG assume that \( K \) is the polynomial ring over \( Z \) in \((n+1)^2 + (n+1)^2 - 1\) indeterminates

\[
\begin{align*}
    a_{i,j} & \quad \text{for all } i \in [n+1] \text{ and } j \in [n+1] ; \\
    b_{i,j} & \quad \text{for all } i \in [n+1] \text{ and } j \in [n+1] \text{ except for } b_{n+1,n+1}.
\end{align*}
\]

And, of course, we assume that the entries of \( A \) and \( B \) that are not zero by assumption are these indeterminates. Proposition 3.1 shows that the ring \( K \) is a UFD (since it is a polynomial ring over \( Z \)).

Let \( S \) be the multiplicative subset \( \left\{ a_{n+1,n+1}^p : p \in \mathbb{N} \right\} \) of \( K \). Then, all elements of \( S \) are regular (since they are monomials in a polynomial ring).

Let \( \mathbb{L} \) be the localization of the commutative ring \( K \) at the multiplicative subset \( S \). Then, Proposition 3.6 (a) shows that the canonical ring homomorphism from \( K \) to \( \mathbb{L} \) is injective; we shall thus consider it as an embedding. Also, Proposition 3.6 (b) shows that \( \mathbb{L} \) is an integral domain.

\(^{10}\)Proof. Let \( I, J \in P_k \). Then, the equality (1) shows that the last row of the matrix \( \text{sub}_{I+}^{J+} A \) is \((0, 0, \ldots, 0, a_{n+1,n+1})\). Hence, an application of [Grinbe17, Theorem 6.43] shows that \( \det \left( \text{sub}_{I+}^{J+} A \right) = a_{n+1,n+1} \det \left( \text{sub}_{I}^{J} A \right) \). Thus, \( \det \left( \text{sub}_{I+}^{J+} A \right) \) is a multiple of \( a_{n+1,n+1} \), qed.
We claim that

$$\det A \mid \det W$$  \hfill (10)

[Proof of (10): Consider $A$, $B$ and $W$ as matrices over $\mathbb{L}$. The entry $a_{n+1,n+1}$ of $A$ is invertible in $\mathbb{L}$ (by the construction of $\mathbb{L}$). Hence, we can subtract appropriate scalar multiples\(^{11}\) of the $(n+1)$-st column of $A$ from each other column of $A$ to ensure that all entries of the last row of $A$ become 0, except for $a_{n+1,n+1}$. (Specifically, for each $j \in [n]$, we have to subtract $a_{j,n+1}/a_{n+1,n+1}$ times the $(n+1)$-st column of $A$ from the $j$-th column of $A$.) All these column transformations preserve the determinant $\det A$, and also preserve the minors $\det\left(\text{sub}_J^{1+} A\right)$ for all $I,J \in P_k\,(k)$ (because when the $(n+1)$-st column of $A$ is subtracted from another column of $A$, the matrix $\text{sub}_J^{1+} A$ either stays the same or undergoes an analogous column transformation\(^{12}\), which preserves its determinant); thus, they preserve the matrix $W$. Hence, we can replace $A$ by the result of these transformations. This new matrix $A$ satisfies (1). Hence, Lemma 3.9 (applied to $\mathbb{L}$ instead of $\mathbb{K}$) yields that $\det A \mid \det W$ in $\mathbb{L}$. This proves (10).]

But we must prove that $\det A \mid \det W$ in $\mathbb{K}$. Fortunately, this is easy: Since $\mathbb{K}$ embeds into $\mathbb{L}$, we can translate our result “$\det A \mid \det W$ in $\mathbb{L}$” as “$\det A \mid a_{n+1,n+1}^{p} \det W$ in $\mathbb{K}$ for an appropriate $p \in \mathbb{N}^+$” (by Proposition 3.6 (c), applied to $a = \det A$ and $b = \det W$). Consider this $p$. The polynomial $a_{n+1,n+1} \in \mathbb{K}$ is coprime to $\det A$ (this is easily checked\(^{13}\)); thus, its power $a_{n+1,n+1}^{p}$ is coprime to $\det A$ as well. Hence, we can cancel the $a_{n+1,n+1}^{p}$ from the divisibility $\det A \mid a_{n+1,n+1}^{p} \det W$, and conclude that $\det A \mid \det W$ in $\mathbb{K}$. This proves Theorem 2.1. \(\square\)

Proof of Theorem 2.2]  We WLOG assume that $\mathbb{K}$ is the polynomial ring over $\mathbb{Z}$ in the \((n+1)^2 - 1\) indeterminates

$$a_{i,j} \quad \text{for all } i \in [n+1] \text{ and } j \in [n+1] \text{ except for } a_{n+1,n+1};$$

$$b_{i,j} \quad \text{for all } i \in [n+1] \text{ and } j \in [n+1] \text{ except for } b_{n+1,n+1}. $$

And, of course, we assume that the entries of $A$ and $B$ that are not zero by assumption are these indeterminates. The ring $\mathbb{K}$ is a UFD (by Proposition 3.1).

WLOG assume that $n > 0$ (otherwise, the result follows from $\det W = \det \left( \begin{smallmatrix} 0 \end{smallmatrix} \right) = 0$). Thus, the monomial $a_{1,n+1}a_{2,n} \cdots a_{n+1,1} = \prod_{i \in [n+1]} a_{i,n+2-i}$ occurs in the polynomial $\det A$ with coefficient $\pm 1$. Hence, the polynomial $\det A$ has content 1. Similarly, the polynomial $B$ has content 1.

---

\(^{11}\)The scalars, of course, come from $\mathbb{L}$ here.

\(^{12}\)Here we are using the fact that $n+1 \in J^+$ (so that the matrix sub$_J^{1+}$ $A$ contains part of the $(n+1)$-st column of $A$).

\(^{13}\)Proof. The polynomial $\det A$ contains the monomial $a_{1,n+1}a_{2,n} \cdots a_{n+1,1} = \prod_{i \in [n+1]} a_{i,n+2-i}$ and thus is not a multiple of $a_{n+1,n+1}$. Hence, it is coprime to $a_{n+1,n+1}$ (since the only non-unit divisor of $a_{n+1,n+1}$ is $a_{n+1,n+1}$ itself, up to scaling by units).
Theorem 2.1 yields $\det A \mid \det W$. The same argument yields $\det B \mid \det W$ (since the matrices $A$ and $B$ play symmetric roles in the construction of $W$). But Proposition 3.4 shows that the polynomials $\det A$ and $\det B$ in $\mathbb{K}$ are coprime (because they have content 1, and don’t have any indeterminates in common). Thus, any polynomial in $\mathbb{K}$ that is divisible by both $\det A$ and $\det B$ must be divisible by the product $(\det A)(\det B)$ as well. Thus, from $\det A \mid \det W$ and $\det B \mid \det W$, we obtain $(\det A)(\det B) \mid \det W$. This proves Theorem 2.2.

4. Further questions

While Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 are now proven, the field appears far from fully harvested. Three questions readily emerge:

**Question 4.1.** What can be said about $\frac{\det W}{\det A}$ (in Theorem 2.1) and $\frac{\det W}{(\det A)(\det B)}$ (in Theorem 2.2)? Are there formulas?

**Question 4.2.** Are there more direct proofs of Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 avoiding the use of polynomial rings and their properties and instead “staying inside $\mathbb{K}$”? Such proofs might help answer the previous question.

**Question 4.3.** The entries of our matrix $W$ were products of minors of two $(n + 1) \times (n + 1)$-matrices that each use the last row and the last column. What can be said about products of minors of two $(n + m) \times (n + m)$-matrices that each use the last $m$ rows and the last $m$ columns, where $m$ is an arbitrary positive integer? The “Generalized Sylvester’s identity” in [Prasol94 §2.7] answers this for the case of one matrix. It is not quite obvious what the right analogues of the conditions $a_{n+1,n+1} = 0$ and $b_{n+1,n+1} = 0$ are; furthermore, nontrivial examples become even more computationally challenging.
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