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Abstract. We describe the algebraic boundary of the cone of sums of nonnegative circuit polynomials (sonc). This cone is generated by monomials and singular circuit polynomials. We interpret a singular circuit polynomial as compositions of an agiform in the sense of Reznick and a real torus action. Our main result is that the algebraic pieces of the boundary of the sonc cone are parametrized by families of tropical hypersurfaces. Each piece is contained in a rational variety called the positive discriminant, defined as the image of a Horn–Kapranov-type map. We give a complete description of the semi-algebraic stratification of the boundary of the sonc cone in the univariate case.

We recover that the sonc cone equals the sage cone, and we prove that that the sonc cone is equal to the nonnegativity cone in codimension at most two. We also derive a combinatorial characterization of support sets for which the sonc cone is equal to the nonnegativity cone, disproving in the process a conjecture by Chandrasekaran, Murray, and Wierman.

Dedicated to Bruce Reznick on the occasion of his 66th birthday.

1. Introduction

In this article, we explore a connection between nonnegativity of multivariate real polynomials, the theory of A-discriminants, and tropical geometry. The objects connecting these different areas are simplicial circuits and agiforms.

Describing the cone $\mathcal{P}_{1+n,2\delta}$ consisting of nonnegative $(1+n)$-variate homogeneous polynomials of degree $2\delta$ is a central problem in real algebraic geometry. A classical approach is to study the cone $\Sigma_{1+n,2\delta} \subset \mathcal{P}_{1+n,2\delta}$ consisting of all sums of squares (SOS). In 1888, Hilbert [Hil88] obtained the seminal result that $\Sigma_{1+n,2\delta} = \mathcal{P}_{1+n,2\delta}$ if and only if $n = 1$, or $\delta = 1$, or $n = \delta = 2$. The fact that these cones are distinct in general motivated Hilbert’s 17th problem, to represent nonnegative forms as sums of squares of rational functions, which was solved in the affirmative by Artin [Art27, Rez00]. Further results describing the relationship between the cones $\Sigma_{1+n,2\delta}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{1+n,2\delta}$ was obtained recently. In 2006, Blekherman [B12] proved the stunning fact that for fixed degree $2\delta \geq 4$, and asymptotically in $n$, almost every nonnegative form is not a sum of squares. For the cone $\mathcal{P}_{3,6}$ consisting of all nonnegative ternary sextics (i.e., $n = 2$ and $\delta = 3$), the obstruction which prevents the SOS cone from filling out the entire nonnegativity cone is obtained from the Cayley–Bacharach relation [B12]. Similar results hold for the cone $\mathcal{P}_{4,4}$ consisting of all nonnegative quaternary quadrics (i.e., $n = 3$ and $\delta = 2$).
While the boundary of the cone $P_{1+n,2δ}$ is contained in a discriminantal hypersurface [Nie12], the structure of the boundary of the cone $Σ_{1+n,2δ}$, as a space stratified in semi-algebraic varieties, is more complicated. In the case of ternary sextics (and similarly for quaternary quartics), Blekherman et al. [BHO+12] showed that the algebraic boundary of the SOS cone has a unique non-discriminantal irreducible component of degree 83200, which is the Zariski closure of the sextics that are sums of three squares of cubics. Despite these developments, no complete algebraic description of the SOS cone is known.

While Hilbert’s proof was nonconstructive, the first explicit example of a nonnegative polynomial which is not SOS was given by Motzkin [Mot67]. The Motzkin polynomial has, in its inhomogeneous version, the form

$$f(z_1, z_2) = 1 + z_1^4 z_2^2 + z_1^2 z_2^4 - 3 z_1^2 z_2^2.$$  

This is an example of a simplicial agiform (see [Rez89] or [IdW16]) whose exponents, respectively coefficients, are described by the simplicial circuit $C$ and Gale dual $B$

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 4 & 2 & 2 \\ 0 & 2 & 4 & 2 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } B = [1, 1, 1, -3]^\top,$$

where $C.B = 0$. Each simplicial circuit $C$ gives rise to an associated family of simplicial agiforms. A systematic study of the cone spanned by all agiforms was initiated by Reznick [Rez89]. Agiforms were generalized to circuit polynomials by Iliman and the second author [IdW16], who studied the cone of all sums of nonnegative circuit polynomials (sonc).

The sonc cone was a bit later studied independently by Chandrasekaran and Shah [CS16] under the name sage. The relationship between agiforms and circuit polynomials can be summarized as follows:

*A singular circuit polynomial is a composition of a simplicial agiform in the sense of Reznick and a real torus action.*

The overlapping naming conventions are unfortunate. We use the term “agiform” throughout, to stress that we assume the real singular locus to be nonempty, and to underline how seminal Reznick’s work [Rez89] from three decades ago really was.

The sonc cone is closely related to toric and polyhedral geometry, and that is where we take our starting point. In this setting it is more natural to consider nonnegativity over the positive orthant $\mathbb{R}^n_+$ rather than $\mathbb{R}^n$, as the former is a connected subgroup of the torus $(\mathbb{C}^*)^n$. Working over $\mathbb{R}^n_+$, there are no obstructions to considering monomials $\mathbf{z}^\alpha = z_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots z_n^{\alpha_n}$ whose exponent vectors $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n)^\top$ are real. Consequently, we consider a real support set or Bohr spectrum

$$A = \{\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_d\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n.$$  

It is standard to use exponential notation and consider the family of exponential sums

$$\mathbb{R}^A = \left\{ f(x) = \sum_{j=0}^d a_j e^{\langle x, \alpha_j \rangle} \middle| a_0, \ldots, a_d \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$
If the exponent vectors in $A$ are all integral, then the substitution $e^x = z$ identifies $\mathbb{R}^A$ with the associated family of polynomials. In $\mathbb{R}^A$ we have the nonnegativity cone

$$P_A^+ = \{ f \in \mathbb{R}^A \mid f(x) \geq 0 \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n \},$$

and we have the sonc cone (see Definition 2.3)

$$(1.4) \quad S_A^+ \subset P_A^+,$$

consisting of all exponential sums in $\mathbb{R}^A$ which can be expressed as a nonnegative combination of simplicial agiforms and monomials. (It is a matter of taste whether a monomial with a positive coefficient should be considered a simplicial agiform or not.) It follows from Chandrasekaran, Murray, and Wierman [MCW18, Theorem 2] (and from Theorem 4.2) that if $f \in \mathbb{R}^A$ admits a sonc-decomposition, in loc. cit. called a sage-decomposition, then it admits a sonc-decomposition whose terms are contained in $\mathbb{R}^A$.

To state our main result, we need additional notation. Let $\mathcal{S}(A)$ denote the set of all simplicial circuits contained in $A$, and let $\mathcal{M}(A)$ denote the set of monomials in $A$. While there is a natural identification $\mathcal{M}_A \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_A$, this extra piece of notation is useful. Let

$$\mathfrak{R}(A) = \mathcal{S}(A) \cup \mathcal{M}(A).$$

For each subset $r \subset \mathfrak{R}(A)$ we define its simplicial part $s$ and its monomial part $m$ in Definition 2.9. A word of caution: while the simplicial part $s$ is contained in $\mathcal{S}(A)$, the monomial part $m$ need not be contained in $\mathcal{M}(A)$, see Example 2.10.

The sonc-support of an exponential sum $f \in \mathbb{R}^A$, denoted $\text{supp}_{\mathfrak{S}}(f)$, is the set of all simplicial circuits and monomials which appear in some sonc-decomposition of $f$, see Definition 2.8. The sonc-support splits into a simplicial sonc support $\text{supp}_{\mathcal{S}}(f)$ and a monomial sonc support $\text{supp}_{\mathcal{M}}(f)$. We show in Proposition 2.11 that we can characterize simplicial and monomial sonc-supports separately. As it turns out, the simplicial sonc-support is a more fundamental object than the sonc-support itself. For example, it is the simplicial sonc-support which determines the algebraic equations defining the boundary pieces of the sonc cone, see §7.

Our first main result states that simplicial sonc-supports are defined by regular subdivisions of the Newton polytope $\mathcal{N}(A)$. We note that a regular subdivision $\Lambda$ is a polyhedral cell-complex (which we write as a set of polytopes); see [4.3] or [LRS10].

**Theorem 1.1.** Let $s \subset \mathcal{S}(A)$. Then, there exists $f \in \mathbb{R}^A$ such that $s = \text{supp}_{\mathcal{S}}(f)$ if and only if there exists a regular subdivision $\Lambda$ of the Newton polytope $\mathcal{N}(A)$ (with vertices in $A$) such that

$$s = \{ C \in \mathcal{S}(A) \mid \text{there exists a } \lambda \in \Lambda \text{ such that } C \subset \lambda \}.$$
boundary of the sonc cone are parametrized by families of tropical hypersurfaces. In particular, this implies the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.2.** The boundary of the sonc cone $S^+_A$ is contained in the union of the coordinate hyperplanes $a_{\alpha} = 0$, for $\alpha$ a vertex of the Newton polytope $N(A)$, and the $\Lambda$-discriminants $D_\Lambda$, as $\Lambda$ runs over all regular subdivisions of the Newton polytope $N(A)$.

**Remark 1.3.** The Zariski closure $D_\Lambda$ of the positive $\Lambda$-discriminant $D^+_\Lambda$ is defined by an explicit parametrization whose parameter space is a Cartesian product of an affine space and a toric variety. In particular, if $A$ is integral, then $D_\Lambda$ is rational algebraic variety. It is straightforward, though computationally expensive, to derive a set of defining equations for $D_\Lambda$ in the integral case using Gröbner basis techniques, see §7.4.

It is a delicate question to describe the semi-algebraic stratification of the boundary of the sonc cone. We give a complete description in the univariate case in Theorem 5.6 and discuss the cases of quartics and sextics in examples. The main issue, in the general case, is that a regular subdivision $\Lambda$ does not uniquely determine the simplicial sonc-support.

For $n \geq 2$, it is also a nontrivial task to determine the dimension of the $\Lambda$-discriminant $D_\Lambda$. The reader familiar with the theory of $A$-discriminants is aware that the dimension of the $A$-discriminantal variety might “unexpectedly” drop, in which case $A$ is said to be dual-defective. The combinatorial characterization of defective support sets was completed by Esterov [Est10] in 2010 for the integral case and by the first author [For18] in 2018 in the real case. Similarly, the dimension of the $\Lambda$-discriminant $D_\Lambda$ might unexpectedly drop, and we leave it as an open combinatorial problem to characterize the dimension of $D_\Lambda$ in terms of the regular subdivision $\Lambda$.

An additional difficulty lies in that the intersection of a $\Lambda$-discriminant and the boundary of the sonc cone can be of strictly smaller dimension than the $\Lambda$-discriminant itself. This is an effect of obstructions in the relationship between the simplicial sonc-support and the monomial sonc-support. We characterize sonc-supports which define a codimension one piece of the boundary of the sonc cone in Proposition 7.9.

As a consequence of our investigation, we present in Theorem 8.2 a combinatorial condition on $A$ which ensures that $S^+_A = P^+_A$. We also present a number of new examples for which the equality of the sonc cone and the nonnegativity cone holds, disproving a conjecture by Chandrasekaran, Murray, and Wierman [MCW18, Conjecture 22].

We recover, as part of our investigation, several fundamental results on sonc-decompositions which appear explicitly or implicitly in the contemporary literature. For example, Theorem 4.1 is equivalent to the “sonc = sage” theorem: the cone generated by all agiforms is equal to the cone generated by all simplicial agiforms. This is essentially a theorem by Reznick [Rez89, Theorem 7.1], extended to the general case by Wang [Wan18, Theorem 1.1] and independently by Chandrasekaran, Murray, and Wierman [MCW18, Theorem 4]. The above mentioned Theorem 4.2 which states that an exponential sum admits a sonc-decomposition if and only if it admits a sonc-decomposition in $\mathbb{R}^A$, is equivalent to results of Chandrasekaran, Murray, and Wierman [MCW18, Theorem 2]. We also show in §4.2 that $P^+_A = S^+_A$ whenever $A$ has codimension at most two, a result which is not stated in, but could be deduced from [MCW18].
2. Agiforms and the sonc cone

2.1. Notation. We denote by \( \mathcal{P} \) the power set operator. For polytopes \( F \) and \( N \), we use the notation \( F \preceq N \) for the relation that \( F \) is a face of \( N \).

Let \( A \) be as in (1.2). The dimension of \( A \), denoted \( \dim(A) \), is the dimension of the affine span of the Newton polytope \( \mathcal{N}(A) = \text{conv}(A) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \).

We say that a point \( \alpha \in A \) is a (relative) interior point of \( A \) if it is a (relative) interior points of the Newton polytope \( \mathcal{N}(A) \). We identify \( A \) with the matrix

\[
A = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\
\alpha_0 & \alpha_1 & \cdots & \alpha_d
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

obtained by arranging the elements \( \alpha \in A \) as column vectors. Then, \( 1 + \dim(A) = \text{rank}(A) \), where \( \text{rank}(A) \) denotes the rank of the matrix \( A \). The codimension of \( A \), denoted by \( m \), is \( d - \dim(A) \); it equals the dimension of the kernel of the matrix \( A \). The support set \( A \) is said to be independent if it is of codimension zero. The support set is called a circuit if it is a minimal dependent set, that is, if all strict subsets of \( A \) are independent. We say that a circuit \( C \) is simplicial if the Newton polytope \( \mathcal{N}(C) \) is a simplex.

The support set \( A \) defines an (exponential) toric morphism \( \varphi_A : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{1+d} \) given by

\[
\varphi_A(w) = (e^{(w, \alpha_0)}, \ldots, e^{(w, \alpha_d)}).
\]

In the integral case, we replace \( \varphi_A \) by the algebraic morphism

\[
\psi_A(s) = (s^{\alpha_0}, \ldots, s^{\alpha_d}),
\]

which is the torus action defined by \( A \).

2.2. The cone of agiforms. The class of nonnegative exponential sums which we consider arise from monomial substitutions into the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality (AGI). Given two sequences of nonnegative respectively positive real numbers \( q_1, \ldots, q_d \) and \( \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_d \), where \( 1 = \beta_1 + \cdots + \beta_d \), the AGI is the inequality \([\text{HLP52}}, (2.5.5)]\)

\[
\beta_1 q_1 + \beta_2 q_2 + \cdots + \beta_d q_d \geq q_1^{\beta_1} q_2^{\beta_2} \cdots q_d^{\beta_d},
\]

with equality if and only if \( q_1 = q_2 = \cdots = q_d \). Consider a set of exponent vectors \( \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d \in \mathbb{R}^n \), and let \( \alpha_0 = \beta_1 \alpha_1 + \cdots + \beta_d \alpha_d \in \mathbb{R}^n \). For any nonnegative constants
$r_1, \ldots, r_d$, the exponentials $r_j e^{(x, \alpha_j)}$ are nonnegative on $\mathbb{R}^n$, for $j = 1, \ldots, d$. It follows that the exponential sum
\begin{equation}
(2.4) \quad f(x) = \beta_1 r_1 e^{(x, \alpha_1)} + \beta_2 r_2 e^{(x, \alpha_2)} + \cdots + \beta_d r_d e^{(x, \alpha_d)} - r_1^\beta_1 \cdot r_2^\beta_2 \cdots r_d^\beta_d e^{(x, \alpha_0)}
\end{equation}
is nonnegative on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Following Reznick [Rez89], exponential sums of the form (2.4) are called agiforms.

The agiform $f(x)$ vanishes at some point $x = w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ if and only if there exists a constant $t$ such that
\[ r_1 e^{(w, \alpha_1)} = \cdots = r_d e^{(w, \alpha_d)} = t. \]
That is, if and only if $r_j = t e^{-(w, \alpha_j)}$ for $j = 1, \ldots, d$. The substitution $x \mapsto x + w$, which is induced by the toric morphism $\varphi_A(w)$, yields an agiform in the sense of Reznick.

An agiform is called simplicial if the points $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d$ forms the vertices of a simplex. If $f(x)$ is a simplicial agiform (which is not a monomial), then the support set $C = \text{supp}(f)$ is a simplicial circuit. Conversely, if $C$ is a simplicial circuit with vertices $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d$ and interior point $\alpha_0$, then the barycentric coordinates of $\alpha_0$ relative to $\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d\}$ is a convex expression
\begin{equation}
(2.5) \quad \begin{cases} 
1 & = \beta_1 + \cdots + \beta_d \\
\alpha_0 & = \beta_1 \alpha_1 + \cdots + \beta_d \alpha_d,
\end{cases}
\end{equation}
which in turn gives rise to a family of simplicial agiforms supported on $C$. The notion “circuit” stems from matroid theory [BVS99]: each circuit $C \subseteq A$ is encoded by a minimally supported vector $c \in \ker(A)$, well defined up to multiplication by a nonzero scalar. Indeed, (2.5) is equivalent to that
\[ c = (-1, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_d)^\top \in \ker(A). \]
From now on, if $C$ is a simplicial circuit, then $c$ denotes the unique vector arising from the barycentric coordinates of the relative interior point. If $C$ is integer, then we rescale $c$ to a primitive integer vector.

Throughout this paper, we require that each simplicial agiform has a nonempty vanishing locus in $\mathbb{R}^n$. That is, if $C$ is a simplicial circuit, then for each simplicial agiform $g$ supported on $C$ there is $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that
\begin{equation}
(2.6) \quad g(x) = \langle \varphi_A(x - w), tc \rangle.
\end{equation}
Equivalently, the coefficient vector $a$ of $g(x)$ is given by
\begin{equation}
(2.7) \quad a = \varphi_A(-w) * (tc),
\end{equation}
where $*$ denotes component-wise multiplication. We use (2.6) and (2.7) when it is beneficial to include in the notation the location of the singular loci. We denote the real vanishing locus of (2.6), which is equal to its real singular locus, by $\text{sing}(g)$. It is given by
\begin{equation}
(2.8) \quad \text{sing}(g) = w + \mathcal{N}(C)^\perp \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n.
\end{equation}
where $\mathcal{N}(C)^\perp$ denotes the normal space to the Newton polytope $\mathcal{N}(C)$.

Readers familiar with earlier articles about circuit polynomials should note that the so-called circuit number determines to the location of the singular locus and vice versa, see [IdW16] and [IdW16, Section 3.4].
2.3. **Sonc-decompositions.** Let us revisit the fundamental concepts mentioned in the introduction, also providing further details.

**Definition 2.1.** A support set \( R \subset \mathbb{Z}^n \) is an **agisupport** if it is either a simplicial circuit or a singleton. Then, \( \mathfrak{R}(A) \) denotes the set of all agisupports contained in \( A \). An agisupport \( R \in \mathfrak{R}(A) \) is **maximal** if \( R \subset R' \) for \( R' \in \mathfrak{R}(A) \) implies that \( R = R' \).

If \( R \in \mathfrak{R}(A) \) is a nonmaximal agisupport, then \( R \) is a singleton. The converse does not hold. One can show (e.g., using Lemma 3.3) that a monomial \( \alpha \in A \) gives a maximal agisupport \( \alpha \) if and only if there is no face \( \alpha \prec F \preceq \mathcal{N}(A) \) such that \( A \cap F \) has a relative interior point. In particular, if \( \alpha \) is a maximal agisupport, then \( \alpha \) is a vertex of the Newton polytope \( \mathcal{N}(A) \).

**Example 2.2.** If \( A \) is a pyramid with apex \( \alpha \), then \( \alpha \) is a maximal agisupport. Let \( A_{\bar{\alpha}} = A \setminus \{\alpha\} \), and consider an exponential sum \( f \in \mathbb{R}^A \). We can write

\[
f(x) = g(x) + ae^{(x,\alpha)},
\]

where \( g \in \mathbb{R}^{A_{\bar{\alpha}}} \). Then, \( f \) is nonnegative if and only if \( a \geq 0 \) and \( g \) is nonnegative. Similarly, since no simplicial circuit contains \( \alpha \), we have that \( f \) admits a nonnegative sonc-decomposition if and only if \( a \geq 0 \) and \( g \) admits a nonnegative sonc-decomposition.

**Definition 2.3.** The **sonc cone** \( S_A^+ \subset \mathbb{R}^A \) consists of all exponential sums \( f \in \mathbb{R}^A \) which admits a decomposition as a positive combination of nonnegative exponential sums in \( \mathbb{R}^A \) supported on simplicial circuits and monomials.

In this definition, we allow that the exponential sums appearing in the decomposition are strictly positive. That is, these exponential sums are not required to be agiforms in the sense of §2.2. However, the main point of this subsection, as shown in Proposition 2.6, is that there is no loss of generality in assuming that they are.

**Definition 2.4.** A **(reduced) sonc-decomposition** of an exponential sum \( f \in \mathbb{R}^A \) is an expression

\[
f(x) = \sum_{R \in \mathfrak{R}(A)} t_R g_R(x)
\]

where for each simplicial circuit \( R \), the term \( g_R \in \mathbb{R}^R \) is an agiform, and all coefficients \( t_R \) are nonnegative.

That is, in a reduced sonc-decomposition, each agisupport \( R \in \mathfrak{R}(A) \) occurs exactly once and each simplicial agiform has a nonempty singular locus.

**Lemma 2.5.** Let \( C \) be a simplicial circuit, let \( f \in \mathbb{R}^C \) be nonnegative, and let \( \alpha \in C \) be arbitrary. Then, there is an agiform \( g \) supported on \( C \) and a nonnegative constant \( a \) such that

\[
f(x) = g(x) + ae^{(x,\alpha)},
\]

where \( a = 0 \) if and only if \( f \) is an agiform.
Proof. In the integral case, this is a result of Iliman and the second author [IdW16]. We give an independent proof in the real case. There is no restriction in assuming that \( C \) is full-dimensional. Comparing (2.6) with the \( A \)-discriminant, described for example in [For18, Theorem 2.4], it follows that the locus of nonnegative singular exponential sums supported on \( C \) is equal to the locus of agiforms supported on \( C \). Let \( f \in \mathbb{R}^C \) be nonnegative on \( \mathbb{R}^n \). Then, there exists a minimal \( a > 0 \) such that

\[
g(x) = f(x) - a e^{(x, \alpha)}
\]

has a nonempty vanishing locus. By minimality of \( a \), the extremal monomials (i.e., monomials corresponding to vertices of \( N(C) \)) of \( g(x) \) have positive coefficients. It follows that \( g(x) \) is strictly positive outside of some compact subset of \( \mathbb{R}^n \). This, in turn, together with the minimality of \( t \), implies that the exponential sum \( g(x) \) is singular. □

Proposition 2.6. The sonc cone \( S_A^+ \) is given by

\[
S_A^+ = \{ f \in \mathbb{R}^A \mid f \text{ admits a reduced sonc-decomposition} \}.
\]

Proof. It suffices to show that if \( g_1 \) and \( g_2 \) are agiforms supported on the same agisupport \( R \), then the sum \( g_1(x) + g_2(x) \) admits a reduced sonc-decomposition. This is trivial if \( R \) is a monomial, and it follows from Lemma 2.5 if \( R \) is a simplicial circuit. □

All sonc-decompositions appearing in this text are assumed to be reduced. That is, from now on, we use the terms “sonc-decomposition” and “reduced sonc-decomposition” as synonyms.

Proposition 2.7. An exponential sum \( f \in \mathbb{R}^A \) lies in the interior of \( S_A^+ \) if and only if it admits a sonc-decomposition (2.9) with \( t_R > 0 \) for all \( R \in \mathfrak{H}(A) \).

Proof. For each \( R \in \mathfrak{H}(A) \), fix an agiform (or a monomial) \( g_R \in \mathbb{R}^R \). Since the sonc cone is full-dimensional if follows that, if \( f \) belongs to the interior of \( S_A^+ \), then so does the exponential sum

\[
h(x) = f(x) - \varepsilon \sum_{R \in \mathfrak{H}(A)} g_R(x),
\]

for \( \varepsilon > 0 \) sufficiently small. By definition, \( h \) admits a sonc-decomposition. To write \( f \) as a positive combination of the agiforms \( g_R \), it suffices to move the sum appearing in the above equality to the left hand side. The converse statement follows from that \( A \subset \mathfrak{H}(A) \). □

2.4. Sonc-supports. In general, sonc-decompositions of an exponential sum \( f \in S_A^+ \) are not unique. In particular, the exponential sum \( f \) does not determine the agisupports which appear in the right hand side of (2.9) with a positive coefficient.

Definition 2.8. The sonc-support of an exponential sum \( f \in \mathbb{R}^A \) is the set

\[
\text{supp}_{\mathfrak{H}}(f) = \{ R \in \mathfrak{H}(A) \mid f \text{ admits a sonc-decomposition with } t_R > 0 \}.
\]

We write \( \text{supp}_{\mathfrak{H}}(f; A) \) in case we need to specify which support set is considered. A subset \( \mathfrak{r} \subset \mathfrak{H}(A) \) is called a sonc-support if there exists some \( f \in \mathbb{R}^A \) such that \( \mathfrak{r} = \text{supp}_{\mathfrak{H}}(f) \).

To describe the boundary of \( S_A^+ \) we first partition the space \( \mathbb{R}^A \) according to sonc-supports. Using Proposition 2.7 we find that there are two “trivial” equivalence classes:
The class \( \{ f \mid \text{supp}_R(f) = \emptyset \} \) consists of the complement of \( S_A^+ \) and the trivial polynomial all of whose coefficients are zero.

- The class \( \{ f \mid \text{supp}_R(f) = \mathcal{R}(A) \} \) consists of the interior of \( S_A^+ \).

However, the task of describing all sonc-supports \( s \subset \mathcal{R}(A) \) is rather intricate.

**Definition 2.9.** Given a subset \( r \subset \mathcal{R}(A) \), the subset of \( A \) covered by \( r \) is the support set
\[
A_r = \bigcup_{R \subset A} R.
\]

We define the **monomial part** \( m \) and **simplicial part** \( s \) of \( r \) as the subsets
\[
m = r \cap \mathcal{R}(r \cap \mathcal{M}(A)) \quad \text{and} \quad s = r \setminus \mathcal{R}(r \cap \mathcal{M}(A)).
\]

**Example 2.10.** Consider the support set \( A \) consisting of the integer points on the boundary of a square of side length two, and the matrix \( \tilde{C}^T \) whose rows encode the simplicial circuits \( c_1, \ldots, c_4 \) contained in \( A \).

\[
A = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 1
\end{bmatrix}
\quad \text{and} \quad
\tilde{C}^T = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & -2 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & -2 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -2 & 1 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -2
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

The monomial part \( m \) consists of all monomials in \( r \) and all simplicial circuit all of whose monomials are contained in \( r \). Consider, for example, the subset
\[
r = \{ \alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, c_1, c_3 \} \subset \mathcal{R}(A).
\]

Notice that all monomials of \( c_1 \) are contained in \( m \). Hence, also \( c_1 \) is contained in \( m \). That is \( r \) has monomial respectively simplicial part
\[
m = \{ \alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, c_1 \} \quad \text{and} \quad s = \{ c_3 \}.
\]

Three additional examples of sonc-supports which have nonempty monomial part and nonempty simplicial part can be found in Example 4.17. The following proposition implies that we can characterize simplicial sonc-supports and monomial sonc-supports separately.

**Proposition 2.11.** Let \( f \in \mathbb{R}^A \) with sonc-support \( r = \text{supp}_R(f) \). Let \( \text{supp}_M(f) = m \) and \( \text{supp}_S(f) = s \) be the monomial respectively simplicial parts of \( r \). Then,
\[
(2.10) \quad A_m \cap A_s = \emptyset.
\]

**Proof.** If \( C \in \text{supp}_M(f) \) is such that \( C \cap A_m \neq \emptyset \), then we conclude from Lemma 2.5 that \( C \subset \text{supp}_R(f) \), which in turn implies that \( C \subset A_m \). \( \square \)

To present examples of simplicial sonc-supports, we make use of Theorem 1.1, whose proof is postponed to \( \S4.3 \). We also make use of the following associated definition.

**Definition 2.12.** Let \( \Lambda \) be a regular subdivision of the Newton polytope \( \mathcal{N}(A) \). Then, the **sonc-complex** \( \Gamma \) associated to \( \Lambda \) is the polyhedral complex
\[
\Gamma(\Lambda) = \{ \lambda \in \Lambda \mid \text{there is a } \hat{\lambda} \in \Lambda \text{ such that } A \cap \hat{\lambda} \text{ has a relative interior point and } \lambda \subset \hat{\lambda} \}.
\]
The sonc-complex $\Gamma$ determines the simplicial sonc-support induced by $\Lambda$. That is, two regular subdivisions which define the same sonc-complex define the same simplicial sonc-supports.

**Example 2.13.** Consider the family of univariate quartic polynomials, defined by

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The Newton polytope $\mathcal{N}(A)$ is the line segment $[0, 4]$, and it has eight regular subdivisions with vertices in $A$, all of which are triangulations, as shown in Figure 1. Black dots mark the vertices of the triangulation, and each cell containing at least one simplicial circuit is colored pink. As we invite the reader to verify by inspection, each simplicial sonc-support is defined by a unique triangulation. This is in fact always the case if $n = 1$, and it is one reason for why we in can describe the stratification of the boundary of the sonc cone in the univariate case, see §5.

**Example 2.14.** Consider the bivariate support set

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 2 & 3 & 1 & 2 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

There are ten simplicial sonc-complexes associated to $A$. These are depicted in pink in Figure 2 together with the regular subdivisions inducing them. The empty simplicial sonc-complex, in the bottom left corner, is induced by any regular subdivision not shown in the picture. There are two one-dimensional sonc-complex in the bottom right corner of the figure, induced by strict faces of the Newton polytope. This is a general phenomenon: if all monomials outside of a face have positive coefficients, then both nonnegativity and existence of sonc-decompositions is determined solely by the monomials contained in the relevant face.

### 2.5. Singular loci.

While sonc-decompositions are far from unique, the singular loci of the agiforms from the simplicial sonc-support are uniquely determined.

**Lemma 2.15.** Let $C \in \text{supp}_E(f) \subset \mathcal{G}(A)$, and let $g_1$ and $g_2$ be agiforms supported on $C$, both appearing in sonc-decompositions of $f$. Then, $\text{sing}(g_1) = \text{sing}(g_2)$. 

---

**Figure 1.** Regular subdivisions of the Newton polytope $\mathcal{N}(A)$ in Example 2.13.

- Regular subdivisions of the Newton polytope $\mathcal{N}(A)$ in Example 2.13.
Proof. If $g_1$ and $g_2$ are agiforms supported on $C$, and $\alpha \in C$, then, by Lemma 2.5,

$$g_1(x) + g_2(x) = g(x) + a e^{\langle x, \alpha \rangle},$$

where $g$ is an agiform supported on $C$ and $a \geq 0$. It holds that $a = 0$ if and only if the singular loci of $g_1$ and $g_2$ coincide.

If $g_1$ appears in a sonc-decomposition of $f$, and $g_2$ appears in a second sonc-decomposition of $f$, then the average $(g_1(x) + g_2(x))/2$ appears in a sonc-decomposition of $f$. Since $C \in \text{supp}_S(f)$, by Proposition 2.11, the monomial $e^{\langle x, \alpha \rangle}$ does not appear in any sonc-decomposition of $f$. It follows that $\text{sing}(g_1) = \text{sing}(g_2)$. \qed

Lemma 2.16. Let $r \subset \mathcal{R}(A)$, and assume that $f \in \mathbb{R}^A$ has a sonc-decomposition $f(x) = \sum_{R \in r} t_R g_R(x)$, with $t_R > 0$ for all $R \in r$. Then, $f$ belongs to the boundary of the sonc cone if and only if for all $s_R > 0$, the exponential sum $h(x) = \sum_{R \in r} s_R g_R(x)$ belongs to the boundary of the sonc cone.

Proof. Let $\varepsilon$ be defined by that $\min(t_R) = \varepsilon \max(s_R)$. Then,

$$f(x) = \varepsilon h(x) + \sum_{R \in r} (t_r - \varepsilon s_R) g_R(x).$$

As the last sum has nonnegative coefficients, we conclude that $\text{supp}_{\mathcal{R}}(h) \subset \text{supp}_{\mathcal{R}}(f)$. The reverse inclusion follows by symmetry. The lemma follows, as an exponential sum belongs to the interior of the sonc cone if and only if $\text{supp}_{\mathcal{R}}(f) = \mathcal{R}(A)$. \qed
The philosophy of Lemma 2.16 is the following: given a simplicial sonc-support \( s \), whether a sonc-decomposition using only the simplicial circuits \( C \in s \) represents an exponential sum on the boundary of the sonc cone or not, depends only on the relative position of the singular loci of the simplicial agiforms appearing in said sonc-decomposition.

3. The Cone of Simplicial Circuits

3.1. Notation. In this section, we discuss some fundamental properties of the set of simplicial circuits contained in \( A \). We identify a simplicial circuit \( C \in A \) with its unique associated vector \( c \in \ker(A) \) obtained from the barycentric coordinates as in §2.2.

Definition 3.1. The cone of simplicial circuits, denoted \( C_A \), is the polyhedral cone in \( \ker(A) \) spanned by the vectors \( c \) for \( C \in \mathcal{G}(A) \).

To convey the importance of the cone \( C_A \), we present the following alternative version of Theorem 1.1, whose proof is postponed to §4.3.

Theorem 3.2. Let \( s \in \mathcal{G}(A) \). Then, there exists an exponential sum \( f \in \mathbb{R}^A \) such that \( \text{supp}_s(f) = s \) if and only if there exists a face \( F \leq C_A \) such that

\[
s = \{ C \in \mathcal{G}(A) | c \in F \}.
\]

The cone \( C_A \) is contained in the \( m \)-dimensional vector space \( \ker(A) \), and we say that \( C_A \) is full-dimensional if it has dimension \( m \). Before we continue, let us prove a modest but fundamental lemma implying the existence of certain simplicial circuits.

Lemma 3.3. Let \( \alpha_0 \in A \) be a relative interior point of \( \mathcal{N}(A) \), and let \( \alpha_1 \in A \) be arbitrary but distinct from \( \alpha_0 \). Then, there exists a simplicial circuit \( C \subset A \) with \( \alpha_0 \) as its relative interior point and \( \alpha_1 \) as a vertex.

Proof. Let \( \ell \) denote the line through \( \alpha_0 \) and \( \alpha_1 \). By convexity, \( \ell \) intersects the boundary of the Newton polytope \( \mathcal{N}(A) \) in two points \( \hat{\alpha}_0 \) and \( \hat{\alpha}_1 \) (not necessarily integer). The points are ordered along \( \ell \) as \( \hat{\alpha}_0 < \alpha_0 < \alpha_1 \leq \hat{\alpha}_1 \), where the first inequality is strict since \( \alpha_0 \neq \alpha_0 \) by assumption. Let \( F \leq \mathcal{N}(A) \) be the smallest face containing \( \hat{\alpha}_0 \), and let \( \Lambda \) be a regular triangulation of \( F \). Let \( \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_r \) denote the vertices of the cell of \( \Lambda \) containing \( \hat{\alpha}_0 \) in its relative interior (this cell can be of smaller dimension than \( F \)). Then, \( C(\alpha_1; \alpha_0; \Lambda) = \{ \alpha_0, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_r \} \) is a subcircuit of \( A \) with \( \alpha_0 \) as a relative interior point.

The construction from Lemma 3.3 is exemplified in Figure 3, where the face \( F \) is an edge of the polygon \( \mathcal{N}(A) \) and the triangulation \( \Lambda \) of \( F \) has been chosen as the trivial triangulation with one top dimensional cell. Our construction does not necessarily yield all simplicial circuits contained in \( A \). For example, any simplicial circuit constructed by Lemma 3.3 will intersect the boundary of the Newton polytope \( \mathcal{N}(A) \).

3.2. The dimension of \( C_A \). The cone \( C_A \) appears in [7] as part of the parameter space of the positive \( A \)-discriminant. Hence, one of the more important issues to settle is to compute the dimension of \( C_A \). We present here a number of results in this direction. The reader familiar with the theory of oriented matroids [BVS+99] will recognize the arguments using sign-vectors which we make use of below.
Proposition 3.4. If $A$ has a relative interior point, then $C_A$ is full-dimensional.

Proof. We show that the vectors $c$ span the kernel of $A$ over $\mathbb{R}$ by a double induction over the dimension $n$ and the codimension $m$. The induction bases consist of the cases $m = 1$ for arbitrary $n \geq 1$, and $n = 1$ for arbitrary $m \geq 1$. If $m = 1$, then $A$ is a simplicial circuit, and the kernel of $A$ is one-dimensional. If $n = 1$, then all circuits $C \subset A$ are simplicial circuits, and it follows by definition that the set of all circuits span $\ker(A)$.

Let $\alpha_0$ denote an interior point of $\mathcal{N}(A)$. Expressing $\alpha_0$ as a generic convex combination of $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d$, yields a vector $b_1 \in \ker(A)$ with the sign pattern

\[
\text{sgn } b_1 = (-, +, +, \ldots, +, +).
\]

Extend $b_1$ to a basis $\{b_1, \ldots, b_m\}$ of $\ker(A)$. By adding sufficiently large multiple of $b_1$ to $b_k$, we can assume that each $b_k$ has the sign pattern \((3.1)\).

We modify the vectors $b_1, \ldots, b_m$ one by elimination. At step $k$, choose some $j \neq k$, and replace $b_k$ with the vector

\[
\hat{b}_k = b_k - \varepsilon b_j,
\]

where $\varepsilon$ is chosen as the smallest positive number such that $\hat{b}_k$ has at least one vanishing coordinate. Then, $\hat{b}_k$ is nontrivial since $b_k$ and $b_j$ are linearly independent, and its first coordinate is negative as $\ker(A)$ does not contain any nontrivial nonnegative vectors.

After these modifications, we obtain a basis $\{b_1, \ldots, b_m\}$ of $\ker(A)$ fulfilling the following two conditions. First, as $b_k$ has a vanishing coordinate, its support is a strict subset $A_k \subset A$. Second, as the only negative coordinate of $b_k$ is its first coordinate, the support set $A_k$ has $\alpha_0$ as a relative interior point. As a strict subset of $A$ has either strictly smaller dimension or strictly smaller codimension, the induction hypothesis implies that each $b_k$ can be written as a linear combination of vectors $c$ for simplicial circuits $C \subset A_k$. But any simplicial circuit contained in $A_k$ is contained in $A$. Since $\{b_1, \ldots, b_k\}$ is a basis for $\ker(A)$, the statement follows. \hfill \Box

Example 3.5. The simplest example of a support set $A$ such that $\ker(A)$ is not spanned by simplicial circuits is the case of a circuit which is not a simplicial circuit. In this case, $\ker(A)$ has dimension one, but $A$ contains no simplicial circuits. \hfill \Box

Figure 3. The construction from Lemma 3.3: the points in black forms a simplicial circuit.
Proposition 3.6. Assume that for each \( \alpha \in A \), the minimal face \( F \preceq \mathcal{N}(A) \) containing \( \alpha \) is a simplex. Then, the dimension of \( C_A \) is equal to the number of non-vertices of \( A \).

Lemma 3.7. The linear span \( \text{Lin} C_A \) is generated by simplicial circuits whose vertex sets are contained in the vertex set of the Newton polytope \( \mathcal{N}(A) \).

Proof. We use induction over the number of non-vertices of \( A \). Let \( C_1, \ldots, C_k \) be the simplicial circuits whose vertices are vertices of \( \mathcal{N}(A) \). If \( A \) has only one non-vertex, then there are no other circuits. Consider a simplicial circuit \( C_0 \). We need to show that \( C_0 \) lies in the span of \( C_1, \ldots, C_k \). Let \( F \) be the smallest face of \( \mathcal{N}(A) \) containing \( C_0 \); without loss of generality we can assume that \( F = \mathcal{N}(A) \). Then, \( A \) has a relative interior point. Assume that there is a vertex \( \alpha \) of \( C_0 \) which is not a vertex of \( \mathcal{N}(A) \). Then, \( \hat{A}_\alpha = A \setminus \{ \alpha \} \) has a relative interior point, and it has fewer non-vertices than \( A \). By Lemma 3.3, there is an \( i \in \{1, \ldots, k\} \), say \( i = 1 \), such that the circuit \( C_1 \) has \( \alpha \) as a relative interior point. A suitable linear combination gives

\[
t_0 c_0 + t_1 c_1 \in \ker(\hat{A}_\alpha).
\]

The cone \( C_{A_\alpha} \) is full-dimensional by Proposition 3.4, which implies that \( \text{Lin} C_{A_\alpha} = \ker(\hat{A}_\alpha) \). By the induction hypothesis, \( \ker(\hat{A}_\alpha) \) is a subset of the linear span of \( c_1, \ldots, c_k \). It follows that \( c_0 \) belongs to said linear span.

Proof of Proposition 3.6. Each \( \alpha \) which is not a vertex of \( \mathcal{N}(A) \) is contained in some minimal face \( F \preceq \mathcal{N}(A) \), and \( F \) is a simplex by assumption. Hence, there is a unique simplicial circuit \( C_\alpha \) containing \( \alpha \) whose vertices are contained in the vertex set of \( \mathcal{N}(A) \). The vectors \( c_\alpha \) span \( \text{Lin} C_A \) by Lemma 3.7, and they are linearly independent as they have disjoint supports. Hence, the dimension of \( \text{Lin} C_A \) is equal to the number of \( \alpha \in A \) which are not vertices of \( \mathcal{N}(A) \).

Corollary 3.8. If \( \mathcal{N}(A) \) is simplicial, then \( C_A \) is full-dimensional if and only if \( A \) has an interior point and/or \( \mathcal{N}(A) \) is a simplex.

Corollary 3.9. If \( A \) is a support set of dimension \( n = 2 \), then \( C_A \) is full-dimensional if and only if \( A \) has an interior point and/or \( \mathcal{N}(A) \) is a simplex.

Example 3.10. The following example consist of a three dimensional prism with one additional relative interior point in each rectangular facet. The support set, and the simplicial circuits, are given by the columns of the matrices

\[
A = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 1
\end{bmatrix}
\quad \text{and} \quad
\hat{C} = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
-2 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & -2
\end{bmatrix}
\]
The matrix $\hat{C}$ has rank five, which is equal to the dimension of $\ker(A)$, implying that $C_A$ is full-dimensional. Notice that $\mathcal{N}(A)$ is not simplicial, and $A$ has no interior points.

### 3.3 Conditions which ensure that $C_A$ is simple.

It is clear, from the formulation of Theorem 3.2, that not only the dimension $C_A$ but also the combinatorial structure of $C_A$ is important. We mention here a few results regarding when the cone $C_A$ is simple, crucial for our investigation of the sonc cone in the univariate case.

**Proposition 3.11.** If $A$ is a support set of dimension $n = 1$, then $C_A$ is a simple polyhedral cone whose extremal rays are given by circuits $C \subset A$ which are minimal in the sense that $A \cap \mathcal{N}(C) = C$.

*Proof.* It suffices to show that if $C$ is a circuit which is not minimal (in the sense of the proposition) then $c$ can be written as a positive combination of vectors associated to minimal circuits. It suffices to consider a support set with four points

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \alpha_0 & \alpha_1 & \alpha_2 & \alpha_3 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\alpha_0 < \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \alpha_3$. The simplicial circuits contained in $A$ are encoded by the columns of the matrix

$$\hat{C} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \alpha_3 - \alpha_2 & \alpha_3 - \alpha_1 & \alpha_2 - \alpha_1 \\ \alpha_3 - \alpha_2 & 0 & \alpha_0 - \alpha_3 & \alpha_0 - \alpha_2 \\ \alpha_1 - \alpha_3 & \alpha_0 - \alpha_3 & 0 & \alpha_1 - \alpha_0 \\ \alpha_2 - \alpha_1 & \alpha_2 - \alpha_0 & \alpha_1 - \alpha_0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The matrix $\hat{C}$ has rank two, and the generators of $\ker(\hat{C})$ are

$$[\alpha_2 - \alpha_0, \alpha_1 - \alpha_2, 0, \alpha_3 - \alpha_2]^T$$

and

$$[\alpha_1 - \alpha_2, 0, \alpha_1 - \alpha_2, \alpha_3 - \alpha_1]^T.$$

whose sign patterns are $(+, -, 0, +)$ and $(+, 0, -, +)$. That is, both the second and the third column of $\hat{C}$ can be expressed as positive combinations of the first and fourth column of $\hat{C}$. In particular, the two minimal subcircuits $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3\}$ and $\{\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$ span $C_A$. □

**Corollary 3.12.** If $A$ is a support set such that for each $\alpha \in A$, the minimal face $F \leq \mathcal{N}(A)$ containing $\alpha$ has dimension at most one, then $C_A$ is simple.

*Proof.* Each simplicial circuit $C \subset A$ is contained in some edge $E$ of the Newton polytope $\mathcal{N}(A)$. It follows that we have a decomposition of $C_A$ as a Cartesian product

$$C_A = \prod C_{A \cap E}$$

where the product is taken over all edges $E$ of $\mathcal{N}(A)$. Hence, the claim follows from Proposition 3.11. □

**Proposition 3.13.** If $A$ is a support set of codimension two, then $C_A$ is simple.

*Proof.* A two dimensional pointed polyhedral cone which has trivial linearity space is simple. □
In general, the number of simplicial circuits contained in \( A \) is strictly greater than the dimension of \( \ker(A) \) and, in particular, it does not suffice to pick a basis consisting of simplicial circuits in order to generate the full cone \( \mathcal{C}_A \).

**Example 3.14.** Let us revisit Example 3.10. The kernel of the matrix \( \hat{C} \) is spanned by the integer vector 
\[
[-1, 1, 1, -1, -1, 1]^T.
\]
It follows from this sign pattern that no column of \( \hat{C} \) is a positive combination of the other columns of \( \hat{C} \). That is, for each simplicial circuit \( C \subset A \) the vector \( c \) generates an edge of the cone \( \mathcal{C}_A \), which implies that \( \mathcal{C}_A \) is not simple.

## 4. Sonc-supports

The following section is the core of the paper. In the first couple of subsections, we recover the fundamental results on sonc-decomposition of the contemporary literature. We then expand these results, with the aim of proving first Theorem 3.2 and then Theorem 1.1.

### 4.1. Reznick’s Theorem on one negative term.

The “sonc = sage” theorem states, in our setting, that an exponential sum with one negative term is nonnegative if and only if it admits a sonc-decomposition. This is a theorem of Reznick [Rez89, Theorem 7.1], extended to the general case by Wang [Wan18, Theorem 1.1] and independently by Chandrasekaran, Murray, and Wierman [MCW18, Theorem 4].

**Theorem 4.1.** Let \( f \in \mathbb{R}^A \) be an exponential sum which has at most one negative coefficient. Then, \( f \in \mathcal{P}_A^+ \) if and only if \( f \in \mathcal{S}_A^+ \).

**Proof.** There is no loss of generality in assuming that \( A \) is full-dimensional. Let \( A \) be a support set for which there exists some counterexample \( f \in \mathbb{R}^A \). There is no loss of generality in assuming that the constant term of \( f \) has a negative coefficient, and that \( \alpha_0 = (0, \ldots, 0) \) is an interior point of \( A \). We can assume that \( A \) is minimal among the set of support sets which admits a counter example in the sense that it has the fewest number of points.

Our proof is based on a condition of Müller et al. [MFR+16, Theorem 1.5] certifying that a system of exponential sums has at most one positive root. We are concerned with the system
\[
\hat{c}_1 f = \cdots = \hat{c}_n f = 0.
\]
Let \( \hat{A} \) denote the matrix obtained from \( A \) by deleting the first row consisting of the all ones vector and deleting the column \( \alpha_0 \). We identify \( \hat{A} \) with the set \( A\setminus\{\alpha_0\} \). Let \( \hat{\alpha} \) be the diagonal matrix whose entries are the coefficients \( a_\alpha \) for \( \alpha \in \hat{A} \). By assumption, all diagonal entries of \( \hat{\alpha} \) are positive. Then, the support matrix of the system (4.1) is \( \hat{A} \), and the coefficient matrix is \( \hat{A} \cdot \hat{\alpha} \). (In [MFR+16], the support matrix was transposed.) Let \( I \subset \hat{A} \) be a set of cardinality \( n \). Since \( \hat{\alpha} \) is a diagonal matrix, the corresponding maximal
minor \( \det((\hat{A} \cdot \hat{a})_{I}) \) is equal to \( \det(\hat{A}_{I}) \det(\hat{a}_{I}) \). It follows that, for each such index set \( I \), the product of maximal minors of the support matrix and the coefficient matrix is

\[
\det(\hat{A}_{I}) \cdot \det((\hat{A} \cdot \hat{a})_{I}) = \det(\hat{A}_{I})^2 \prod_{\alpha \in I} a_{\alpha},
\]

which is nonnegative since \( a_{\alpha} \) is positive for \( \alpha \in I \subset \hat{A} \). Since \( A \) is full-dimensional, there exists an index set \( I \) such that \( \det(\hat{A}_{I}) \neq 0 \). Hence, by \([\text{MFR}^{+}16] \text{ Theorem 1.5}\), the system (4.1) has at most one positive solution.

The system (4.1) is unaltered if we subtract from \( f \) a positive constant. Since \( \alpha_0 = 0 \) is an interior point of \( \mathcal{N}(A) \), subtracting a constant does not change that \( f \) is positive close to the boundary of \( \mathbb{R}^n \). By choosing the constant sufficiently large, so that \( f \) takes negative values in \( \mathbb{R}^n \), we conclude that \( f \) vanishes. For each \( \alpha \in \mathcal{S}_A^{+} \), the system (4.1) is full-dimensional, and its support \( \Sigma(\alpha) \) is nonnegative. It follows that \( h_{\alpha} \) is nonnegative. By continuity, \( h_{\alpha} \) is nonnegative. But \( h_{\alpha} \) has at most one negative term, and its support is strictly smaller than \( A \). It follows that \( h_{\alpha} \) admits a sonc-decomposition. By moving \( g \) to the left hand side of (4.2) we conclude that \( f \in \mathcal{S}_A^{+} \), contradicting to the assumption that \( f \) is a counterexample.

\[\square\]

**Theorem 4.2.** Let \( A' \subset A \), with induced inclusions \( \mathbb{R}^{A'} \subset \mathbb{R}^{A} \) and \( \mathcal{S}_{A'}^{+} \subset \mathcal{S}_{A}^{+} \). Then, \( \mathcal{S}_{A'}^{+} = \mathcal{S}_{A}^{+} \cap \mathbb{R}^{A'} \).

**Proof.** We have a canonical induced embedding \( \mathcal{S}_{A'}^{+} \to \mathcal{S}_{A}^{+} \cap \mathbb{R}^{A'} \), we need only show that it is surjective. It suffices to consider the case that \( A \setminus A' = \{\alpha\} \), where we write \( a \) for the corresponding coefficient. Consider an exponential sum \( f \), with \( a = 0 \), which admits a nonnegative sonc-decomposition

\[
f(x) = \sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}(A)} t_{R} g_{R}(x)
\]

relative \( A \). We can rearrange the above sum as a sum of two-term sonc-decompositions

\[
h(x) = t_{1} g_{1}(x) + t_{2} g_{2}(x),
\]

such that \( g_{1} \) and \( g_{2} \) are supported on agisupports \( R_{1} \) and \( R_{2} \) respectively, and the coefficient of \( e^{(x, \alpha)} \) in \( h \) vanishes. If \( g_{1}, g_{2} \in \mathbb{R}^{A'} \), then \( h \in \mathcal{S}_{A'}^{+} \). If \( g_{1} \) or \( g_{2} \notin \mathbb{R}^{A} \), then the monomial \( e^{(x, \alpha)} \) appears in one of them with a negative coefficient, and in the other with a positive coefficient. It follows that \( h \) has one negative term. Hence, \( h \in \mathcal{S}_{A'}^{+} \) by Theorem 4.1 as \( h \) is nonnegative.

\[\square\]
4.2. Support sets of small codimension. These results alone settles the cases of small codimension, where the combinatorial possibilities are limited.

**Proposition 4.3.** Let $A$ be a support set of codimension $m = 1$. Then, $\mathcal{P}_A^+ = S_A^+$. 

**Proof.** If $A$ is a pyramid, then we can reduce to a lower dimensional case as in Example 2.2. The case of a simplicial circuit follows from Reznick [Rez89]. If $A$ is circuit which is not a simplicial circuit, then $A$ is equal to the vertex set of $\mathcal{N}(A)$. In this case, $f \in \mathcal{P}_A^+$ if and only if all coefficients are positive, which implies that $f \in S_A^+$.

**Theorem 4.4.** Let $A$ be a support set of codimension $m = 2$. Then, $\mathcal{P}_A^+ = S_A^+$. 

**Proof.** If $A$ is a pyramid, then we can reduce to a lower dimensional case as in Example 2.2. The case when $A$ is equal to the set of vertices of $\mathcal{N}(A)$ is analogous to the case of nonsimplicial circuits in the proof of Proposition 4.3. The case when all but one point of $A$ is a vertex of $\mathcal{N}(A)$ follows from Reznick [Rez89]. We need only consider the complimentary case when $\mathcal{N}(A)$ is a simplex. It suffices to show that the boundary of $\mathcal{P}_A^+$ is contained in $S_A^+$.

Let $\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_n$ denote the vertices of $\mathcal{N}(A)$, and let

$$A = \{ \alpha_0, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}, \alpha_{n+2} \}.$$ 

Let $f \in \mathbb{R}^A$ be singular, with a singularity at $w$. By Proposition 4.1, it suffices to consider the case when $f$ has two negative coefficients.

Let $F_1$ and $F_2$ denote the minimal faces of the Newton polytope $\mathcal{N}(A)$ containing $\alpha_{n+1}$ and $\alpha_{n+2}$ in their relative interior. Using Lemma 3.3 we find two simplicial circuits $C_1$ and $C_2$ such that $\alpha_1 \notin C_2$ and $\alpha_2 \notin C_1$. Then, the vectors $c_1$ and $c_2$ are linearly independent, hence they span $\ker(A)$ as the latter is two-dimensional. It follows that there are real numbers $t_1$ and $t_2$ such that

$$f(x) = \langle \varphi_A(x - w), t_1 c_1 + t_2 c_2 \rangle,$$

where we have used the notation from (2.6). By comparing the coefficients of the monomials $e^{\langle x, \alpha_{n+1} \rangle}$ and $e^{\langle x, \alpha_{n+2} \rangle}$, we conclude that $t_1, t_2 > 0$. □

4.3. Simplicial onc-supports and the associated singular loci. Having settled the fundamentals, we now turn our focus to describing the possible onc-supports.

**Proposition 4.5.** Assume that $A$ has a relative interior point. Let $f \in \mathbb{R}^A$ be such that $\text{supp}_\mathfrak{R}(f) = \mathcal{S}(A)$. Then, $f$ has singular point.

**Proof.** Let $\alpha_0 \in A$ be a relative interior point of $\mathcal{N}(A)$. If all points of $A \backslash \{ \alpha_0 \}$ are vertices of $A$, then $f$ has at most one negative term. Since $\text{supp}_\mathfrak{R}(f) \neq \mathcal{R}(A)$, we have that $f$ belongs to the boundary of $S_A^+$, so $f$ belongs to the boundary of $\mathcal{P}_A^+$, by Theorem 4.1.

We use induction over the number of points of $A$ which are not vertices, still assuming that $\alpha_0 \in A$ is a relative interior point. Let $\alpha_1 \in A$ be a non-vertex distinct from $\alpha_0$, and let $C_1$ be a simplicial circuit containing $\alpha_1$ as an interior point. By Lemma 3.3, there exists a simplicial circuit $C_0$ with $\alpha_1$ as a vertex and $\alpha_0$ as an interior point. Let
\( \mathcal{S}(A) = \{C_0, C_1, \ldots, C_k\} \). Consider a sonc-decomposition

\[
f(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{k} t_i g_i(x),
\]

where \( g_i(x) \) is an agiform supported on \( C_i \) and with \( t_i > 0 \) for all \( C \in \mathcal{S}(A) \). Since the coefficient of \( e^{\langle x, \alpha \rangle} \) is negative in \( g_1(x) \) and positive in \( g_0(x) \), we can find \( s_0, s_1 > 0 \) such that the coefficient of \( e^{\langle x, \alpha \rangle} \) in the exponential sum

\[
h(x) = f(x) + s_0 g_0(x) + s_1 g_1(x)
\]
vansishes. But \( \text{supp}_{\mathbb{R}}(h; A \setminus \{\alpha_1\}) = \mathcal{S}(A \setminus \{\alpha_1\}) \), and \( \alpha_0 \) is a relative interior point of \( A \setminus \{\alpha_1\} \). Hence, the induction hypothesis implies that \( h(x) \) has a singular point \( w \). Then,

\[
0 = h(w) \geq f(w) \geq 0,
\]

which implies that \( w \) is a singular point of \( f(x) \).

**Proposition 4.6.** Assume that \( A = \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d\} \) has a relative interior point, and that \( f \in \mathbb{R}^A \) is such that \( \text{supp}_{\mathbb{R}}(f; A) = \mathcal{S}(A) \). Let \( \alpha_0 \in \mathcal{N}(A) \) be a point not contained in \( A \), and let \( A_0 = A \cup \{\alpha_0\} \). Then, \( \text{supp}_{\mathbb{R}}(f; A_0) = \mathcal{S}(A_0) \).

**Proof.** Let \( \mathcal{S}(A) = \{C_1, \ldots, C_k\} \). By Proposition 4.5, the exponential sum \( f(x) \) has a singular point, which we can assume to be \( x = (0, \ldots, 0) \). Using (2.6), we obtain a sonc-decomposition

\[
f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \langle \varphi_A(x), t_i c_i \rangle.
\]

Let \( \alpha_1 \) denote the relative interior point of \( A \). By Lemma 3.3, we find a simplicial circuits \( D_0 \subset A_0 \) containing \( \alpha_0 \) as a vertex and \( \alpha_1 \) as an interior point. On the other hand, \( \alpha_0 \) is not a vertex of \( \mathcal{N}(A) \), so it is a relative interior point of some face \( F \) of the Newton polytope \( \mathcal{N}(A) \). Hence, also by Lemma 3.3, there is a simplicial circuit \( D_1 \subset A_0 \) containing \( \alpha_0 \) as its interior point. Then, there are positive constants \( s_0 \) and \( s_1 \) such that \( s_0 d_0 + s_1 d_1 \in \ker(A) \). It follows that there are real numbers \( r_1, \ldots, r_k \) such that

\[
s_0 d_0 + s_1 d_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{k} r_i c_i,
\]

and, by choosing \( \varepsilon > 0 \) sufficiently small so that \( t_i - \varepsilon r_i > 0 \),

\[
f(x) = \langle \varphi_A(x), \varepsilon s_0 d_0 \rangle + \langle \varphi_A(x), \varepsilon s_1 d_1 \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \langle \varphi_A(x), (t_i - \varepsilon r_i) c_i \rangle,
\]
is a sonc-decomposition of \( f(x) \). We conclude that \( D_0, D_1 \in \text{supp}_{\mathbb{R}}(f; A_0) \). Since \( A \) has a relative interior point, Proposition 3.4 implies that \( \text{supp}_{\mathbb{R}}(f; A) \) contains a basis of \( \ker(A) \). Hence, \( \text{supp}_{\mathbb{R}}(f; A_0) \), which contains both \( \text{supp}_{\mathbb{R}}(f; A) \) and \( D_0 \), contains a basis of \( \ker(A_0) \). That is, for any simplicial circuit \( D \subset A_0 \) we have that \( d \) can be written as a linear combination of the vectors \( d_0 \) and \( c_1, \ldots, c_k \). The same trick we used to show that \( D_0 \) and \( D_1 \) belong to \( \text{supp}_{\mathbb{R}}(f; A_0) \) gives that \( D \in \text{supp}_{\mathbb{R}}(f; A_0) \). 

\[ \square \]
Example 4.7. Consider the univariate agiform
\[ g(z) = 1 - 3z^2 + 2z^3. \]
Since \( g \) vanishes at \( x = 1 \), its monomial sonc-support is empty. As a polynomial supported on the circuit \( C_1 = \{0, 2, 3\} \), we find that
\[ \text{supp}_G(g; C_1) = \{c_1\} = \mathcal{S}(C_1). \]
Let us now view \( g \) as a polynomial supported on \( A = \{0, 1, 2, 4\} \). For \( i = 0, \ldots, 4 \), let \( C_i \) denote the simplicial circuit obtained by deleting \( i \) from \( A \), and let \( g_i \) denote the simplicial circuit obtained from the barycentric coordinates. We find that
\[ 4g(z) = 5g_0(x) + g_1(x) + g_2(x) + g_3(x), \]
which shows that
\[ \text{supp}_G(g; A) = \{c_0, c_1, c_2, c_3\} = \mathcal{S}(A). \]

Proposition 4.6 allows us, under certain conditions, to add points to the support set \( A \), as long as we do not change the Newton polytope \( \mathcal{N}(A) \). This “trick” is used in several of the subsequent proofs. A benefit of working with real support sets is that we can always find an additional point in the Newton polytope.

Let \( F \leq \mathcal{N}(A) \) be a face of the Newton polytope \( \mathcal{N}(A) \). We define the truncation of a sonc-decomposition
\[ f(x) = \sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}(A)} t_R g_R(x) \]
to the face \( F \) to be the sonc-decomposition
\[ g(x) = \sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}(A \cap F)} t_R g_R(x). \]
It is important to note that the truncation depends on the sonc-decomposition. That is, truncation is not a well-defined operator on \( \mathbb{R}^A \).

Lemma 4.8. Let \( A \) have a relative interior point and assume that \( f \in \mathbb{R}^A \) has \( \text{supp}_R(f) = \mathcal{S}(A) \). Let \( F \leq \mathcal{N}(A) \) be a face of \( \mathcal{N}(A) \). Let \( g(x) \) be a truncation of a sonc-decomposition of \( f(x) \) to the face \( F \) such that the Newton polytope of \( g \) is \( \mathcal{N}(A \cap F) \). Then,
\[ \text{sing}(g) = \text{sing}(f) + \text{Aff}(F)^\perp. \]

Proof. We can assume that \( \mathcal{N}(A) \) is full dimensional, in which case \( \text{sing}(f) = w \) is a point. By Proposition 4.5, we have that \( w = \text{sing}(f) \subset \text{sing}(g) \). Hence, using (2.8), we find that \( \text{sing}(g) = w + \text{Aff}(F)^\perp \). \( \square \)

Theorem 4.9. Let \( A_1 \) and \( A_2 \) be support sets both of which contains a relative interior point. Let \( F_1 \leq \mathcal{N}(A_1) \) and \( F_2 \leq \mathcal{N}(A_2) \) be the minimal faces containing the intersection \( P = \mathcal{N}(A_1) \cap \mathcal{N}(A_2) \). Let \( f_1 \) and \( f_2 \), supported on \( A_1 \) respectively \( A_2 \), be such that \( \text{supp}_R(f_1; A_1) = \mathcal{S}(A_1) \) and \( \text{supp}_R(f_2; A_2) = \mathcal{S}(A_2) \). Then, the exponential sum
\[ f(x) = f_1(x) + f_2(x) \]
either has \( \text{supp}_R(f; A_1 \cup A_2) = \mathcal{R}(A_1 \cup A_2) \), or there is a translate of the normal space of \( \text{Aff}(F_1 \cup F_2) \) which intersects both \( \text{sing}(f_1) \) and \( \text{sing}(f_2) \).
Proof. If \( P = \emptyset \) or if \( P \) is a vertex of both \( \mathcal{N}(A_1) \) and \( \mathcal{N}(A_2) \), then there is nothing to prove. There are two more cases: the case that one of \( F_1 \) and \( F_2 \) is zero-dimensional, and the case the neither \( F_1 \) nor \( F_2 \) is zero-dimensional.

First we note that if \( \alpha \in \hat{P} \) is a relative interior point of \( F_i \), then by Proposition 4.6 there is no loss of generality in assuming that there is a circuit \( C \subset A_i \cap F_i \), with \( \alpha \) as its relative interior point, such that \( \dim C = \dim(A_i) \cap F_i \). Then, by Lemma 4.8 there is no loss of generality in replacing \( f_i \) by a simplicial agiform \( g_i \), supported on \( C \), which appears in some sonc-decomposition of \( f_i \).

Second, we note that if \( \alpha \in A_1 \cap A_2 \), then \( \alpha \in \text{supp}_{\mathcal{R}}(f; A) \) implies that \( \text{supp}_{\mathcal{R}}(f; A) = \mathcal{R}(A) \). Indeed, Lemmas 2.5 and 3.3 gives that \( \alpha \in \text{supp}_{\mathcal{R}}(f_i; A_i) \) implies that the relative interior point of \( A_i \) is contained in \( \text{supp}_{\mathcal{R}}(f_i; A_i) \), which in turn implies that \( A_i \subset \text{supp}_{\mathcal{R}}(f_i; A_i) \) for \( i = 1, 2 \).

Consider now the case that neither \( F_1 \) nor \( F_2 \) is zero-dimensional. Let \( \alpha \) be a relative interior point of \( P \), so that \( \alpha \) is a relative interior of both \( F_1 \) and \( F_2 \). As noted above, we can reduce to the case of two simplicial agiforms \( g_1 \) and \( g_2 \) with supports \( C_1 \subset F_1 \) respectively \( C_2 \subset F_2 \), both which have \( \alpha \) as their relative interior point. It suffices to show that either \( g_1 \) and \( g_2 \) have a common singular point, or the exponential sum \( g(x) = g_1(x) + g_2(x) \) has \( \alpha \in \text{supp}_{\mathcal{R}}(g; C_1 \cup C_2) \). But the exponential sum \( g(x) \) has exactly one negative term. Hence, if \( g \) is strictly positive (i.e., if \( g_1 \) and \( g_2 \) does not have a common singular point), then \( \alpha \in \text{supp}_{\mathcal{R}}(g) \) by Theorem 4.1.

Consider now the case that \( F_2 = P = \{\alpha\} \) is a vertex of \( \mathcal{N}(A_2) \), while it is a relative interior point of \( F_1 \). As noted above, we can assume that \( F_1 = \mathcal{N}(A_1) \). Then, \( \text{Aff}(F_1 \cup F_2) = \text{Aff}(F_1) \), so by (2.8) it remains to show that either \( \alpha \in \text{supp}_{\mathcal{R}}(f) \) or \( f_1 \) and \( f_2 \) have a common singular point. By Proposition 4.6 there is no loss of generality in assuming that \( A_2 \) contains a circuit \( C_2 \) with \( \alpha \) as a vertex such that \( \dim C_2 = \dim \mathcal{N}(A_2) \). Hence, we can reduce to two simplicial agiforms \( g_1 \) and \( g_2 \). Since the monomial \( e^{x,\alpha} \) has coefficients of different signs in \( g_1 \) and \( g_2 \), then there exists \( t_1, t_2 > 0 \) such that the coefficient of \( e^{x,\alpha} \) in \( t_1g_1(x) + t_2g_2(x) \) vanishes. Then, \( t_1g_1(x) + t_2g_2(x) \) has one negative term, and we can apply Proposition 4.1 as in the previous case.

While Theorem 4.9 is rather technical, the following corollary illustrates its strength.

Corollary 4.10. Let \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) be full-dimensional simplicial circuits whose Newton polytopes overlap in a full-dimensional region. Then, the exponential sum

\[
f(x) = f_1(x) + f_2(x)
\]

either has \( \text{supp}_{\mathcal{R}}(f; C_1 \cup C_2) = \mathcal{R}(C_1 \cup C_2) \), or \( \text{sing}(f_1) = \text{sing}(f_2) \).

Proof. Using the notation of Theorem 4.9, we find that \( \text{Aff}(F_1 \cup F_2) = \mathbb{R}^2 \), and hence the normal space of \( \text{Aff}(F_1 \cup F_2) \) is trivial. Hence, a translate of the normal space of \( \text{Aff}(F_1 \cup F_2) \) intersects both \( \text{sing}(f_1) \) and \( \text{sing}(f_2) \) if and only if \( \text{sing}(f_1) = \text{sing}(f_2) \).

4.4. The characterization of simplicial sonc-supports. We are now ready to prove Theorem 3.2 which states that the simplicial part \( \text{supp}_{\mathcal{S}}(f) \) of a sonc-support is defined by a face \( F \) of the cone \( \mathcal{C}_A \) of simplicial circuits.
Proof of Theorem 3.2. We first prove that if $s \subset \mathcal{S}(A)$ is a simplicial sonc-support, then $s$ is defined by a face of the cone of simplicial circuits. Assume first that $C \in s$ is contained in the relative interior of some face $F$ of the cone $\mathcal{C}_A$. We claim that the generators $c_1, \ldots, c_k$ of the face $F$ also belongs to $s$. There is an expression

\begin{equation}
(4.3) \quad c = \sum_{i=1}^{k} t_i c_i
\end{equation}

where $t_i > 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$. Using (2.6) we find that

\begin{equation}
(4.4) \quad g(x) = \langle \varphi_A(x - w), c \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \langle \varphi_A(x - w), t_i c_i \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{k} t_i g_i(x),
\end{equation}

where $g_i$ is a simplicial agiform supported on $C_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$. That is, every sonc-decomposition containing $g(x)$ can be rewritten as a sonc-decomposition containing the agiforms $g_1, \ldots, g_k$ from (4.4). In particular, $C_1, \ldots, C_k \in s$.

Assume now that the generators $C_1, \ldots, C_k$ of a face $F$ belongs to $s$, and let $c$ lie in the relative interior of the face $F$. We need to show that $C \in s$. We show the slightly stronger statement that as soon as there is a relationship (4.3), then $C_1, \ldots, C_k \in s$ implies that $C \in s$. We use induction over the number of vanishing components of $c$. If $c$ has no vanishing components, then each $C_i$ is a subcircuit of $C$, implying that $k = 1$ and that $C = C_1 \in s$. If there is a common vanishing component of $c$ and each $c_i$, then we can delete that component (i.e., remove the corresponding point of $A$). Assume now that the first component of $c$, corresponding to $\alpha_0$, vanishes, but it is not vanishing for all $c_i$ in the right hand side of (4.3).

We can partition the sum in the right hand side of (4.3) into partial sums with two terms such that for each partial sum, the first component vanishes. Let us consider such a partial sum $s_i c_i + s_j c_j$, for which the first component of $c_i$ and $c_j$ does not vanish. Then, the first components of $c_i$ and $c_j$ have opposite signs; assume it is negative in $c_i$ and positive in $c_j$.

Let $h(x)$ be such that $\text{sup}_{\mathcal{S}}(h) = \mathcal{S}(A)$, and let $g_i$ and $g_j$ be simplicial agiform supported on $C_i$ respectively $C_j$, appearing in some sonc-decomposition of $h(x)$. Let us apply Theorem 4.9 to $g_i(x) + g_j(x)$, using the notation of said theorem.

Let $P = \mathcal{N}(C_i) \cap \mathcal{N}(C_j)$. We have that $\alpha_0 \in C_i \cap C_j \subset P$. As $\alpha_0$ is the relative interior point of $C_i$, the minimal face $F_i$ of $\mathcal{N}(C_i)$ containing $P$ is the full Newton polytope $\mathcal{N}(C_i)$. By Theorem 4.9 there is a translation $S$ of the normal space of $\text{Aff}(F_i \cup F_j)$ which intersects both $\text{sing}(g_i)$ and $\text{sing}(g_j)$. Since $F_i = \mathcal{N}(C_i)$, the normal space to $\text{Aff}(F_i \cup F_j)$ is a subspace of the normal space to $\text{Aff}(\mathcal{N}(C_i))$. Hence, we can conclude from (2.8) that

\begin{equation}
S \subset \text{sing}(g_i).
\end{equation}

Since $S$ intersects the singular loci of $g_j$, we find that $g_i(x)$ and $g_j(x)$ have a common singular point. We can assume that the common singular point is $x = (0, \ldots, 0)$.
It follows that the exponential sum \( s_ig_i(x) + s_jg_j(x) \) is supported on \( A \setminus \{ \alpha_0 \} \). Hence, by Theorem 4.2 we can find simplicial circuits \( D_1, \ldots , D_\ell \subset A \setminus \{ \alpha_0 \} \) such that

\[
s_ig_i(x) + s_jg_j(x) = \langle \varphi_A(x), s_ic_i + s_jc_j \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^\ell t_j \langle \varphi_A(x), d_j \rangle
\]

It follows that \( D_1, \ldots , D_\ell \in s \). Hence, replacing each partial sum \( s_ic_i + s_jc_j \) of (4.3) by \( \sum_{j=1}^\ell t_jd_j \), all vectors have a vanishing first component. We can then delete the first component, and apply the induction hypothesis.

It remains to prove the converse statement: if \( s \) is defined by a face \( F \) of the cone \( C_A \), then there exists an exponential sum \( f \in \mathbb{R}^A \) such that \( s \) is the simplicial sonc-support \( \text{supp}_R(f) \). We use the following characterization of a face of a polyhedral cone. For any linear relation

\[
\sum_{i=1}^k t_ic_i = \sum_{j=1}^\ell s_jd_j
\]

where \( t_i, s_j > 0 \), we have that \( c_i \in F \) for all \( i \) if and only if \( d_j \in F \) for all \( j \). Let \( s \) be defined by a face \( F \) of the cone \( C_A \), and consider the exponential sum

\[
f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^k t_i \langle \varphi_A(x), c_i \rangle.
\]

Since \( f \) has a singular point at \( x = (0, \ldots , 0) \), each sonc-decomposition of \( f \) only contains simplicial agiforms which vanishes at \( x = (0, \ldots , 0) \). In particular, any second sonc-decomposition

\[
f(x) = \sum_{j=1}^\ell s_j \langle \varphi_A(x), d_j \rangle.
\]

reduces to a linear relation of the form (4.5). Hence, \( \text{supp}_{\mathbb{R}}(f) = s \). \( \square \)

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.1 which states that the simplicial part \( \text{supp}_S(f) \) of a sonc-support is defined by a regular subdivision of the Newton polytope \( N(A) \). First, let us remind the reader about a few facts on regular subdivisions \( \text{GRZ08, LRS10, Stu96} \).

Consider a weight function \( \nu : A \to \mathbb{R} \), and the \( n+1 \) dimensional polytope \( N(A; \nu) = \text{conv} \left( \{ (\alpha, \nu(\alpha)) | \alpha \in A \} \right) \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \).

The upper convex hull of the polytope \( N(A; \nu) \) is the graph of the piecewise linear and concave function \( \hat{\nu} : N(A) \to \mathbb{R} \) defined by

\[
\hat{\nu}(y) = \{ \max(s) | (y, s) \in N(A; \nu) \}.
\]

The regular subdivision \( \Lambda \) induced by \( \nu \) is the subdivision of \( N(A) \) whose cells are the linearity spaces of the function \( \hat{\nu} \).

**Proof of Theorem 1.1.** By Theorem 3.2 each a subset \( s \subset \mathbb{G}(A) \) is the simplicial part of a sonc-support if and only if it is defined by a face \( F \) of the polyhedral cone \( C_A \). We now show that a subset of \( \mathbb{G}(A) \) is defined by a face of the polyhedral cone \( C_A \) if and only if it is defined by a regular subdivision of the Newton polytope \( N(A) \).
For each face $F$ of the polyhedral cone $C_A$, there is a weight vector $\omega$ such that $\langle \omega, c \rangle = 0$ for each $c \in F$ and $\langle \omega, c \rangle < 0$ for each $c \notin F$. Let $\nu: \Lambda \to \mathbb{R}$ be the weight function $\nu(\alpha_i) = \omega_i$, and let $\Lambda$ be the regular subdivision induced by $\nu$. As every regular subdivision of $\mathcal{N}(A)$ and every face $F$ of $C_A$ appear in this manner, it suffices to show that the face $F$ and the polyhedral subdivision $\Lambda$ define the same subset of $\mathcal{G}(A)$.

The weight $\omega$, being chosen as an outwards normal vector of some nontrivial face of the cone $C_A$, is far from generic: we claim that $\nu(\alpha) = \hat{\nu}(\alpha)$ for all $\alpha \in A$. To see this, notice first that

$$0 \geq \langle \omega, c \rangle = -\nu(\alpha_0) + \sum_{i=1}^{d} \beta_i \nu(\alpha_i).$$

Now, let $C = \{\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_d\}$ be a simplicial circuit contained in some cell $\lambda$ of $\Lambda$ (i.e., a linearity space of $\hat{\nu}$) with $\alpha_0$ as its relative interior point and such that the vertices $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d$ are contained in the vertex set (i.e., zero-dimensional cells) of $\Lambda$. Then, $\nu(\alpha_i) = \hat{\nu}(\alpha_i)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, d$, and hence the above inequality gives that

$$\nu(\alpha_0) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{d} \beta_i \nu(\alpha_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \beta_i \hat{\nu}(\alpha_i) = \hat{\nu}(\alpha_0).$$

But $\hat{\nu}(\alpha_0) \geq \nu(\alpha_0)$ by definition. Hence, $\hat{\nu}(\alpha_0) = \nu(\alpha_0)$, provided the existence of the circuit $C$.

For each $\alpha \in A$, either $\alpha$ is a vertex of $\Lambda$ or it is the relative interior point of some cell $\lambda \in \Lambda$. In the latter case, Lemma 3.3 applied with $\alpha$ as a relative interior point of the support set $A \cap \lambda$, gives the existence of a simplicial circuit $C \subset \lambda$ with $\alpha$ as a relative interior point and whose vertex set is contained in the vertex set of $\lambda$. Hence, $\nu(\alpha) = \hat{\nu}(\alpha)$ for each $\alpha \in A$.

In particular, for any simplicial circuit $C = \{\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d\}$ with $\alpha_0$ as its relative interior point

$$\nu(\alpha_0) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{d} \beta_i \nu(\alpha_i),$$

by concavity of $\hat{\nu}$, with equality if and only if $C$ belongs to a linearity space of $\Lambda$.  

4.5. The characterization of monomial sonc-supports. Let us now characterize possible monomial sonc-supports.

**Proposition 4.11.** Let $m \subset \mathcal{R}(A)$. Then, there exists an $f \in \mathbb{R}^A$ such that $m = \text{supp}_{\mathcal{R}}(f)$ if and only if $m = \mathcal{R}(A_m)$ and $\mathcal{N}(A_m) \cap A = A_m$.

**Proof.** Assume that $m = \text{supp}_{\mathcal{R}}(f)$. Let $C = \{\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d\} \subset A_m$ be a simplicial circuit with $\alpha_0$ as a relative interior point. For any positive numbers $s_1, \ldots, s_d$, there is a positive number $s_0$ such that

$$g(x) = s_1 e^{x, \alpha_1} + \cdots + s_d e^{x, \alpha_d} - s_0 e^{x, \alpha_0}$$

is a agiform supported on $C$. Moving the monomial $s_0 e^{x, \alpha_0}$ to the left hand side of the above equality, we find that a sonc-support containing $\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d\}$ also contains both $\alpha_0$ and $c$. It follows that $\mathcal{N}(A_m) \cap A = A_m$ and that $m = \mathcal{R}(A_m)$. 
To prove the converse statement, it suffices to note that if $A_m$ is a strict subset of $A$, then Theorem 4.2 implies that the sonc cone $S_{A_m}^+$ is contained in the boundary of the sonc cone $S_A^+$. □

4.6. The characterization of sonc-supports. Having characterized both the possible simplicial sonc-supports, and the possible monomial sonc-support, the next step is to characterize the possible sonc-supports. Proposition 2.11 says that the simplicial sonc-support and the monomial sonc-support are disjoint; but this is not the only obstruction.

Proposition 4.12. Let $f \in \mathbb{R}^A$ with simplicial sonc-support $s = \text{supp}_{\mathbb{E}}(f)$ and monomial sonc-support $m = \text{supp}_{\mathbb{M}}(f)$. Assume that the sonc-complex $\Gamma$ defined by $f$ is connected. Then, there is no simplicial circuit $C \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with at least one vertex in $\mathcal{N}(A_m)$ and whose interior point is contained in $\Gamma$.

Lemma 4.13. Let $\{C_1, \ldots, C_k\} \subset \mathcal{S}(A)$ be a sequence of simplicial circuits such that $C_i \cap C_{i+1} \neq \emptyset$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k - 1$. Let $\alpha_0 \in C_1$ and $\alpha_k \in C_k$ be arbitrary. Then, for any simplicial agiforms $g_1, \ldots, g_k$ supported on $C_1, \ldots, C_k$, and any positive numbers $t_0, t_1, \ldots, t_k$, there exists simplicial agiforms $h_1, \ldots, h_k$ supported on $C_1, \ldots, C_k$ and positive numbers $s_0, s_1, \ldots, s_k$ such that

$$t_0 e^{x, \alpha_0} + t_1 g_1(x) + \cdots + t_k g_k(x) = s_0 e^{x, \alpha_k} + s_1 h_1(x) + \cdots + s_k h_k(x).$$

Proof. We use induction over the length $k$ of the sequence. The case $k = 1$ follows from Lemma 2.5. Consider the case $k = j + 1$. By assumption, there exists an element $\alpha_j \in C_j \cap C_{j+1}$. By the induction hypothesis, we find agiforms $h_1, \ldots, h_j$ and positive numbers $\tilde{s}_0$ and $s_1, \ldots, s_j$ such that

$$t_0 e^{x, \alpha_0} + t_1 g_1(x) + \cdots + t_j g_j(x) = \tilde{s}_0 e^{x, \alpha_j} + s_1 h_1(x) + \cdots + s_j h_j(x),$$

and by the case $k = 1$ (or, by Lemma 2.5) we find $s_0, s_j > 0$ and $h_{j+1}$ such that

$$\tilde{s}_0 e^{x, \alpha_j} + t_{j+1} g_{j+1}(x) = s_0 e^{x, \alpha_{j+1}} + s_{j+1} h_{j+1}(x).$$

Proof of Proposition 4.12. Assume the contrary. Assume that there is a simplicial circuit $C = \{\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d\}$, with $\alpha_0$ as its relative interior point, such $\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{j+1} \in \Gamma$ and $\alpha_{j+1}, \ldots, \alpha_d \in A_2$ for some $1 \leq j < d$. Since $\Gamma$ is connected, for each $\alpha_i \in \Gamma$, there is a sequence of simplicial circuits $\{C_i, \ldots, C_k\}$ such that $\alpha_0 \in C_{i1}$ and $\alpha_i \in C_{ik}$. Applying Lemma 4.13 once for each sequence, we find positive numbers $s_0, \ldots, s_j$ such that

$$f(x) = \bar{f}(x) - s_0 e^{x, \alpha_0} + s_1 e^{x, \alpha_1} + \cdots + s_j e^{x, \alpha_j}.$$
follows that $C \in \text{supp}_R(f)$. But $C$ intersects both $A_s$ and $A_m$, which is a contradiction to Proposition 2.11. □

The following special cases are sufficient in many cases.

**Corollary 4.14.** Let $f \in \mathbb{R}^A$ with simplicial sonc-support $\text{supp}_S(f)$ and monomial sonc-support $m$. Then, for each $C \in \text{supp}_S(f)$, the intersection $\text{Aff}(C) \cap N(A_m)$ is empty.

*Proof.* Assume that the intersection is not empty. By Theorem 4.2 there is no loss of generality in assuming that $\alpha_1 \in \text{Aff}(C) \cap N(A_m)$ is an element of $A_m$. Let $\alpha_0$ be the relative interior point of $C$. By Lemma 3.3 to the support set $C \cup \{\alpha_1\}$, with $\alpha_1$ as vertex and $\alpha_0$ as the relative interior point, yields a simplicial circuit with interior point in $C$ and a vertex in $N(A_m)$. Now apply Proposition 4.12. □

**Corollary 4.15.** Let $f \in \mathbb{R}^A$ with simplicial sonc-support $s$ and monomial sonc-support $m$. If there exists a $C \in s$ such that $N(p)C^qX^N(p)A^m_q$ is full-dimensional, then $A_m = \emptyset$. □

The following converse suffices to characterize the sonc-supports which defines codimension one pieces of the boundary of the sonc cone, see Proposition 7.9.

**Theorem 4.16.** Let $v \in \mathcal{R}(A)$ have monomial part $m$ and simplicial part $s$. Then, there exists an exponential sum $f \in \mathbb{R}^A$ such that $v = \text{supp}_R(f)$ if and only if

(a) $s$ is a simplicial sonc-support, as described in Theorem 7.1.
(b) $m$ is a monomial sonc-support, as described in Proposition 4.11.
(c) $A_s \cap A_m = \emptyset$, as described in Proposition 2.11.
(d) The compatibility condition of Proposition 4.12 is fulfilled.

*Proof.* It suffices to show that if the condition (a)–(d) are fulfilled, then there exists an exponential sum $f$ such that $v = \text{supp}_R(f)$. We claim that $f$ can be chosen by the sonc-decomposition

$$f(x) = \sum_{C \in s} \langle \varphi_A(x), c \rangle + \sum_{\alpha \in A_2} e^{\langle x, \alpha \rangle}.$$ 

Assume to the contrary that there is a nonempty set of simplicial circuits $D_1, \ldots, D_k \in \text{supp}_R(f)$ not contained in $v$. It cannot be that each $D_i$ is contained in $A_s$, for then $s$ would not be a sonc-support. Of the simplicial circuits $D_1, \ldots, D_j$ which intersects both $A_s$ and $A_m$, we claim that at least one must have its interior point in $A_m$.

To prove the claim, assume the contrary. Then, with, $\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_r\} = (D_1 \cup \cdots \cup D_j) \cap A_s$, there are positive numbers $s_1, \ldots, s_r$ such that the exponential sum

$$\sum_{C \in s} \langle \varphi_A(x), c \rangle - \sum_{j=1}^{r} s_j e^{\langle x, \alpha_j \rangle}$$

admits a sonc-decomposition, contradicting that $s$ is a simplicial sonc-support.

By Proposition 4.12 the existence of a simplicial $D_k$ which intersects both $A_s$ and $A_m$ yields a contradiction. Hence, no such set of simplicial circuits $D_1, \ldots, D_k$ exists. □
Example 4.17. Let us consider the bivariate support set
\[ A = \begin{bmatrix}
  1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
  0 & 2 & 3 & 1 & 2 & 1 \\
  0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 2
\end{bmatrix}, \]
and the two one-dimensional simplicial circuits
\[ c_1 = [1, -3, 2, 0, 0, 0, 0] \quad \text{and} \quad c_2 = [0, 0, 1, 0, -2, 1, 0], \]
where we label the points as \( \alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_6 \). The Newton polytope \( \mathcal{N}(A) \) and three sonc-supports associated to \( A \) are depicted in Figure 4.

In the first sonc-support, we have that \( s = \{c_1, c_2\} \) and \( m = \{\alpha_3\} \). By Proposition 4.12, the point \( \alpha_6 \) cannot be contained in \( m \).

In the second and third sonc-supports, we have that \( s = \{c_2\} \). In this case, \( \alpha_6 \) can be contained in \( m \), but, by Proposition 4.12, only if no other monomial is contained in \( m \). Hence, we can have either \( m \subset \{\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_3\} \), as in the second sonc-support, or we can have that \( m = \{\alpha_6\} \) as in the third picture.

5. The Univariate Case

In this section we give a complete description of the semi-algebraic stratification of the boundary of the sonc cone \( \mathcal{S}_+^A \) in the case that \( n = 1 \). We represent a univariate support set as
\[ (5.1) \quad A = \begin{bmatrix}
  1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\
  \alpha_0 & \alpha_1 & \cdots & \alpha_d
\end{bmatrix}, \]
where \( \alpha_0 < \alpha_1 < \cdots < \alpha_d \).

In the univariate case, all simplicial circuits are full-dimensional. Hence, Corollary 4.15 implies that for each sonc-support \( \text{supp}_\mathfrak{R}(f) \), either the monomial part or the simplicial part is empty.

Corollary 4.14 implies that each monomial sonc-support is given by a sub-polytope \( [i_1, i_2] \subset \mathcal{N}(A) \). The corresponding class, in the stratification of \( \mathbb{R}^A \) according to sonc-supports, is denoted as \( S_{[i_1, i_2]} \). We write \([i]\) and \( S_{[i]} \) in the case that \( i = i_1 = i_2 \). There is one special class, labelled by \( S_\emptyset \), which only consists of the exponential sum all of whose coefficients are zero.
We showed in Propositions 3.4 and 3.11 that the cone $C_A$ is a full-dimensional and simple polyhedral cone, generated by the vectors $c_i$ associated to the minimal circuits $C_i$.

$$C_i = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \alpha_{i-1} & \alpha_i & \alpha_{i+1} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{where } i = 1, \ldots, m.$$ 

Notice that $m = d - 1$ is the codimension of $A$. In particular, each face of $C_A$ is determined by an index set

$$I = \{i_1, \ldots, i_k\} \subset \{1, \ldots, m\}.$$ 

We identify the set of all simplicial sonic-supports with the power set $\mathcal{P}(\{1, \ldots, m\})$.

**Lemma 5.1.** Let $f \in \mathbb{R}^A$ be such that the simplicial sonic-support $\text{supp}_S(f)$ is given by the index set $I = \{i_1, \ldots, i_k\}$. Then, $f$ has a unique sonic-decomposition 

$$f(x) = g_{i_1}(x) + \cdots + g_{i_k}(x),$$

where $g_i(x)$ is a simplicial agiform supported on the minimal simplicial circuit $C_i$.

**Proof.** It suffices to show that the sonic-decomposition is unique. The singular loci of the agiforms $g_i(x)$ are uniquely defined by Lemma 2.15. Hence, if $f(x)$ admits two distinct sonic-decompositions, then there is a linear combination of agiforms supported on $C_{i_1}, \ldots, C_{i_k}$ which vanishes identically. This yields a contradiction, as $g_{i_1}, \ldots, g_{i_k}$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{R}$. $\square$

Recall Lemma 2.16, where we showed that given a simplicial sonic-support $s$, and a linear combination $f$ of agiforms supported on the simplicial circuits $C \in s$, whether $f$ belongs to the boundary of the sonic cone or not depends only on the relative position of the singular loci of the agiforms.

**Example 5.2.** Consider the support set 

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \end{bmatrix}$$

and the two minimal simplicial subcircuit $C_1$ and $C_3$. Let us consider a polynomial 

$$f(z) = g_1(z) + g_3(z).$$

We claim that $f$ belongs to the boundary of $S_A^+$ if and only if $z_1 \leq z_3$, where $z_i$ denotes the singular loci of $g_i$. After a rescaling of $z$ and multiplication by a positive constant, we can reduce to the case that 

$$g_1(z) = 1 - 2w_1z + w_1^2z^2 \quad \text{and} \quad g_3(z) = z^2(w_3^2 - 2w_3z + z^2),$$

so that $z_1 \leq z_3$ is equivalent to that $w_1w_3 \geq 1$. Proposition 3.11 implies that the exponential sum $f(z)$ belongs to the interior of $S_A^+$ if and only if we can write 

$$f(z) = h_1(z) + h_2(z) + h_3(z)$$

where $h_1$ and $h_3$ are agiforms supported on $C_1$ and $C_3$ respectively, and 

$$h_2(z) = a_0z - a_1z^2 + a_2z^3.$$
is positive. By identifying coefficients, we find that there exists a (not necessarily unique) \( \zeta = (\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \) such that
\[
\begin{align*}
h_1(z) &= g_1(\zeta_1 z) \
h_3(z) &= \zeta_4^2 g_3(z/\zeta_2).
\end{align*}
\]
It follows that
\[
a_0(\zeta) = 2w_1(\zeta_1 - 1), \quad a_1(\zeta) = w_1^2(\zeta_1^2 - 1) + w_2^2(\zeta_2^2 - 1), \quad \text{and} \quad a_2(\zeta) = 2w_3(\zeta_2 - 1).
\]
In particular, if \( h_2(z) \) is positive on \( \mathbb{R}_+ \) then \( \zeta > 1 \), which in turn implies that \( a_1 > 0 \). Hence, \( f(z) \) belongs to the interior of \( S_A^+ \) if and only if we can find \( \zeta > 1 \) such that
\[
p(\zeta) = 4a_0(\zeta)a_2(\zeta) - a_1(\zeta)^2 > 0.
\]
We find, with \( q(\xi) = p(1 + \xi) \), that
\[
q(\xi) = 8w_1 w_3(2 - w_1 w_3)\xi_1 \xi_2 - w_1^4 \xi_1^2(\xi_1^2 + 4 \xi_1 + 4) - w_3^4 \xi_2^2(\xi_2^2 + 4 \xi_2 + 4) - 2 w_1^2 w_3^2 \xi_1 \xi_2 (2 \xi_1 + 2 \xi_2 + \xi_1 \xi_2).
\]
Notice that \( q(\xi) \) has one term with a positive coefficient, and the corresponding monomial belongs to a strict face \( F \) of the Newton polytope of \( q \) (viewed as a polynomial in \( \xi \)). In particular, there exists \( \xi > 0 \) such that \( q(\xi) \) is positive if and only if there exists a \( \xi > 0 \) such that the extremal polynomial
\[
q_F(\xi) = 8w_1 w_3(2 - w_1 w_3)\xi_1 \xi_2 - 4w_1^4 \xi_1^2 - 4w_3^4 \xi_2^2
\]
is positive. This is the case if and only if \( w_1 w_3 < 1 \). If \( w_1 w_3 = 1 \), then \( z_1 = z_3 \), which in turn implies that \( f \) is singular. All in all, we find that \( f \) belongs to the interior of \( S_A^+ \) if and only if \( w_1 w_3 < 1 \).

Each exponential sum \( f \in \mathbb{R}^A \) determines the simplicial sonc-support \( \text{supp}_{\text{sonc}}(f) \), and hence also the associated sonc-complex \( \Gamma \). In the following proof, we denote by \( \Gamma_f \) the sonc-complex determined by \( f \).

**Proposition 5.3.** Let \( A \) be a univariate support set, let \( I = \{i_1, \ldots, i_k\} \subset \{1, \ldots, m\} \) be such that \( i_1 < \cdots < i_k \), and let \( g_i \) be a simplicial agiform supported on \( C_i \) with a singular point at \( w_i \). Then, the exponential sum
\[
(5.3) \quad f(x) = g_{i_1}(x) + \cdots + g_{i_k}(x)
\]
belongs to the boundary \( S_A^+ \) only if \( w_{i_1} \leq \cdots \leq w_{i_k} \).

**Proof.** It suffices to consider a sum of two minimal simplicial agiforms \( g_{i_1} \) and \( g_{i_2} \). There are three cases to consider.

The first case is when the Newton polytope \( \mathcal{N}(C_{i_1}) \) and \( \mathcal{N}(C_{i_2}) \) overlap in a line segment. Then, \( w_{i_1} = w_{i_2} \) by Theorem [4.9].

The second case is when the Newton polytopes \( \mathcal{N}(C_{i_1}) \) and \( \mathcal{N}(C_{i_2}) \) overlap in a point. In this case, by Proposition [4.6] there is no loss of generality in assuming that \( C_{i_1} \cap C_{i_2} \) is a rescaling of the support set from Example [5.2]. Hence, \( w_{i_1} \leq w_{i_2} \).

The third, most complicated case is when there is an open line segment separating \( \mathcal{N}(C_{i_1}) \) and \( \mathcal{N}(C_{i_2}) \). There is no loss of generality in assuming that
\[
A = \{ \alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4, \alpha_5, \alpha_6 \}
\]
and that \( i_1 = 1 \) and \( i_2 = 5 \). That is, there is no loss of generality in assuming that \( A \) contains a point \( \alpha_3 \) located in the line segment separating \( N(C_1) \) and \( N(C_5) \).

Let \( g_1 \) and \( g_5 \) be minimal simplicial agiforms with singular loci \( w_1 \) and \( w_5 \) respectively. Assume that the exponential sum

\[
f(x) = g_1(x) + g_5(x)
\]

belongs to the boundary of the sonc cone \( S^+_A \). We need to show that \( x_1 \leq x_5 \).

Since \( f(x) \) belongs to the boundary of the sonc cone, and since the leading and the constant term of \( f \) have nonvanishing coefficients, Proposition 4.11 and Corollary 4.14 imply that the monomial sonc-support is empty. It follows that the exponential sum

\[
p_\varepsilon(x) = f(x) - \varepsilon e^{x_{\alpha_3}}
\]

does not belong to the sonc cone. On the other hand, if \( g_3 \) denotes some simplicial agiform supported on the minimal circuit \( C_3 \), then

\[
q_\varepsilon(x) = f(x) + \varepsilon g_3(x)
\]

belongs to the sonc cone. It follows that there is a convex combination

\[
h_\varepsilon(x) = s_1(\varepsilon)p_\varepsilon(x) + s_2(\varepsilon)q_\varepsilon(x) = f(x) - \varepsilon s_1(\varepsilon)e^{x_{\alpha_3}} + \varepsilon s_2(\varepsilon)g_3(x),
\]

where \( s_1(\varepsilon) + s_2(\varepsilon) = 1 \), which belongs to the boundary of the sonc cone. Notice that this is not a sonc-decomposition of \( h_\varepsilon(x) \). Just as for \( f(x) \), we conclude that the monomial sonc-support of each \( h_\varepsilon(x) \) is empty.

By Lemma 5.1 there exists a unique sonc-decomposition

\[
h_\varepsilon(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{5} t_i(\varepsilon) \langle \varphi_A(x - w_i(\varepsilon)), \mathbf{c}_i \rangle,
\]

using the minimal circuit \( \mathbf{c}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{c}_5 \). Since the constant and leading coefficient appears in \( h_\varepsilon(x) \) with a positive coefficient, we have that \( t_1(\varepsilon), t_5(\varepsilon) > 0 \). Since the monomial \( e^{x_{\alpha_3}} \) appears in \( h_\varepsilon(x) \) with a negative coefficient, we have that \( t_3(\varepsilon) > 0 \). Hence, the first two cases implies that

\[
w_1(\varepsilon) \leq w_3(\varepsilon) \leq w_5(\varepsilon)
\]

for all \( \varepsilon > 0 \). Taking limits as \( \varepsilon \to 0 \), we obtain that \( w_1 \leq w_5 \).

Remark 5.4. Consider a piece of the boundary of the sonc cone whose sonc-support is given by a (nonempty, ordered) index set \( \{i_1, \ldots, i_k\} \subset \{1, \ldots, m\} \). We deduce from Proposition 5.3 that

\[
(x) \quad x_{i_1} \leq \cdots \leq x_{i_k}
\]

Hence, we can stratify the class with simplicial sonc-support \( \{i_1, \ldots, i_k\} \) according to which of the inequalities of (5.4) are strict and which are equalities. We label such a strata by grouping the indices in \( I \) for which the singular loci are equal. Groups of indices are separated by a vertical bar. Note that, by Theorem 4.9, if \( i_{j+1} = i_j + 1 \), then the singular loci are necessarily equal. We prove in Proposition 7.8 that the dimension of a strata is the sum of the number of indices and the number of groups.

The set of labels of strata is partially ordered as follows.
Comparing two monomial sonc-supports, we write \([i_1, i_2] < [i_3, i_4]\) if and only if \([i_1, i_2] \subset [i_3, i_4]\).

Comparing a simplicial sonc-support with a monomial sonc-support, we write \(I < [i_1, i_2]\) if each \(i \in I\) is an interior point of \([i_1, i_2]\).

Comparing two simplicial sonc-supports, we write \(I_1 < I_2\) if \(I_1 \subset I_2\) and any two indices which are grouped together in \(I_2\) are also grouped together in \(I_1\).

Remark 5.5. The coefficient vector \(\mathbf{a}\) of the exponential sum \(f\) from (5.3) admits the explicit presentation

\[
\mathbf{a} = \sum_{j=1}^{k} t_{ij} \varphi_A(-\mathbf{w}_{ij}) \ast \mathbf{c}_{ij}.
\]

That is, each piece \(S_I\) in the stratification of the boundary of the sonc cone has a canonical parametrization.

Theorem 5.6. Let \(A\) be a univariate support set. Then, the partitioning described in Remark 5.4 gives a stratification of the sonc cone \(\mathcal{S}_A^+\).

Proof. Let \(S_I\) denote the strata indexed by \(I\). The strata are disjoint by construction, and it is straightforward to check that

\[
\overline{S_I} = \bigcup_{J \subseteq I} S_J,
\]

from which the statement follows.

Example 5.7. Let us revisit Example 2.13. The support set is given by

\[
A = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

That is, we consider the family of univariate quartic polynomials:

\[
f(z) = a_0 + a_1 z + a_2 z^2 + a_3 z^3 + a_4 z^4.
\]
We listed all triangulations of \( \mathcal{N}(A) \) in Figure 1. As \( A \) is an integral support set, we use the toric morphism \( \psi_A \) from (2.3).

Let us compute the algebraic equations of the codimension one strata of the boundary of the sonc cone. There are two strata, labelled by \([0,3]\) and \([1,4]\), contained in the coordinate spaces 

\[
a_4 = 0 \quad \text{respectively} \quad a_0 = 0.
\]

There are two additional four-dimensional strata, labelled by \([1,2,3]\) and \([1|3]\).

The strata labelled by \([1,2,3]\) has one group of indices. Hence, the strata \( S_{[1,2,3]} \) consists of all polynomials of the form 

\[
f(z) = \langle \varphi_A(zw^{-1}), t_1c_1 + t_2c_2 + t_3c_3 \rangle.
\]

Alternatively, we get the explicit representation 

\[
a = \varphi_A(w^{-1}) \ast (t_1c_1 + t_2c_2 + t_3c_3),
\]

where \( \ast \) denotes component-wise multiplication and \( a \) denotes the coefficient vector of \( f \).

This is the Horn–Kapranov uniformization map associated to \( A \), and the strata \( S_{[1,2,3]} \) is contained in the \( A \)-discriminantal variety; see [7]. A Gröbner basis computation, eliminating \( t_1, t_2, t_3, \) and \( w \), yields the implicit representation as the vanishing locus of the degree six homogeneous polynomial

\[
D_{[1,2,3]}(a) = a_1^2a_2^2a_3^2 - 4a_0a_2a_3^2 - 4a_1^3a_3^3 + 18a_0a_1a_2a_3^3 - 27a_0a_2^2a_3 - 4a_1^2a_2^2a_4 + 16a_0a_2^2a_4 \\
+ 18a_1^2a_2a_3a_4 - 80a_0a_1a_2^2a_3a_4 - 6a_0a_1^2a_3a_4 + 144a_0^2a_2a_3^2a_4 - 27a_1^2a_4^2 \\
+ 144a_0a_1^2a_2a_4^2 - 128a_0^2a_2^2a_4^2 - 192a_0^2a_1a_3a_4^2 + 256a_0^3a_4^3.
\]

The strata labelled by \([1|3]\) has two groups of indices, to which we associate singular loci \( w_1 \) respectively \( w_3 \). Then, the strata \( S_{[1|3]} \) consists of all polynomials of the form 

\[
f(z) = \langle \varphi_A(zw_1^{-1}), t_1c_1 \rangle + \langle \varphi_A(zw_3^{-1}), t_3c_3 \rangle.
\]

Alternatively, we get the explicit representation 

\[
a = \varphi_A(w_1^{-1}) \ast (t_1c_1) + \varphi_A(w_3^{-1}) \ast (t_3c_3),
\]

where \( w_1 < w_3 \). A Gröbner basis computation gives an implicit representation by the cubic form

\[
D_{[1|3]}(a) = 4a_0a_2a_4 - a_0a_3^2 - a_1^2a_4.
\]

The algebraic hypersurfaces defined by \( D_{[1,2,3]} \) and \( D_{[1|3]} \), in the three dimensional affine space given by \( a_0 = a_4 = 1 \), are pictured in Figure 5, together with a picture of the boundary of the sonc cone. Note that only four strata intersect the affine space \( a_0 = a_4 = 1 \): they are labelled by \([0,4], [1,2,3], [1|3], \) and \([1,3] \).

**Example 5.8.** Bernd Sturmfels posed, to the authors, the challenge of computing the semi-algebraic stratification of the boundary of the sonc cone of the support set

\[
A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \end{bmatrix}
\]
Figure 5. The Zariski-closures of the strata $S_{\{1,2,3\}}$ and $S_{\{1,3\}}$, and the boundary of the sonc cone of univariate quartics from Example 5.7

associated to the family of all univariate sextics

$$f(z) = a_0 + a_1 z + a_2 z^2 + a_3 z^3 + a_4 z^4 + a_5 z^5 + a_6 z^6.$$ 

As any univariate support set, the case of sextics is covered by Theorem 5.6. Let us describe the boundary pieces of codimension one.

There are two strata of codimension one corresponding to monomial sonc-supports. They are labelled by $r_0$, $r_5$, and $r_1$, $r_6$, and they are contained in the coordinate spaces $a_6 = 0$ respectively $a_0 = 0$. There are five additional strata of codimension one, corresponding to simplicial sonc-supports. Notice that the dimension of a strata indexed by a set of groups of indices is equal to the sum of number of indices and the number of groups. That is, the codimension one strata of the boundary of the sonc cone are labelled by

$$\{1,2,3,4,5\}, \{1|3,4,5\}, \{1,2|4,5\}, \{1,2,3|5\}, \text{ and } \{1|3|5\}.$$

Remark 5.9. In typical fewnomial fashion, the structure of the boundary of the sonc cone in the univariate case, as a stratified space, depends only on the cardinality of $A$. For example, if $A$ contains $1 + d$ points then the number strata of codimension one is $2 + F_d$, where $F_d$ is the $d$th number in the Fibonacci sequence.

6. TROPICAL ARRANGEMENTS OF SINGULAR LOCI

In this section we discuss the possible arrangement of singular loci of the simplicial agiforms appearing in a sonc-decomposition in the multivariate case. As a main result, we show that such an arrangement is determined by a tropical variety. Let us first introduce the basic elements of tropical geometry.

A tropical exponential sum is a max-plus expression

$$\theta(x) = \max_{i=0,\ldots,d} \left( \omega_i + \langle x, \alpha_i \rangle \right),$$

where $\omega_i \in \mathbb{R}$, Let $\omega = (\omega_0, \ldots, \omega_d)$.

The corresponding tropical variety is the locus of all points $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that the maximum is attained at least twice [MS15]. If all $\alpha_i$ are distinct, this locus coincides with the corner locus (or, nonsmooth locus) of the graph of the function $\theta(x)$. 
There are two polyhedral complexes associated to $\theta(x)$ obtained from the indicator function $\iota : \mathbb{R}^n \to \varphi([0, \ldots, d])$ defined by

$$\iota(x) = \{ i \in \{0, \ldots, d\} \mid \theta(x) = \omega_i + \langle x, \alpha^i \rangle \}$$

The tropical complex $M$ has cells for subsets $I \subset \{0, \ldots, d\}$:

$$\mu_I = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \iota(x) \subset I \},$$

where we discard empty cells. Each $\mu_I$ is a convex polyhedral cone (or convex polytope) in $\mathbb{R}^n$. The tropical variety of $\theta$ is the codimension one skeleton of the complex $M(\theta)$. Let

$$\lambda_I = \text{conv} \left(\{\alpha_i \mid i \in I\}\right).$$

Then, the regular subdivision $\Lambda$ associated to $\theta$ is given by

$$\Lambda = \{\lambda_I \mid \mu_I \neq \emptyset\}.$$

It is a standard fact in tropical geometry that the complex $\Lambda$ is the regular subdivision of Newton polytope $N(A)$ defined by the weight vector $\omega = (\omega_0, \ldots, \omega_d)$. There is a duality relation between the complexes $\Lambda$ and $M$ given by

$$\hat{\mu}_I = \lambda_I.$$

The following lemma is a multivariate version of Proposition 5.3. We have chosen the simplest formulation which suffices to prove the subsequent theorem. First, let us introduce some notation. Let $C_1$ and $C_2$ be two full-dimensional simplicial circuits separated by an affine hyperplane $H$. We orient $H$ by choosing a normal vector $v$ such that

$$\langle v, \alpha^1 \rangle \geq \langle v, \alpha^2 \rangle, \quad \text{for all } \alpha^1 \in C_1, \text{ and } \alpha^2 \in C_2.$$

**Lemma 6.1.** Let $C_1$ and $C_2$ be two full-dimensional simplicial circuits whose Newton polytopes intersect in a common facet $F$. Let $H = \text{Aff}(F)$ be the (oriented) affine hyperplane separating $C_1$ and $C_2$, and let $v$ be a normal vector chosen as above. Let $g_i \in \mathbb{R}^{C_i}$ be simplicial agiforms, and let $g(x) = g_1(x) + g_2(x)$. Then, either $\text{supp}_R(g) = R(C_1 \cup C_2)$, or $\langle w_1, v \rangle \geq \langle w_2, v \rangle$, where $w_i$ denotes the singular loci of $g_i$.

**Proof.** By Theorem 4.9, either $R(g) = R(C_1 \cup C_2)$ or the singular loci of $g_1$ and $g_2$ are contained in the same line $\ell$ with direction vector $v$. After a translation, we can assume that $\ell$ passes through the origin. Let $w_i$ be defined by that $v_i = w_i \cdot v$. Consider a translate $\hat{\ell}$ of $\ell$ passing through the interior of $N(C_1)$ and $N(C_2)$. Let $\hat{C}_i$ be one-dimensional simplicial circuit contained in $N(C_i) \cap \hat{\ell}$. By Proposition 4.6, $g_i$ admits a sonc-decomposition which contains a simplicial agiform $\hat{g}_i$ supported on $C_i$. Let $\hat{g}(x) = \hat{g}_1(x) + \hat{g}_2(x)$. It suffices to show that either $\text{supp}_R(g) = R(\hat{C}_1 \cup \hat{C}_2)$, or $\langle w_1, v \rangle \geq \langle w_2, v \rangle$. This follows from Proposition 5.3: the singular loci of the restriction $h_i(x) = \hat{g}_i(xv)$ is $w_i$, and $\langle w_1, v \rangle \geq \langle w_2, v \rangle$ is equivalent to that $w_1 \geq w_2$. \)

**Theorem 6.2.** Let $f \in \mathbb{R}^A$ have simplicial sonc-support $s = \text{supp}_s(f)$ such that the sonc-complex $\Gamma_f$ is connected. Then, there is a tropical complex $M$ such that

(a) The regular subdivision $\Lambda = \hat{M}$ is compatible with the simplicial sonc-support $s$ in the sense that for each $C \in \text{supp}_s(f)$, there is a $\lambda \in \Lambda$ such that $C \subset \lambda$. 

(b) If \( C \in \lambda \), where \( \lambda = \mu \) for \( \mu \in M \), and if \( g \in \mathbb{R}^C \) appears in some sonc-decomposition of \( f \), then \( \text{sing}(g) \supset \text{Aff}(\mu) \).

Our proof is a more involved version of the proof of Proposition 5.3. New difficulties arise since in the multivariate setting there is no longer only a finite number of cases, and there is no unique minimal sonc-decomposition.

**Proof of Theorem 6.2.** Assume first that \( f \) is an exponential sum such that the sonc-complex \( \Gamma_f \) covers \( N_p(A) \). By Lemma 4.8, it suffices to show that the singular loci of the full-dimensional simplicial circuits is the vertex set of a tropical complex. But this follows immediately from Theorem 4.9 and Lemma 6.1.

Assume that there is some exponential sum \( f \) for which there is no tropical complex \( M \) fulfilling (a) and (b). Let \( A = \text{supp}(f) \). As \( \mathfrak{s} \) is nontrivial, \( f \) belongs to the boundary of the sonc cone in \( \mathbb{R}^A \). We can assume that \( A \) is minimal in the sense that for any exponential sum supported on a strict subset of \( A \), there is a tropical complex \( M \) fulfilling (a) and (b). It follows that the sonc-complex \( \Gamma_f \) covers \( A \).

Consider the family \( \mathcal{F} \) consisting of all exponential sums \( h \) such that

1. \( A \subset \text{supp}(h) \subset N(A) \),
2. \( h \) belongs to the boundary of the sonc cone in \( \mathbb{R}^{\text{supp}(h)} \),
3. the sonc-complex \( \Gamma_h \) is connected,
4. the sonc-complex \( \Gamma_h \) covers \( \text{supp}(h) \),
5. any point in \( \text{supp}(h) \setminus A \) is an interior point of \( \Gamma_h \), and
6. there is no tropical complex \( M \) fulfilling (a) and (b).

Then, \( f \in \mathcal{F} \), so \( \mathcal{F} \) is nonempty. For each \( h \in \mathcal{F} \), denote by \( \Delta_h \) the complement

\[
\Delta_h = N(A) \setminus \Gamma_h.
\]

By condition (5), there are only finitely many possible values for the Euclidean volume \( v(\Delta_h) \). Hence, there exists some \( h \in \mathcal{F} \) such that the volume \( v(\Delta_h) \) is minimal. If \( v(\Delta_h) = 0 \), then \( \Gamma_f \) covers the Newton polytope \( N(A) \), implying that \( h \notin \mathcal{F} \) by the first paragraph of the proof. Hence, \( v(\Delta_h) \) is positive for \( h \in \mathcal{F} \).

Let \( \alpha \in \Delta_h \) be generic in the sense the each simplicial circuit in \( \text{supp}(h) \cup \{\alpha\} \) containing \( \alpha \) is full-dimensional, and let \( D = \text{supp}(h) \cup \{\alpha\} \). We construct, as in Proposition 5.3, a sequence of exponential sums \( \{h_j(x)\}_{j=1}^{\infty} \subset \mathbb{R}^D \), such that

(i) \( h_j \to h \) as \( j \to \infty \),
(ii) \( h_j \) belongs to the boundary of the sonc cone in \( \mathbb{R}^D \),
(iii) the monomial \( e^{\langle x, \alpha \rangle} \) appears in each \( h_j \) with a negative coefficient.

By (iii) there is a simplicial circuit \( C_j \in \text{supp}_R(h_j) \) with \( \alpha \) as its relative interior point. After taking a subsequence, we can assume that \( C = C_j \) is independent of \( j \). Fix a sonc-decomposition of \( h_j(x) \) containing a term

\[
t_j \langle \varphi_A(x - w_j), c \rangle,
\]

where \( t_j > 0 \) and \( c \) is the vector associated to \( C \). By Lemma 2.16, we can rescale the coefficient \( t_j \), say by adding a positive number \( s_j \), without changing the fact that \( h_j \) belongs to the boundary of the sonc cone.
If the sequence $\mathbf{w}_j$ does not converge in $\mathbb{R}^n$, then, after composing with the moment map associated to the Newton polytope $\mathcal{N}(A)$, it converges to some strict face $F \subsetneq \mathcal{N}(A)$. Then, with $s_j = \min(\varphi_A(\mathbf{w}_j))$,
\[
\lim_{j \to 0} s_j \langle \varphi_A(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{w}_j), \mathbf{c} \rangle
\]
is a sum of monomials from $F$ with positive coefficients. By Lemma 2.16, we find that
\[
p(\mathbf{x}) = \lim_{j \to 0} \left( h_j(\mathbf{x}) + s_j \langle \varphi_A(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{w}_j), \mathbf{c} \rangle \right) = h(\mathbf{x}) + \lim_{j \to 0} s_j \langle \varphi_A(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{w}_j), \mathbf{c} \rangle
\]
belongs to the boundary of the sonc cone. By the sonc-complex of $h$ is connected and covers $\text{supp}(h)$, by properties (3) and (4), hence adding any monomial with positive coefficient to $h$ gives an exponential sum in the interior of the sonc cone, a contradiction.

Hence, the sequence $\mathbf{w}_j$ converges in $\mathbb{R}^n$. By Lemma 2.16, we find that
\[
p(\mathbf{x}) = \lim_{j \to 0} \left( h_j(\mathbf{x}) + \langle \varphi_A(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{w}_j), \mathbf{c} \rangle \right) = h(\mathbf{x}) + \lim_{j \to 0} \langle \varphi_A(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{w}_j), \mathbf{c} \rangle
\]
belongs to the boundary of the sonc cone. That is, $p$ fulfills (2). By Lemma 2.16 there is no loss of generality in assuming that $\text{supp}(p) = \text{supp}(h) \cup \{ \alpha \}$, from which it follows that $p$ fulfills (1).

We now claim that the monomial sonc-support of $p$ is empty. If there is some monomial in $\text{supp}_\mathbb{Q}(p)$, then Lemma 2.5 and the facts that $h$ is a summand of $p$ and that $\Gamma_\mathbb{R}$ is connected and covers $\text{supp}(h)$, implies that $\text{supp}_\mathbb{Q}(p) = \mathcal{R}(D)$. This is a contradiction to that $p$ belongs to the boundary of the sonc cone in $\mathbb{R}^D$.

It follows that the sonc-complex $\Gamma_\mathbb{R}$ is a sub-complex of $\Gamma_p$, from which we conclude that $p$ fulfills (3) and (4). To conclude that $p$ fulfills (5), it now suffices to note that $\alpha$ is an interior point of $\Gamma_p$.

We have that $C \in \text{supp}_\mathbb{Q}(p)$. Since $C$ contains $\alpha$, it is full-dimensional by construction, and it intersects the relative interior of $\Delta_h$. Hence, $v(\Delta_p) < v(\Delta_h)$. Hence, $p \notin \mathcal{F}$, by minimality of $h$. It follows that there is a tropical complex $M$ fulfilling (a) and (b) for the exponential sum $p$. As $h$ is a summand of $p$. It follows that the same tropical complex $M$ fulfills (a) and (b) for the exponential sum $h$. This is a contradiction to the existence of the minimal element $h \in \mathcal{F}$. \hfill \Box

**Example 6.3.** Consider the support set from Example (2.10), consisting of all integer points on the boundary of a square of side length two. In Figure 6, three regular subdivisions of the Newton polytope $\mathcal{N}(A)$ are shown, together with examples of dual tropical curves. While these regular subdivisions induce the same sonc-complex (see Example 7.11), the associated families of dual tropical curves are distinct. Hence, these regular subdivision describe different pieces of the boundary of the sonc cone. \hfill \Diamond

**Remark 6.4.** The coefficient vector $\mathbf{a}$ of the exponential sum $f$ from (5.3) admits the explicit presentation
\[
\mathbf{a} = \sum_{C \in \Gamma} t_C \varphi_A(-\mathbf{w}_C) \ast \mathbf{c}.
\]
where the sum is over all simplicial circuits $C$ contained in some cell of the sonc-complex $\Gamma$. The variables $\mathbf{w}_C$ are not independent, but should be arranged according to the tropical
complex $M$. Taking also the monomial sonc-support into account, we obtain the explicit presentation
\begin{equation}
\alpha = \sum_{C \in \Gamma} t_{C} \varphi_{A}(-w_{C}) \ast \mathbf{c} + \sum_{\alpha \in A_{m}} a_{\alpha} e_{\alpha},
\end{equation}
where $e_{\alpha}$ denotes the standard basis vector for the coordinate axes $a_{\alpha}$. Here, the parameters $a_{\alpha}$ for $\alpha \in A_{m}$ are contained in the interior of the sonc cone in $\mathbb{R}^{A_{m}}$.

Let $\Lambda$ be a regular subdivisions of $\mathcal{N}(A)$. In §7, we define the positive $\Lambda$-discriminant $D_{A}^{\Lambda}$ as the locus consisting of all exponential sums $f$ whose singular loci are arranged according to a tropical complex dual to $\Lambda$. Theorem 6.2 implies that these loci cover the boundary of the sonc cone. It is natural to ask whether they also stratify the boundary of the sonc cone. Without proper adjustments, the answer to this question is “no.”

In the univariate case, the regular subdivision $\Lambda$ uniquely determines the simplicial sonc-support. This implies that two positive $\Lambda$-discriminants only intersect along common lower dimensional strata. The main issue, in the multivariate case, is that two positive $\Lambda$-discriminants, which do not coincide, may overlap in a common Zariski-dense subset.

7. The Positive Discriminant

7.1. Toric geometry. For the reader not familiar with toric geometry, the toric structure underlying each and every step of this work might not be immediately clear. Let us briefly describe some of its more important elements. We focus, in this subsection, on the integral case.

In toric geometry, the support set $A$ represents a finite collection of algebraic characters of the complex torus $(\mathbb{C}^{*})^{1+n}$. The associated torus action of $(\mathbb{C}^{*})^{1+n}$ on complex affine space $\mathbb{C}^{1+d}$ is given by the multiplicative morphism $\psi_{A}$ from (2.3). By definition, the Zariski-closure of the image of $\varphi_{A}$ in complex projective space $\mathbb{P}^{d}$ is a complex toric variety, denoted $X_{A}$. The condition that the vector $(1, \ldots, 1)$ belongs to the row span of the matrix $A$, as in (2.1), ensures that the Zariski closure of the image of $\varphi_{A}$ in $\mathbb{C}^{1+d}$ is the cone over the projective variety $X_{A}$.
We define that space $C^A$ analogous to $[1.3]$. The identification of a polynomial $f \in C^A$ with its coefficient vector is the identification of $C^A$ as the dual space of $C^{1+d}$. Let $P^A$ denote the projectivization of $C^A$. The $A$-discriminantal variety $X_A \subset P^A$ is the projectively dual variety to $X_A$ [GKZ08, Kap91]. We identify $X_A$ with its affine cone in $C^A$. Geometrically, the $A$-discriminantal variety is the Zariski-closure of the locus of all polynomials $f \in C^A$ which have a singular point in $pC\ast q^n$.

The support set $A$ is said to be dual defective if the variety $X_A$ is not a hypersurface. Dual defective support sets were characterized combinatorially by Esterov [Est10] in the integral case and by the first author [For18] in the real case. In the integral case, if $A$ is nondefective, then the $A$-discriminant variety is defined by an integral polynomial $D_A \in \mathbb{Z}[\alpha]$, unique up to scaling, called the $A$-discriminant polynomial.

The $A$-discriminant variety is empty if and only if $A$ is a pyramid, as in Example 2.2. Let us assume this is not the case. A Gale dual of $A$ is a set of generators of the kernel $\ker Z_A$, usually arranged as the columns of a matrix $B$. In the real case, we consider a set of generators for the kernel $\ker pAq$. The $A$-discriminant variety $X_A$ is equipped with a rational parametrization known as the Horn–Kapranov uniformization [Kap91]. It is straightforward to deduce the homogeneous version of the Horn–Kapranov uniformization from the following observations (see, e.g., Dickenstein, Feichtner, and Sturmfels [DFS07]). Consider the open dense variety of $X_A$ given by all polynomials $f \in C^A$ with a singular point at $p1, \ldots, 1q$. The crucial observation is that the space of all polynomials with a singular point at $p1, \ldots, 1q$ is equal to $\ker pAq$. Hence, there is a birational map
\[
\Psi_A: C^m \times C^n \dashrightarrow X_A
\]
given in coordinates by
\[
(7.1) \quad \Psi_A(t; s) = \psi_A(s) \ast (Bt),
\]
where $\ast$ denotes component-wise multiplication.

Readers familiar with earlier articles about circuit polynomials should note the relationship between the so-called circuit number and the $A$-discriminants was pointed out already in [IdW16 Section 3.4], see also [GKZ08 Proposition 1.8, pages 274–5].

7.2. The positive discriminant. We now return to the real setting. Whilst $\ker(A)$ is an important object, we are primarily focused on the sub-cone $C_A$ spanned by simplicial circuits.

Definition 7.1. The real exponential Horn–Kapranov map is the map $\Phi_A : \ker(A) \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^A$ defined by
\[
(7.2) \quad \Phi_A(w; b) = \varphi_A(w) \ast b.
\]
The positive $A$-discriminant $D^+_A \subset \mathbb{R}^A$ is the image of the real Horn–Kapranov uniformization map restricted to the space $C_A \times \mathbb{R}^n$. We say that $A$ is positively defective if the rank of the Jacobian of $\Phi_A$ is everywhere smaller than $n + m$. 

\[\diamondsuit\]
The positive $A$-discriminant is a part of the boundary of the sonc cone; it consists of sums of simplicial agiforms which have a singular point. However, it need not be a codimension one part of the boundary.

**Proposition 7.2.** A support set $A$ is positively defective if and only if it is either dual defective or $C_A$ is not full-dimensional.

**Proof.** The dimension of the parameter space $C_A \times \mathbb{R}^n$ is equal to $n + \dim C_A$. Hence, $A$ is positively nondefective if and only if $C_A$ is full-dimensional and the Jacobian of $\Phi_A$ has maximal rank at a generic point. The latter condition is equivalent to that $A$ is nondefective [For18, §3.1]. □

**Example 7.3.** Let $A$ have an interior point. Then $A$ is nondefective, for a defective support set is contained in two parallel hyperplanes. By Proposition 3.4, the kernel $\ker(A)$ is spanned by simplicial circuits. Hence, $A$ is positively nondefective. □

7.3. The positive discriminant of a regular subdivision. We extend the definition of the positive $A$-discriminant to a regular subdivision $\Lambda$ of the Newton polytope $N(\mathcal{A})$. The positive $A$-discriminant $D_A$ appears as the positive $\Lambda$-discriminant of the regular subdivision $\Lambda$ which has $N(\mathcal{A})$ itself as the only full-dimensional cell.

Consider a regular subdivision $\Lambda$ of the Newton polytope $N(\mathcal{A})$. Define, for each cell $\lambda \in \Lambda$ the subset

$$A_\lambda = \lambda \cap A.$$ 

We have a canonical linear projection

$$\pi_\Lambda : \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathbb{R}^{A_\lambda} \to \mathbb{R}^A,$$

which is far from injective. We define the associated cone of simplicial circuits by

$$C_\Lambda = \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} C_{A_\lambda} \subset \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \ker(A_\lambda).$$

The cone $C_\Lambda$ is the analogue of the first factor of the parameter space if the exponential Horn–Kapranov map. The analogue of the second factor is more involved.

**Definition 7.4.** Let $\Lambda$ be a regular subdivision of the Newton polytope $N(\mathcal{A})$. Consider the Cartesian product

$$\prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where $\Lambda_{n-1}$ denote the set of codimension one cells of $\Lambda$. Let $\lambda_i, \lambda_j \in \Lambda_n$ intersect in a $(n-1)$-dimensional cell $\lambda_{ij}$. Let $v_{i,j}$ be a normal vector of the affine span $\text{Aff}(\lambda_{ij})$, oriented as in Lemma 6.1. We get an associated polyhedral cone

$$L_{i,j} = \left\{ \mathbf{w} \in \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} \mathbb{R}^n \mid \langle \mathbf{w}_i - \mathbf{w}_j, v_{i,j} \rangle \geq 0 \land \langle \mathbf{w}_i - \mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{u} \rangle = 0, \; \mathbf{u} \in \text{Lin}(\lambda_{ij}) \right\}.$$

There is a canonical inclusion

$$\iota : \bigcap_{i,j} L_{i,j} \to \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathbb{R}^{\dim \lambda},$$
defined as follows. For each \( \lambda \in \Lambda \), choose some full-dimensional cell \( \hat{A}_\lambda \supset \lambda \). There is a natural projection \( \pi: \mathbb{R}^{\dim \lambda} \to \mathbb{R}^{\dim \lambda} \), given by projection along the normal space of \( \lambda \) in \( \hat{A}_\lambda \). Define \( \iota(\mathbf{w})_\lambda = \pi(\mathbf{w}_\lambda) \). The equalities in the definition of \( L_{i,j} \) ensures that the map \( \iota \) does not depend on the choice of \( \hat{A}_\lambda \). We define \( \mathbb{R}^\Lambda \) as the image of the map \( \iota \).

After reordering the factors, there is a natural containment
\[
C_\Lambda \times \mathbb{R}^\Lambda \subset \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} (C_{A_\lambda} \times \mathbb{R}^{\dim \lambda}).
\]

There is a canonical Horn–Kapranov-type map
\[
\Phi_\Lambda : \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} (C_{A_\lambda} \times \mathbb{R}^{\dim \lambda}) \to \mathbb{R}^A,
\]
given by \( \Phi_\Lambda = \pi_\Lambda \circ \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \Phi_{A_\lambda} \).

**Definition 7.5.** The *positive \( \Lambda \)-discriminant* \( D^+_\Lambda \) of the regular subdivision \( \Lambda \) is the semi-algebraic set which is the image of the map
\[
\Phi_\Lambda : C_\Lambda \times \mathbb{R}^\Lambda \to \mathbb{R}^A.
\]

The proof of Theorem 1.2, which states that the \( \Lambda \)-discriminants covers the boundary of the socn cone, is now a formality.

**Proof of Theorem 1.2.** Let \( f \in \mathbb{R}^A \) belong to the boundary of the socn cone. If all coefficient \( a_\alpha \), for \( \alpha \) a vertex of \( \mathcal{N}(A) \), are nonvanishing, then it follows from Proposition 4.11 that the simplicial socn-support \( \mathcal{s} = \text{supp}_{\mathcal{S}}(f) \) is nonempty. Let \( \mathcal{m} = \text{supp}_{\mathcal{M}}(f) \) denote the monomial socn-support of \( f \). It suffice to consider an exponential sum \( f \) such that \( \text{supp}(f) = \mathcal{A} \) (cf. Proposition 7.9). Then, it holds that \( \mathcal{A}_s \cup \mathcal{A}_m = \mathcal{A} \). Hence, the result follows from Theorem 6.2 and (6.1). \( \Box \)

**Remark 7.6.** Let \( A \) be an integral support set, and consider the associated family of exponential sums \( \mathbb{R}^A \), and let \( D_\Lambda \) denote the Zariski-closure of the positive \( \Lambda \)-discriminant \( D^+_\Lambda \). In the coordinates \( z = e^x \), the equalities in the definition of \( L_{i,j} \) is transformed into the binomial equations
\[
z_i^u = z_j^u, \quad u \in \text{Lin}(\lambda_{i,j}).
\]
It follows that the Zariski closure of \( \mathbb{R}^A \) is a toric variety. In particular, \( D_\Lambda \) is a rational variety. \( \Box \)

**Proposition 7.7.** The *positive \( \Lambda \)-discriminant is at most a hypersurface.*

**Proof.** Let us label the cells of \( \Lambda \) which contain at least one simplicial circuit as \( \{\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_k\} \), and write \( A_i = A \cap \lambda_i \). Let \( d \) denote the cardinality of \( A \), so that \( \mathbb{R}^A \) has dimension \( d \). For any subset \( I \subset \{1, \ldots, k\} \), let \( d_I, n_I, \) and \( m_I \) denote the cardinality, dimension, and codimension of the intersection
\[
A_I = \bigcap_{i \in I} A_i.
\]
By the inclusion-exclusion principle, we have that
\[ d = \sum_{j=1}^{k} (-1)^{j+1} \sum_{|I|=j} d_I. \]

The dimension of \( \mathbb{R}^\Lambda \), denoted \( n_\Lambda \), is
\[ n_\Lambda = \sum_{j=1}^{k} (-1)^{j+1} \sum_{|I|=j} n_I. \]

and whilst the dimension of \( \mathcal{C}_\Lambda \) is \( m_1 + \cdots + m_k \) (since each \( A_i \) has a relative interior point), the intersection \( \bigcap_{i \in I} \ker(A_i) \) is covered \( |I| \)-many times. That is, we can restrict \( \Phi_\Lambda \) to a subspace of \( \text{Lin}(\mathcal{C}_\Lambda) \) of dimension
\[ m_\Lambda = \sum_{j=1}^{k} (-1)^{j+1} \sum_{|I|=j} m_I. \]

All in all, we find that the codimension of \( D_\Lambda^+ \) is at least
\[ d - n_\Lambda - m_\Lambda = \sum_{j=1}^{k} (-1)^{j+1} \sum_{|I|=j} 1 = \sum_{j=1}^{k} (-1)^{j+1} \binom{k}{j} = 1. \]

**Proposition 7.8.** Let \( A \) be a univariate support set, and let \( \Lambda \) be a regular subdivision of \( \mathcal{N}(A) \). Then, the codimension of the positive \( \Lambda \)-discriminant \( D_\Lambda \) is equal to the number of connected components of the sonc-complex \( \Gamma(\Lambda) \).

**Proof.** It follows from Proposition 7.7 that the codimension is at least equal to the number of connected components of the sonc-complex \( \Gamma \). To show equality, it suffices to show that \( \Gamma \) is connected, then \( D_\Lambda \) is a hypersurface. Let \( \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_k \) be the one-dimensional cells of the sonc-complex. Each subset \( A_i = A \cap \gamma_i \) contains at least three points, and hence each \( A_i \) is nondefective [For18]. Since \( \Gamma \) is connected, and \( A \) is a univariate support set, we have that
\[ A_i \cap A_{i+1} = \{ \alpha_{ji} \}. \]

Since we are taking Zariski closures, we have that \( \mathbb{R}^\Lambda = \mathbb{R}^k \). Hence, \( D_\Lambda \) is given in explicit form by
\[ \mathbf{a} = \varphi_A(w_1) * \mathbf{b}_1 + \cdots + \varphi_A(w_k) * \mathbf{b}_k \]
where \( \mathbf{b}_i \in \ker(A_i) \). Denote by
\[ \mathbf{a}_i = \varphi_A(w_i) * \mathbf{b}_i. \]

By [For18], all maximal minors of the Jacobian of the maps \( \Phi_{A_i} \) defined by \( (w; \mathbf{b}_i) \mapsto \mathbf{a}_i \) are nonvanishing. The maps \( \Phi_{A_i} \), for \( i = 1, \ldots, k \) depend on disjoint sets of parameters. Together with the intersection property \((7.3)\), this implies that maximal minors of the Jacobian of \( \Phi_A \) factors into a product of maximal minors of the Jacobians of \( \Phi_{A_i} \). The result follows. \( \square \)
7.4. Computing the algebraic equations of the boundary strata. The reader might recall that we did not characterize all sonc-supports. However, our characterization suffices to describe all codimension one pieces of the boundary of the sonc cone. There are two types of codimension one pieces of the strata. The first type is given by $a_\alpha = 0$ where $\alpha$ is a vertex of the Newton polytope $N(A)$. This strata consists of the sonc cone associated to $A \setminus \{\alpha\}$. The second type of strata has nontrivial simplicial part $s$.

**Proposition 7.9.** A subset $r = s \cup m \in R(A)$, with nontrivial simplicial part, is the sonc-support of a codimension one piece of the boundary of the sonc cone if and only if the four conditions holds.

(a) The set $r$ covers $A$.
(b) The sonc-complex $\Gamma$ defined by $s$ is connected.
(c) The compatibility condition of Proposition 4.12 is fulfilled.
(d) There is a nondefective regular subdivision $\Lambda$ which induces $s$.

**Proof.** Each connected component of the sonc-complex defines a strict subvariety by Proposition 7.7. In case there is more then one connected components, then the defining equations are in disjoint sets of coefficients, implying that the codimension is at least two.

If $r$ does not cover $A$, then there is an $\alpha \in A$ such the positive $\Lambda$-discriminant is contained in the hyperplane $a_\alpha = 0$. Since the simplicial sonc-support is nontrivial by assumption, this forces that the codimension is at least two.

By Theorem 4.16 assuming that the compatibility conditions of Proposition 4.12 implies that the set $r$ is the sonc-support of some family of exponential sums, and this family is contained in the boundary of the sonc cone as the simplicial sonc-support is nontrivial. As the number of parameters of the map $\Phi_\Lambda$ are the correct ones, it remains only to check that the Jacobian of the map $\Phi_\Lambda$ has maximal rank; which is the definition of nondefective. \qed

**Example 7.10.** Let us return to Example 2.14 and the support set $A$, and generators of $C_A$ given by the rows of the matrix $\hat{C}$

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 2 & 3 & 1 & 2 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{C}^\top = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & -4 & 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -2 & 1 \\ 1 & -3 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & -3 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$  

There are ten sonc-complexes contained in $\mathcal{S}(A)$, which are depicted in Figure 2. Out of these, only seven are related to a codimension one piece of the boundary of the sonc cone. The empty sonc-complex, in the bottom left corner of Figure 2, is related to three codimension one pieces of the sonc cone contained in the coordinate axes

$$a_0 = 0, \quad a_2 = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad a_5 = 0.$$  

In the upper left corner of Figure 2 is the trivial regular subdivision $\Lambda_0$, which contains $N(A)$ is the only full-dimensional cell. This triangulation yields the positive $A$-discriminant. This gives the explicit description

$$a = \varphi_A(w^{-1}) * (t_1c_1 + t_2c_2 + t_3c_3 + t_4c_4).$$
A Gröbner basis computation (note that \( \ker(A) \) is three-dimensional) yields the implicit description

\[
D_0(a) = -a_2a_3^6 + a_1a_3^5a_4 + a_0a_3^3a_4^3 - a_1^2a_3a_5 - 36a_0a_2a_3^3a_4a_5 + 30a_0a_1a_3a_4^2a_5 + 27a_0^2a_4a_5
+ 72a_0a_1a_2a_3^2a_5^2 - 96a_0a_3^2a_3a_4a_5^2 - 216a_0^2a_2a_3^2a_5^2 + 64a_0^3a_4a_5^3 + 432a_0^2a_3a_5^3.
\]

Consider now the regular subdivision \( \Lambda_1 \) in the top of the middle column in Figure 2. The simplicial sonc-support associated to this triangulation consists of the two simplicial circuits \( c_1 \) and \( c_2 \). The regular subdivision \( \Lambda_1 \) has two top-dimensional cells \( \lambda_1 \) and \( \lambda_2 \), to which we associate two points \( w_1 = (w_1, w_1) \) and \( w_2 = (w_2, w_2) \). The cells \( \lambda_1 \) and \( \lambda_2 \) intersect in the line segment with tangent vector \( u = (1, -2) \). That is, the positive discriminant \( D_1(a) \) admits the representation

\[
a = \varphi_A(w_1^{-1}) \ast (t_1c_1) + \varphi_A(w_2^{-1}) \ast (t_2c_2), \quad \text{where} \quad w_1^u = w_2^u.
\]

A Gröbner basis computation yields the explicit representation

\[
D_1(a) = -a_2^2a_3^4 + 4a_0a_1a_4^4 - 32a_0a_1a_2a_4^2a_5 + 64a_0a_1a_2^2a_5^2.
\]

The computations for the regular subdivision \( \Lambda_2 \) in the upper right corner of Figure 2 are similar, and yields the explicit representation

\[
D_2(a) = a_2^2a_3^4 + 4a_1^3a_4a_5 + 27a_0a_2a_4a_5.
\]

The regular subdivision on the second row of Figure 2 do not yield codimension one pieces of the boundary of the sonc cone, as the points of \( A \) which are not covered by the sone-complex cannot be added to the sonc-support without violating Theorem 4.16.

Consider the regular subdivision \( \Lambda_3 \) in the left column of the third row of Figure 2. The sone-complex consists of the two one-dimensional circuits \( c_2 \) and \( c_3 \). The point \( \alpha_3 = (1, 1) \) is not contained in the sone-complex. In this case, adding \( \alpha_3 \) to the sonc-support does not violate the conditions of Theorem 4.16. Hence, we still obtain a codimension one piece of the boundary. The regular subdivision has three full-dimensional cells, of which only two contains simplicial circuits. The separating hyperplane has tangent \( u = (2, -1) \).

\[
a = \varphi_A(w_2^{-1}) \ast (t_2c_2) + \varphi_A(w_3^{-1}) \ast (t_3c_3) + a_3e_3 \quad \text{and} \quad w_2^u = w_3^u.
\]
where $e_i$ denotes the $(i + 1)$th standard basis vector for $i = 0, \ldots, d$. A Gröbner basis computation yields the explicit representation

$$D_3(a) = 27a_0a_4^4 - 216a_0a_2a_4^2a_5 + 64a_1^3a_5^2 + 432a_0a_2^2a_5^2.$$ 

The two remaining regular subdivisions are induced by faces $F$ of the Newton polytope $N_{A+q}$. The corresponding positive discriminants are simply the positive $(A \cap F)$-discriminants of the corresponding faces, and they are given by

$$D_4(a) = a_1^2 - 4a_2a_5 \quad \text{and} \quad D_5(a) = 4a_3^2 - 9a_0a_4^2.$$ 

The boundary of the sonc cone in the affine space $2a_0 = a_2 = a_5 = 2$ can be seen in Figure 7, where also the positive discriminants $D_0(a)$ and $D_1(a)$ are depicted. Note that, in this figure, the boundary of the sonc cone seems to be disconnected is an artifact of numerical instabilities, which occur due to the severe singularities of $D_1(a)$ along the affine subspace $a(s) = (1, 0, 2, s, -4, 2)$.

\begin{example} \textbf{7.11.} \end{example} Consider again the support set from Examples 2.10 and 6.3 consisting of the integer points on the boundary of a square of side length two. Let us compute the algebraic equations of the boundary of the sonc cone in the orthant in $\mathbb{R}^A$ defined by

$$a_0, a_2, a_4, a_6 > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad a_1, a_3, a_5, a_7 < 0.$$ 

There is only one sonc-complex which is relevant in this orthant, pictured in Figure 8 together with the three triangulations inducing it. The simplicial circuit contained in $A$ are given by the rows of the matrix

$$\hat{C}^\top = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -2 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -2 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -2 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -2 \end{bmatrix}.$$ 

For the first regular subdivision, the separating line has tangent $u = (1, 1)$. Hence, we get the explicit representation

$$a = \varphi_A(w_1) \ast (t_1c_1 + t_2c_2) + \varphi_A(w_2) \ast (t_3c_3 + t_4c_4) \quad \text{and} \quad w_1^u = w_2^u.$$ 

For the second regular subdivision, the separating line has tangent $\bar{u} = (1, -1)$. Hence, we get the explicit representation

$$a = \varphi_A(\bar{w}_1) \ast (t_1c_1 + t_4c_4) + \varphi_A(\bar{w}_2) \ast (t_2c_2 + t_3c_3) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{w}_1^u = \bar{w}_2^u.$$
However, the change of variables given by
\[ w_{11} = \bar{w}_{11}, \quad w_{12} = \bar{w}_{22}, \quad w_{21} = \bar{w}_{21}, \quad \text{and} \quad w_{22} = \bar{w}_{12} \]
transforms the first explicit representation into the second. That is, the two regular subdivisions given rise to the same algebraic hypersurface, defined by the polynomial
\[ D_\Lambda(a) = a_1^2 a_5^2 - 4a_0 a_2 a_5^2 - 4a_0 a_3^2 a_6 - 4a_1^2 a_4 a_6 + 16a_0 a_2 a_4 a_6 - 2a_1 a_5 a_7 + a_3^2 a_7^2 - 4a_2 a_4 a_7. \]
In particular, the boundary of the sonc cone is, in this orthant, contained in an algebraic hypersurface. However, the natural stratification of the boundary of the sonc cone has three pieces, corresponding to the three regular subdivisions above.

8. On the equality \( S_A^+ = P_A^+ \)

We deduce, as a corollary of our description of the boundary of the sonc cone, a combinatorial characterization of when the sonc cone is equal to the nonnegativity cone.

Remark 8.1. Let \( A \) be a real support set. The principal \( A \)-determinant variety is the union of the real \((A \cap F)\)-discriminants, as \( F \) ranges over all (not necessarily strict) faces of the Newton polytope \( N(A) \). The boundary of the nonnegativity cone \( P_A^+ \) is contained in the principal \( A \)-determinant.

Theorem 8.2. Let \( A \) be a support set. If every sonc-complex \( \Gamma \) is defined by a unique top-dimensional cell \( \gamma \), and, in addition, the minimal face \( F \leq N(A) \) containing \( \Gamma \) satisfies \( \dim(F) = \dim(\Gamma) \), then the sonc cone \( S_A^+ \) is equal to the nonnegativity cone \( P_A^+ \).

Proof. It suffices to show that each exponential sum \( f \) which belongs to the boundary of the sonc cone belongs to the principal \( A \)-determinant. If the sonc-complex \( \Gamma \) is empty, then some monomial corresponding to a vertex of \( N(A) \) has a vanishing coefficient, implying that \( f \) belongs to the principal \( A \)-determinant. Assume now that the sonc-complex is nonempty, and let \( F \) be the minimal face containing \( \Gamma \). Then, by Corollary 4.14, the monomial sonc-support does not intersect \( A \cap F \). It follows that the truncation of \( f \) to \( F \) has a singular point, and hence \( f \) belongs to the \((A \cap F)\)-discriminant.

In [MCW18, Conjecture 22], it was conjectured by Chandrasekaran, Murray, and Wierman that the only case when the sonc cone is equal to the nonnegativity cone is if either the support set consists of the vertices of a simplex with two additional non-vertices, or if there is a unique non-vertex. We give two families of counterexamples to this conjecture.

Example 8.3. Let \( V \) be the vertices of a simplex, and assume that the origin is an interior point of the Newton polytope \( N(V) \). Let \( 0 < \varepsilon < 1 \) be close to 1, and denote by \( \varepsilon V \) the dilation of \( V \) by a scaling factor \( \varepsilon \). Consider the support set
\[ A = V \cup \varepsilon V. \]
We have that
\[ A \setminus \{\alpha, \varepsilon \alpha\} = (V \setminus \{\alpha\}) \cup \varepsilon(V \setminus \{\alpha\}). \]
That is, the support set \( A \setminus \{\alpha, \varepsilon \alpha\} \) consists of the vertices of the two \((n - 1)\)-dimensional simplices contained in two parallel hyperplanes. In particular, there are no simplicial
circuits contained in $A \setminus \{\alpha, \varepsilon \alpha\}$. It follows that each simplicial circuit must contain either $\alpha$ or $\varepsilon \alpha$ (or both).

In particular, each simplicial circuit $C \subset A$ has $N(\varepsilon V) \subset N(C)$. It follows that all simplicial circuits are full-dimensional, and that the Newton polytope of any two simplicial circuits overlap in a full-dimensional domain. Hence, Theorem 8.2 implies that $S_A^+ = P_A^+$.

We have depicted in Figure 9 the explicit example given by

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\ 0 & 3 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

which admits three sonc-complexes up to rotational symmetries.

**Example 8.4.** Let $V$ be the vertices of the polytope $N(V)$, and assume that the origin is contained in the interior of $N(V)$. Let $F \subseteq N(V)$ be a simplicial face of $N(V)$. Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ be close to 1, let $V_F = V \cap F$, and consider the support set

$$A = V \cup \varepsilon V_F.$$

If $F$ is a vertex, then $A$ has exactly one interior point, and $S_A^+ = P_A^+$ by Theorem 4.1. Assume this is not the case. If the origin is in generic position relative to the vertices of $N(V)$, then the support set $A = V \cup \varepsilon V_F$ contains only of full-dimensional circuits.

If the origin is sufficiently close to a relative interior point of the face $F$, then the origin lies in the complement polytope $N(V \setminus \{\alpha\})$ for each $\alpha \in V_F$. As in the previous example, we find that the set $A \setminus \{\alpha, \varepsilon \alpha\}$ contains no simplicial circuits.

It follows that each simplicial circuit $C \subset A$ contains $\varepsilon V_F$. Since the interior of $C$ is contained in $\varepsilon V_F$, we conclude that the Newton polytope any two simplicial circuits overlap in a full-dimensional region. Hence, Theorem 8.2 implies that $S_A^+ = P_A^+$.

We have depicted in Figure 10 the explicit example given by

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 5 & 5 \\ 0 & 5 & 2 & 3 & 0 & 5 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Up to the symmetry given by mirroring in the axis $\alpha_1 = 5/2$, there are five sonc-complexes, each of which has a unique full-dimensional cell.
Figure 10. Five sone-complexes from Example 8.4.
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