

ON THE NUMBER OF SYMMETRIC PRESENTATIONS OF A DETERMINANTAL HYPERSURFACE

MATTHEW BRASSIL AND ZINOVY REICHSTEIN

ABSTRACT. A hypersurface H in \mathbb{P}^r of degree n is called determinantal if it is the zero locus of a polynomial of the form $\det(x_0A_0 + \dots + x_rA_r)$ for some $(r + 1)$ -tuple of $n \times n$ matrices $A = (A_0, \dots, A_r)$. We will refer to A as a presentation of H . Another presentation $B = (B_0, B_1, \dots, B_r)$ of H can be obtained by choosing $g_1, g_2 \in \mathrm{GL}_n$ and setting $B_i = g_1A_i g_2$ for every $i = 0, 1, \dots, r$. In this case A and B are called equivalent. The second author and A. Vistoli have shown that for $r \geq 3$ a general determinantal hypersurface admits only finitely many presentations up to equivalence. In this paper we prove a similar result for symmetric presentations for every $r \geq 2$. Here the matrices A_0, \dots, A_r are required to be symmetric, and two $(r + 1)$ -tuples of $n \times n$ symmetric matrices $A = (A_0, A_1, \dots, A_r)$ and $B = (B_0, B_1, \dots, B_r)$ are considered equivalent if there exists a $g \in \mathrm{GL}_n$ such that $B_i = g^t A_i g$ for every $i = 0, \dots, r$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout this paper k will be an algebraically closed field. We will denote the spaces of $n \times n$ matrices and symmetric $n \times n$ matrices over k by Mat_n and Sym_n , respectively. Given an $(r + 1)$ -tuple $A = (A_0, A_1, \dots, A_r) \in \mathrm{Mat}_n^{r+1}$, we define the generalized characteristic polynomial of A to be

$$P_A(x_0, \dots, x_r) = \det(x_0A_0 + x_1A_1 + \dots + x_rA_r)$$

and the determinantal hypersurface H_A associated to A to be the hypersurface

$$(1) \quad P_A(x_0, \dots, x_r) = 0$$

in \mathbb{P}^r . We will refer to the $(r + 1)$ -tuple A as a “presentation” of this determinantal hypersurface. We will say that $B = (B_0, \dots, B_r) \in \mathrm{Mat}_n^{r+1}$ is equivalent to A if there exist non-singular $n \times n$ matrices g_1 and g_2 such that $B_i = g_1A_i g_2$ for every $i = 0, 1, \dots, r$. Clearly $H_A = H_B$ if A and B are equivalent but the converse is not true in general. Our starting point is the following theorem from [7].

Theorem 1. *Assume $r \geq 3$. For $A \in (\mathrm{Mat}_n)^{r+1}$ in general position the determinantal hypersurface H_A has only finitely many presentations up to equivalence.*

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14M12, 15A22, 15A86.

Key words and phrases. Determinantal hypersurfaces, symmetric matrices, matrix pencils.

Matthew Brassil was partially supported by a Graduate Research Fellowship from the University of British Columbia. Zinovy Reichstein was partially supported by National Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada Discovery grant 253424-2017.

The purpose of this note is to prove an analogous assertion for symmetric determinantal hypersurfaces. A symmetric determinantal hypersurfaces of degree n in \mathbb{P}^r is a hypersurface $H = H_A$ where $A = (A_0, \dots, A_r)$ is an $(r+1)$ -tuple of $n \times n$ symmetric matrices. In this case we will refer to A as a symmetric presentation of H . The definition of equivalence is modified as follows. We say that $A = (A_0, A_1, \dots, A_r)$ and $B = (B_0, B_1, \dots, B_r) \in \text{Symm}_n^r$ are equivalent if there exists a non-singular $n \times n$ -matrix g such that $B_i = g^t A_i g$ for every $i = 0, 1, \dots, r$. Here g^t denotes the transpose of g . This is the only type of equivalence we will use in the sequel. Our main result is as follows.

Theorem 2. *Assume $r \geq 2$ and the base field k is of characteristic $\neq 2$. Then for $A \in (\text{Symm}_n)^{r+1}$ in general position, the determinantal hypersurface H_A has only finitely many symmetric presentations up to equivalence.*

Note that Theorem 2 cannot be deduced from Theorem 1. Indeed, Theorem 1 concerns $(r+1)$ -tuples $A = (A_0, \dots, A_r)$ of $n \times n$ matrices in general position. This means that there exists a non-empty (and thus dense) Zariski open subset $U \subset \text{Mat}_{n \times n}^{r+1}$ such that Theorem 1 holds for every $A \in U$. We do not know what this open subset U is; in particular, it is possible that every $(r+1)$ -tuple of symmetric matrices may be in the complement of U . For this reason we cannot extract any information about presentations of a general symmetric determinantal variety H_A from Theorem 1. We also remark that Theorem 1 fails for $r = 2$ (see [7, Remark (5), p. 615]), while Theorem 2 is valid for every $r \geq 2$.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Sections 2-4 will be devoted to proving Theorem 2. In Section 5 we will study the number of inequivalent symmetric presentations of a general symmetric determinantal hypersurface. This number is unknown in general; we will show that it is 1 if r is sufficiently large.

2. REDUCED TUPLES OF SYMMETRIC MATRICES

Let $U_{r,n}$ be the subset of Symm_n^{r+1} consisting of $(r+1)$ -tuples $A = (A_0, \dots, A_r)$ such that

- (i) A_0 is non-singular and
- (ii) the polynomial $f(t) = \det(tA_0 - A_1) = 0$ has n distinct roots.

It is easy to see that $U_{r,n}$ is a non-empty (and hence, dense) Zariski open subset of Symm_n^{r+1} .

Lemma 3. (a) *Suppose $H_A = H_B$ for some $A = (A_0, A_1, \dots, A_r)$ and $B = (B_0, B_1, \dots, B_r) \in \text{Symm}_n^{r+1}$. Then A lies in $U_{r,n}$ if and only if B lies in $U_{r,n}$.*

(b) *Suppose A and $B \in \text{Symm}_n^{r+1}$ are equivalent. Then A lies in $U_{r,n}$ if and only if B lies in $U_{r,n}$.*

Proof. (a) By our assumption there exists a $0 \neq c \in k$ such that

$$(2) \quad \det(x_0 A_0 + x_1 A_1 + \dots + x_r A_r) = c \det(x_0 B_0 + x_1 B_1 + \dots + x_r B_r)$$

as polynomials in x_0, \dots, x_r . Setting $x_0 = 1$ and $x_1 = \dots = x_r = 0$, we see that then

$$\det(A_0) = c \det(B_0).$$

Similarly, setting $x_0 = t$, $x_1 = -1$ and $x_2 = \dots = x_r = 0$, we conclude that

$$\det(tA_0 - A_1) = c \det(tB_0 - B_1).$$

Thus $\det(A_0) \neq 0$ if and only if $\det(B_0) \neq 0$ and $\det(tA_0 - A_1)$ has distinct roots if and only if $\det(tB_0 - B_1)$ has distinct roots. This proves part (a). Now part (b) readily follows, because if A and B are equivalent, then $H_A = H_B$. \square

We will say that an $(r + 1)$ -tuple (A_0, A_1, \dots, A_r) is reduced if $A_0 = I$ is the $n \times n$ identity matrix and A_1 is a diagonal matrix with distinct eigenvalues. Clearly every reduced $(r + 1)$ -tuple lies in $U_{r,n}$.

Let $\mu_2^n \subset \text{GL}_n$ be the subgroup of diagonal $n \times n$ matrices with ± 1 on the diagonal, $S_n \subset \text{GL}_n$ be the subgroup of $n \times n$ permutation matrices and $H_n \simeq \mu_2^n \rtimes S_n$ be the subgroup of GL_n generated by μ_2^n and S_n . It is easy to see that if A is reduced, then so is $h^t A h$ for any $h \in H_n$.

Lemma 4. *Let $A = (A_0, \dots, A_r) \in U_{r,n}$. Then*

(a) *the equivalence class of A contains a reduced $(r + 1)$ -tuple.*

(b) *Reduced $(r + 1)$ -tuples in Symm_n^{r+1} equivalent to A are transitively permuted by H_n . In particular, there are only finitely many of them.*

Proof. (a) Recall that $n \times n$ symmetric matrices X are in a natural bijective correspondence with symmetric bilinear forms $b: k^n \times k^n \rightarrow k$. The symmetric bilinear form corresponding to X is

$$b(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{v}^t X \mathbf{w},$$

and the symmetric matrix corresponding to b is the Gram matrix

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} b(\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_1) & \dots & b(\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_n) \\ \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ b(\mathbf{e}_n, \mathbf{e}_1) & \dots & b(\mathbf{e}_n, \mathbf{e}_n) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Here \mathbf{v} and \mathbf{w} denote column vectors in k^n and

$$\mathbf{e}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \dots, \quad \mathbf{e}_n = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

is the standard basis of k^n . Under this correspondence, non-degenerate symmetric bilinear forms correspond to non-singular matrices and the GL_n -action on symmetric bilinear forms by $(g \cdot b)(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) = b(g(\mathbf{v}), g(\mathbf{w}))$ corresponds to the GL_n -action on symmetric matrices by $g \cdot X = g^t X g$. Since k is an algebraically closed field of characteristic $\neq 2$, every non-degenerate symmetric bilinear form on k^n is equivalent to

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_n \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} y_1 \\ \vdots \\ y_n \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle = x_1 y_1 + \dots + x_n y_n.$$

In other words, there exists a $g \in \mathrm{GL}_n$ such that $g^t A_0 g = I$. By Lemma 3, since A lies in $U_{r,n}$, so does $g^t A g$. Thus after replacing A by $g^t A g$, we may assume that $A_0 = I$.

By the definition of $U_{r,n}$, A_1 has distinct eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$. Since A_1 is symmetric, the respective eigenvectors $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n$ are mutually orthogonal relative to $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. Hence, there exists an orthogonal matrix $h \in \mathrm{O}_n$ which takes each standard basis vector \mathbf{e}_i to a scalar multiple of \mathbf{v}_i . Setting $B = (B_0, B_1, \dots, B_r) = h^t A h$ and noting that by our choice of h , $B_0 = h^t I h = I$ and $B_1 = h^t A_1 h = h^{-1} A_1 h = \mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$, we conclude that B is reduced, as desired.

(b) Suppose $B = (I, B_1, \dots, B_r)$ and $B' = (I, B'_1, \dots, B'_r)$ are reduced $(r+1)$ -tuples in Symm_n^{r+1} , both equivalent to A . Then they are equivalent to each other. In other words, there exists a $g \in \mathrm{GL}_n$ such that $g^t B g = B'$. In particular, (i) $g^t I g = I$ and (ii) $g^t B_1 g = B'_1$, where B_1 and B'_1 are both diagonal matrices with distinct eigenvalues.

(i) tells us that g is an orthogonal matrix, i.e., $g^t = g^{-1}$. Now (ii) is equivalent to saying that g lies in the normalizer N of the diagonal maximal torus T in GL_n . It is well known that $N = T \rtimes S_n$. Since S_n lies in O_n and $T \cap \mathrm{O}_n = \mu_2^n$, we conclude that $N \cap \mathrm{O}_n = H_n$, and part (b) follows. \square

3. THE LOCUS OF SYMMETRIC DETERMINANTAL HYPERSURFACES

Let $\mathrm{Hyp}_{r,n} \simeq \mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+n}{n}-1}$ denote the space of degree n hypersurfaces in \mathbb{P}^r and consider the rational map

$$(3) \quad \phi_{r,n}: \mathrm{Symm}_n^{r+1} \dashrightarrow \mathrm{Hyp}_{r,n}$$

taking $A = (A_0, \dots, A_r)$ to the hypersurface H_A given by (1). Let $\mathrm{SDHyp}_{r,n}$ be the closure of the image of $\phi_{r,n}$ in $\mathrm{Hyp}_{r,n}$. This is the ‘‘locus of symmetric determinantal hypersurfaces’’ of degree n in \mathbb{P}^r .

Proposition 5. *Let r, n be positive integers and k be a field of characteristic $\neq 2$. Then the following assertions are equivalent.*

(a) *Given an $(r+1)$ -tuple $A = (A_0, A_1, \dots, A_r) \in \mathrm{Symm}_n^{r+1}$ in general position, there are only finitely many $(r+1)$ -tuples $B \in \mathrm{Symm}_n^{r+1}$ (up to equivalence) such that $H_A = H_B$.*

(b) *Given an $(r+1)$ -tuple $A = (A_0, A_1, \dots, A_r) \in \mathrm{Symm}_n^{r+1}$ in general position, there are only finitely many reduced $(r+1)$ -tuples $B = (I, B_1, \dots, B_r)$ such that $H_A = H_B$.*

$$(c) \dim(\mathrm{SDHyp}_{r,n}) = (r-1) \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + n.$$

Proof. (a) \iff (b): We may assume without loss of generality that $A \in U_{r,n}$. Fix A and let $B \in \mathrm{Symm}_n^{r+1}$ vary over the symmetric presentations of H_A . Every such B lies in $U_{r,n}$ by Lemma 3 and thus is equivalent to at least one and at most finitely many reduced tuples by Lemma 4. In summary, for a given $A \in U_{r,n}$, there are finitely many presentations $B \in \mathrm{Symm}_n^{r+1}$ of H_A up to equivalence if and only if there are finitely many reduced symmetric presentations.

(b) \iff (c): Let $Z_{r,n} = \{I\} \times D_n \times \mathrm{Symm}_n^{r-1}$ be the subvariety of reduced tuples in Symm_n^{r+1} . Here D_n is the space of diagonal $n \times n$ matrices with distinct eigenvalues. The

rational map (3) restricts to a morphism

$$(4) \quad \phi_{r,n}: Z_{r,n} \longrightarrow \text{Hyp}_{r,n}.$$

Note that $\phi_{r,n}(A) = \phi_{r,n}(B)$ whenever A and B are equivalent. By Lemma 4, up to equivalence every $A \in U_{r,n}$ can be represented by a $B \in Z_{r,n}$. Thus

$$(5) \quad \text{SDHyp}_{r,n} = \overline{\phi_{r,n}(\text{Symm}_n^{r+1})} = \overline{\phi_{r,n}(U_{r,n})} = \overline{\phi_{r,n}(Z_{r,n})}.$$

Here the horizontal bar denotes Zariski closure in $\text{Hyp}_{r,n}$.

To finish the proof observe that (b) is equivalent to the general fiber of (4) being finite. On the other hand in view of (5), (c) is equivalent to the image of (4) being of dimension $(r-1)\frac{n(n+1)}{2} + n$, i.e., of the same dimension as $Z_{r,n}$. The equivalence between (b) and (c) now follows from the Fiber Dimension Theorem; see, e.g., [8, Section I.6.3]. \square

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 2

We will first prove the theorem for $r = 2$. Our strategy here is to compute the dimension of $\text{SDHyp}_{2,n}$ and appeal to Proposition 5. It is well known that every smooth curve of degree $n \geq 1$ in \mathbb{P}^2 can be written in the form $P_A(x_0, x_1, x_2) = 0$ for some triple $A = (A_0, A_1, A_2)$ of symmetric $n \times n$ matrices. This was first proved in [4]; for a modern proof and further references see [1, Proposition 2(a)] or [6, Theorem 1]. Thus $\text{SDHyp}_{2,n}$ contains a dense open subset of $\text{Hyp}_{2,n} \simeq \mathbb{P}^{\frac{(n+2)(n+1)}{2}-1}$. We conclude that

$$\dim(\text{SDHyp}_{2,n}) = \frac{(n+2)(n+1)}{2} - 1 = \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + n.$$

This means that condition (c) of Proposition 5 holds for $r = 2$, and hence, so does condition (a).

This completes the proof of Theorem 2 for $r = 2$. In view of Proposition 5 this case can be restated as follows. There exists a dense open subset V of Symm_n^3 such that for any $(A_0, A_1, A_2) \in V$, there exist only finitely many reduced triples $(I, B_1, B_2) \in Z_{2,n}$ satisfying

$$(6) \quad H_{(A_0, A_1, A_2)} = H_{(I, B_1, B_2)}.$$

as polynomials in x_0, x_1, x_2 .

Now suppose $r \geq 3$. We may assume without loss of generality that

$$A = (A_0, A_1, \dots, A_r) \in U_{r,n} \text{ and } (A_0, A_1, A_i) \in V \text{ for every } i = 2, 3, \dots, r.$$

By Proposition 5 it suffices to show that there are only finitely many reduced $(r+1)$ -tuples $B = (I, B_1, \dots, B_r) \in Z_{r,n}$ such that $H_A = H_B$. In other words, $\det(x_0 I + x_1 B_1 + \dots + x_r B_r)$ is a non-zero scalar multiple of $\det(x_0 A_0 + x_1 A_1 + \dots + x_r A_r)$. Setting $x_3 = \dots = x_r = 0$, we see that $\det(x_0 I + x_1 B_1 + x_2 B_2)$ is a non-zero scalar multiple of $\det(x_0 A_0 + x_1 A_1 + x_2 A_2)$, i.e., (6) holds. Remembering that $(A_0, A_1, A_2) \in V$, we conclude that for a fixed A there are only finitely many possibilities for the reduced triple (I, B_1, B_2) . Similarly, for any $i = 3, 4, \dots, r$, since $(A_0, A_1, A_i) \in V$, there are only finitely many possibilities for the reduced triple (I, B_1, B_i) . In summary, as B ranges over the reduced symmetric

presentations of H_A , there are only finitely many possibilities for B_1, B_2, \dots, B_r . This tells us that H_A has only finitely many reduced symmetric presentations. Theorem 2 now follows from the equivalence of (a) and (b) in Proposition 5. \square

Corollary 6. *The dimension of the locus of symmetric determinantal varieties $\text{SDHyp}_{r,n}$ is $(r-1)\frac{n(n+1)}{2} + n$ for any $r \geq 2$ and $n \geq 1$.*

Proof. This follows from Proposition 5. We have proved that condition (a) holds, and hence so does condition (c). \square

5. THE NUMBER OF SYMMETRIC PRESENTATIONS

Theorem 2 asserts that the number of inequivalent symmetric presentations of a general element of $\text{SDHyp}_{r,n}$ is finite. Denote this number by $\mu(r, n)$. It is clear from the definition that $\mu(r, 1) = 1$ for any $r \geq 1$. It is also known that

$$\mu(2, n) = \begin{cases} 2^{\frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{2}} (2^{\frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{2}} + 1) - 1, & \text{if } n \geq 11 \text{ and } n \equiv \pm 3 \pmod{8} \\ 2^{\frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{2}} (2^{\frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{2}} + 1), & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases}$$

see [6, Theorem 1]. In this sections we will prove the following

Proposition 7. *If $r \geq \frac{n(n+1)}{2} - 1$, then $\mu(r, n) = 1$ for every $n \geq 2$.*

Proof. First assume $r = \frac{n(n+1)}{2} - 1$. Choose $A = (A_0, A_1, \dots, A_r) \in \text{Symm}_n^{r+1}$ such that A_0, \dots, A_r are linearly independent over k , i.e., A_0, \dots, A_r form a basis for Symm_n as a k -vector space. Suppose $H_A = H_B$ for some $B = (B_0, B_1, \dots, B_r) \in \text{Symm}_n$. This means that P_A is a non-zero scalar multiple of P_B . After replacing B by $g^t B g$ for a suitably chosen scalar matrix g , we may assume that $P_A = P_B$. Our goal is to show that B is equivalent to A .

Let $T : \text{Symm}_n \rightarrow \text{Symm}_n$ be the linear transformation sending A_i to B_i for each $1 \leq i \leq r$. The condition that $P_B = P_A$ translates to $\det(T(X)) = \det(X)$ for every symmetric matrix $X \in \text{Symm}_n$. Any such linear transformation is of the form $T(A) = g^t A g$; see [2, Corollary 8.6] or [3, Theorem 1.1]¹. This shows that A and B are equivalent, as desired.

We will show that $\mu(r, n) = 1$ for any $r \geq \frac{n(n+1)}{2} - 1$ by induction on r . The base case, where $r = \frac{n(n+1)}{2} - 1$, was settled in the previous paragraph. For the induction step, let us assume that $\mu(r, n) = 1$ for some $r \geq \frac{n(n+1)}{2} - 1$. Our goal is to show that $\mu(r+1, n) = 1$. We will argue by contradiction. Assume that $\mu(r+1, n) \geq 2$. Then for $A = (A_0, \dots, A_r, A_{r+1})$ in general position in Symm_n^{r+2} , there exists a $B =$

¹[2, Corollary 8.6] and [3, Theorem 1.1] asserts that $T(A) = \alpha g^t A g$ for some $\alpha \in k$ and $g \in \text{GL}_n$ such that $\det(\alpha g^2) = 1$. However, since we are assuming that our base field k is algebraically closed, we can absorb α by into g by replacing g with $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} g$.

$(B_0, \dots, B_r, B_{r+1}) \in \text{Symm}_n^{r+2}$ such that B is not equivalent to A and $H_A = H_B$. Once again, after replacing B by a scalar multiple, we may assume that $P_A = P_B$. (Since k is an algebraically closed field, any scalar multiple of B is equivalent to B .) In other words,

$$(7) \quad \det(x_0 A_0 + \dots + x_r A_r + x_{r+1} A_{r+1}) = \det(x_0 B_0 + \dots + x_r B_r + x_{r+1} B_{r+1}).$$

Setting $x_{r+1} = 0$, we see that $P_{\bar{A}} = P_{\bar{B}}$, and thus $H_{\bar{A}} = H_{\bar{B}}$, where

$$\bar{A} = (A_0, A_1, \dots, A_r) \text{ and } \bar{B} = (B_0, B_1, \dots, B_r).$$

Since A is in general position in Symm_n^{r+2} , \bar{A} is in general position on Symm_n^{r+1} . By our assumption, $\mu(r, n) = 1$; hence, \bar{A} and \bar{B} are equivalent, i.e., $\bar{A} = g^t \bar{B} g$ for some $g \in \text{GL}_n$. After replacing B by $g^t B g$, we may assume that $B_0 = A_0, \dots, B_r = A_r$. In other words, $A = (A_0, \dots, A_r, A_{r+1})$, $B = (A_0, \dots, A_r, B_{r+1})$ and B is not equivalent to A .

We claim that this is not possible. More specifically, we claim that in this situation our assumption that $P_A = P_B$ forces B_{r+1} to be equal to A_{r+1} . Since $r \geq \frac{n(n+1)}{2} - 1$ and A is in general position in Symm_n^{r+1} , we may assume without loss of generality that A_0, \dots, A_r span Symm_n as a k -vector space.

Now recall that the symmetric bilinear form $(X, Y) \mapsto \text{tr}(XY)$ (otherwise known as the trace form) is non-degenerate on Symm_n . Thus in order to prove the claim, it suffices to show that

$$(8) \quad \text{tr}(C A_{r+1}) = \text{tr}(C B_{r+1}) \text{ for every } C \in \text{Symm}_n.$$

Since non-singular matrices are Zariski dense in Symm_n , we only need to prove (8) for every non-singular symmetric matrix $C \in \text{Symm}_n$. To establish (8) for a non-singular matrix $C \in \text{Symm}_n$, note that C^{-1} is also symmetric and thus can be written as a linear combination

$$C^{-1} = c_0 A_0 + \dots + c_r A_r$$

for suitable scalars $c_0, c_1, \dots, c_r \in k$. Substituting $x_i = \lambda c_i$ for $i = 0, \dots, r$ and $x_{r+1} = -1$ into (7), where λ is a variable, and remembering that $A_i = B_i$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, r$, we see that

$$\det(\lambda C^{-1} - A_{r+1}) = \det(\lambda C^{-1} - B_{r+1}).$$

Multiplying both sides by $\det(C)$, we conclude that $C A_{r+1}$ and $C B_{r+1}$ have the same characteristic polynomial. Hence, they have the same trace, $\text{tr}(C A_{r+1}) = \text{tr}(C B_{r+1})$. This completes the proof of the claim and thus of Proposition 7. \square

Remark 8. Using Lemma 4(b), one can show that

$$\mu(r, n) = \frac{\text{deg}(\phi_{r,n})}{2^{n-1} n!},$$

where $\text{deg}(\phi_{r,n})$ denotes the separable degree of the morphism $\phi_{r,n}: Z_{r,n} \rightarrow \text{SDHyp}_{r,n}$ in (4). The denominator $2^{n-1} n!$ is half the size of the group H_n . The reason for the ‘‘half’’ is that the kernel of the H_n -action on $Z_{r,n}$ is the subgroup $\{\pm I\}$ of order 2. Thus for general $A \in \text{Symm}_n^{r+1}$ the number of reduced $(r+1)$ -tuples equivalent to A is $|H_n|/2$.

Remark 9. The description of the linear transformation $T: \text{Symm}_n \rightarrow \text{Symm}_n$ preserving the determinant which was used in the proof of Proposition 7 is a symmetric version of a classical theorem of Frobenius [5]. For a detailed discussion of this and related “preserver problems” we refer the reader to [2].

Remark 10. We do not know what the value of $\mu(r, n)$ is for $3 \leq r \leq \frac{n(n+1)}{2} - 2$.

Remark 11. A variant of Theorems 1 and 2 for “skew-symmetric” matrices is also of interest. Here “determinant” should be replaced by “Pfaffian”. We leave it as an open problem for the reader.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to Boris Reichstein whose questions led to both [7] and the present paper and to Giorgio Ottaviani for his interest in Theorem 2 and helpful comments.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Beauville. Determinantal hypersurfaces. *Michigan Math. J.*, 48:39–64, 2000. Dedicated to William Fulton on the occasion of his 60th birthday.
- [2] H. Bermudez, S. Garibaldi, and V. Larsen. Linear preservers and representations with a 1-dimensional ring of invariants. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 366(9):4755–4780, 2014.
- [3] C. Cao and X. Tang. Determinant preserving transformations on symmetric matrix spaces. *Electron. J. Linear Algebra*, 11:205–211, 2004.
- [4] A. C. Dixon. Note on the reduction of a ternary quantic to a symmetrical determinant. *Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc.* 11, 11(0):350–351, 1902.
- [5] G. Frobenius. über die darstellung der endlichen gruppen durch lineare substitutionen. *Berlin Sitzungsber.*, pages 994–1015, 1897.
- [6] D. Plaumann, B. Sturmfels, and C. Vinzant. Computing linear matrix representations of Helton-Vinnikov curves. In *Mathematical methods in systems, optimization, and control*, volume 222 of *Oper. Theory Adv. Appl.*, pages 259–277. Birkhäuser/Springer Basel AG, Basel, 2012.
- [7] Z. Reichstein and A. Vistoli. On the dimension of the locus of determinantal hypersurfaces. *Canad. Math. Bull.*, 60(3):613–630, 2017.
- [8] I. R. Shafarevich. *Basic algebraic geometry. 1*. Springer, Heidelberg, third edition, 2013. Varieties in projective space.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, VANCOUVER, CANADA
Email address: mbrassil@math.ubc.ca, reichst@math.ubc.ca