

# INTERMEDIATE CONES BETWEEN THE CONES OF POSITIVE SEMIDEFINITE FORMS AND SUMS OF SQUARES

CHARU GOEL, SARAH HESS, AND SALMA KUHLMANN

ABSTRACT. The cone  $\mathcal{P}_{n+1,2d}$  ( $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$ ) of all positive semidefinite (PSD) real forms in  $n+1$  variables of degree  $2d$  contains the subcone  $\Sigma_{n+1,2d}$  of those that are representable as finite sums of squares (SOS) of real forms of half degree  $d$ . Hilbert [Hil88] proved that these cones coincide exactly in the *Hilbert cases*  $(n+1, 2d)$  with  $n+1 = 2$  or  $2d = 2$  or  $(n+1, 2d) = (3, 4)$ . To establish the strict inclusion  $\Sigma_{n+1,2d} \subsetneq \mathcal{P}_{n+1,2d}$  in any non-Hilbert case, one can show that verifying the assertion in the *basic non-Hilbert cases*  $(4, 4)$  and  $(3, 6)$  suffices.

In this paper, we construct a filtration of intermediate cones between  $\Sigma_{n+1,2d}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{n+1,2d}$ . This filtration is induced via the Gram matrix approach [CLR95] on a filtration of irreducible projective varieties  $V_{k-n} \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq V_n \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq V_0$  containing the Veronese variety. Here,  $k$  is the dimension of the vector space of real forms in  $n+1$  variables of degree  $d$ . By showing that  $V_0, \dots, V_n$  are varieties of minimal degree, we demonstrate that the corresponding intermediate cones coincide with  $\Sigma_{n+1,2d}$ . Likewise, for the special case when  $n = 2$ ,  $V_{n+1}$  is also a variety of minimal degree and the corresponding intermediate cone also coincides with  $\Sigma_{n+1,2d}$ . We moreover prove that, in the non-Hilbert cases of  $(n+1)$ -ary quartics for  $n \geq 3$  and  $(n+1)$ -ary sextics for  $n \geq 2$ , all the remaining cone inclusions are strict.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

**1.1. Overview.** A prominent question in real algebraic geometry is whether a given positive semidefinite (PSD) polynomial of even degree can be represented by a finite sum of squares (SOS) of half degree polynomials. It suffices to consider this question for forms, since the PSD and SOS properties are preserved under homogenization [Mar08, Proposition 1.2.4.]. In 1888, Hilbert [Hil88] classified all cases  $(n+1, 2d)$  in which  $\mathcal{P}_{n+1,2d} = \Sigma_{n+1,2d}$ , namely the *Hilbert cases*  $(2, 2d)$ ,  $(n+1, 2)$  and  $(3, 4)$ . For the remaining cases, he proved the existence of PSD-not-SOS forms by reducing this investigation to the *basic non-Hilbert cases*  $(4, 4)$  and  $(3, 6)$  (using an argument that allows him to increase the number of variables and the even degree while preserving the PSD-not-SOS property). In the cases  $(4, 4)$  and  $(3, 6)$ , he gave a non-constructive proof for the existence of PSD-not-SOS forms. The first explicit PSD-not-SOS examples of a ternary sextic and a quaternary quartic were given by Motzkin [Mot67] and Robinson [Rob73] respectively. More examples of PSD-not-SOS ternary sextics and quaternary quartics were given by Choi and Lam [CL76, CL78].

In this paper, we use the Gram matrix method [CLR95] to construct a filtration of intermediate cones between  $\Sigma_{n+1,2d}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{n+1,2d}$  along irreducible projective varieties containing the Veronese variety. For determining the intermediate cones coinciding with  $\Sigma_{n+1,2d}$ , we use a result on varieties of minimal degree by Blekherman et al. [BSV16]. On the other hand, we identify the strictly separating intermediate cones in the non-Hilbert cases  $(n+1, 4)_{n \geq 3}$  and  $(n+1, 6)_{n \geq 2}$ . To this end, we reconsider the Motzkin and the Choi-Lam forms in light of the Gram matrix method. In the next paper [GHK], we shall extend the above results by identifying all strictly separating intermediate cones in any non-Hilbert case via a *degree-jumping principle*. Both papers together will provide a complete generalization of Hilbert's 1888 Theorem along a filtration of irreducible projective varieties containing the Veronese variety.

**1.2. Preliminaries.** For  $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\mathcal{F}_{n,d}$  denote the vector space of real forms in  $n$  variables of degree  $d$ ;  $p \in \mathcal{F}_{n,d}$  is called a  $n$ -ary  $d$ -ic. A form  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{n+1,2d}$  is *locally positive semidefinite* on  $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  if  $f(x) \geq 0$  holds for all  $x \in K$ . In particular, if  $K = \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ , then  $f$  is (*globally*) *positive semidefinite* (PSD). Moreover, a form  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{n+1,2d}$  is a *sum of squares* (SOS), if there exist some  $g_1, \dots, g_s \in \mathcal{F}_{n+1,d}$  ( $s \in \mathbb{N}$ ) s.t.  $f = \sum_{i=1}^s g_i^2$ . The cone of all PSD resp. SOS forms in  $\mathcal{F}_{n+1,2d}$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{P}_{n+1,2d}$  resp.  $\Sigma_{n+1,2d}$ .

**The Gram Matrix Method and the Veronese Embedding.**  $\Sigma_{n+1,2d}$  can be studied by using the Gram matrix method introduced in [CLR95]. The crux of this method is that a SOS representation  $f = \sum_{i=1}^s g_i^2$  ( $s \in \mathbb{N}$ ) of a form  $f$  corresponds to a real, symmetric, positive semidefinite matrix whose entries come from the coefficients of the half degree forms  $g_1, \dots, g_s$ .

Set

$$\begin{aligned} k: \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} &\rightarrow \mathbb{N} \\ (n, d) &\mapsto k(n, d) := \dim(\mathcal{F}_{n+1,d}) - 1 = \binom{n+d}{n} - 1. \end{aligned}$$

We write  $k$  instead of  $k(n, d)$  whenever  $(n, d)$  is clear from the context. Consider the linear bijective map

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{aligned} Q: \text{Sym}_{k+1}(\mathbb{R}) &\rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{k+1,2} \\ A &\mapsto q_A(Z) := ZAZ^t, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\text{Sym}_{k+1}(\mathbb{R})$  is the vector space of all  $(k+1) \times (k+1)$  symmetric matrices with real entries and  $Z := (Z_0, \dots, Z_k)$ . We order the set of exponents of monomials in  $\mathcal{F}_{n+1,d}$ , that is  $\{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^{n+1} \mid |\alpha| = d\}$  (where  $\mathbb{N}_0 := \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ ), lexicographically and recognize that it naturally consists of exactly  $k+1$  elements. Thus, we obtain the ordered set of exponents  $\{\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_k\}$  and write  $\alpha_i = (\alpha_{i,0}, \dots, \alpha_{i,n})$ . Lastly, we enumerate the monomial basis of

$\mathcal{F}_{n+1,d}$  along the  $\alpha_i$  by setting  $m_i(X) := X^{\alpha_i}$  for  $i = 0, \dots, k$ . Let us now consider the linear surjective map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}: \text{Sym}_{k+1}(\mathbb{R}) &\rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{n+1,2d} \\ A &\mapsto f_A(X) := q_A(m_0(X) \dots m_k(X)). \end{aligned}$$

We call  $\mathcal{G}$  the *Gram map*. For any  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{n+1,2d}$ , the preimage  $\mathcal{G}^{-1}(f)$  is always nonempty. Any matrix  $A \in \mathcal{G}^{-1}(f)$  is called a *Gram matrix associated to  $f$*  and  $q_A$  its corresponding *quadratic form (associated to  $f$ )*. In particular, we can fix a generic  $A_f \in \mathcal{G}^{-1}(f)$ . Clearly, any form  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{n+1,2d}$  can be interpreted as a form  $g \in \mathcal{F}_{m+1,2d}$  for  $m \geq n$ . The same is true for the associated Gram matrices as the following observation clarifies:

**Observation.** *Let  $n, m, d \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $n \leq m$ ,  $i_0, \dots, i_n \in \{0, \dots, m\}$  such that  $i_0 < \dots < i_n$ . For  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{n+1,2d}$ , define  $g(X_0, \dots, X_m) := f(X_{i_0}, \dots, X_{i_n})$  in  $\mathcal{F}_{m+1,2d}$  and set  $I := \{i \in \{0, \dots, k(m, d)\} \mid \alpha_{i,s} = 0 \text{ for } s \neq i_0, \dots, i_n\}$ .*

*For any  $B := (b_{i,j})_{0 \leq i,j \leq k(m,d)} \in \mathcal{G}^{-1}(g)$ , set  $A := B_I \in \text{Sym}_{k(n,d)+1}(\mathbb{R})$  to be the submatrix of  $B$  given by  $B_I := (b_{i,j})_{i,j \in I}$ , then  $A$  is a Gram matrix associated to  $f$ .*

*Conversely, for any  $A \in \mathcal{G}^{-1}(f)$ , expand  $A$  to a matrix  $B \in \text{Sym}_{k(m,d)+1}(\mathbb{R})$  with  $B_I := (b_{i,j})_{i,j \in I} = A$  and zero elsewhere, then  $B$  is a Gram matrix associated to  $g$ .*

The map  $\mathcal{G}$  is not injective in general and hence  $\mathcal{G}^{-1}(f)$  is not a singleton. In fact,  $\mathcal{G}^{-1}(f)$  is the coset of  $A_f$  w.r.t.  $\ker(\mathcal{G})$ . Let us characterize the kernel of  $\mathcal{G}$  via the (projective) Veronese embedding

$$\begin{aligned} V: \mathbb{P}^n &\rightarrow \mathbb{P}^k \\ [x] &\mapsto [m_0(x) : \dots : m_k(x)]. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that  $V$  is not surjective in general. Set

$$(1.2) \quad \mathcal{S}_V := \{Z_i Z_j - Z_s Z_t \mid i, j, s, t \in \{0, \dots, k\} : \alpha_i + \alpha_j = \alpha_s + \alpha_t\},$$

then  $V(\mathbb{P}^n) = \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{S}_V)$  [Goe14, Lemma 2.35], [Pla20, Satz 4.3.13]. We call  $V(\mathbb{P}^n)$  the *Veronese variety*.

We now build a bridge between the real affine and the complex projective formulations. For any projective set  $W$ , let  $W(\mathbb{R})$  denote the *set of real points of  $W$*  and assume  $x$  to be a real representative for  $[x] \in W(\mathbb{R})$ . Observe that  $V(\mathbb{P}^n(\mathbb{R})) = V(\mathbb{P}^n)(\mathbb{R})$  and

$$\ker(\mathcal{G}) = \{A \in \text{Sym}_{k+1}(\mathbb{R}) \mid q_A \text{ vanishes on } V(\mathbb{P}^n)(\mathbb{R})\}.$$

Consequently, for any  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{n+1,2d}$ ,

$$(1.3) \quad \mathcal{G}^{-1}(f) = \{A \in \text{Sym}_{k+1}(\mathbb{R}) \mid q_{A-A_f} \text{ vanishes on } V(\mathbb{P}^n)(\mathbb{R})\}.$$

**Cone Filtration between  $\Sigma_{n+1,2d}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{n+1,2d}$ .** We now extend the (locally) positive semidefinite notion to a projective setting. For any projective variety  $W \subseteq \mathbb{P}^k$ , we call a form  $q \in \mathcal{F}_{k+1,2}$  *locally positive semidefinite (locally PSD) on  $W(\mathbb{R}) \subseteq \mathbb{P}^k(\mathbb{R})$*  if  $q(x) \geq 0$  holds for any  $[x] \in W(\mathbb{R})$ . In

particular, if  $W(\mathbb{R}) = \mathbb{P}^k(\mathbb{R})$ , then we refer to  $q$  as *positive semidefinite (PSD)* or *nonnegative*.

A form  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{n+1,2d}$  is SOS if and only if there exists a Gram matrix  $A$  associated to  $f$  such that  $q_A$  is PSD [CLR95, Theorem 2.4]. Hence,

$$(1.4) \quad \Sigma_{n+1,2d} = \{f \in \mathcal{F}_{n+1,2d} \mid \exists A \in \mathcal{G}^{-1}(f): q_A|_{\mathbb{P}^k(\mathbb{R})} \geq 0\}.$$

Likewise, a form  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{n+1,2d}$  is PSD if and only if for any Gram matrix associated to  $f$  the corresponding quadratic form is locally PSD on  $V(\mathbb{P}^n)(\mathbb{R})$ . Equivalently, there exists a Gram matrix  $A$  associated to  $f$  such that  $q_A$  is locally PSD on  $V(\mathbb{P}^n)(\mathbb{R})$ . Indeed, assume that for some  $A \in \mathcal{G}^{-1}(f)$ , the corresponding quadratic form  $q_A$  is locally PSD on  $V(\mathbb{P}^n)(\mathbb{R})$ , then  $f(X) = q_A(m_0(X), \dots, m_k(X)) = (m_0(X), \dots, m_k(X))A(m_0, \dots, m_k(X))^t$  verifies that  $f$  is PSD. Equivalently, any Gram matrix associated to  $f$  is locally PSD on  $V(\mathbb{P}^n)(\mathbb{R})$ . Thus,

$$(1.5) \quad \mathcal{P}_{n+1,2d} = \{f \in \mathcal{F}_{n+1,2d} \mid \exists A \in \mathcal{G}^{-1}(f): q_A|_{V(\mathbb{P}^n)(\mathbb{R})} \geq 0\}.$$

In (1.4), the SOS property of a form in  $\mathcal{F}_{n+1,2d}$  was characterized by a PSD restriction for corresponding quadratic forms on the set of real points over the variety  $\mathbb{P}^k$ . Analogously, in (1.5), the PSD property was described by a local PSD restriction for corresponding quadratic forms on the set of real points of the variety  $V(\mathbb{P}^n)$ . For any  $i \in \{0, \dots, k-n\}$ , set

$$H_i := \{[z] \in \mathbb{P}^k \mid \exists x \in \mathbb{C}^{n+1}: (z_0, \dots, z_{n+i}) = (m_0(x), \dots, m_{n+i}(x))\}$$

and let  $V_i \subseteq \mathbb{P}^k$  be the Zariski closure of  $H_i$  in  $\mathbb{P}^k$  (that is, the smallest projective variety in  $\mathbb{P}^k$  containing  $H_i$ ). In particular,  $V_i = \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{I}(H_i))$ , where  $\mathcal{I}(H_i)$  denotes the vanishing ideal of  $H_i$ . Clearly,  $V_{k-n} = V(\mathbb{P}^n)$  and  $V_0 = \mathbb{P}^k$ , so that we obtain a filtration of projective varieties

$$V(\mathbb{P}^n) = V_{k-n} \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq V_0 = \mathbb{P}^k$$

in which each inclusion is strict. Moreover, each inclusion in the corresponding filtration of sets of real points is also strict. That is

$$(1.6) \quad V(\mathbb{P}^n)(\mathbb{R}) = V_{k-n}(\mathbb{R}) \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq V_0(\mathbb{R}) = \mathbb{P}^k(\mathbb{R}).$$

This allows us to induce a filtration of cones between  $\Sigma_{n+1,2d}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{n+1,2d}$  by following the Gram matrix method. In particular, for  $i = 0, \dots, k-n$ , setting

$$C_i := \{f \in \mathcal{F}_{n+1,2d} \mid \exists A \in \mathcal{G}^{-1}(f): q_A|_{V_i(\mathbb{R})} \geq 0\},$$

we obtain

$$(1.7) \quad \Sigma_{n+1,2d} = C_0 \subseteq \dots \subseteq C_{k-n} = \mathcal{P}_{n+1,2d}.$$

Even though the inclusions between sets of real points in (1.6) are all strict, the induced cone inclusions in (1.7) need not be.

If  $(n+1, 2d)$  is a Hilbert case, then (1.7) collapses to one and the same cone, that is,

$$\Sigma_{n+1,2d} = C_0 = C_1 = \dots = C_{k-n} = \mathcal{P}_{n+1,2d}.$$

On the other hand, in any non-Hilbert case  $(n+1, 2d)$  at least one inclusion in (1.7) is strict since  $\Sigma_{n+1, 2d}$  is a proper subcone of  $\mathcal{P}_{n+1, 2d}$ . However, it is not clear how many among these inclusions are strict and which ones. Our main goal is to identify all strict inclusions in (1.7).

**1.3. Structure of the Paper and Main Results.** This paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we give an explicit description of  $V_0, \dots, V_{k-n}$  in Theorem 2.2 along the quadratic generators of the Veronese variety in  $\mathcal{S}_V$ . In Section 3, we investigate potential equalities in the cone filtration  $\Sigma_{n+1, 2d} = C_0 \subseteq \dots \subseteq C_n$  for  $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$ . In the special case of  $n = 2$ , we extend these considerations a step further to  $C_n \subseteq C_{n+1}$ . This leads us to our first main result:

**Theorem A.** *If  $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $i = 0, \dots, n-1$ , then  $C_i = C_{i+1}$ . Moreover, if  $n \leq 2$ , then also  $C_n = C_{n+1}$ .*

For proving this result, our main tool is Proposition 3.3 that establishes the applicability of a result on varieties of minimal degree from [BSV16]. In Section 4, we consider quaternary quartics and ternary sextics. We construct explicit examples of separating forms in these cases (see Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.2) thereby establishing all the remaining inclusions in (1.7) being strict. In Section 5, we generalize these findings to  $(n+1)$ -ary quartics for  $n \geq 4$  and  $(n+1)$ -ary sextics for  $n \geq 3$  by proving our second main result (see Theorem B below), which allows us to maintain proper cone inclusions when going over to higher degrees for a fixed number of variables.

**Theorem B.** *If  $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $i = 0, \dots, k(n, d) - 1$  such that  $C_i \subsetneq C_{i+1}$  as subcones of  $\mathcal{P}_{n+1, 2d}$ , then  $C_i \subsetneq C_{i+1}$  also as subcones of  $\mathcal{P}_{n+1, 2\delta}$  for  $\delta \geq d$ .*

Using this result and our observations made in Section 4, we deduce in Theorem C and Theorem D that all the remaining cone inclusions in (1.7) are also strict:

**Theorem C.** *For  $(n+1, 4)_{n \geq 4}$  and  $i = n, \dots, k-n-1$ , the strict inclusion  $C_i \subsetneq C_{i+1}$  holds.*

**Theorem D.** *For  $(n+1, 6)_{n \geq 3}$  and  $i = n, \dots, k-n-1$ , the strict inclusion  $C_i \subsetneq C_{i+1}$  holds.*

## 2. EXPLICIT DESCRIPTION OF THE FILTRATION OF VARIETIES CONTAINING THE VERONESE VARIETY

In a first step towards a complete determination of all strict inclusions in the induced cone filtration (1.7), we give an explicit description of the projective varieties  $V_0, \dots, V_{k-n}$  along the quadratic forms in  $\mathcal{S}_V$ .

Let  $(n+1, 2d)$  be a non-Hilbert case and for  $i = 0, \dots, k-n$ , set

$$s_i := \min\{s \in \{1, \dots, k\} \mid \exists t \in \{s, \dots, k\}: \alpha_s + \alpha_t = \alpha_0 + \alpha_{n+i}\}.$$

Fix  $t_i \in \{s_i, \dots, k\}$  such that  $\alpha_{s_i} + \alpha_{t_i} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_{n+i}$  correspondingly and consider the quadratic form  $q_i(Z) := Z_0 Z_{n+i} - Z_{s_i} Z_{t_i} \in \mathcal{S}_V$ . Define the sets

$K_0 := \mathcal{V}(\emptyset) = \mathbf{C}^k$  and  $K_i := \mathcal{V}(q_1(1, Z_1, \dots, Z_k), \dots, q_i(1, Z_1, \dots, Z_k)) \subseteq \mathbf{C}^k$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k - n$ . Moreover, for  $i = 0, \dots, k - n$ , set  $W_i$  to be the Zariski closure of  $K_i$  under the embedding

$$\begin{aligned} \phi: \quad \mathbf{C}^k &\rightarrow \mathbf{P}^k \\ (z_1, \dots, z_k) &\mapsto [1 : z_1 : \dots : z_k]. \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 2.1.** *For  $i = 0, \dots, k - n$ , the projective variety  $W_i$  is irreducible and has codimension  $i$ .*

*Proof.* The affine variety  $K_i$  is isomorphic to the irreducible affine variety  $\mathbf{C}^{k-i}$ . Thus, the projective closure  $W_i$  of  $K_i$  under the embedding  $\phi$  is also irreducible and has codimension  $i$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 2.2.** *For  $i = 0, \dots, k - n$ , then  $W_i = V_i$ .*

*Proof.* Clearly,  $W_0 = \mathbf{P}^k = V_0$  and  $W_{k-n}$  is a subvariety of the Veronese variety. Furthermore, by Lemma 2.1,  $W_{k-n}$  is irreducible and has dimension  $n$ . The same is true for  $V(\mathbf{P}^n)$  [Har92, Example 13.4]. Hence, it follows  $W_{k-n} = V(\mathbf{P}^n) = V_{k-n}$ .

Let  $i = 1, \dots, k - n - 1$  and observe that  $V_i = \overline{\mathcal{Z}} \cup W_i$ , where  $\overline{\mathcal{Z}}$  is the Zariski closure of  $\mathcal{Z} := \{[z] \in H_i \mid z_0 = 0\}$ . Hence, it suffices to show  $\overline{\mathcal{Z}} \subseteq W_i$ .

According to Buchberger's algorithm for a Gröbner basis construction [CLO15, Chapter 2 §7 Theorem 2], we fix a set of forms  $F \subseteq \mathbf{C}[Z_0, \dots, Z_{n+i}]$  such that  $W_i = \mathcal{V}(F)$ . Thus, using the projective Hilbert-Nullstellensatz [CLO15, Chapter 8 §3 Theorem 9], it is enough to show  $\sqrt{\langle F \rangle} \subseteq \sqrt{\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{Z})}$  for which it suffices to verify  $\langle F \rangle \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{Z})$ .

Let  $f \in F$  and  $[z] \in \mathcal{Z}$  be arbitrary but fixed. Hence, for some  $x \in \mathbf{C}^{n+1}$  with  $x_0 = 0$ , we get  $(z_0, \dots, z_{n+i}) = (m_0(x), \dots, m_{n+i}(x))$ . Observe that  $f(z) = f(\tilde{z})$  for  $\tilde{z} := (m_0(x), \dots, m_k(x))$ . Recall  $W_i \supseteq V(\mathbf{P}^n)$ , which implies  $\mathcal{I}(W_i) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(V(\mathbf{P}^n)) = \sqrt{\langle \mathcal{S}_V \rangle}$ . Hence, we can fix some  $m \in \mathbf{N}$  and  $g \in \langle \mathcal{S}_V \rangle$  such that  $f^m = g$ . It follows  $f(z)^m = f(\tilde{z})^m = (f^m)(\tilde{z}) = g(\tilde{z}) = 0$ . So,  $f \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{Z})$ .  $\square$

*Remark 2.3.* Since  $\dim(\mathbf{P}^k) - \dim(V(\mathbf{P}^n)) = k - n$ , the filtration of irreducible projective varieties  $V(\mathbf{P}^n) = V_0 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq V_{k-n} = \mathbf{P}^k$  is of maximal length w.r.t.  $\subsetneq$ .

### 3. EQUALITY OF THE FIRST $n + 1$ (RESPECTIVELY $n + 2$ IF $n \leq 2$ ) CONES

Our investigation of the cone inclusions  $\Sigma_{n+1,2d} = C_0 \subseteq \dots \subseteq C_n$  (respectively  $\Sigma_{n+1,2d} = C_0 \subseteq \dots \subseteq C_n \subseteq C_{n+1}$  if  $n = 2$ ) makes use of the result [BSV16, Theorem 1.1] on varieties of minimal degree. Recall that for any irreducible nondegenerate projective variety  $W$ ,  $\deg(W) \geq 1 + \text{codim}(W)$  [EH87, Proposition 0].

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $W$  be an irreducible nondegenerate projective variety with  $\deg(W) = 1 + \text{codim}(W)$ , then  $W$  is called a projective variety of *minimal degree*.

Theorem A will then follow from Proposition 3.2 and Proposition 3.3 below.

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$ . If  $W \subseteq \mathbb{P}^k$  is a totally real irreducible nondegenerate projective variety of minimal degree with  $V(\mathbb{P}^n) \subseteq W$ , then*

$$\{f \in \mathcal{F}_{n+1,2d} \mid \exists A \in \mathcal{G}^{-1}(f): q_A|_{W(\mathbb{R})} \geq 0\} = \Sigma_{n+1,2d}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{n+1,2d}$  with  $A \in \mathcal{G}^{-1}(f)$  such that  $q_A$  is locally PSD on  $W(\mathbb{R})$  be arbitrary but fixed. Thus, by [BSV16, Theorem 1.1],  $q_A \in \mathbb{R}[Z]$  is SOS in  $\mathbb{R}[Z]/\mathcal{I}(W)$ . Therefore, there exist some linear forms  $h_1, \dots, h_s \in \mathbb{R}[Z]$  ( $s \in \mathbb{N}$ ) with  $q_A - \sum_{i=1}^s h_i^2 \in \mathcal{I}(W) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(V(\mathbb{P}^n))$ . Set  $q(Z) := \sum_{i=1}^s h_i^2 \in \Sigma_{k+1,2}$  and fix  $B \in Q^{-1}(q)$ , then  $q_A \equiv q_B$  on  $V(\mathbb{P}^n)(\mathbb{R})$  testifies  $B \in \mathcal{G}^{-1}(f)$ . We conclude  $f \in \Sigma_{n+1,2d}$ .  $\square$

To get equality of each inclusion in  $\Sigma_{n+1,2d} = C_0 \subseteq \dots \subseteq C_n$  (respectively  $\Sigma_{n+1,2d} = C_0 \subseteq \dots \subseteq C_{n+1}$  if  $n = 2$ ), it thus remains to verify that  $V_n$  (respectively  $V_{n+1}$  if  $n = 2$ ) are varieties of minimal degree.

**Proposition 3.3.** *For  $n \geq 2$ , the following are true:*

- (1)  $\deg(V_i) = i + 1$  for  $i = 0, \dots, n$
- (2)  $\deg(V_{n+1}) = n + 2$  for  $n = 2$

*Proof.* (1) Clearly,  $V_0 = \mathbb{P}^k$  has degree 1 and  $V_1 = W_1 = \mathcal{V}(q_1)$  has degree 2 since  $q_1$  is a quadratic form. It therefore remains to determine  $\deg(V_i)$  for  $i \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ .

If  $n = 2$ , then  $\deg(V_2) = \deg(W_2) = 3$  by a straight forward computation and we are done.

Thus, w.l.o.g. assume  $n \geq 3$  and argue inductively. By explicit calculations  $\deg(V_2) = \deg(W_2) = 3$  and  $\deg(V_3) = \deg(W_3) = 4$ . Now, assume that the assertion already holds up to some  $i \in \{3, \dots, n-1\}$ . In the inductive step, we now consider  $i + 1$ .

Recall  $\deg(V_{i+1}) = \deg(W_{i+1}) \geq i + 2$  by [EH87, Proposition 0]. Set

$$B^{[2]} := \{Z_0, Z_1, Z_{n+1}, Z_{n+s} - Z_s Z_{n+2} \mid s = 3, \dots, i\}$$

in  $\mathbb{R}[Z_0, Z_1, Z_3, \dots, Z_k]$  and let  $W^{[2]}$  be the projective closure of the affine variety  $H^{[2]} := \mathcal{V}(B^{[2]}) \subseteq \mathbb{C}^k$  under the embedding

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^{[2]}: \quad \mathbb{C}^k &\longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^k \\ (z_0, z_1, z_3, \dots, z_n) &\longmapsto (z_0, z_1, 1, z_3, \dots, z_n). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that  $W_{i+1}$ ,  $\mathcal{V}(Z_0, \dots, Z_i)$  and  $W^{[2]}$  are three pairwise distinct irreducible components of  $W_i \cap \mathcal{V}(q_{i+1})$ . Thus, Bézout's Theorem [Har77, Theorem 7.7] together with the inductive assumption

yields that for some  $c_1, c_2, c_3 \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned}
2(i+1) &= \deg(\mathcal{V}(q_{i+1})) \deg(W_i) \\
&\geq c_1 \deg(W_{i+1}) + c_2 \deg(\mathcal{V}(Z_0, \dots, Z_i)) + c_3 \deg(W^{[2]}) \\
&\geq \deg(W_{i+1}) + \deg(\mathcal{V}(Z_0, \dots, Z_i)) + \deg(W^{[2]}) \\
&= \deg(W_{i+1}) + 1 + (i-1) \\
&\geq (i+2) + 1 + (i-1) = 2(i+1).
\end{aligned}$$

So,  $\deg(W_{i+1}) + 1 + (i-1) = 2(i+1)$  and the irreducible decomposition of  $V_i \cap \mathcal{V}(q_{i+1})$  is  $V_{i+1} \cup \mathcal{V}(Z_0, \dots, Z_i) \cup W^{[2]}$ . Therefore, we conclude  $\deg(V_{i+1}) = \deg(W_{i+1}) = i+2$ .

- (2) Set  $W := \mathcal{V}(Z_3Z_0 - Z_1^2, Z_0Z_4 - Z_1Z_2, Z_0Z_5 - Z_2^2, Z_3Z_5 - Z_4^2) \subseteq \mathbb{P}^k$  and observe that  $W = W_3$ . Thus, we have  $\dim(W) = k-3$  and therefore by [EH87, Proposition 0]  $\deg(W) \geq 1 + \text{codim}(W) = 4$ . Moreover, observe that  $W_3$  and  $\mathcal{V}(Z_0, Z_1, Z_2)$  are two distinct irreducible components of  $W_2 \cap \mathcal{V}(Z_0Z_5 - Z_2^2)$ . Hence, we observe by Bézout's Theorem [Har77, Theorem 7.7] that

$$\begin{aligned}
6 &= 3 \cdot 2 = \deg(W_2) \cdot \deg(\mathcal{V}(Z_0Z_5 - Z_2^2)) \\
&\geq c_1 \deg(W_3) + c_2 \deg(\mathcal{V}(Z_0, Z_1, Z_2)) \geq \deg(W_3) + 1
\end{aligned}$$

for some  $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ . We conclude  $\deg(W) = \deg(W_3) \in \{4, 5\}$ . However, the degree of  $W$  is also divisible by 4. Therefore it follows  $\deg(V_3) = \deg(W_3) = \deg(W) = 4$ .

□

#### 4. QUATERNARY QUARTICS AND TERNARY SEXTICS

Applying Theorem A to  $(n+1, 2d) = (4, 4)$  and  $(3, 6)$  respectively, the cone filtration (1.7) becomes

$$(4.1) \quad \Sigma_{4,4} = C_0 = C_1 = C_2 = C_3 \subseteq C_4 \subseteq C_5 \subseteq C_6 = \mathcal{P}_{4,4}, \text{ and}$$

$$(4.2) \quad \Sigma_{3,6} = C_0 = C_1 = C_2 = C_3 \subseteq C_4 \subseteq C_5 \subseteq C_6 \subseteq C_7 = \mathcal{P}_{3,6}$$

respectively. We now investigate the remaining inclusions.

**Theorem 4.1.** *If  $(n+1, 2d) = (4, 4)$ , then  $C_3 \subsetneq C_4 \subsetneq C_5 \subsetneq C_6$ .*

*Proof.* Consider the Choi-Lam quaternary quartic

$$\mathfrak{C}(X_0, X_1, X_2, X_3) := X_0^2X_1^2 + X_0^2X_2^2 + X_1^2X_2^2 + X_3^4 - 4X_0X_1X_2X_3.$$

From [CL76, CL78], we know that  $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathcal{P}_{4,4} \setminus \Sigma_{4,4}$ . Thus, the same holds for the permuted forms  $\mathfrak{C}^\sigma := \mathfrak{C}(X_0, X_3, X_1, X_2)$  and  $\mathfrak{C}^\tau := \mathfrak{C}(X_3, X_1, X_2, X_0)$ . We now show the following:

- (1)  $\mathfrak{C}^\sigma \in C_4 \setminus C_3$ ,
- (2)  $\mathfrak{C}^\tau \in C_5 \setminus C_4$ ,
- (3)  $\mathfrak{C} \in C_6 \setminus C_5$ .



The above three statements can be shown by similar arguments. Thus, it is enough to prove (1). Observe that

$$\mathfrak{C}^\sigma = m_1(X)^2 + m_3(X)^2 + m_6(X)^2 + m_7(X)^2 - 4m_2(X)m_6(X).$$

- (a) To prove that  $\mathfrak{C}^\sigma \in C_4$ , it suffices to show that there exists a Gram matrix  $A := (a_{i,j})_{0 \leq i,j \leq 9}$  associated to  $\mathfrak{C}^\sigma$  such that  $q_A$  is locally PSD on  $\mathcal{V}(q_1, q_2, q_3, q_4)(\mathbb{R})$ . Consider the Gram matrix  $A := (a_{i,j})_{0 \leq i,j \leq 9}$  associated to  $\mathfrak{C}^\sigma$  given by

$$a_{i,j} := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } i = j \in \{1, 3, 6, 7\} \\ -2, & \text{if } \{i, j\} = \{2, 6\} \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Observe that for any  $[z] \in \mathcal{V}(q_1, q_2, q_3, q_4)(\mathbb{R})$ , we have

$$q_A(z) = \begin{cases} z_1^2 + z_3^2 + z_6^2 + z_7^2, & \text{if } z_0 = 0 \\ \frac{1}{z_0^2} C^\sigma(1, z_1, z_2, z_3), & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

This implies  $q_A(z) \geq 0$  for any  $[z] \in \mathcal{V}(q_1, q_2, q_3, q_4)(\mathbb{R})$ .

- (b) To prove that  $\mathfrak{C}^\sigma \notin C_3$ , it suffices to show that for any Gram matrix  $B$  associated to  $\mathfrak{C}^\sigma$ ,  $q_B$  is not locally PSD on  $\phi(K_3)(\mathbb{R})$ . On contrary, assume that there exists a Gram matrix  $B = (b_{i,j})_{0 \leq i,j \leq 9}$  associated to  $\mathfrak{C}^\sigma$  such that  $q_B(z) \geq 0$  for any  $[z] \in \phi(K_3)(\mathbb{R})$ . A comparison of coefficients between  $\mathfrak{C}^\sigma$  and  $q_B(m_0(X), \dots, m_9(X))$  as well as several point evaluations of  $q_B$  on  $\phi(K_3)(\mathbb{R})$  now reveals that necessarily  $b_{7,7} = 1$ ,  $b_{i,j} = b_{j,i} = 0$  for  $j \in \{7, 8, 9\}$ ,  $i \in \{0, \dots, j\}$ ,  $(i, j) \neq (7, 7)$ . This gives  $q_B(z) < 0$  for  $[z] := [1 : \dots : 1 : 0 : 0 : 0] \in \phi(K_3)(\mathbb{R})$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.2.** *If  $(n+1, 2d) = (3, 6)$ , then  $C_3 \subsetneq C_4 \subsetneq C_5 \subsetneq C_6 \subsetneq C_7$ .*

*Proof.* Consider the Motzkin form

$$\mathfrak{M}(X_0, X_1, X_2) := X_0^4 X_1^2 + X_0^2 X_1^4 + X_2^6 - 3X_0^2 X_1^2 X_2^2$$

and the Choi-Lam ternary sextic

$$\mathfrak{L}(X_0, X_1, X_2) := X_0^4 X_1^2 + X_0^2 X_2^4 + X_1^4 X_2^2 - 3X_0^2 X_1^2 X_2^2.$$

From [Mot67] and [CL76, CL78], we know  $\mathfrak{M}, \mathfrak{L} \in \mathcal{P}_{3,6} \setminus \Sigma_{3,6}$ . Thus, the same holds for the permuted forms  $\mathfrak{M}^\sigma := \mathfrak{M}(X_0, X_2, X_1)$  and  $\mathfrak{L}^\tau := \mathfrak{L}(X_0, X_2, X_1)$ . We now show the following:

- (1)  $\mathfrak{M}^\sigma \in C_4 \setminus C_3$ ,
- (2)  $\mathfrak{L} \in C_5 \setminus C_4$ ,
- (3)  $\mathfrak{L}^\tau \in C_6 \setminus C_5$ ,
- (4)  $\mathfrak{M} \in C_7 \setminus C_6$ .

These statements follow analogously as in the proof of Theorem 4.1 except that an appropriate choice of the Gram matrix  $\mathbf{A} := (\alpha_{i,j})_{0 \leq i,j \leq 9}$  associated to  $\mathfrak{M}^\sigma$  such that  $q_{\mathbf{A}}$  is locally PSD on  $\mathcal{V}(q_1, q_2, q_3, q_4)(\mathbb{R})$  is given by

$$\alpha_{i,j} := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } i = j \in \{2, 4, 5, 6\} \\ 4, & \text{if } i = j = 3 \\ -2, & \text{if } \{i, j\} = \{1, 6\} \text{ or } \{i, j\} = \{3, 5\} \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

□

From the cone filtrations (4.1), (4.2) and Theorem 4.1, Theorem 4.2, we conclude that

$$(4.3) \quad \Sigma_{4,4} = C_0 = C_1 = C_2 = C_3 \subsetneq C_4 \subsetneq C_5 \subsetneq C_6 = \mathcal{P}_{4,4}, \text{ and}$$

$$(4.4) \quad \Sigma_{3,6} = C_0 = C_1 = C_2 = C_3 \subsetneq C_4 \subsetneq C_5 \subsetneq C_6 \subsetneq C_7 = \mathcal{P}_{3,6}.$$

This determines all the strict inclusions in (1.7) for quaternary quartics and ternary sextics.

## 5. $(n+1)$ -ARY QUARTICS FOR $n \geq 4$ AND $(n+1)$ -ARY SEXTICS FOR $n \geq 3$

We now investigate the cone filtration (1.7) in the non-Hilbert cases of  $(n+1)$ -ary quartics ( $n \geq 4$ ) and  $(n+1)$ -ary sextics ( $n \geq 3$ ) by generalizing our findings (4.3) and (4.4), see (5.1) below. As explained in Section 1.3, for the proof of Theorem C and Theorem D below, we first need to prove Theorem B.

**Proof of Theorem B.** When  $\delta = d$ , the statement is clear. On the other hand, when  $\delta \geq d+1$ , then we argue inductively. For the purpose of this proof, denote by  $C_i^\delta$  and  $C_{i+1}^\delta$  the subcones  $C_i$  and  $C_{i+1}$  respectively of  $\mathcal{P}_{n+1,2\delta}$ . Likewise, denote by  $V_i^\delta$  and  $V_{i+1}^\delta$  the subvarieties  $V_i$  and  $V_{i+1}$  respectively of  $\mathbb{P}^{k(n,\delta)}$ . Choose  $f \in C_{i+1}^\delta \setminus C_i^\delta$  and set  $g(X) := X_0^2 f(X)$  in  $\mathcal{F}_{n+1,2(\delta+1)}$ . We claim  $g \in C_{i+1}^{\delta+1} \setminus C_i^{\delta+1}$ .

Since  $f \in C_{i+1}^\delta$ , we can fix some  $A \in \mathcal{G}^{-1}(f)$  with  $q_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{y}) \geq 0$  for any  $[\mathbf{y}] \in V_{i+1}^\delta(\mathbb{R})$ . Set  $I := \{0, \dots, k(n, \delta)\}$  and expand  $A$  to a real matrix  $B := (b_{i,j})_{0 \leq i,j \leq k(n,\delta+1)} \in \text{Sym}_{k(n,\delta+1)+1}(\mathbb{R})$  with  $B_I := (b_{i,j})_{i,j \in I} = A$  and zero elsewhere. Observe that  $B \in \mathcal{G}^{-1}(g)$ . For any  $[z] \in V_{i+1}^{\delta+1}(\mathbb{R})$  define  $[\mathbf{y}] := [z_0 : \dots : z_{k(n,\delta)}] \in V_{i+1}^\delta(\mathbb{R})$ , then  $q_B(z) = q_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{y}) \geq 0$ . This shows  $g \in C_{i+1}^{\delta+1}$ .

It remains to show  $g \notin C_i^{\delta+1}$ . It is enough to verify that  $q_B$  is not locally PSD on  $V_i^{\delta+1}(\mathbb{R})$  for any  $B \in \mathcal{G}^{-1}(g)$ . On contrary, assume that there exists a  $B := (b_{i,j})_{0 \leq i,j \leq k(n,\delta+1)}$  such that  $q_B(z) \geq 0$  for any  $[z] \in V_i^{\delta+1}(\mathbb{R})$ . A comparison of coefficients between  $g$  and  $q_B(m_0(X), \dots, m_{k(n,\delta+1)}(X))$  as well as several point evaluations of  $q_B$  on  $V_i^{\delta+1}(\mathbb{R})$  now reveals that necessarily  $b_{i,j} = b_{j,i} = 0$  for  $j = k(n, \delta) + 1, \dots, k(n, \delta + 1)$  and  $i = 0, \dots, j$ . Hence,

the submatrix  $A := B_I := (b_{i,j})_{i,j \in I}$  of  $B$  is a Gram matrix associated to  $f$ . Since  $f \notin C_i^\delta$ , it is possible to fix a  $[y] \in V_i^\delta(\mathbb{R})$  with  $q_A(y) < 0$ . Set  $[z] := [y_0 : \dots : y_{k(n,\delta)} : 0 : \dots : 0] \in V_i^{\delta+1}(\mathbb{R})$ , then  $q_B(z) = q_A(y) < 0$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem C.** For the purpose of this proof, denote by  $C_j^3$  the subcone  $C_j$  of  $\mathcal{P}_{4,4}$  for  $j = 3, \dots, 6$ , and by  $C_i^n$  and  $C_{i+1}^n$  the subcones  $C_i$  and  $C_{i+1}$  respectively of  $\mathcal{P}_{n+1,4}$ . Likewise, set  $K_3^3$  to be the affine subvariety  $K_3$  of  $\mathbb{C}^{k(3,2)}$  and set  $K_i^n$  to be the affine subvariety  $K_i$  of  $\mathbb{C}^{k(n,2)}$ . Let  $q_{j,3}$  denote the quadratic form  $q_j$  in  $\mathcal{F}_{k(3,2)}$  for  $j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$  and let  $q_{j,n}$  denote the quadratic form  $q_j$  in  $\mathcal{F}_{k(n,2)}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, i+1$ . We distinguish three cases:

- (1)  $m_{n+i}(X) = X_j X_n$  for some  $j \in \{2, \dots, n-1\}$
- (2)  $m_{n+i}(X) = X_j X_l$  for some  $j, l \in \{2, \dots, n-1\}$  such that  $j \leq l$
- (3)  $m_{n+i}(X) = m_{k-n-1}(X)$

The above three cases can be treated by similar arguments for which it suffices to find  $g \in \mathcal{P}_{n+1,4}$  with the following two properties:

- (a) There exists a Gram matrix  $B$  associated to  $g$  such that  $q_B$  is locally PSD on  $V(q_{1,n}, \dots, q_{i+1,n})(\mathbb{R})$ .
- (b) For any Gram matrix  $B$  associated to  $g$ , there exists a  $[y] \in \phi(K_i^n)$  with  $q_B(y) < 0$ .

Let us determine a form  $g$  satisfying (a) and (b) in case (1).

- (a) Fix  $f \in C_4^3 \setminus C_3^3$  and  $A \in \mathcal{G}^{-1}(f)$  as in the proof of Theorem 4.1. Set  $g(X_0, \dots, X_n) := f(X_0, X_{j-1}, X_j, X_n) \in \mathcal{P}_{n+1,4}$ . As in the observation given in Section 1.2, choose  $I \subseteq \{0, \dots, k(n,2)\}$  appropriately. This allows us to induce the Gram matrix  $B := A_I$  associated to  $g$ . Define

$$\begin{aligned} \pi: \quad \mathbb{C}^{k(n,2)+1} &\rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{k(3,2)+1} \\ (z_0, \dots, z_{k(n,2)}) &\mapsto (z_i)_{i \in I}. \end{aligned}$$

For any  $[z] \in V(q_{1,n}, \dots, q_{i+1,n})(\mathbb{R})$ , we get  $q_B(z) = q_A(y) \geq 0$  for  $[y] := [\pi(z)] \in \mathcal{V}(q_{1,3}, \dots, q_{4,3})(\mathbb{R})$ .

- (b) Let  $B \in \mathcal{G}^{-1}(g)$  be arbitrary but fixed and let  $A \in \mathcal{G}^{-1}(f)$  be obtained from  $B$  using the observation from Section 1.2. Since  $f \notin C_3^3$ , we can fix some  $[y] \in \phi(K_3^3)(\mathbb{R})$  with  $q_A(y) < 0$ . Define  $[z] \in \phi(K_i^n)(\mathbb{R})$  with  $\pi(z) = y$  and zero elsewhere, then  $q_B(y) = q_A(z) < 0$ .

Case (2) can be verified analogously for  $g_1(X_0, \dots, X_n) := f_1(X_0, X_1, X_j, X_{l+1})$  with  $f_1 \in C_5^3 \setminus C_4^3$  and case (3) for  $g_2(X_0, \dots, X_n) := f_2(X_0, X_1, X_{n-1}, X_n)$  with  $f_2 \in C_6^3 \setminus C_5^3$ .  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem D.** Theorem C yields that  $C_n \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq C_{k(n,2)-n}$  as a subcone filtration of  $\mathcal{P}_{n+1,4}$ . Hence, also  $C_n \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq C_{k(n,2)-n}$  as a subcone filtration of  $\mathcal{P}_{n+1,6}$  by Theorem B. For proving that each inclusion in the remaining subcone filtration  $C_{k(n,2)-n} \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq C_{k(n,3)-n}$  of  $\mathcal{P}_{n+1,6}$  is strict, we distinguish five cases:

- (1)  $m_{n+i}(X) = m_{k(n,2)-n}(X)$
- (2)  $m_{n+i}(X) = X_j^3$  for some  $j, l \in \{1, \dots, n-2\}$ ,  $j \leq l \leq n-1$
- (3)  $m_{n+i}(X) = X_j X_l X_n$  for some  $j, l \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ ,  $j \leq l$
- (4)  $m_{n+i}(X) = X_j X_n^2$  for some  $j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$
- (5)  $m_{n+i}(X) = X_j X_l X_r$  for some  $j \in \{1, \dots, n-2\}$ ,  $l, r \in \{j+1, \dots, n-1\}$ ,  $j+1 \leq l, l \leq r$

These cases can be treated similarly as the ones in the proof of Theorem C by reducing to ternary sextics and consideration of extensions  $g \in \mathcal{F}_{n+1,6}$  of appropriate separating forms  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{3,6}$ . These are respectively:

- (1)  $g(X_0, \dots, X_n) := f(X_0, X_1, X_n)$  with  $f \in C_4 \setminus C_3$
- (2)  $g(X_0, \dots, X_n) := f(X_0, X_j, X_{l+1})$  with  $f \in C_5 \setminus C_4$
- (3)  $g(X_0, \dots, X_n) := f(X_0, X_j, X_{l+1})$  with  $f \in C_6 \setminus C_5$
- (4)  $g(X_0, \dots, X_n) := f(X_0, X_j, X_{j+1})$  with  $f \in C_7 \setminus C_6$

The same argumentation also remains valid for case (5). However, here, we have to reduce to the non-Hilbert case (4, 6) and find an appropriate separating form  $f \in C_{11} \setminus C_{10}$  with a corresponding extension  $g \in \mathcal{F}_{n+1,6}$ . For example,  $f(X) := X_1^2 \mathfrak{C}^\tau(X)$  and  $g(X_0, \dots, X_n) := f(X_0, X_j, X_l, X_{r+1})$  could be considered.  $\square$

For  $(n+1, 4)_{n \geq 4}$  and  $(n+1, 6)_{n \geq 3}$ , Theorems A, C and D together yield

$$(5.1) \quad \Sigma_{n+1,2d} = C_0 = \dots = C_n \subsetneq C_{n+1} \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq C_{k(n,d)-n} = \mathcal{P}_{n+1,2d}.$$

**Concluding Remark.** It follows from (4.3), (4.4) and (5.1) that the exact number of strictly separating cones in (1.7) is

- (1)  $\mu(n, 2) := (k(n, 2) - n) - (n + 1)$  for  $(n + 1, 4)_{n \geq 3}$ , and
- (2)  $\mu(n, 3) := (k(n, 3) - n) - (n + 1)$  for  $(n + 1, 6)_{n \geq 2}$ .

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We wish to thank *Mathematisches Forschungsinstitut Oberwolfach* for its hospitality. The first author acknowledges the support through *Oberwolfach Leibniz Fellows* program. The second author is grateful for the *Oberwolfach Leibniz Graduate Students* award. The third author acknowledges the support of *Ausschuss für Forschungsfragen* der Universität Konstanz. The authors are thankful to Maria Infusino and Victor Vinnikov for useful discussions.

#### REFERENCES

- [BSV16] G. Blekherman, G. G. Smith, and M. Velasco. Sums of squares and varieties of minimal degree. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 29, no. 3:893–913, 2016.
- [CL76] M. D. Choi and T. Y. Lam. An old question of Hilbert. In *Conference on Quadratic Forms – 1976*, pages 385–405. Proc. Conf., Queen’s Univ., Kingston, Ont., 1976.
- [CL78] M. D. Choi and T. Y. Lam. Extremal positive semidefinite forms. *Math. Ann.*, 231, no.1:1–18, 1977/78.

- [CLO15] D. A. Cox, J. Little, and D. O’Shea. *Ideals, Varieties, and Algorithms. An Introduction to Computational Algebraic Geometry and Commutative Algebra*. Fourth Edition. Undergraduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer, 2015.
- [CLR95] M. D. Choi, T. Y. Lam, and B. Reznick. Sums of squares of real polynomials. In *K-Theory and Algebraic Geometry: Connections with Quadratic Forms and Division Algebras, Part 2*, volume 58 of *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, pages 103–126. Amer. Math. Soc., 1995.
- [EH87] D. Eisenbud and J. Harris. On varieties of minimal degree (a centennial account). In *Algebraic geometry*, volume 46 of *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, pages 3–13. Amer. Math. Soc., 1987.
- [GHK] C. Goel, S. Hess, and S. Kuhlmann. Cones separating the cone of positive semi-definite forms from that of sums of squares. *In preparation*.
- [Goe14] C. Goel. *Extension of Hilbert’s 1888 Theorem to Even Symmetric Forms*. PhD thesis, University of Konstanz, Konstanzer Online - Publikations - System, 2014.
- [Har77] R. Hartshorne. *Algebraic Geometry*, volume 52 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, 1977.
- [Har92] J. Harris. *Algebraic Geometry. A first course*, volume 133 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, 1992.
- [Hil88] D. Hilbert. *Über die Darstellung definiter Formen als Summe von Formquadraten*, volume 32 of *Math. Ann.* Springer-Verlag, 1888.
- [Mar08] M. Marshall. *Positive Polynomials and Sums of Squares*, volume 146 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, 2008.
- [Mot67] T. S. Motzkin. The arithmetic-geometric inequalities. In *Inequalities (Proc. Sympos. Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, 1965)*, pages 205–224. Academic Press, 1967.
- [Pla20] D. Plaumann. *Einführung in die Algebraische Geometrie (German)*, volume 1. Springer-Verlag, 2020.
- [Rob73] R. M. Robinson. Some definite polynomials which are not sums of squares of real polynomials. In *Selected questions of algebra and logic (a collection dedicated to the memory of A. I. Mal’cev)*, pages 264–282. “Nauka” Sibirsk. Otdel. Novosibirsk, 1973.

DEPARTMENT OF BASIC SCIENCES, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY, NAGPUR, INDIA

*Email address:* `charugoel@iiitn.ac.in`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF KONSTANZ, KONSTANZ, GERMANY

*Email address:* `Sarah.Hess@uni-konstanz.de`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF KONSTANZ, KONSTANZ, GERMANY

*Email address:* `Salma.Kuhlmann@uni-konstanz.de`