

THETA BODIES FOR POLYNOMIAL IDEALS

JOÃO GOUVEIA, PABLO A. PARRILO, AND REKHA R. THOMAS

ABSTRACT. A polynomial ideal $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ is TH_k -exact if every linear polynomial that is non-negative over $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I)$, the real variety of I , is a sum of squares of polynomials of degree at most k modulo I . Lovász recognized that a graph is perfect if and only if the vanishing ideal of the characteristic vectors of its stable sets is TH_1 -exact, and asked for a characterization of ideals which are TH_1 -exact. We characterize finite point sets whose vanishing ideals are TH_1 -exact answering Lovász's question for zero-dimensional varieties instead of ideals. Several properties and examples follow. Lovász's question leads to a hierarchy of relaxations for the convex hull of $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I)$ that generalizes Lovász's theta body of a graph to a sequence of theta bodies for polynomial ideals. We prove that these theta bodies are a version of Lasserre's relaxations, and are thus feasible regions of semidefinite programs. When $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$, we show how these theta bodies relate to the Lovász-Schrijver relaxations of the convex hull of $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I)$. As an application we derive a (new) canonical set of semidefinite relaxations for the cut polytope of an arbitrary graph. We also determine the structure of the first theta body of an arbitrary ideal which yields examples of non-zero-dimensional TH_1 -exact ideals.

1. INTRODUCTION

This work was motivated by Problem 8.3 in the paper “Semidefinite programs and combinatorial optimization” by Lovász [11]. We begin with the key definitions.

Definition 1.1. Let f be a polynomial in $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ and I be an ideal in $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ with real variety $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I) := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : f(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \forall f \in I\}$.

- (1) The polynomial f is **non-negative** mod I , written as $f \geq 0 \text{ mod } I$, if $f(\mathbf{s}) \geq 0$ for all $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I)$.
- (2) The polynomial f is a **sum of squares (sos)** mod I if there exists $h_j \in \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ such that $f \equiv \sum_{j=1}^t h_j^2 \text{ mod } I$, or equivalently, $f - \sum_{j=1}^t h_j^2 \in I$. If each h_j has degree at most k , then we say that f is **k -sos** mod I .
- (3) The ideal I is **k -sos** if every polynomial that is non-negative mod I is k -sos mod I .
- (4) The ideal I is **TH_k -exact** if every *linear* polynomial that is non-negative mod I is k -sos mod I .

Date: February 6, 2020.

The first author was partially supported by Fundação Para a Ciência e Tecnologia.

- (5) The **sos-type (theta-rank)** of I is the smallest k such that I is k -sos (TH_k -exact).

Definition 1.2. Given a set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, its **vanishing ideal** in $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ is the ideal $\mathcal{I}(S) := \{f \in \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}] : f(\mathbf{s}) = 0 \forall \mathbf{s} \in S\}$.

With these definitions, Lovász’s question can be stated as follows.

Problem 1.3. [11, Problem 8.3] *Which ideals in $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ are TH_1 -exact? How about TH_k -exact?*

This problem was motivated by a property of perfect graphs. Let $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $G = ([n], E)$ be an undirected graph. Let $S_G \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$ be the set of characteristic vectors of all stable sets in G . Then

$$\mathcal{I}(S_G) = \langle x_j^2 - x_j \forall j \in [n], x_i x_j \forall \{i, j\} \in E \rangle \subseteq \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}].$$

Lovász recognized that G is perfect (in the graph theory sense) if and only if $\mathcal{I}(S_G)$ is TH_1 -exact.

Problem 1.3 suggests the following hierarchy of nested convex sets that contain $\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I))$, the convex hull of the real variety of I .

Definition 1.4. For a positive integer k , the k -th **theta body** of $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ is $\text{TH}_k(I) := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : f(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0 \text{ for every linear } f \text{ that is } k\text{-sos mod } I\}$.

By definition, $\text{TH}_1(I) \supseteq \text{TH}_2(I) \supseteq \dots \supseteq \text{conv}(I)$, and Proposition 4.3 proves that I is TH_k -exact if and only if $\text{TH}_k(I) = \text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I))$. In particular, I is TH_1 -exact if and only if $\text{TH}_1(I) = \text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I))$. When $S = S_G$ is the set of characteristic vectors of stable sets of a graph $G = ([n], E)$, $\text{TH}_1(\mathcal{I}(S_G))$ is precisely Lovász’s theta body of G which is the reason for calling $\text{TH}_k(I)$ a “theta body”. Section 3 describes the theta body sequences that arise in the maximum stable set problem and two different formulations of the maximum cut problem on a graph. Theta bodies yield a natural new sequence of semidefinite relaxations of the cut polytope of an arbitrary graph.

Theta bodies are the crucial geometric objects behind the theta-rank of an ideal I . In Section 2 we show that the theta body sequence is a version of Lasserre’s hierarchy of relaxations of $\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I))$, arising from the theory of moments and constructed for approximating polynomial optimization problems over $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I)$ [3, 4]. In particular, each theta body is the feasible region of a semidefinite program. When $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$ there are several well-known relaxations of $\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I))$ besides Lasserre’s, such as the Lovász-Schrijver and Sherali-Adams relaxations. See [6] for a comparison (and description) of all these relaxations for 0/1-programming. We establish the relationship between the theta sequence and the Lovász-Schrijver relaxations via a uniform basis free framework within which to view these convex bodies.

In Section 4 we give equivalent conditions for a polynomial ideal I to be TH_k -exact (Proposition 4.3). Of particular interest is the case of the vanishing ideal of a finite set S and an important source of such examples is

combinatorial optimization where S is typically a subset of $\{0, 1\}^n$ (the set of feasible solutions to a combinatorial optimization problem). Every finite $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a real variety; if $S = \{\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_t\}$ then $\mathcal{I}(S)$ is the ideal

$$\mathcal{I}(S) = \bigcap_{i=1}^t \langle x_1 - s_{i1}, \dots, x_n - s_{in} \rangle.$$

Theorem 4.4 characterizes finite sets with TH_1 -exact vanishing ideals via four equivalent conditions. Several corollaries follow from this structure theorem. For instance, such a finite set in \mathbb{R}^n is affinely equivalent to a subset of $\{0, 1\}^n$ (Corollary 4.7) and its convex hull can have at most 2^n facets (Theorem 4.10). If S is the vertex set of a down-closed 0/1-polytope in \mathbb{R}^n , then $\mathcal{I}(S)$ is TH_1 -exact if and only if $\text{conv}(S)$ is the stable set polytope of a perfect graph (Theorem 4.12 and Corollary 4.13). Several families of finite sets with this property are exhibited.

Finally, in Section 5, we give a precise description of $\text{TH}_1(I)$ for an arbitrary polynomial ideal I . This result leads to non-trivial examples of TH_1 -exact ideals with arbitrarily high-dimensional real varieties.

We conclude the introduction with an example that shows that the theta-rank can be arbitrarily large even for univariate ideals.

Example 1.5. Consider the ideal $I_k \subset \mathbb{R}[x]$ generated by $g_k := x(x-1)(x-2) \cdots (x-k)$. Suppose $f \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ is linear and non-negative mod I_k , and there exist polynomials $h_j \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ of degree at most p such that $f \equiv \sum h_j^2 \pmod{I_k}$. Then $f - \sum h_j^2 = hg_k$ for some $h \in \mathbb{R}[x]$. The left-hand-side has degree at most $2p$ while the right-hand-side has degree at least $k+1$. This is impossible if $p \leq k/2$. Therefore the theta-rank of I_k is at least $k/2$.

Acknowledgments. We would like to thank Monique Laurent for helpful discussions.

2. THETA BODIES

In Definition 1.4, we introduced the k -th theta body of a polynomial ideal $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ and observed that these bodies create a nested sequence of convex relaxations of $\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I))$ with $\text{TH}_k(I) \supseteq \text{TH}_{k+1}(I) \supseteq \text{conv}(I)$. The goal of this section is to establish the precise relationship between these theta bodies and other known sequences of relaxations of $\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I))$ from the optimization literature. In [3], Lasserre introduced a sequence of semidefinite relaxations for polynomial optimization over a basic semialgebraic set in \mathbb{R}^n using results from the theory of moments. In Corollary 2.6 we prove that $\text{TH}_k(I)$ is precisely a version of Lasserre's relaxation of $\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I))$ and hence is a semidefinite relaxation of $\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I))$. This result follows from a basis free formulation of Lasserre's relaxations in Theorem 2.5. We adopt the point of view in [13] of Lasserre's method to prove our results.

An important instance of polynomial optimization is over sets $S \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$. While Lasserre's method covers this case [4], other nested sequences of relaxations of $\text{conv}(S)$ were known earlier for 0/1-programming, such as the hierarchies by Sherali and Adams [18] and Lovász and Schrijver [12]. In [6], Laurent compares the methods in [4], [12] and [18] and proves that Lasserre's hierarchy is the strongest of the three. In Theorems 2.13 we formulate the Lovász-Schrijver relaxations in the same framework as what we use for Lasserre's sequence. Using this we establish the relationship between theta bodies and the Lovász-Schrijver relaxations (Theorem 2.14 and Corollary 2.15). The Sherali-Adams method can be treated similarly and so we do not explicitly work it out. We also show how theta bodies can be handled computationally using the combinatorial moment matrices from [8].

2.1. Lasserre's hierarchy and theta bodies.

Definition 2.1. Let $G = \{g_1, \dots, g_m\}$ be a set of polynomials and I an ideal in $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$. The **quadratic module** of $G \pmod{I}$ is

$$\mathcal{M}_I(G) := \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^m s_i g_i + I : s_i \text{ is a sum of squares in } \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}] \right\},$$

where $g_0 := 1$. Let $w_i := \min_{g \in g_i + I} \deg g$ and $v_i := \lceil w_i/2 \rceil$. The **k -th truncation** of $\mathcal{M}_I(G)$ is

$$\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(G) := \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^m s_i g_i + I : s_i \text{ is } (k - v_i)\text{-sos} \right\}.$$

Both $\mathcal{M}_I(G)$ and $\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(G)$ are cones in the \mathbb{R} -vector space $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I$. Let $(\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I)^*$ denote the set of linear forms on $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I$ and π_I be the projection map from $(\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I)^*$ to \mathbb{R}^n defined as $\pi_I(y) = (y(x_1 + I), \dots, y(x_n + I))$.

Definition 2.2. For each $y \in (\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I)^*$, let H_y be the Hermitian form

$$\begin{aligned} H_y : \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I \times \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ (f + I, g + I) &\longmapsto y(fg + I) \end{aligned}$$

and $H_{y,t}$ be the restriction of H_y to the subspace $(\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]_t/I)$ of cosets with a representative of degree at most t . For a polynomial $p \in \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ define

$$\begin{aligned} H_y^p : \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I \times \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ (f + I, g + I) &\longmapsto y(pfg + I) \end{aligned}$$

and let $H_{y,t}^p$ be its restriction to $(\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]_t/I)$.

Recall that a Hermitian form $H : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where V is a \mathbb{R} -vector space, is *positive semidefinite* (written as $H \succeq 0$) if $H(v, v) \geq 0$ for all non-zero elements $v \in V$. Given a basis B of V , the matrix indexed by the elements of B with (b_i, b_j) -entry equal to $H(b_i, b_j)$ is called the *matrix representation* of H in the basis B . The form H is positive semidefinite if and only if its matrix representation in any basis is positive semidefinite.

For I and G as above, let $\mathcal{F} := \{\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I) : g(\mathbf{p}) \geq 0 \forall g \in G\}$. Following Section 10.5 in Marshall's book [13], we define Lasserre's hierarchy of relaxations of $\text{conv}(\mathcal{F})$ as follows.

Definition 2.3. Let I, G and \mathcal{F} be as above, and k be a positive integer. Let $\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(G)^\circ \subseteq (\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I)^*$ denote the polar cone to $\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(G)$ which is the set of all linear forms in $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I$ that are non-negative on $\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(G)$. The k -th Lasserre relaxation $Q_{I,k}(G)$ of $\text{conv}(\mathcal{F})$ is

$$Q_{I,k}(G) := \pi_I\{y \in \mathcal{M}_{I,k}(G)^\circ : y(1+I) = 1\}.$$

For $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{F}$, consider $y^{\mathbf{p}} \in (\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I)^*$ obtained by linearly extending the map $\mathbf{x}^\alpha + I \mapsto \mathbf{p}^\alpha$ where \mathbf{x}^α is an arbitrary monomial in $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$. Then $y^{\mathbf{p}}$ is in $\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(G)^\circ$ and so $\pi_I(y^{\mathbf{p}}) = \mathbf{p} \in Q_{I,k}(G)$ for all k . Therefore, $\text{conv}(\mathcal{F}) \subseteq Q_{I,k}(G)$ and since $Q_{I,k+1}(G) \subseteq Q_{I,k}(G)$, these bodies create a nested sequence of relaxations of $\text{conv}(\mathcal{F})$. Up to an index shift, for $I = \{0\}$ this definition of Lasserre's relaxations is equivalent to the original definition by Lasserre in [3], while setting I to be the ideal generated by $\{x_i^2 - x_i : i = 1, \dots, n\}$ gives Lasserre's hierarchy for 0/1-polytopes in [4]. The Hermitian forms come in as follows.

Theorem 2.4. Let I, G and k be as in Definition 2.3. Then

$$\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(G)^\circ = \{y \in (\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I)^* : H_{y,k-v_i}^{g_i} \succeq 0, i = 0, \dots, m\}.$$

Proof: Note that $y \in \mathcal{M}_{I,k}(G)^\circ$ if and only if for $i = 0, \dots, m$, $y(g_i s_i + I) \geq 0$ whenever s_i is $(k - v_i)$ -sos. The latter condition is equivalent to $y(g_i h_i^2 + I) \geq 0$ for all $h_i \in \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ of degree at most $(k - v_i)$ which is the definition of $H_{y,k-v_i}^{g_i}$ being positive semidefinite. \square

To relate theta bodies to Lasserre's relaxations, we establish a direct definition of $Q_{I,k}(G)$ as a set in \mathbb{R}^n instead of as a projection.

Theorem 2.5. Let I, G and k be as in Definition 2.3. Then

$$Q_{I,k}(G) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : f(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0 \forall \text{ linear } f \text{ such that } f + I \in \mathcal{M}_{I,k}(G)\}.$$

Proof: Pick $\mathbf{p} \in Q_{I,k}(G)$ and $y \in \mathcal{M}_{I,k}(G)^\circ$ such that $y(1+I) = 1$ and $\pi_I(y) = \mathbf{p}$. Let $f = a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i$ and $f + I \in \mathcal{M}_{I,k}(G)$. Then

$$f(\mathbf{p}) = f(\pi_I(y)) = a_0 y(1+I) + \sum_{i=1}^n a_i y(x_i + I) = y(f + I) \geq 0$$

by definition which proves the " \subseteq " direction of the claim.

Suppose we now have $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $f(\mathbf{p}) \geq 0$ for all linear f such that $f + I \in \mathcal{M}_{I,k}(G)$. Choose a basis f_1, f_2, \dots of the \mathbb{R} -vector space I such that f_1, \dots, f_k is a basis for the linear polynomials in I . Complete it to a basis of $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ by adding polynomials h_1, h_2, \dots such that $f_1, \dots, f_k, h_1, \dots, h_m$

is a basis for the polynomials in $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ of degree at most one. We can then define a linear form y' in $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]^*$ by setting

$$y' \left(\sum (\alpha_i f_i + \beta_i h_i) \right) := \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i h_i(\mathbf{p}).$$

Since $y'(I) = \{0\}$ by definition, we can descend y' to a linear operator $y \in (\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I)^*$ by simply setting $y(f+I) = y'(f)$ for all f . Since for $i = 1, \dots, k$, $f_i + I = -f_i + I = I \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{I,k}(G)$, we must have $f_i(\mathbf{p}) = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$. Otherwise $f_i(\mathbf{p}) < 0$ or $-f_i(\mathbf{p}) < 0$ contradicting our choice of \mathbf{p} . Let g be any linear polynomial. Then $g(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j f_j(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{j=1}^m \beta_j h_j(\mathbf{x})$ for some constants α_i, β_i , and

$$y(g+I) = \sum_{j=1}^m \beta_j h_j(\mathbf{p}) = g(\mathbf{p}).$$

In particular, $\pi_I(y) = \mathbf{p}$ and by the choice of \mathbf{p} , for all linear polynomials g such that $g+I \in \mathcal{M}_{I,k}(G)$, $y(g+I) \geq 0$. This implies

$$\mathbf{p} = \pi_I(y) \in \pi_I(\{g \text{ linear}\} \cap \mathcal{M}_{I,k}(G))^\circ = \pi_I(\overline{\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(G)^\circ + \{g \text{ linear}\}^\perp})$$

but since adding anything to $\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(G)^\circ$ that does not affect linear terms does not change the projection π_I , and since the dual of a cone is always closed, we have

$$\mathbf{p} \in \pi_I(\overline{\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(G)^\circ}) = \pi_I(\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(G)^\circ) = Q_{I,k}(G).$$

□

Theorem 2.5 relates the theta bodies of an ideal I to the broader family of Lasserre relaxations as follows.

Corollary 2.6. *Let I be any ideal in $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ and k be a positive integer. Then $\text{TH}_k(I) = Q_{I,k}(\emptyset)$.*

In the relaxations $Q_{I,k}(G)$, some constraints are imposed implicitly by I and others explicitly by G . It is important to understand when constraints become redundant and how they can be moved from one part to the other. This is needed to compare our theta bodies, where all constraints are in the ideal, with the Lasserre relaxations for specific problems already in the literature. We begin with a simple result that gives sufficient conditions under which some of the explicit inequalities in G can be dropped, with the possible trade-off of increasing the rank (the index k) of the relaxation.

Theorem 2.7. *Let I and G be as before and $G' \subseteq G$. Suppose there exists a non-negative integer l such that for all $g_i \in G \setminus G'$, g_i is $(l + v_i)$ -sos mod I . Then $Q_{I,k+l}(G') \subseteq Q_{I,k}(G)$. In particular if all elements $g_i \in G$ are $(l + v_i)$ -sos mod I , then $\text{TH}_{k+l}(I) \subseteq Q_{I,k}(G)$.*

Proof: It is enough to show that $\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(G) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{I,k+l}(G')$. Suppose $f = s_0 + \sum_{g_i \in G} s_i g_i + I \in \mathcal{M}_{I,k}(G)$. Since each $g_i \in G \setminus G'$ is $(l + v_i)$ -sos and

the corresponding s_i is $(k - v_i)$ -sos by definition, $s_i g_i$ is $(k + l)$ -sos whenever $g_i \in G \setminus G'$. Adding these terms to s_0 , f can be rewritten as

$$f = s'_0 + \sum_{g_i \in G'} s_i g_i + I \in \mathcal{M}_{I, k+l}(G').$$

□

Note that the bigger the ideal I , the smaller the dimension of the vector space $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I$, which tends to make computations easier. So it is advisable to always consider the largest possible ideal. In the next theorem we give conditions under which enlarging the ideal does not alter the relaxation.

Theorem 2.8. *Let I and G be as before and J be an ideal in the lineality space of $\mathcal{M}_{I, k}(G)$ (i.e., $J \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{I, k}(G) \cap (-\mathcal{M}_{I, k}(G))$). Then $Q_{I, k}(G) = Q_{I+J, k}(G)$.*

Proof: Let $\mathbf{p} \in Q_{I+J, k}(G)$ and $y \in M_{I+J, k}(G)^\circ \subseteq (\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/(I+J))^*$ such that $\mathbf{p} = \pi_{I+J}(y)$. We can then lift y to an operator $\bar{y} \in (\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I)^*$ by simply setting $\bar{y}(f+I) := y(f+(I+J))$, and we will still have $\mathbf{p} = \pi_I(\bar{y})$. Furthermore, for all $f+I \in \mathcal{M}_{I, k}(G)$ we have $f+(I+J) \in \mathcal{M}_{I+J, k}(G)$ and so $\bar{y}(f+I) = y(f+(I+J)) \geq 0$. Therefore $\bar{y} \in M_{I, k}(G)^\circ$ and $\mathbf{p} \in Q_{I, k}(G)$.

Suppose now $\mathbf{p} \in Q_{I, k}(G)$, and $\mathbf{p} = \pi_I(y)$ for some $y \in M_{I, k}(G)^\circ$. Note that for all $f \in J$, both $f+I$ and $-f+I$ are in $\mathcal{M}_{I, k}(G)$ so $y(f+I) \geq 0$ and $-y(f+I) = y(-f+I) \geq 0$, so we have $y(J) = \{0\}$. This means that the operator \bar{y} in $(\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/(I+J))^*$ obtained by setting $\bar{y}(f+(I+J)) = y(f+I)$ is well-defined. For all $f+(I+J) \in \mathcal{M}_{I+J, k}(G)$ we then have

$$f+(I+J) = \sum_{i=0}^m s_i g_i + (I+J)$$

where we can take each s_i to be $(k - v_i)$ -sos. Therefore

$$\bar{y}(f+(I+J)) = y\left(\sum_{i=0}^m s_i g_i + I\right) \in y(M_{I, k}(G))$$

and so it must be non-negative, thus $\mathbf{p} = \pi_{I+J}(\bar{y}) \in Q_{I+J, k}(G)$. □

In particular, the lineality space of $\mathcal{M}_{I, k}(G)$ is an ideal (Proposition 2.1.2 [13]), so to get a minimal quotient we can always take J to be this lineality space. Theorem 2.8 also allows Corollary 2.6 to be extended to some cases where G is not trivial as follows.

Corollary 2.9. *Let I , J and G be as in Theorem 2.8 and k be a non-negative integer. If all $g_i \in G$ are v_i -sos mod $I+J$ then $\text{TH}_k(I+J) = Q_{I, k}(G)$.*

Proof: By Theorem 2.8, $Q_{I+J, k}(G) = Q_{I, k}(G)$ and by Theorem 2.7, $\text{TH}_k(I+J) \subseteq Q_{I+J, k}(G)$. The reverse inclusion is trivial since $\mathcal{M}_{I+J, k}(\emptyset) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{I+J, k}(G)$ implies $\text{TH}_k(I+J) = Q_{I+J, k}(\emptyset) \supseteq Q_{I+J, k}(G)$. □

Corollary 2.9 will be important in Section 3.1.1 where it will be used to show that the usual Lasserre relaxations of the stable set polytope of a graph are all theta bodies. We end this subsection with a useful lemma that is needed later and is an immediate corollary of Proposition 2.6 in [15].

Lemma 2.10. *If $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ is a radical ideal then $\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(\emptyset) \subset \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I$ is closed for all positive integers k .*

2.2. Theta bodies and Lovász-Schrijver N_+ operator. Let $K \subseteq [0, 1]^n$ be a convex body and $S = K \cap \{0, 1\}^n$. In this case, Lovász and Schrijver have proposed a series of relaxations of $\text{conv}(S)$ based on semidefinite programming [12]. We now establish the relationship between these relaxations and the theta body relaxations of $\text{conv}(S)$. Our definition of the Lovász-Schrijver relaxations is taken from [6].

Definition 2.11. Consider a convex set $K \subseteq [0, 1]^n$ and its homogenization $\tilde{K} := \left\{ \lambda \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \mathbf{x} \end{pmatrix} : \mathbf{x} \in K, \lambda \geq 0 \right\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Let $M_+(K)$ denote the following cone of positive semidefinite matrices in $\mathbb{R}^{(n+1) \times (n+1)}$ indexed by $0, \dots, n$:

$$M_+(K) := \left\{ M \succeq 0 : \begin{array}{l} (i) M_{ii} = M_{0i} \ \forall i = 1, \dots, n, \\ (ii) M\mathbf{e}_i, M(\mathbf{e}_0 - \mathbf{e}_i) \in \tilde{K} \ \forall i = 1, \dots, n \end{array} \right\}$$

where $\mathbf{e}_0, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n$ are the standard unit vectors in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} . Then define

$$N_+(K) := \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \mathbf{x} \end{pmatrix} = M\mathbf{e}_0, \text{ for some } M \in M_+(K) \right\}.$$

Setting $N_+^1(K) := N_+(K)$ and $N_+^k(K) := N_+(N_+^{k-1}(K))$ produces a series of convex relaxations of $\text{conv}(S)$ with $\text{conv}(S) \subseteq N_+^k(K) \subseteq N_+^{k-1}(K)$. See [12]. In order to compare these relaxations to theta bodies, we first recast them in terms of linear maps on $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$.

Definition 2.12. Let $C := \langle x_i^2 - x_i : i = 1, \dots, n \rangle$ be the vanishing ideal of $\{0, 1\}^n$, and $\overline{H}_y, \overline{H}_{y,t}, \overline{H}_y^p, \overline{H}_{y,t}^p$ denote the Hermitian forms with respect to C . For a convex body $K \subseteq [0, 1]^n$, define $M^*(K)$ to be the collection of all linear maps $y \in (\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/C)^*$ such that

- (a) $y(x_i f + C) \geq 0$ and $y((1 - x_i)f + C) \geq 0$ for all linear f non-negative on K , and
- (b) the restricted Hermitian form $\overline{H}_{y,1} \succeq 0$.

Theorem 2.13. *Let C and K be as in Definition 2.12. Then*

$$N_+(K) = \pi_I \{y \in M^*(K) : y(1 + C) = 1\}.$$

Proof: Pick $\mathbf{p} \in N_+(K)$ and $M \in M_+(K)$ such that $\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \mathbf{p} \end{pmatrix} = M\mathbf{e}_0$. Then define $y \in (\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/C)^*$ by setting $y(1 + C) := 1 = M_{00}$, $y(x_i + C) := p_i = M_{i0}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, $y(x_i x_j + C) := M_{ij}$ and y of all other cosets to be zero. By construction, $y(1 + C) = 1$ and $\pi_C(y) = \mathbf{p}$. Therefore, we just need

to check $y \in M^*(K)$. Note that the matrix representation of $\overline{H}_{y,1}$ in the basis $\{1, x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ of $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]_1$ is M which is positive semidefinite. Therefore, $\overline{H}_{y,1} \succeq 0$. Next note that

$$\begin{aligned} M\mathbf{e}_i &= (y(x_i + C), y(x_1x_i + C), y(x_2x_i + C), \dots, y(x_nx_i + C))^t, \text{ and} \\ M(\mathbf{e}_0 - \mathbf{e}_i) &= (y((1 - x_i) + C), y(x_1(1 - x_i) + C), \dots, y(x_n(1 - x_i) + C))^t. \end{aligned}$$

A point $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is in \tilde{K} if and only if for every linear inequality $f(\mathbf{x}) = a_0 + \sum_{j=1}^n a_j x_j \geq 0$ valid on K , the homogenized inequality $f_h(\mathbf{x}) := a_0 x_0 + \sum_{j=1}^n a_j x_j \geq 0$ is satisfied by \mathbf{z} . Therefore, $M\mathbf{e}_i \in \tilde{K}$ if and only if

$$a_0 y(x_i + C) + \sum_{j=1}^n a_j y(x_j x_i + C) = y(x_i(a_0 + \sum_{j=1}^n a_j x_j) + C) = y(x_i f + C) \geq 0.$$

Similarly, $M(\mathbf{e}_0 - \mathbf{e}_i) \in \tilde{K}$ implies that $y((1 - x_i)f + C) \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Therefore, $y \in M^*(K)$.

Conversely, suppose $\mathbf{p} = \pi_C(y)$ for some $y \in M^*(K)$ with $y(1 + C) = 1$. Then taking M to be the matrix representation of $\overline{H}_{y,1}$, we get $M \succeq 0$. Also, $M_{00} = y(1 + C) = 1$ and $M_{i0} = M_{0i} = p_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Since $x_i^2 + C = x_i + C$, we also get $M_{ii} = M_{0i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. The last part of the previous direction of the proof shows that $M\mathbf{e}_i, M(\mathbf{e}_0 - \mathbf{e}_i) \in \tilde{K}$. Therefore, $M \in M_+(K)$ and $\mathbf{p} \in N_+(K)$. \square

We can now relate the N_+ relaxations with theta bodies.

Theorem 2.14. *If $S \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$ then $\text{TH}_k(\mathcal{I}(S)) \subseteq N_+(\text{TH}_{k-1}(\mathcal{I}(S)))$ for all $k > 1$ and integer.*

Proof: Set $I := \mathcal{I}(S)$. Then since $C \subseteq I$, for all polynomials $g \in \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$, $g + C \subseteq g + I$. Pick $\mathbf{p} \in \text{TH}_k(I)$. Then there exists $y' \in \mathcal{M}_{I,k}(\emptyset)^\circ$ such that $y'(1 + I) = 1$ and $\pi_I(y') = \mathbf{p}$. Extend $y' \in (\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I)^*$ to a linear function y on $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/C$ by setting $y(g + C) = y'(g + I)$ for all $g \in \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$. Then $y(1 + C) = y'(1 + I) = 1$ and $\pi_C(y) = (y(x_1 + C), \dots, y(x_n + C)) = (y'(x_1 + I), \dots, y'(x_n + I)) = \pi_I(y') = \mathbf{p}$.

Therefore, it only remains to show that $y \in M^*(\text{TH}_{k-1}(I))$. In other words, we need to show that (i) $y(x_i f + C), y((1 - x_i)f + C) \geq 0$ for all linear f non-negative on $\text{TH}_{k-1}(I)$ and (ii) $\overline{H}_{y,1} \succeq 0$. Condition (ii) follows immediately since $\overline{H}_{y,1} = H_{y',1}$ and $H_{y',1} \succeq 0$ since $H_{y',k} \succeq 0$ because $y' \in \mathcal{M}_{I,k}(\emptyset)^\circ$ (see Theorem 2.4). To show that (i) holds, let f be a linear polynomial that is non-negative on $\text{TH}_{k-1}(I)$. Then $f(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ is a non-negative linear combination of the defining inequalities of $\text{TH}_{k-1}(I)$, which by Theorem 2.5 are limits of linear polynomials in $\mathcal{M}_{I,k-1}(\emptyset)$. Since this set is closed by Lemma 2.10, $f \in \mathcal{M}_{I,k-1}(\emptyset)$, that is to say, f is $(k-1)$ -sos modulo I , so we can write it as $f \equiv \sum_l g_l^2 \pmod{I}$ with $\deg g_l \leq k-1$. Therefore, $y(x_i f + C) = y(x_i^2 f + C) = y'(x_i^2 f + I) = y'((\sum_l x_i^2 g_l^2) + I) =$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_l y'(x_i^2 g_l^2 + I) \\ &= \sum_l y'((x_i g_l + I)(x_i g_l + I)) = \sum_l H_{y',k}(x_i g_l + I, x_i g_l + I) \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

since $H_{y',k} \succeq 0$. The same argument can be repeated for $(1 - x_i)$. \square

Corollary 2.15. *Suppose $S \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$, $I = \mathcal{I}(S)$ and $K \subset [0, 1]^n$ is a convex body such that $K \cap \{0, 1\}^n = S$. Then if for any non-negative integer l , $\text{TH}_1(I) \subseteq N_+^l(K)$ then $\text{TH}_{k+1}(I) \subseteq N_+^{l+k}(K)$.*

In [6], Laurent proves that for $S \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$, the Lasserre hierarchy of relaxations is stronger than the corresponding Lovász-Schrijver hierarchy using a particular common start set up. Theorem 2.14 also arrives at the same conclusion for the more general set up we have in this paper.

2.3. Combinatorial moment matrices. For computations with theta bodies we rely on the combinatorial moment matrices introduced by Laurent in [8]. Let $\mathcal{B} = \{f_0 + I, f_1 + I, \dots\}$ be a basis for $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I$. As before, define $\deg(f_i + I) := \min_{f \in f_i + I} \deg f$. For a positive integer k , let $\mathcal{B}_k := \{f_l + I \in \mathcal{B} : \deg(f_l + I) \leq k\}$, and $\mathbf{f}_k := (f_l + I : f_l + I \in \mathcal{B}_k)$ denote the vector of elements in \mathcal{B}_k . We may assume that the elements of \mathcal{B} are indexed in order of increasing degree.

Let $\lambda^{(g+I)} := (\lambda_l^{(g+I)})$ be the vector of coordinates of $g + I$ with respect to \mathcal{B} . Note that $\lambda^{(g+I)}$ has only finitely many non-zero coordinates.

Definition 2.16. Let $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{B}}$. Then the **combinatorial moment matrix** $M_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{y})$ is the (possibly infinite) matrix indexed by \mathcal{B} whose (i, j) entry is

$$\lambda^{(f_i f_j + I)} \cdot \mathbf{y} = \sum \lambda_l^{(f_i f_j + I)} y_l.$$

The **k -th-truncated combinatorial moment matrix** $M_{\mathcal{B}_k}(\mathbf{y})$ is the finite (upper left principal) submatrix of $M_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{y})$ indexed by \mathcal{B}_k .

Although only a finite number of the components in $\lambda^{(f_i f_j + I)}$ are non-zero, for practical purposes we need to control exactly which indices can be non-zero. One way to do this is by choosing \mathcal{B} such that if $f + I$ has degree k then $f + I \in \text{span}(\mathcal{B}_k)$. This is true for instance if \mathcal{B} is the set of standard monomials of a term order that respects degree. If \mathcal{B} has this property then the matrix $M_{\mathcal{B}_k}(\mathbf{y})$ only depends on the entries of y indexed by \mathcal{B}_{2k} .

These definitions allow a practical characterization of theta bodies.

Theorem 2.17. *For each positive integer k , we have*

$$\text{proj}_{\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{B}_1}} \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{B}_{2k}} : M_{\mathcal{B}_k}(\mathbf{y}) \succeq 0, y_0 = 1\} = \mathbf{f}_1(\text{TH}_k(I)),$$

where $\text{proj}_{\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{B}_1}}$ is the projection onto the coordinates indexed by \mathcal{B}_1 .

Proof: Note that we can see any $\mathbf{y} = (y_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{B}_{2k}}$ as an operator $\bar{y} \in (\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I)^*$ by setting $\bar{y}(f_i + I) = y_i$ if $f_i + I \in \mathcal{B}_{2k}$ and zero otherwise. But

then $M_{\mathcal{B}_k}(\mathbf{y})$ is simply the matrix representation of $H_{\bar{y},k}$ in the basis \mathcal{B} , and we get that $\text{proj}_{\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{B}_1}}\{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{B}_{2k}} : M_{\mathcal{B}_k}(\mathbf{y}) \succeq 0\}$ equals

$$\{(\bar{y}(f_i + I))_{\mathcal{B}_1} : \bar{y} \in (\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I)^*, H_{\bar{y},1} \succeq 0\},$$

since because of the assumptions we made, if $\deg f_i + I, \deg f_j + I \leq k$ then $\bar{y}(f_i f_j + I)$ depends only on the value of \bar{y} on \mathcal{B}_{2k} . Furthermore,

$$(\bar{y}(f_i + I))_{\mathcal{B}_1} = (f_i(\pi_I(\bar{y})))_{\mathcal{B}_1} =: \mathbf{f}_1(\pi_I(\bar{y}))$$

so by Theorem 2.4, $\text{proj}_{\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{B}_1}}\{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{B}_{2k}} : M_{\mathcal{B}_k}(\mathbf{y}) \succeq 0\} = \mathbf{f}_1(\text{TH}_k(I))$. \square

Corollary 2.18. *If $\mathcal{B}_1 = \{1 + I, x_1 + I, \dots, x_n + I\}$ and $\mathbf{y} = (y_0, y_1, \dots)$, then*

$$\text{TH}_k(I) = \{(y_1, \dots, y_n) : \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{B}_{2k}} \text{ with } M_{\mathcal{B}_k}(\mathbf{y}) \succeq 0, y_0 = 1\}.$$

3. COMBINATORIAL EXAMPLES

In this section, we apply the theory developed in Section 2 to some well known examples from combinatorial optimization.

3.1. Examples from simplicial complexes. Let Δ be a simplicial complex with vertex set $[n]$, and J_Δ be the ideal generated by the squarefree monomials $x_{i_1}x_{i_2}\cdots x_{i_k}$ such that $\{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k\} \subseteq [n]$ is not a face of Δ . This ideal J_Δ is the *Stanley-Reisner ideal* of Δ . Let $I_\Delta := J_\Delta + C$ where $C = \langle x_i^2 - x_i : i \in [n] \rangle$. Then $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I_\Delta) = \{\mathbf{s} \in \{0, 1\}^n : \text{support}(\mathbf{s}) \in \Delta\}$. For $T \subseteq [n]$, let $\mathbf{x}^T := \prod_{i \in T} x_i$. Then $\mathcal{B} := \{\mathbf{x}^T : T \in \Delta\}$ is a basis for $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I_\Delta$ containing $1, x_1, \dots, x_n$. Therefore, by Corollary 2.18,

$$\text{TH}_k(I_\Delta) = \text{proj}_{y_1, \dots, y_n} \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{B}_{2k}} : M_{\mathcal{B}_k}(\mathbf{y}) \succeq 0, y_0 = 1\}.$$

Since \mathcal{B} is in bijection with the faces of Δ , and $x_i^2 - x_i \in I_\Delta$ for all $i \in [n]$, the theta body can be written explicitly as follows:

$$\text{TH}_k(I_\Delta) = \left\{ \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \begin{array}{l} \exists M \succeq 0, M \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{B}_k| \times |\mathcal{B}_k|} \text{ such that} \\ M_{\emptyset\emptyset} = 1, \\ M_{\emptyset\{i\}} = M_{\{i\}\emptyset} = M_{\{i\}\{i\}} = y_i \\ M_{UU'} = 0 \text{ if } U \cup U' \notin \Delta \\ M_{UU'} = M_{WW'} \text{ if } U \cup U' = W \cup W' \end{array} \right\}.$$

If $d - 1$ is the dimension of Δ , then $\text{TH}_d(I_\Delta) = \text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I_\Delta))$ and I_Δ is TH_d -exact. As we will see, the theta-rank of I_Δ might be a lot less than d . We examine two specific cases of the above set up.

3.1.1. Stable sets in graphs. A classical problem in combinatorial optimization is the stable set problem. Given an undirected finite graph $G = ([n], E)$, the problem is to find $\alpha(G)$, the size of the largest stable set in G . More generally we could consider the same problem with weighted vertices. For $U \subseteq [n]$, let $\chi^U \in \{0, 1\}^n$ be its characteristic vector and let

$$S_G := \{\chi^U : U \subseteq [n], U \text{ stable set in } G\} \text{ and } \text{STAB}(G) := \text{conv}(S_G).$$

The stable set problem over G is then the linear optimization problem $\alpha(G) = \max \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} x_i : \mathbf{x} \in \text{STAB}(G) \right\}$, to which we can apply the relaxations defined in the last section. The vanishing ideal of S_G is

$$I_G := \langle x_i^2 - x_i \ \forall i \in [n], \text{ and } x_i x_j : \{i, j\} \in E \rangle$$

which fits the simplicial complex setting with Δ the complex of stable sets in G . Therefore, $\mathcal{B} := \{\mathbf{x}^U : U \text{ stable set in } G\}$ is a basis of $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I_G$ and

$$\text{TH}_k(I_G) = \left\{ \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \begin{array}{l} \exists M \succeq 0, M \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{B}_k| \times |\mathcal{B}_k|} \text{ such that} \\ M_{\emptyset\emptyset} = 1, \\ M_{\emptyset\{i\}} = M_{\{i\}\emptyset} = M_{\{i\}\{i\}} = y_i \\ M_{UU'} = 0 \text{ if } U \cup U' \text{ is not stable in } G \\ M_{UU'} = M_{WW'} \text{ if } U \cup U' = W \cup W' \end{array} \right\}.$$

In particular,

$$\text{TH}_1(I_G) = \left\{ \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \begin{array}{l} \exists M \succeq 0, M \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+1) \times (n+1)} \text{ such that} \\ M_{00} = 1, \\ M_{0i} = M_{i0} = M_{ii} = y_i \ \forall i \in [n] \\ M_{ij} = 0 \ \forall \{i, j\} \in E \end{array} \right\}.$$

In [9] Lovász introduced the *theta number*, $\vartheta(G)$, of a graph G which is an approximation of $\alpha(G)$. He also introduced a semidefinite relaxation, $\text{TH}(G)$, of $\text{STAB}(G)$, called the **theta body** of G [2, Chapter 9], and showed that $\vartheta(G) = \max \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} x_i : \mathbf{x} \in \text{TH}(G) \right\}$. There are multiple descriptions of $\text{TH}(G)$, but the one in [12, Lemma 2.17], for instance, shows that $\text{TH}(G) = \text{TH}_1(I_G)$, which appears to have motivated Problem 1.3, and consequently, our definitions. The following theorem is well-known.

Theorem 3.1. [2, Chapter 9] *The following are equivalent for a graph G .*

- (1) G is perfect.
- (2) $\text{STAB}(G) = \text{TH}(G)$.
- (3) $\text{TH}(G)$ is a polytope.
- (4) The complement \overline{G} of G is perfect.

Using the fact that $\text{TH}(G) = \text{TH}_1(I_G)$ we immediately have the following.

Corollary 3.2. *A graph G is perfect if and only if I_G is TH_1 -exact. Also, I_G is TH_1 -exact if and only if $I_{\overline{G}}$ is TH_1 -exact.*

Since no monomial in the basis \mathcal{B} of $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I_G$ has degree larger than $\alpha(G)$, $\text{STAB}(G) = \text{TH}_{\alpha(G)}(I_G)$. However, for many non-perfect graphs the theta-rank of I_G can be a lot smaller than $\alpha(G)$. For instance if G is a $(2k+1)$ -cycle, then $\alpha(G) = k$ while Proposition 3.4 shows that I_G is TH_2 -exact.

Theorem 3.3. [17, Corollary 65.12a] *If $G = ([n], E)$ is an odd cycle or its complement with $n \geq 5$ then $\text{STAB}(G)$ is determined by the following*

inequalities:

$$x_i \geq 0 \forall i \in [n], \quad 1 - \sum_{i \in C} x_i \geq 0 \text{ for each clique } C, \quad \alpha(G) - \sum_{i \in [n]} x_i \geq 0.$$

Proposition 3.4. *If G is an odd cycle with at least five vertices, then I_G is TH_2 -exact.*

Proof: Let $n = 2k+1$ and G be an n -cycle. Then $I_G = \langle x_i^2 - x_i, x_i x_{i+1} \mid i \in [n] \rangle$ where $x_{n+1} = x_1$. Therefore, $(1 - x_i)^2 \equiv 1 - x_i$ and $(1 - x_i - x_{i+1})^2 \equiv 1 - x_i - x_{i+1} \pmod{I_G}$. This implies that, mod I_G ,

$$p_i^2 := ((1 - x_1)(1 - x_{2i} - x_{2i+1}))^2 \equiv p_i = 1 - x_1 - x_{2i} - x_{2i+1} + x_1 x_{2i} + x_1 x_{2i+1}.$$

Summing over $i = 1, \dots, k$, we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^k p_i^2 \equiv 1 - kx_1 - \sum_{i=2}^{2k+1} x_i + \sum_{i=3}^{2k} x_1 x_i \pmod{I_G}$$

since $x_1 x_2$ and $x_1 x_{2k+1}$ lie in I_G . Define $g_i := x_1(1 - x_{2i+1} - x_{2i+2})$. Then $g_i^2 - g_i \in I_G$ and mod I_G we get that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} g_i^2 \equiv (k-1)x_1 - \sum_{i=3}^{2k} x_1 x_i, \text{ which implies } \sum_{i=1}^k p_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} g_i^2 \equiv k - \sum_{i=1}^{2k+1} x_i.$$

To prove that I_G is TH_2 -exact it suffices to show that the left hand sides of the inequalities in the description of $\text{STAB}(G)$ in Theorem 3.3 are 2-sos mod I_G . Clearly, $x_i \equiv x_i^2 \pmod{I_G}$ for all $i \in [n]$ and one can check that for each clique C , $(1 - \sum_{i \in C} x_i) \equiv (1 - \sum_{i \in C} x_i)^2 \pmod{I_G}$. The previous paragraph shows that $k - \sum_{i=1}^{2k+1} x_i$ is also 2-sos mod I_G . □

The above proof uses the inference rules outlined by Lovász in [10] which can be applied to more examples. Schoenebeck [16] has recently shown that there is no constant k such that $\text{STAB}(G) = \text{TH}_k(I_G)$ for all graphs G . A constructive version of this result remains open.

Lasserre and Lovász-Schrijver relaxations of $\text{STAB}(G)$ have been studied extensively in the literature. These relaxations are usually set up from the following initial linear programming relaxation of $\text{STAB}(G)$. Let $G = ([n], E)$ be an undirected graph and let

$$\text{FSTAB}(G) := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_i \geq 0 \forall i \in [n], 1 - x_i - x_j \geq 0 \forall \{i, j\} \in E\}.$$

Then $\text{conv}(\text{FSTAB} \cap \{0, 1\}^n) = \text{STAB}(G)$.

As before, let $C := \langle x_i^2 - x_i : i \in [n] \rangle$ and let $H := \{x_i \mid i \in [n], 1 - x_i - x_j \geq 0 \forall \{i, j\} \in E\}$. Then the usual k -th Lasserre relaxation of $\text{STAB}(G)$ (see [4], [6]) is $L_k(G) := Q_{C,k}(H)$ where $Q_{C,k}(H)$ is as in Definition 2.3. Thus this version of Lasserre's relaxations uses both an ideal (C) and an inequality system ($g \geq 0$ for all $g \in H$) whereas in the theta body formulation, $\text{TH}_k(I_G) = Q_{I_G,k}(\emptyset)$, there is only the ideal I_G and no inequalities. The k -th Lovász-Schrijver relaxation of $\text{STAB}(G)$ that is of interest to us is

$N_+^k(\text{FSTAB}(G))$. In [8], Laurent proves that the usual Lasserre hierarchy is exactly our theta body hierarchy for the stable set problem. This equality also follows easily from the machinery developed in Section 2.

Theorem 3.5. *For a graph G and any positive integer k , $\text{TH}_k(I_G) = L_k(G)$.*

Proof: Let $J := \langle x_i x_j : \{i, j\} \in E \rangle$. Then note that $I_G = C + J$ and that all $g_i \in H$ are 1-sos mod I_G since they are all idempotents mod I_G . Also, J is in the lineality space of $\mathcal{M}_{C,k}(H)$. The result now follows from Corollary 2.9. \square

Theorem 3.6. *For a graph G and any positive integer k , $\text{TH}_{k+1}(I_G) \subseteq N_+^k(\text{FSTAB}(G))$.*

Proof: By Corollary 2.15 it is enough to show that $\text{TH}_1(I_G)$ is contained in $N_+^0(\text{FSTAB}(G)) = \text{FSTAB}(G)$. This is true because all polynomials g such that $g(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ is a facet inequality of $\text{FSTAB}(G)$ are 1-sos mod I_G . \square

3.1.2. *Cuts in graphs.* Let $G = ([n], E)$ be an undirected finite graph and

$$SG := \{\chi^F : F \subseteq E \text{ is contained in a cut of } G\} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^E.$$

Then the max cut problem with non-negative weights w_e on the edges $e \in E$ coincides with $\max\{\sum_{e \in E} w_e x_e : \mathbf{x} \in SG\}$, and the vanishing ideal

$$\mathcal{I}(SG) = \langle x_e^2 - x_e \forall e \in E, \mathbf{x}^T \forall T \text{ an odd cycle in } G \rangle.$$

This again fits the simplicial complex setting with Δ equal to the complex of edge sets of G without odd cycles. A basis of $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/\mathcal{I}(SG)$ is

$$\mathcal{B} = \{\mathbf{x}^U : U \subseteq E \text{ does not contain an odd cycle in } G\}$$

and hence its elements correspond to certain subsets of E . Therefore,

$$\text{TH}_k(\mathcal{I}(SG)) = \left\{ \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^E : \begin{array}{l} \exists M \succeq 0, M \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{B}_k| \times |\mathcal{B}_k|} \text{ such that} \\ M_{\emptyset\emptyset} = 1, \\ M_{\emptyset\{i\}} = M_{\{i\}\emptyset} = M_{\{i\}\{i\}} = y_i \\ M_{UU'} = 0 \text{ if } U \cup U' \text{ has an odd cycle} \\ M_{UU'} = M_{WW'} \text{ if } U \cup U' = W \cup W' \end{array} \right\}.$$

In particular,

$$\text{TH}_1(\mathcal{I}(SG)) = \left\{ \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^E : \begin{array}{l} \exists M \succeq 0, M \in \mathbb{R}^{(|E|+1) \times (|E|+1)} \text{ such that} \\ M_{00} = 1, \\ M_{0e} = M_{e0} = M_{ee} = y_e \forall e \in E \end{array} \right\}.$$

Proposition 3.7. *The ideal $\mathcal{I}(SG)$ is TH_1 -exact if and only if G is a bipartite graph.*

Since the maximum degree of a monomial in \mathcal{B} is the size of the max cut in G , $\text{TH}_{|\text{maxcut}(G)|}(\mathcal{I}(SG)) = \text{conv}(SG)$. We state some related observations.

Proposition 3.8. *There is no constant k such that $\mathcal{I}(SG)$ is TH_k -exact, equivalently, $\text{TH}_k(\mathcal{I}(SG)) = \text{conv}(SG)$, for all graphs G .*

Proof: Let G be a $(2k + 1)$ -cycle. Then $\text{TH}_k(\mathcal{I}(SG)) \neq \text{conv}(SG)$ since the linear constraint imposed by the cycle in the definition of $\text{TH}_k(\mathcal{I}(SG))$ will not appear in theta bodies of index k or less. \square

Note that for any graph G , $\text{TH}_1(\mathcal{I}(SG))$ is the unit cube in \mathbb{R}^E which may not be equal to $\text{conv}(SG)$. This stands in contrast to the case of stable sets for which $\text{TH}_1(I_G)$ is a polytope if and only if $\text{TH}_1(I_G) = \text{STAB}(G)$. If G is a $(2k + 1)$ -cycle then in fact, $\text{TH}_1(\mathcal{I}(SG)) = \text{TH}_2(\mathcal{I}(SG)) = \cdots = \text{TH}_k(\mathcal{I}(SG))$ is the unit cube in \mathbb{R}^E even though $\text{TH}_k(\mathcal{I}(SG)) \neq \text{conv}(SG)$. Therefore $\text{TH}_i(\mathcal{I}(SG))$ need not be strictly contained in $\text{TH}_{i-1}(\mathcal{I}(SG))$ in the theta body hierarchy.

3.2. Cuts revisited: a new formulation. Our last example reconsiders the max-cut problem and uses theta bodies to derive a new canonical series of semidefinite relaxations for the cut polytope of an arbitrary graph. Throughout this subsection, let $G = ([n], E)$ be a connected graph. The edge set of the complete graph K_n will be denoted by E_n . Each of the 2^{n-1} distinct ways to partition $[n]$ into two parts V_1 and V_2 induces a distinct cut in G since G is connected. In particular, there is a bijection between the cuts in K_n and any G as above.

Let $\mathbf{c} \in \{\pm 1\}^n$ be the vector with $c_i = 1$ if $i \in V_1$ and $c_i = -1$ if $i \in V_2$. Then \mathbf{c} induces the *cut vector* χ^C of C in $\{\pm 1\}^E$ with $\chi_{\{i,j\}}^C = 1$ if $c_i = c_j$ and $\chi_{\{i,j\}}^C = -1$ otherwise for each $\{i, j\} \in E$. For $G = ([n], E)$, let $\pi_G : \mathbb{R}^{E_n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^E$ denote the natural projection map between the two spaces. The *cut polytope* of G is

$$\text{CUT}(G) := \text{conv}\{\chi^C : C \text{ is a cut in } G\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^E = \pi_G(\text{CUT}(K_n)).$$

The weighted max cut problem can then be formulated as

$$\max \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\{i,j\} \in E} w_{\{i,j\}} (1 - x_{\{i,j\}}) : \mathbf{x} \in \text{CUT}(G) \right\},$$

for some weights $w_{\{i,j\}}$.

For a fixed cut C , the cut vector χ^C of K_n can be identified with the strictly lower (or upper) triangular part of $\mathbf{c}\mathbf{c}^t$, the *cut matrix* of C . (The corresponding cut vector in any other G is the projection under π_G of χ^C for K_n .) This implies a bijection between cuts in K_n and rank one symmetric $n \times n$ matrices of the form

$$M_n(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & x_{\{1,2\}} & x_{\{1,3\}} & \cdots & x_{\{1,n\}} \\ x_{\{1,2\}} & 1 & x_{\{2,3\}} & \cdots & x_{\{2,n\}} \\ x_{\{1,3\}} & x_{\{2,3\}} & 1 & & x_{\{3,n\}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_{\{1,n\}} & x_{\{2,n\}} & x_{\{3,n\}} & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

which are all positive semidefinite. Let IK_n be the ideal generated by the 2×2 minors of $M_n(\mathbf{x})$. Then IK_n is the vanishing ideal of the cut vectors of

K_n . For any other G let $\mathbb{R}G := \mathbb{R}[x_{\{i,j\}} : \{i,j\} \in E]$ and let IG denote the elimination ideal $IG := \mathbb{R}G \cap IK_n$. By our discussion above the following is true for IG .

Lemma 3.9. *The elimination ideal IG is the vanishing ideal of cut vectors of G . In particular, $\mathbb{R}G/IG$ has dimension 2^{n-1} as an \mathbb{R} -vector space.*

In what follows we identify a subgraph F of G with its set of edges $E(F) \subseteq E$ and conversely, a collection of edges $U \subseteq E$ with the subgraph of G with edge set U . For a subgraph F in G , let \mathbf{x}^F denote the squarefree monomial

$$\prod_{\{i,j\} \in E(F)} x_{\{i,j\}} \in \mathbb{R}G.$$

Lemma 3.10. (1) *For each edge $\{i,j\} \in E$, $x_{\{i,j\}}^2 - 1 \in IG$.*
 (2) *For each cycle Y in G and any partition of its edges into two sets A and B , the binomial $\mathbf{x}^A - \mathbf{x}^B \in IG$. In particular, $\mathbf{x}^Y - 1 \in IG$.*

Proof: Since every cut vector from G is in $\{\pm 1\}^E$, (1) holds. To see (2), let Y be a cycle in G and $A \cup B$ a partition of the edges in Y . For a cut C in G , let C^- denote the collection of edges in G that index the -1 entries in the cut vector χ^C . Then since $|Y \cap C^-|$ is even, $|A \cap C^-|$ and $|B \cap C^-|$ are either both even or both odd. This implies that \mathbf{x}^A and \mathbf{x}^B have the same value on χ^C and so $\mathbf{x}^A - \mathbf{x}^B \in IG$. \square

Lemma 3.11. *Let K be a non-empty even subset of $[n]$. Then there is a subgraph of G with at least one edge whose set of odd-degree vertices is K .*

Proof: Since K is non-empty and even, group the vertices in K in pairs $\{i_1, j_1\}, \dots, \{i_k, j_k\}$. For each pair $\{i_l, j_l\} \subseteq K$, let P_l be a path in G between i_l and j_l . Such a path always exists since G is connected. Let G_K be the subgraph of G defined as $((P_1 \Delta P_2) \Delta P_3) \dots \Delta P_k$. Then G_K has the desired property since the degree of a vertex in the edgewise symmetric difference of two graphs is odd if and only if the parity of the degree of that vertex is different in each of the graphs. \square

Lemma 3.12. *Let K and L be two even subsets of $[n]$ and G_K and G_L be subgraphs of G whose sets of odd-degree vertices are respectively K and L . Then $\mathbf{x}^{G_K} \equiv \mathbf{x}^{G_L} \pmod{IG}$ if and only if $K = L$.*

Proof: If $K = L$ then the graph $G_K \Delta G_L$ is Eulerian and thus is a collection of cycles in G . Then by Lemma 3.10 (2), $\mathbf{x}^{G_K} - \mathbf{x}^{G_L} = \mathbf{x}^{G_K \cap G_L} (\mathbf{x}^{G_K \setminus G_L} - \mathbf{x}^{G_L \setminus G_K}) \in IG$. Now suppose $K \neq L$. Let $j \in K \Delta L$ and consider the cut C in G induced by the partition $\{j\} \cup ([n] - \{j\})$. We may assume that $j \in K$. Then \mathbf{x}^{G_K} evaluates to -1 on χ^C while \mathbf{x}^{G_L} evaluates to 1 since j is either not a vertex in G_L or is an even degree vertex in G_L . Therefore, $\mathbf{x}^{G_K} - \mathbf{x}^{G_L} \notin IG$. \square

Definition 3.13. Let \succ denote a total degree term order on $\mathbb{R}G$.

- (1) For every even subset K in $[n]$ let F_K be the minimal subgraph in G with respect to \succ whose odd-degree vertices are those in K (i.e., $\mathbf{x}^{F'_K} \succ \mathbf{x}^{F_K}$ if F_K and F'_K are both subgraphs with odd-degree vertices those in K).
- (2) Let $\mathcal{B}G$ be the set of all the squarefree monomials \mathbf{x}^{F_K} from (1).
- (3) Let $HG \subset IG$ consist of the following two types of binomials:
 - (a) $x_{\{i,j\}}^2 - 1$ for all $\{i,j\} \in E$, and
 - (b) $\mathbf{x}^A - \mathbf{x}^B$ where A, B varies over all partitions of the edge set of every cycle in G , and $\mathbf{x}^A \succ \mathbf{x}^B$.

Note that F_K is always a forest since removing a cycle doesn't change the parities of the vertex degrees. The following theorem relies on Definition 3.13 and Lemma 3.9.

Theorem 3.14. *The set HG is a Gröbner basis of IG with respect to the total degree term order \succ , and $\mathcal{B}G$ is the set of standard monomials of the initial ideal of IG with respect to \succ .*

Proof: By Lemma 3.10, the set HG from Definition 3.13 is contained in IG . Therefore, $\text{in}_\succ(HG)$, the ideal generated by the initial terms of the binomials in HG , is contained in $\text{in}_\succ(IG)$. We will show that $\mathcal{B}G$ is contained in the set of standard monomials of $\text{in}_\succ(HG)$. Since $\mathcal{B}G$ has 2^{n-1} elements, by Lemma 3.9, we will get that $\text{in}_\succ(HG) = \text{in}_\succ(IG)$ which will prove both statements of the theorem.

Let $\mathbf{x}^{F_K} \in \mathcal{B}G$ and suppose \mathbf{x}^{F_K} can be reduced by some $\mathbf{x}^A - \mathbf{x}^B \in HG$. This means that A is a subgraph in F_K and the reduction would yield $\mathbf{x}^{F_K-A}\mathbf{x}^B$ which reduces further to $\mathbf{x}^{F'_K}$ where $F'_K = (F_K - A)\Delta B$. Since A and B form a partition of a cycle, this reduction operation does not change the parity of the degree of any vertex present in F_K , so F'_K also has K as its set of odd-degree vertices. But then, $\mathbf{x}^{F_K} \succ \mathbf{x}^{F'_K}$ which contradicts the choice of F_K as minimal with respect to \succ . Therefore, all monomials in $\mathcal{B}G$ are standard monomials of $\text{in}_\succ(HG)$. □

For an arbitrary G , the key fact is that the elements of $\mathcal{B}G$ are indexed by the even subsets K in $[n]$. The graph F_K can be any edge minimal forest in G with K the set of its odd-degree vertices. For instance, $\mathcal{B}K_n$ can be taken to be the set of all squarefree monomials $x_{\{i_1,i_2\}}x_{\{i_3,i_4\}} \cdots x_{\{i_{2t-1},i_{2t}\}}$ with $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_{2t} \leq n$.

The important thing to keep track of is the degree, d_K , of \mathbf{x}^{F_K} which is the number of edges in F_K . If $\mathbf{x}^{F_K}, \mathbf{x}^{F_L} \in \mathcal{B}G$ then $\mathbf{x}^{F_K}\mathbf{x}^{F_L} \equiv \mathbf{x}^{F_K\Delta F_L} \pmod{IG}$ since the odd-degree vertices in $F_K\Delta F_L$ are precisely the vertices in $K\Delta L$, this also implies immediately that $d_{K\Delta L} \leq d_K + d_L$.

As usual, we denote by $\mathcal{B}G_k$ the subset of all monomials in $\mathcal{B}G$ of degree at most k . By identifying the monomial coset $\mathbf{x}^{F_K} + IG$ with the underlying

set K we have $\mathcal{B}G_k = \{K \subseteq [n] : K \text{ even}, d_K \leq k\}$, in particular $\mathcal{B}G_1$ can be identified with the set of edges of G . We identify $\mathcal{B}G$ with the basis for $\mathbb{R}G/IG$ provided by the cosets represented by $\mathcal{B}G$. If $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{B}G_{2k}}$ then the combinatorial moment matrix $M_{\mathcal{B}G_k}(\mathbf{y})$ is indexed by the monomials in $\mathcal{B}G_k$ and $[M_{\mathcal{B}G_k}(\mathbf{y})]_{K,L} = y_{K\Delta L}$. Since $d_{K\Delta L} \leq d_K + d_L$, this is well-defined.

The k -th theta body of IG is

$$\text{TH}_k(IG) = \left\{ \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^E : \begin{array}{l} \exists M \succeq 0, M \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{B}G_k| \times |\mathcal{B}G_k|} \text{ such that} \\ M_{K,K} = 1 \ \forall K \in \mathcal{B}G_k, \\ M_{e,\emptyset} = y_e \ \forall e \in E \\ M_{K,L} = M_{K',L'} \text{ if } K\Delta L = K'\Delta L' \end{array} \right\}.$$

In particular,

$$\text{TH}_1(IG) = \left\{ \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^E : \begin{array}{l} \exists M \succeq 0, M \in \mathbb{R}^{(|E|+1) \times (|E|+1)} \text{ such that} \\ \text{diag}(M) = (1, 1, \dots, 1), \\ M_{\emptyset,e} = M_{e,\emptyset} = y_e \ \forall e \in E, \\ \left. \begin{array}{l} M_{e,f} = y_g \text{ if } e, f, g \in E \text{ form a triangle in } G, \\ M_{e,f} = M_{g,h} \\ M_{e,g} = M_{f,h} \end{array} \right\} \text{ if } (e, f, g, h) \text{ is a 4-cycle in } G \end{array} \right\}.$$

Let $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and $I := \mathcal{I}(S) \subset \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ be its vanishing ideal. For $J \subseteq [n]$, let $\pi_J : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{|J|}$ denote projection onto the coordinates indexed by J and $\tilde{\pi}_J(I)$ denote the elimination ideal $I \cap \mathbb{R}[x_j : j \in J]$. Then recall that $\tilde{\pi}_J(I)$ is the vanishing ideal of $\pi_J(S)$. There is a simple relationship between the k -th theta body of the elimination ideal $\tilde{\pi}_J(I)$ which is a relaxation of $\text{conv}(\pi_J(S))$, and the projection of the k -th theta body of I by π_J , as follows.

Lemma 3.15. $\pi_J(\text{TH}_k(I)) \subseteq \text{TH}_k(\tilde{\pi}_J(I))$.

Proof: Since $\tilde{\pi}_J(I) \subseteq I$, if a linear polynomial $f \in k[x_j : j \in J]$ is k -sos mod $\tilde{\pi}_J(I)$, then it is also k -sos mod I . \square

In [7], Laurent studies various relaxations of $\text{CUT}(G)$. For K_n , the Lasserre relaxation of $\text{CUT}(K_n)$ that she indexes as $Q_{2k-1}(K_n)$ is exactly our $\text{TH}_k(IK_n)$ even though the relaxations $Q_*(K_n)$ are derived differently from us. For $G = ([n], E)$, she defines $Q_t(G) := \pi_E(Q_t(K_n))$ and so using Lemma 3.15,

$$Q_{2k-1}(G) := \pi_E(Q_{2k-1}(K_n)) = \pi_E(\text{TH}_k(IK_n)) \subseteq \text{TH}_k(IG).$$

This shows that our relaxation $\text{TH}_k(IG)$ is weaker than $Q_{2k-1}(G)$. It can be strictly weaker; for the five cycle C_5 , Laurent proves that $Q_1(C_5) = \text{CUT}(C_5)$ while $\text{TH}_1(C_5) = [-1, 1]^5$ (see Example 3.17 (3)). On the other hand, $\text{TH}_k(IG)$ can be much simpler than $Q_{2k-1}(G)$ and often use much smaller matrices in their definition. This is because, $Q_{2k-1}(G)$ is always computed from $Q_{2k-1}(K_n)$ which needs matrices with rows and columns indexed by all $K \subseteq [n]$ of size at most $2k$ while the matrices needed in $\text{TH}_k(IG)$ are indexed by $K \subseteq [n]$ with $d_K \leq k$. For instance, if $k = 1$ then

$\text{TH}_1(IG)$ needs matrices of size $|E| + 1$ while those needed in $Q_1(G)$ always have size $1 + n + \binom{n}{2}$ regardless of the G in question.

In analogy with the stable set problem, we call G *cut-perfect* if the ideal IG is TH_1 -exact. Problem 8.4 in [11] asks to characterize “cut-perfect” graphs. We present some partial results in that direction. To simplify the proofs, we rely on the following consequence of the forthcoming Theorem 4.4.

Proposition 3.16. *A graph G is cut-perfect if and only if for every facet defining inequality $g(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ of $\text{CUT}(G)$, the linear form $g(\mathbf{x})$ takes at most two distinct values on the vertices of $\text{CUT}(G)$.*

This result allows us to check for cut-perfection in examples without having to solve semidefinite programs which is very useful in practice.

Example 3.17. Here are several examples of cut-perfect and non-cut-perfect graphs.

- (1) If G is a tree on n vertices then $\text{TH}_1(IG) = [-1, 1]^{n-1} = \text{CUT}(G)$ and G is cut-perfect.
- (2) If G has at most 4 vertices, direct computations show that G is cut-perfect.
- (3) If G is the n -cycle with $n \geq 5$ then $\text{TH}_1(IG) = [-1, 1]^n$ while $\text{CUT}(G)$ is a subpolytope of $[-1, 1]^n$ with 2^{n-1} vertices, so G is not cut-perfect.
- (4) K_5 is not cut-perfect: $\sum_{e \in E_5} x_e + 2 \geq 0$ is a facet of $\text{CUT}(K_5)$ and the linear form $\sum_{e \in E_5} x_e + 2$ takes 3 distinct values on the vertices of $\text{CUT}(K_5)$ (namely, 0 on the facet, 12 on the trivial empty cut and 4 on the cut obtained by separating a vertex from all the others) which by Proposition 3.16 implies that K_5 is not cut-perfect.

Simple graph operations yield more examples and infinite families of cut-perfect graphs. For $G = (V, E)$ and an edge $\{u, v\} \in E$, we denote by G/uv the graph obtained from G by *contracting* $\{u, v\}$, that is to say, the graph with vertices $V \setminus \{u, v\} \cup w$ and whose edges are all edges of G that do not contain u or v and all the edges $\{w, x\}$ for $x \in V \setminus \{u, v\}$ such that either $\{u, x\}$ or $\{v, x\}$ are in E . We say that H is a *contraction minor* of G if it can be obtained from G by a sequence edge contractions. Recall that H is a *minor* of G if it can be obtained from G by edge contractions and deletions.

Let $G_i = (V_i, E_i), i = 1, 2$ be two graphs such that the set $V_1 \cap V_2$ induces a clique in both G_1 and G_2 . Then the graph $G = (V_1 \cup V_2, E_1 \cup E_2)$ is a *t-clique sum* of G_1 and G_2 , where $t = |V_1 \cap V_2|$. Both edge contractions and clique sums preserve cut-perfectness.

Theorem 3.18. *Let G_1 and G_2 be cut-perfect and suppose $G = (V_1 \cup V_2, E_1 \cup E_2)$ is their t -clique sum, then G is cut-perfect.*

Proof: It is shown in [1] that if $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{E_1 \cup E_2}$ and \mathbf{y}_i is its projection in \mathbb{R}^{E_i} for $i = 1, 2$, then $\mathbf{y} \in \text{CUT}(G)$ if and only if $\mathbf{y}_i \in \text{CUT}(G_i)$. So there is a linear inequality description of $\text{CUT}(G)$ where every $g(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$

is a facet inequality for one of the $\text{CUT}(G_i)$. Since G_i are cut-perfect, by Proposition 3.16, each such $g(\mathbf{x})$ takes at most two distinct values on the vertices of $\text{CUT}(G_i)$ and hence also on the vertices of $\text{CUT}(G)$. Then by Proposition 3.16, G is cut-perfect. \square

Theorem 3.19. *If G is cut-perfect then so are all its contraction minors.*

Proof: It is enough to show that cut-perfection is preserved by the contraction of a single edge $\{u, v\}$ onto a vertex w . Let $G = (V, E)$ and F be the edge set of G/uv . Define a map $\phi : \mathbb{R}^F \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^E$ by setting $\phi(\mathbf{x})_{\{v,y\}} = \phi(\mathbf{x})_{\{u,y\}} = x_{\{w,y\}}$ for $y \in V \setminus \{u, v\}$, $\phi(\mathbf{x})_{\{y_1,y_2\}} = x_{\{y_1,y_2\}}$ for $y_1, y_2 \in V \setminus \{u, v\}$ and $\phi(\mathbf{x})_{\{u,v\}} = 1$. This is an injection that maps the vertices of $\text{CUT}(G/uv)$ bijectively onto the vertices of $\text{CUT}(G) \cap \{\mathbf{x} : x_{uv} = 1\}$. Hence, $\text{CUT}(G/uv)$ is affinely equivalent to a face of $\text{CUT}(G)$, and by Corollary 4.7, if G is cut-perfect then so is G/uv . \square

It is not true that cut-perfectness is closed under taking minors, in fact, edge deletion does not preserve cut-perfectness. For example take a five cycle with a chord. This graph is the edge sum of a square and a triangle, so by Example 3.17 (2) and Theorem 3.18, is cut-perfect. However, erasing the chord will leave the five-cycle which is not cut-perfect. There is however a relation between cut-perfectness and minors.

Corollary 3.20. *If G has a K_5 minor then it is not cut-perfect.*

Proof: Note that a graph has a K_5 minor if and only if it has a K_5 contraction minor. But we have seen that K_5 is not cut-perfect, so by Theorem 3.19, G cannot be cut-perfect. \square

For complete graphs, the results for cut-perfectness that we prove here are also proved in [7].

4. THE STRUCTURE OF EXACT REAL VARIETIES

We now return to Problem 1.3 and in particular to a slightly restricted version of it. We recall a few definitions.

Definition 4.1. Let I be an ideal in $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ with complex variety $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(I) := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^n : f(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \forall f \in I\}$. Then I is

- (1) **radical** if it equals its **radical ideal**

$$\sqrt{I} := \{f \in \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}] : f^m \in I, m \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}\},$$

- (2) **real radical** if it equals its **real radical ideal**

$$\sqrt[\mathbb{R}]{I} := \{f \in \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}] : f^{2m} + g_1^2 + \dots + g_t^2 \in I, m \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}, g_1, \dots, g_t \in \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]\},$$

- (3) and **zero-dimensional** if $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(I)$ is finite.

The focus of this section is on real radical ideals, particularly those that are zero-dimensional, while the next section deals with arbitrary ideals. *Hilbert's Nullstellensatz* states that $\sqrt{I} = \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(I))$ and the *Real Nullstellensatz* states that $\sqrt[\mathbb{R}]{I} = \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I))$. Hence, $I \subseteq \sqrt{I} \subseteq \sqrt[\mathbb{R}]{I}$, and if I is real radical then it is also radical. See [13, Appendix 2] for instance. Real radical ideals are therefore exactly the vanishing ideals of real varieties.

Definition 4.2. A real variety $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is *exact* if its vanishing ideal $\mathcal{I}(S) \subseteq \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ is TH_1 -exact.

Proposition 4.3. For a real variety $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ the following are equivalent.

- (1) $\mathcal{I}(S)$ is TH_k -exact.
- (2) There is a linear inequality description of $\text{conv}(S)$ in which for each inequality $g(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$, $g(\mathbf{x})$ is k -sos mod $\mathcal{I}(S)$.
- (3) The set $\text{conv}(S)$ equals $\text{TH}_k(\mathcal{I}(S))$.

Proof: If $\mathcal{I}(S)$ is TH_k -exact, then every linear polynomial that is non-negative mod $\mathcal{I}(S)$ is k -sos mod $\mathcal{I}(S)$. Hence every linear inequality in a linear inequality description of $\text{conv}(S)$ is k -sos. Conversely, suppose every g_i in some linear inequality description of $\text{conv}(S)$ is k -sos mod $\mathcal{I}(S)$. Then if f is a linear and $f(\mathbf{s}) \geq 0$ for all $\mathbf{s} \in S$ then f is a non-negative \mathbb{R} -linear combination of a finite number of the linear inequalities $g_i(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ in the description of $\text{conv}(S)$ which implies that f is k -sos mod $\mathcal{I}(S)$.

If (2) holds then $\text{TH}_k(\mathcal{I}(S)) \subseteq \text{conv}(S)$ and hence $\text{conv}(S) = \text{TH}_k(\mathcal{I}(S))$. Conversely, suppose $\text{conv}(S) = \text{TH}_k(\mathcal{I}(S))$, then we can get a linear inequality description of $\text{conv}(S)$ where each inequality is a limit of linear polynomials that are k -sos mod $\mathcal{I}(S)$. Then by Lemma 2.10, the supporting inequality itself must be k -sos mod $\mathcal{I}(S)$ and we have (2). \square

When S is finite (that is to say, $\mathcal{I}(S)$ is zero-dimensional), Proposition 4.3 specializes and extends to give the following characterizations of exactness.

Theorem 4.4. Let S be a finite subset of \mathbb{R}^n and $\mathcal{I}(S)$ be its vanishing ideal in $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$. Then the following are equivalent.

- (1) S is exact.
- (2) There is a finite linear inequality description of $\text{conv}(S)$ in which for every inequality $g(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$, g is 1-sos mod $\mathcal{I}(S)$.
- (3) $\text{conv}(S) = \text{TH}_1(\mathcal{I}(S))$.
- (4) There is a finite linear inequality description of $\text{conv}(S)$ in which for every inequality $g(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$, $g(\mathbf{x})$ is an idempotent mod $\mathcal{I}(S)$ (i.e., $g(\mathbf{x}) \equiv g(\mathbf{x})^2 \pmod{\mathcal{I}(S)}$).
- (5) There is a finite linear inequality description of $\text{conv}(S)$ such that for every inequality $g(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$, every point in S lies either on the hyperplane $g(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ or a unique parallel translate of it.

Proof: Since S is finite, $\text{conv}(S)$ admits a finite linear inequality description. The proof of Proposition 4.3 goes through with this finiteness assumption giving the equivalences (1) \Leftrightarrow (2) \Leftrightarrow (3).

Suppose (2) holds and $\text{conv}(S)$ is a full-dimensional polytope. Let F be a facet of $\text{conv}(S)$, and $g(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ its defining inequality in the given description of $\text{conv}(S)$. Then $g(\mathbf{x})$ is 1-sos mod $\mathcal{I}(S)$ if and only if there are linear polynomials $h_1, \dots, h_l \in \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ such that $g \equiv h_1^2 + \dots + h_l^2 \pmod{\mathcal{I}(S)}$. In particular, since $g(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ on the vertices of F , and all the h_i^2 are non-negative, each h_i must be zero on all the vertices of F . Hence, since the h_i 's are linear, they must vanish on the affine span of F which is the hyperplane defined by $g(\mathbf{x}) = 0$. Thus each h_i must be a multiple of g and $g \equiv \alpha g^2 \pmod{\mathcal{I}(S)}$ for some $\alpha > 0$. We may assume that $\alpha = 1$ by replacing $g(\mathbf{x})$ by $g'(\mathbf{x}) := \alpha g(\mathbf{x})$. If $\text{conv}(S)$ is not full-dimensional, then since mod $\mathcal{I}(S)$, all linear polynomials can be assumed to define hyperplanes whose normal vectors are parallel to the affine span of S , the proof still holds. Conversely, since if $g \equiv g^2 \pmod{\mathcal{I}(S)}$ then g is 1-sos mod $\mathcal{I}(S)$, (4) implies (2).

The equivalence (4) \Leftrightarrow (5) follows since $g \equiv g^2 \pmod{\mathcal{I}(S)}$ if and only if $g(\mathbf{s})(1 - g(\mathbf{s})) = 0 \forall \mathbf{s} \in S$. \square

Parrilo has shown that if $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ is a zero-dimensional radical ideal, then $f \geq 0 \pmod{I}$ if and only if f is a sum of squares mod I [14], [5, Theorem 2.4]. The proof uses a set of interpolating polynomials of $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I)$ to write the sos representations. Since interpolators can be constructed to have degree at most $|\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(I)| - 1$, the sos-type, and hence the theta-rank, of I is bounded above by $|\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(I)| - 1$. Better upper bounds for exactness can be derived using the following extension of Parrilo's theorem whose proof is similar.

Proposition 4.5. *Suppose $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a finite point set such that for each facet F of $\text{conv}(S)$ there is an hyperplane H_F such that $H_F \cap \text{conv}(S) = F$ and S is contained in at most t parallel translates of H_F . Then $\mathcal{I}(S)$ is TH_t -exact.*

Remark 4.6. The theta-rank of $\mathcal{I}(S)$ could be much smaller than the upper bound in Proposition 4.5. Consider a $(2t + 1)$ -cycle G and the set S_G of characteristic vectors of its stable sets. Using Theorem 3.3 check that for each facet F of $\text{STAB}(G)$, S_G is contained in at most $t + 1$ parallel translates of the hyperplane spanned by F and that exactly $t + 1$ translates are needed for the facet cut out by $\sum_{i \in [n]} x_i = t (= \alpha(G))$. However, Proposition 3.4 shows that $\mathcal{I}(S_G)$ is TH_2 -exact.

We now return to Theorem 4.4 and discuss various consequences.

Corollary 4.7. *Let $S, S' \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be exact sets. Then*

- (1) *all points of S are vertices of $\text{conv}(S)$,*
- (2) *the set of vertices of any face of $\text{conv}(S)$ is again exact,*
- (3) *the product $S \times S'$ is exact, and*
- (4) *$\text{conv}(S)$ is affinely equivalent to a 0/1 polytope.*

Proof: The first three properties follow from Theorem 4.4 (5). If the dimension of $\text{conv}(S)$ is $d (\leq n)$, then $\text{conv}(S)$ has at least d non-parallel facets. If $\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{x} \geq 0$ cuts out a facet in this collection, then $\text{conv}(S)$ is supported




FIGURE 1. Exact 0/1 varieties in \mathbb{R}^3 .




FIGURE 2. Non-exact 0/1 varieties in \mathbb{R}^3 .

by both $\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{x} = 0\}$ and a parallel translate of it. Taking these two parallel hyperplanes from each of the d facets gives a parallelepiped. By Theorem 4.4, S is contained in the vertices of this parallelepiped intersected with the affine hull of S . This proves (4). \square

By Corollary 4.7 (3), it essentially suffices to look at subsets of $\{0, 1\}^n$ to obtain all exact finite varieties. In \mathbb{R}^2 , the set of vertices of any 0/1-polytope verify this property. In \mathbb{R}^3 there are eight full-dimensional 0/1-polytopes up to affine equivalence. In Figures 1 & 2 the convex hulls of the exact and non-exact 0/1 configurations in \mathbb{R}^3 are shown. The octahedron in Figure 1 is not the stable set polytope of any perfect graph since it is not down-closed.

Example 4.8. The vertices of the following 0/1-polytopes in \mathbb{R}^n are exact for every n : (1) simplices, (2) hypercubes, (3) (regular) cross polytopes, (4) hypersimplices, (5) the hypercube intersected with $\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : k \leq \sum x_i \leq k + 1\}$ for $k = 0, \dots, n - 1$, (6) pyramids over polytopes whose vertex set is exact, and (7) stable set polytopes of perfect graphs on n vertices.

Example 4.9. In contrast to (5) in Example 4.8, the set S of vertices of $[0, 1]^5$ that satisfy $\sum x_i = 1$ or $\sum x_i = 3$ is not exact. The convex hull of S has 22 facets one of which is defined by $-x_1 - x_2 - x_3 + x_4 + x_5 \leq 1$. The linear form $-x_1 - x_2 - x_3 + x_4 + x_5$ takes values $-1, 1$ and -3 on the points of S which proves that S is not exact.

Theorem 4.10. *If $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a finite exact point set then $\text{conv}(S)$ has at most 2^d facets and vertices, where $d = \dim \text{conv}(S)$. Both bounds are sharp.*

Proof: The bound on the number of vertices is immediate by Corollary 4.7 and is achieved by $[0, 1]^d$.

For a polytope $P \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with vertex set S , define a **face pair** to be an unordered pair (F_1, F_2) of proper faces of P such that $S \subseteq F_1 \cup F_2$ and F_1 and F_2 lie in parallel hyperplanes, or equivalently, such that there exists a linear form $h_{F_1, F_2}(\mathbf{x})$ such that $h_{F_1, F_2}(F_1) = 0$ and $h_{F_1, F_2}(F_2) = 1$.

If $d = 1$, then an exact S consists of two distinct points and P has two facets and one face pair as desired. Assume the result holds for $(d - 1)$ -polytopes and consider a d -polytope P with an exact vertex set S . Let F be a facet of P which by Theorem 4.4, is in a face pair (F, F') of P . Since exactness does not depend on the affine embedding, we may assume that P is full-dimensional and that F spans the hyperplane $\{\mathbf{x} : x_d = 0\}$, while F' lies in $\{\mathbf{x} : x_d = 1\}$. By Corollary 4.7, F satisfies the induction hypothesis and so has at most $(2^{d-1} - 1)$ face pairs. Any face pair of P besides (F, F') induces a face pair of F by intersection with F , and every facet of P is in a face pair of P since S is exact. The plan is to count how many face pairs of P induce the same face pair of F and the number of facets they contain.

Fix a face pair (F_1, F_2) of F , with h_{F_1, F_2} the associated linear form depending only on x_1, \dots, x_{d-1} , and let $H(\mathbf{x})$ be the linear form associated to a face pair of P that induces (F_1, F_2) in F . Then H and h_{F_1, F_2} are the same in every vertex of F , hence $H(\mathbf{x}) = h_{F_1, F_2}(x_1, \dots, x_{d-1}) + cx_d$ for some constant c .

If $h_{F_1, F_2}(x_1, \dots, x_{d-1})$ takes always the same value v in F' , then $c = -v$ or $c = 1 - v$. The two possibilities lead to the face pairs $(\text{conv}(F_1 \cup F'), F_2)$ and $(\text{conv}(F_2 \cup F'), F_1)$. Each such pair contains at most one facet of P .

If $h_{F_1, F_2}(x_1, \dots, x_{d-1})$ takes more than one value on the vertices of F' , then for H to exist, these values must be one of v or $v + 1$ for some v . In that case, $c = -v$, so H is unique and we get at most one face pair of P inducing (F_1, F_2) . This pair will contain at most two facets of P .

Since there are at most $2^{d-1} - 1$ face pairs in F , they give us at most $2(2^{d-1} - 1)$ face pairs and facets of P . Since we have not counted (F, F') as a face pair of P , and F and F' as possible facets of P , we get the desired result. The bound on the number of facets is attained by cross-polytopes. \square

Recall that Lovász was inspired by perfect graphs to propose Problem 1.3. Theorem 4.4 implies the following characterization of perfect graphs.

Corollary 4.11. *For a graph G , let S_G denote the set of characteristic vectors of stable sets in G . Then the following are equivalent.*

- (1) *The graph G is perfect.*
- (2) *The set S_G is exact.*
- (3) *For each facet F of $\text{STAB}(G)$, S_G is contained in the union of F and one other translate of the hyperplane spanned by F .*

Theorem 4.4 suggests that for a finite set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ we may want to consider the “idempotent (polytope) relaxation” of $\text{conv}(S)$ defined as

$$\text{Ip}(S) = \{\mathbf{x} : g(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0 \text{ for all } g \text{ linear and idempotent modulo } \mathcal{I}(S)\}.$$

Since all linear idempotent polynomials are 1-sos we immediately have that $\text{TH}_1(\mathcal{I}(S)) \subseteq \text{Ip}(S)$ and Theorem 4.4 translates as $\text{TH}_1(\mathcal{I}(S)) = \text{conv}(S)$ if and only if $\text{Ip}(S) = \text{conv}(S)$. For the stable set polytope, it is easy to

see that $\text{Ip}(S_G)$ is simply the well-known polytope relaxation $\text{QSTAB}(G)$ of $\text{STAB}(G)$, defined as

$$\text{QSTAB}(G) = \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_i \geq 0; \sum_{i \in C} x_i \leq 1, \text{ for all cliques } C \text{ of } G \right\}.$$

Thus in this case, Theorem 4.4 recovers some of the results in [2] such as $\text{TH}(G) = \text{STAB}(G)$ if and only if $\text{QSTAB} = \text{STAB}(G)$.

For any graph G , $\text{STAB}(G)$ is a down-closed 0/1-polytope. Theorem 4.12 and Corollary 4.13 establish a connection between perfect graphs and down-closed 0/1-polytopes.

Theorem 4.12. *Let $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a down-closed 0/1-polytope and S be its set of vertices. Then S is exact if and only if all facets of P are either defined by non-negativity constraints on the variables or by an inequality of the form $\sum_{i \in I} x_i \leq 1$ for some $I \subseteq [n]$.*

Proof: If P is not full-dimensional then since it is down-closed, it must be contained in a coordinate hyperplane $x_i = 0$ and the arguments below can be repeated in this lower-dimensional space. So we may assume that P is n -dimensional. Then since P is down-closed, S contains $\{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n\}$.

Suppose all facets of P are of the stated form. Since $S \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$, each $\mathbf{s} \in S$ satisfies either $x_i = 0$ or $x_i = 1$. Suppose P has a facet inequality of the form $\sum_{i \in I} x_i \leq 1$. Then since every $\mathbf{s} \in S$ satisfies this inequality, S must be contained in

$$\left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sum_{i \in I} x_i = 1 \right\} \cup \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sum_{i \in I} x_i = 0 \right\}.$$

Therefore S is exact.

Now assume that S is exact and $g(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ is a facet inequality of P that is not a non-negativity constraint. Then $g(\mathbf{x}) := c - \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i \geq 0$ for some integers c, a_1, \dots, a_n with $c \neq 0$. Since $\mathbf{0} \in S$ and S is exact, we get that $g(\mathbf{s})$ equals 0 or c for all $\mathbf{s} \in S$. Therefore, for all i , $g(\mathbf{e}_i) = c - a_i$ equals 0 or c , so a_i is either 0 or c . Dividing through by c , we get that the facet inequality $g(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ is of the form $\sum_{i \in I} x_i \leq 1$ for some $I \subseteq [n]$. \square

Corollary 4.13. *Let $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a full-dimensional down-closed 0/1-polytope and S be its vertex set. Then S is exact if and only if P is the stable set polytope of a perfect graph.*

Proof: By Corollary 4.11 we only need to prove the “only-if” direction. Suppose S is exact. Then by Theorem 4.12, all facet inequalities of P are either of the form $x_i \geq 0$ for some $i \in [n]$ or $\sum_{i \in I} x_i \leq 1$ for some $I \subseteq [n]$. Define the graph $G = ([n], E)$ where $\{i, j\} \in E$ if and only if $\{i, j\} \subseteq I$ for some I that indexes a facet inequality of P .

We prove that $P = \text{STAB}(G)$ and that G is perfect. Let $K \subseteq [n]$ such that its characteristic vector $\chi^K \in S$. If there exists $i, j \in K$ such that $i, j \in I$

for some I that indexes a facet inequality of P , then $1 - \sum_{i \in I} x_i$ takes three different values when evaluated at the points $\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{e}_i, \chi^K$ in S which contradicts that S is exact. Therefore, K is a stable set of G and $P \subseteq \text{STAB}(G)$. If $K \subseteq [n]$ is a stable set of G then, by construction, for every I indexing a facet inequality of P , χ^K lies on either $\sum_{i \in I} x_i = 1$ or $\sum_{i \in I} x_i = 0$. Therefore $\chi^K \in P$ and $\text{STAB}(G) \subseteq P$. Since all facet inequalities of $\text{STAB}(G)$ are either non-negativities or clique inequalities, $\text{STAB}(G) = \text{QSTAB}(G)$ and G is perfect. \square

5. ARBITRARY TH_1 -EXACT IDEALS

In this last section we describe $\text{TH}_1(I)$ for an arbitrary (not necessarily radical or zero-dimensional) ideal $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$. The main structural result is Theorem 5.6 which allows the construction of non-trivial high-dimensional TH_1 -exact ideals as in Example 5.7.

In this study, the *convex quadrics* in $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ play a particularly important role. These are precisely the polynomials of degree two that can be written as $F(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}^t A \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}^t \mathbf{x} + c$, where A is an $n \times n$ positive semidefinite matrix, $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Note that every sum of squares of linear polynomials in $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ is a convex quadric.

Lemma 5.1. *For $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$, $\text{TH}_1(I) \neq \mathbb{R}^n$ if and only if there exists some convex quadric $F \in I$.*

Proof: Suppose $f(\mathbf{x})$ is linear and 1-sos mod I . Then there exists some $A \succeq 0$ such that $f(\mathbf{x}) \equiv \mathbf{x}^t A \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}^t \mathbf{x} + c \pmod{I}$. In particular, $\mathbf{x}^t A \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}^t \mathbf{x} + c - f(\mathbf{x}) \in I$ is a convex quadric.

Conversely, suppose $\mathbf{x}^t A \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}^t \mathbf{x} + c \in I$ with $A \succeq 0$. Then for any $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{d})^t A (\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{d}) = \mathbf{x}^t A \mathbf{x} + 2\mathbf{d}^t A \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{d}^t A \mathbf{d} \equiv (2\mathbf{d}^t A - \mathbf{b}^t) \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{d}^t A \mathbf{d} - c \pmod{I}$.

Therefore, since $(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{d})^t A (\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{d})$ is a sum of squares of linear polynomials, the linear polynomial $(2\mathbf{d}^t A - \mathbf{b}^t) \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{d}^t A \mathbf{d} - c$ is 1-sos mod I and $\text{TH}_1(I)$ must satisfy it. Since \mathbf{d} can be chosen so that $(2\mathbf{d}^t A - \mathbf{b}^t) \neq 0$, $\text{TH}_1(I)$ is not trivial. \square

Example 5.2. For $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$, $\text{TH}_1(\mathcal{I}(S)) \neq \mathbb{R}^2$ if and only if S is contained in a pair of parallel lines, a parabola, or an ellipse.

Corollary 5.3. *If $\mathbf{x}^t A \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}^t \mathbf{x} + c \in I$ with $A \succeq 0$ and of full rank then $\text{TH}_1(I)$ is bounded.*

Proof: In this case $\{2\mathbf{d}^t A - \mathbf{b}^t : \mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{R}^n\} = \mathbb{R}^n$ and so there are valid inequalities for $\text{TH}_1(I)$ with all possible elements of \mathbb{R}^n as normals. \square

Corollary 5.4. *For $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ is an ideal, $\text{TH}_1(I) = \bigcap \text{TH}_1(\langle F \rangle)$, where F varies over all convex quadrics in I .*

Proof: If $F \in I$ then $\langle F \rangle \subseteq I$. Also, if f is linear and 1-sos mod $\langle F \rangle$ then it is also 1-sos mod I . Therefore, $\text{TH}_1(I) \subseteq \text{TH}_1(\langle F \rangle)$.

To prove the reverse inclusion, we need to show that whenever $f(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ is valid for $\text{TH}_1(I)$, it is also valid for $\bigcap_{F \in I} \text{TH}_1(\langle F \rangle)$, where F is a convex quadric. It suffices to show that whenever f is linear and 1-sos mod I , then there is a convex quadric $F \in I$ such that $f(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ is valid for $\text{TH}_1(\langle F \rangle)$, or equivalently that f is 1-sos mod $\langle F \rangle$. Since f is 1-sos mod I , there is a sum of squares of linear polynomials $g(\mathbf{x})$ such that $f(\mathbf{x}) \equiv g(\mathbf{x}) \pmod{I}$. But g is a convex quadric, hence so is $g(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x})$. Thus f is 1-sos mod the ideal $\langle g(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}) \rangle$ and we can take $F(\mathbf{x}) = g(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x})$. \square

Lemma 5.5. *If $F(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}^t A \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}^t \mathbf{x} + c$ with $A \succeq 0$, then $\text{TH}_1(\langle F \rangle) = \text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(F))$.*

Proof: First of, we know that $\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(F)) \subseteq \text{TH}_1(\langle F \rangle)$. Since F is convex, $\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(F)) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : F(\mathbf{x}) \leq 0\}$. Thus, if for every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(F)$, $\text{grad}F(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{0}$ then $\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(F))$ is supported by the tangent hyperplanes to the curve $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(F)$. In this case, to show that $\text{TH}_1(\langle F \rangle) \subseteq \text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(F))$, it suffices to prove that all tangent hyperplanes to the curve $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(F)$ are 1-sos mod $\langle F \rangle$. The proof of the “if” direction of Lemma 5.1 shows that it would suffice to prove that a tangent hyperplane to $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(F)$ has the form $(2\mathbf{d}^t A - \mathbf{b}^t)\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{d}^t A \mathbf{d} - c = 0$, for some $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The tangent at $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(F)$ has equation $0 = (2A\mathbf{x}_0 + \mathbf{b})^t(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0)$ which can be rewritten as

$$0 = (2\mathbf{x}_0^t A + \mathbf{b}^t)\mathbf{x} - 2\mathbf{x}_0^t A \mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{b}^t \mathbf{x}_0 = (2\mathbf{x}_0^t A + \mathbf{b}^t)\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0^t A \mathbf{x}_0 + c,$$

and so setting $\mathbf{d} = -\mathbf{x}_0$ gives the result.

Suppose there is an \mathbf{x}_0 such that $F(\mathbf{x}_0) = 0$ and $\text{grad}F(\mathbf{x}_0) = \mathbf{0}$. By translation we may assume that $\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{0}$, hence, $c = 0$ and $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0}$. Therefore $F = \mathbf{x}^t A \mathbf{x} = \sum h_i^2$ where the h_i are linear. Since $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(\langle F \rangle) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(\langle h_1, \dots, h_m \rangle)$ it is enough to prove that all inequalities $\pm h_i \geq 0$ are valid for $\text{TH}_1(\langle F \rangle)$. For any $\epsilon > 0$ we have

$$(\pm h_l + \epsilon)^2 + \sum_{i \neq l} h_i^2 = F \pm 2\epsilon h_l + \epsilon^2 \equiv 2\epsilon(\pm h_l + \epsilon/2) \pmod{\langle F \rangle},$$

so $\pm h_l + \epsilon/2$ is 1-sos mod $\langle F \rangle$ for all l and all $\epsilon > 0$. This implies that all the inequalities $\pm h_l + \epsilon/2 \geq 0$ are valid for $\text{TH}_1(\langle F \rangle)$, therefore so are the inequalities $h_i \geq 0$. \square

Theorem 5.6. *Let $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ be any ideal, then*

$$\text{TH}_1(I) = \bigcap_{\substack{F \in I \\ F \text{ convex quadric}}} \text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(F)).$$

Example 5.7. Theorem 5.6 shows immediately that some non-principal ideals such as $\langle x^2 - z, y^2 - z \rangle \subseteq \mathbb{R}[x, y, z]$ and $\langle x^2 - z, (z - 1)^2 + y^2 - 1 \rangle \subseteq \mathbb{R}[x, y, z]$ are TH_1 -exact. This allows us to create non-trivial examples of TH_1 -exact ideals with high-dimensional varieties.




FIGURE 3. Example 5.9

Example 5.8. Theorem 5.6 also gives us easy examples of non-radical TH_1 -exact ideals. For example $I = \langle x^2 \rangle$ is TH_1 -exact since x^2 itself is a convex quadric.

Example 5.9. Consider the set $S = \{(0, 0), (1, 0), (0, 1), (2, 2)\}$. Then the family of all quadratic curves in $\mathcal{I}(S)$ is

$$a(x^2 - x) + b(y^2 - y) - \left(\frac{a+b}{2}\right)xy = (x, y) \begin{bmatrix} a & -\left(\frac{a+b}{4}\right) \\ -\left(\frac{a+b}{4}\right) & b \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} - ax - by.$$

Since the case where both a and b are zero is trivial, we may normalize by setting $a + b = 1$ and get the matrix in the quadratic to be

$$\begin{bmatrix} \lambda & -1/4 \\ -1/4 & 1 - \lambda \end{bmatrix}$$

with $\lambda \geq 0$. This matrix is positive semidefinite if and only if $\lambda(1 - \lambda) - 1/16 \geq 0$, or equivalently, if and only if $\lambda \in [1/2 - \sqrt{3}/4, 1/2 + \sqrt{3}/4]$.

This means that $(x, y) \in \text{TH}_1(\mathcal{I}(S))$ if and only if, for all such λ ,

$$\lambda(x^2 - x) + (1 - \lambda)(y^2 - y) \leq \frac{1}{2}xy.$$

Since the right-hand-side does not depend on λ , and the left-hand-side is a convex combination of $x^2 - x$ and $y^2 - y$, the inequality holds for every $\lambda \in [1/2 - \sqrt{3}/4, 1/2 + \sqrt{3}/4]$ if and only if it holds at the end points of the interval. Equivalently, if and only if

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}\right)(x^2 - x) + \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}\right)(y^2 - y) \leq \frac{1}{2}xy,$$

and

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}\right)(x^2 - x) + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}\right)(y^2 - y) \leq \frac{1}{2}xy.$$

But this is just the intersection of the convex hull of the two curves obtained by turning the inequalities into equalities. Figure 5.9 shows this intersection.

REFERENCES

- [1] Francisco Barahona. The max-cut problem on graphs not contractible to K_s . *Oper. Res. Lett.*, 2(3):107–111, 1983.
- [2] Martin Grötschel, László Lovász, and Alexander Schrijver. *Geometric algorithms and combinatorial optimization*, volume 2 of *Algorithms and Combinatorics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 1993.
- [3] Jean B. Lasserre. Global optimization with polynomials and the problem of moments. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 11(3):796–817 (electronic), 2000/01.
- [4] Jean B. Lasserre. An explicit equivalent positive semidefinite program for nonlinear 0-1 programs. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 12(3):756–769 (electronic), 2002.
- [5] Monique Laurent. Sums of squares, moment matrices and optimization over polynomials. In M. Putinar and S. Sullivant, editors, *Emerging Applications of Algebraic Geometry*, volume 149 of *IMA Volumes in Mathematics and its Applications*. Springer, to appear.
- [6] Monique Laurent. A comparison of the Sherali-Adams, Lovász-Schrijver, and Lasserre relaxations for 0-1 programming. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 28(3):470–496, 2003.
- [7] Monique Laurent. Semidefinite relaxations for max-cut. In *The sharpest cut*, MPS/SIAM Ser. Optim., pages 257–290. SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 2004.
- [8] Monique Laurent. Semidefinite representations for finite varieties. *Math. Program.*, 109(1, Ser. A):1–26, 2007.
- [9] László Lovász. On the Shannon capacity of a graph. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 25(1):1–7, 1979.
- [10] László Lovász. Stable sets and polynomials. *Discrete Math.*, 124(1-3):137–153, 1994. Graphs and combinatorics (Qawra, 1990).
- [11] László Lovász. Semidefinite programs and combinatorial optimization. In *Recent advances in algorithms and combinatorics*, volume 11 of *CMS Books Math./Ouvrages Math. SMC*, pages 137–194. Springer, New York, 2003.
- [12] László Lovász and Alexander Schrijver. Cones of matrices and set-functions and 0-1 optimization. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 1(2):166–190, 1991.
- [13] Murray Marshall. *Positive polynomials and sums of squares*, volume 146 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2008.
- [14] Pablo Parrilo. An explicit construction of distinguished representations of polynomials nonnegative over finite sets. IfA Technical Report AUT02-02, ETH Zurich, 2002.
- [15] Victoria Powers and Claus Scheiderer. The moment problem for non-compact semi-algebraic sets. *Adv. Geom.*, 1(1):71–88, 2001.
- [16] Grant Schoenebeck. Linear level Lasserre lower bounds for certain k-csp. preprint.
- [17] Alexander Schrijver. *Combinatorial optimization. Polyhedra and efficiency. Vol. B*, volume 24 of *Algorithms and Combinatorics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003. Matroids, trees, stable sets, Chapters 39–69.
- [18] Hanif D. Sherali and Warren P. Adams. A hierarchy of relaxations between the continuous and convex hull representations for zero-one programming problems. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 3(3):411–430, 1990.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, BOX 354350, SEATTLE, WA 98195, USA, AND CMUC, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF COIMBRA, 3001-454 COIMBRA, PORTUGAL

E-mail address: `jgouveia@math.washington.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, LABORATORY FOR INFORMATION AND DECISION SYSTEMS, MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, 77 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139-4307, USA

E-mail address: `parrilo@mit.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, BOX 354350, SEATTLE, WA 98195, USA

E-mail address: `thomas@math.washington.edu`