

THETA BODIES FOR POLYNOMIAL IDEALS

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

ABSTRACT. Inspired by a question of Lovász, we introduce a hierarchy of nested semidefinite relaxations of the convex hull of real solutions to an arbitrary polynomial ideal, called theta bodies of the ideal. For the stable set problem in a graph, the first theta body in this hierarchy is exactly Lovász's theta body of the graph. We prove that theta bodies are, up to closure, a version of Lasserre's relaxations for real solutions to ideals, and that they can be computed explicitly using combinatorial moment matrices. Theta bodies provide a new canonical set of semidefinite relaxations for the max cut problem. For vanishing ideals of finite point sets, we give several equivalent characterizations of when the first theta body equals the convex hull of the points. We also determine the structure of the first theta body for all ideals.

1. INTRODUCTION

A central concern in optimization is to understand the convex hull of feasible solutions to a given problem. In many instances, the feasible solutions can be described as the set of real solutions to a system of polynomial equations: $f_1(\mathbf{x}) = f_2(\mathbf{x}) = \dots = f_m(\mathbf{x}) = 0$, where $f_1, \dots, f_m \in \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}] := \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. This set is the *real variety* of the *ideal* in $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ generated by f_1, \dots, f_m . Given an ideal $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$, let $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I) := \{\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}^n : f(\mathbf{s}) = 0 \forall f \in I\}$ denote the real variety of I . The convex hull of $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I)$ is described by the *affine linear polynomials*, $f = a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i$, that are non-negative on $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I)$. Throughout this paper we will say that f is a *linear* polynomial if it is affine linear of the form $f = a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i$.

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 $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I)$.

- (1) The polynomial f is **non-negative** mod I , written as $f \geq 0$ 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 $f \equiv \sum_{j=1}^t h_j^2$ mod I for some t , or equivalently, $f - \sum_{j=1}^t h_j^2 \in I$. If, in addition, each h_j has degree at most k , then we say that f is **k -sos** mod I .

Date: February 20, 2019.

All authors were partially supported by the NSF Focused Research Group grant DMS-0757371. J. Gouveia was also partially supported by Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia and R.R. Thomas by the Robert R. and Elaine K. Phelps Endowed Professorship.

- (3) The ideal I is k -**sos** if *every* polynomial that is non-negative mod I is k -sos mod I . If every polynomial of degree at most d that is non-negative mod I is k -sos mod I , we say that I is (d, k) -**sos**.

Thus $\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I))$, the convex hull of $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I)$, is described by the linear polynomials f such that $f \geq 0 \pmod{I}$. A certificate for the non-negativity of $f \pmod{I}$ is the existence of a sos polynomial $\sum_{j=1}^t h_j^2$ that is congruent to $f \pmod{I}$. In his paper “Semidefinite programs and combinatorial optimization”, Lovász asks to study this connection which motivated the work in this paper. We state the problem in the language of Definition 1.1.

Problem 1.2. [12, Problem 8.3] *Which ideals in $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ are $(1, 1)$ -sos? How about $(1, k)$ -sos?*

Lovász was motivated by a property of perfect graphs to ask Problem 1.2. 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 . Recall that given a set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, its *vanishing ideal* in $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ is the ideal $\mathcal{I}(S) := \{f \in \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}] : f(\mathbf{s}) = 0 \forall \mathbf{s} \in S\}$. The vanishing ideal of S_G is

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

Lovász recognized that G is perfect (in the graph theory sense) if and only if $\mathcal{I}(S_G)$ is $(1, 1)$ -sos. See Section 3 for more details.

Problem 1.2 suggests the following hierarchy of nested closed convex sets that contain $\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I))$ and thus approximate it from outside.

Definition 1.3. (1) For a positive integer k , the k -th **theta body** of an ideal $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ is

$$\text{TH}_k(I) := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : f(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0 \text{ for every linear } f \text{ that is } k\text{-sos mod } I\}.$$

- (2) An ideal $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ is **TH $_k$ -exact** if the k -th theta body $\text{TH}_k(I)$ coincides with the closure of $\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I))$.

- (3) The **theta-rank** of I is the smallest k such that $\text{TH}_k(I)$ coincides with $\text{cl}(\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I)))$.

Example 1.4. Consider the principal ideal $I = \langle x^2 y - 1 \rangle \subset \mathbb{R}[x, y]$. Then $\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I)) = \{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : p_2 > 0\}$, and any linear polynomial that is non-negative over $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I)$ is of the form $\alpha + \beta y$, where $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$. Since $\alpha y + \beta \equiv (\sqrt{\alpha x y})^2 + (\sqrt{\beta})^2 \pmod{I}$, I is $(1, 2)$ -sos and TH_2 -exact.

By definition, $\text{TH}_1(I) \supseteq \text{TH}_2(I) \supseteq \dots \supseteq \text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I))$. As seen in Example 1.4, $\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I))$ may not always be closed and so the theta-body sequence of I can converge, if at all, only to the closure of $\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I))$.

It is easy to see that if an ideal $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ has the algebraic property of being $(1, k)$ -sos then it has the geometric property of being TH_k -exact. Indeed, if I is $(1, k)$ -sos then any supporting linear inequality of $\text{cl}(\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I)))$ is k -sos mod I which implies that $\text{TH}_k(I) \subseteq \text{cl}(\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I)))$. But since the reverse inclusion is always true, we get $\text{cl}(\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I))) = \text{TH}_k(I)$. On the other hand, if I is TH_k -exact, it need not be $(1, k)$ -sos as we now show.

Example 1.5. Consider $I = \langle x^2 \rangle \subset \mathbb{R}[x]$. Then $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I)$ is the origin. All linear polynomials that are non-negative mod I are of the form $\pm a^2 x + b^2$ for some $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$. If $b \neq 0$, then $(\pm a^2 x + b^2) \equiv (\frac{a^2}{2b} x \pm b)^2 \pmod{I}$. However, $\pm x$ is not a sum of squares mod I , and hence I is not $(1, k)$ -sos for any k . On the other hand, I is TH_1 -exact since $\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I))$ is cut out by the infinitely many linear inequalities of the form $\pm x + b^2 \geq 0$ as b varies.

In Proposition 2.8 we prove that if I is *real radical* then I is $(1, k)$ -sos if and only if it is TH_k -exact. The definitions are below. Real radical ideals occur quite often in practise especially in combinatorial optimization.

Definition 1.6. Let I be an ideal in $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$. 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 its **complex variety** $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(I) := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^n : f(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \forall f \in I\}$ is finite.

Hilbert's Nullstellensatz states that for an ideal $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$, $\sqrt{I} = \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(I))$ 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 [14, Appendix 2].

In Section 2 we establish the connection between the theta body sequence of an ideal I and 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 closure of the projection of a *spectrahedron* (feasible region of a semidefinite program) which allows them to be represented usefully for optimization. Several situations in which the theta body sequence of an ideal I is guaranteed to converge to the closure of $\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I))$ are indicated. We also show that theta bodies can be computed explicitly using the *combinatorial moment matrices* introduced by Laurent.

By Proposition 2.8, a real radical ideal $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ is $(1, 1)$ -sos if and only if $\text{TH}_1(I)$, the first theta body of I , equals $\text{cl}(\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I)))$. When S_G is the set of characteristic vectors of stable sets of a graph G , $\text{TH}_1(\mathcal{I}(S_G))$ is precisely *Lovász's theta body of G* and the equality of this theta body with $\text{conv}(S_G)$ yields the only known polynomial time algorithm for the stable set problem in perfect graphs. Thus, our theta bodies generalize the theta body of a graph to a hierarchy of approximations for any real variety. In Section 3 we describe the theta body sequence for the maximum stable set problem and two different formulations of the max cut problem on a graph.

In Section 4 we focus on vanishing ideals of finite sets in \mathbb{R}^n which are all real radical ideals. 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 $\mathcal{I}(S) = \bigcap_{i=1}^t \langle x_1 - s_{i1}, \dots, x_n - s_{in} \rangle$. An important

source of finite sets is combinatorial optimization where S is typically a subset of $\{0, 1\}^n$ (the set of feasible solutions to a combinatorial optimization problem). Theorem 4.2 characterizes finite sets with TH_1 -exact (equivalently, $(1, 1)$ -sos) vanishing ideals via four equivalent conditions, answering Lovász’s question for such ideals. Several corollaries follow from this structure theorem. Such a finite set in \mathbb{R}^n is affinely equivalent to a subset of $\{0, 1\}^n$ (Corollary 4.5) and its convex hull can have at most 2^n facets (Theorem 4.7). If S is the vertex set of a down-closed 0/1-polytope in \mathbb{R}^n , then $\mathcal{I}(S)$ is $(1, 1)$ -sos if and only if $\text{conv}(S)$ is the stable set polytope of a perfect graph (Theorem 4.10 and Corollary 4.11). 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.

Acknowledgments. We thank Monique Laurent for several valuable comments and corrections on the first version of this paper, and for hosting João Gouveia at CWI for two weeks while this work was in progress. We also thank Ting Kei Pong for useful inputs.

2. THETA BODIES

In Definition 1.3 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 closed convex relaxations of $\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I))$ with $\text{TH}_k(I) \supseteq \text{TH}_{k+1}(I) \supseteq \text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I))$. The main 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 particular, Lasserre [3] and Parrilo [15, 17] have independently introduced hierarchies of semidefinite relaxations for polynomial optimization over basic semialgebraic sets in \mathbb{R}^n using results from real algebraic geometry and the theory of moments. In Corollary 2.6 we prove that $\text{TH}_k(I)$ is, up to closure, 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 follows from a basis-free formulation of Lasserre’s relaxations in Theorem 2.5. We adopt the point of view in [14] of Lasserre’s method to prove our results. Proposition 2.8 shows that if I is real radical then being $(1, k)$ -sos is equivalent to being TH_k -exact. Real radical ideals play an important role in Section 4. Using results in the literature we point out several situations in which the theta body sequence of an ideal I is guaranteed to converge to $\text{cl}(\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I)))$. We also show how theta bodies can be handled computationally, by directly computing SOS decompositions in the quotient ring $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I$ [18], or dually, by 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 symmetric bilinear 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 symmetric bilinear 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 [14], we define a 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 on $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I$ 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 $y^{\mathbf{p}} \in (\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I)^*$ defined as $y^{\mathbf{p}}(f + I) := f(\mathbf{p})$. Then $y^{\mathbf{p}} \in \mathcal{M}_{I,k}(G)^\circ$ and $y^{\mathbf{p}}(1 + I) = 1$. Therefore, $\pi_I(y^{\mathbf{p}}) = \mathbf{p} \in Q_{I,k}(G)$ for all k , and $\text{conv}(\mathcal{F}) \subseteq Q_{I,k}(G)$ since $Q_{I,k}(G)$ is convex. Since $Q_{I,k+1}(G) \subseteq Q_{I,k}(G)$, these bodies create a nested sequence of relaxations of $\text{conv}(\mathcal{F})$.

We remark that the relaxations in Definition 2.3 are different, but similar, to those in [3, 4]. The main difference is that they are calculated using the truncated quadratic module $\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(G)$ (or dually, by looking at sum of squares over the quotient ring $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I$), and not just via the (generally much smaller) set generated by considering bounded-degree $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ -linear combinations of generators of the ideal, as in the “standard” Lasserre relaxations.

Despite these differences, often the definitions are equivalent, up to an index shift. For instance, when $I = \{0\}$ our definition is equivalent to the original definition by Lasserre in [3], while the case $I = \langle x_i^2 - x_i : i = 1, \dots, n \rangle$ gives the hierarchy for 0/1-polytopes in [4]. A similar situation arises whenever we have a “good” set of generators for the ideal such as a Gröbner basis with respect to a total degree ordering.

The bilinear 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 $y(g_i h^2 + I) \geq 0$ for all $h \in \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ 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 (as in Definition 2.3), we establish a direct definition of the closure of $Q_{I,k}(G)$ as a set in \mathbb{R}^n instead of as a projection. Example 2.12 will show that $Q_{I,k}(G)$ need not be closed.

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

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

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

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

Since the set on the right side of the equation asserted in the theorem is closed, we get that $\text{cl}(Q_{I,k}(G))$ is contained in it.

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_t 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 $f_1, \dots, f_t, h_1, \dots, h_s$ 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

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

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 $i = 1, \dots, t$, $f_i + I = -f_i + I = I \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{I,k}(G)$, we must have $f_i(\mathbf{p}) = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, t$. 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 $g(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^t \alpha_i f_i(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^s \beta_i h_i(\mathbf{x})$ for some constants α_i, β_i , and

$$y(g + I) = \sum_{i=1}^s \beta_i h_i(\mathbf{p}) = g(\mathbf{p}).$$

In particular, $\pi_I(y) = \mathbf{p}$, $y(1 + I) = 1$, and for all linear polynomials g such that $g + I \in \mathcal{M}_{I,k}(G)$, $y(g + I) = g(\mathbf{p}) \geq 0$. Therefore, $\mathbf{p} = \pi_I(y)$ belongs to

$$\begin{aligned} & \pi_I[(\{g \text{ linear}\} \cap \mathcal{M}_{I,k}(G))^\circ \cap \{y \in (\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I)^* : y(1 + I) = 1\}] \\ &= \pi_I[(\text{cl}(\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(G)^\circ + \{g \text{ linear}\}^\perp) \cap \{y \in (\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I)^* : y(1 + I) = 1\})] \\ &\subseteq \text{cl}(\pi_I[(\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(G)^\circ + \{g \text{ linear}\}^\perp) \cap \{y \in (\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I)^* : y(1 + I) = 1\}]). \end{aligned}$$

Since, $\{g \text{ linear}\}^\perp$ lies in the kernel of π_I , we can conclude that \mathbf{p} lies in

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

□

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*

- (1) $\text{TH}_k(I) = \text{cl}(Q_{I,k}(\emptyset))$, and
- (2) *if there is a linear polynomial g such that $g + I$ is in the interior of $\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(G)$ then $\text{TH}_k(I) = Q_{I,k}(\emptyset)$.*

Proof: The first statement follows directly from Theorem 2.5. For the second assertion, if the hypothesis is true, then at the end of the proof of Theorem 2.5 we can conclude that $\mathbf{p} \in Q_{I,k}(G)$ as opposed to $\text{cl}(Q_{I,k}(G))$ using the fact that $(\{g \text{ linear}\} \cap \mathcal{M}_{I,k}(G))^\circ = \mathcal{M}_{I,k}(G)^\circ + \{g \text{ linear}\}^\perp$. □

Recall that whenever I is $(1, k)$ -sos for some finite k then I is TH_k -exact which by definition means that $\text{TH}_k(I) = \text{cl}(\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I)))$. The converse implication can be false as in the ideal $I = \langle x^2 \rangle$ (Example 1.5) which is TH_1 -exact but not $(1, k)$ -sos for any k . We now prove that if I is real radical, then being TH_k -exact is equivalent to being $(1, k)$ -sos. The following lemma, which is an immediate corollary of Proposition 2.6 in [19], will be used.

Lemma 2.7. *If $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ is a real radical ideal then $\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(\emptyset) \subseteq \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I$ is closed for all positive integers k .*

Proposition 2.8. *If $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ is a real radical ideal then I is $(1, k)$ -sos if and only if I is TH_k -exact.*

Proof: If I is $(1, k)$ -sos, then any supporting linear inequality of $\text{cl}(\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I)))$ is k -sos mod I which implies that $\text{TH}_k(I) \subseteq \text{cl}(\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I)))$. But since the reverse inclusion is always true, we get $\text{cl}(\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I))) = \text{TH}_k(I)$.

Now suppose I is TH_k -exact and f is a linear polynomial that is non-negative mod I . We have to prove that $f \in \mathcal{M}_{I,k}(\emptyset)$. Since $f(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I)$, we get $f(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \text{cl}(\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I))) = \text{TH}_k(I) = \text{cl}(Q_{I,k}(\emptyset)) = \text{cl}(\pi_I(\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(\emptyset)^\circ \cap \{y \in (\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I)^* : y(1+I) = 1\}))$. This implies that if $y \in \mathcal{M}_{I,k}(\emptyset)^\circ \cap \{y : y(1+I) = 1\}$, then $y(f) = f(\pi_I(y)) \geq 0$. Therefore, $f \in (\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(\emptyset)^\circ \cap \{y : y(1+I) = 1\})^\circ$. The result then follows from the following assertions:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(\emptyset)^\circ \cap \{y : y(1+I) = 1\})^\circ \\ \stackrel{(1)}{=} & (\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(\emptyset)^\circ \cap \{y : y(1+I) > 0\})^\circ \\ \stackrel{(2)}{=} & (\text{cl}(\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(\emptyset)^\circ \cap \{y : y(1+I) > 0\}))^\circ \\ \stackrel{(3)}{=} & (\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(\emptyset)^\circ \cap \text{cl}(\{y : y(1+I) > 0\}))^\circ \\ \stackrel{(4)}{=} & \mathcal{M}_{I,k}(\emptyset) + (\text{cl}(\{y : y(1+I) > 0\}))^\circ \\ \stackrel{(5)}{=} & \mathcal{M}_{I,k}(\emptyset). \end{aligned}$$

The equality (1) is straightforward to check, and (2) holds since the polar of a set equals the polar of its closure.

To prove (3), we first note that $\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(\emptyset)^\circ \cap \{y : y(1+I) > 0\} \neq \emptyset$ since if we pick $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I)$ and $y \in (\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I)^*$ such that $y(g+I) := g(\mathbf{p})$ then y lies in $\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(\emptyset)^\circ \cap \{y : y(1+I) > 0\}$. Since $\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(\emptyset)^\circ$ is closed, we have

$$\text{cl}(\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(\emptyset)^\circ \cap \text{cl}(\{y : y(1+I) > 0\})) = \mathcal{M}_{I,k}(\emptyset)^\circ \cap \text{cl}(\{y : y(1+I) > 0\}).$$

Therefore, to justify (3), it suffices to prove that

$$\text{cl}(\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(\emptyset)^\circ \cap \{y : y(1+I) > 0\}) = \text{cl}(\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(\emptyset)^\circ) \cap \text{cl}(\{y : y(1+I) > 0\})$$

whenever $\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(\emptyset)^\circ \cap \{y : y(1+I) > 0\} \neq \emptyset$. The set on the left is contained in the set on the right so we just need to prove the reverse containment. Pick y_0 in $\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(\emptyset)^\circ \cap \{y : y(1+I) > 0\}$ which we know is not empty, and y in $\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(\emptyset)^\circ \cap \text{cl}(\{y : y(1+I) > 0\})$. Then $\epsilon y_0 + (1-\epsilon)y \in \mathcal{M}_{I,k}(\emptyset)^\circ \cap \{y : y(1+I) > 0\}$ for all $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ which implies that y lies in $\text{cl}(\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(\emptyset)^\circ \cap \{y : y(1+I) > 0\})$.

By Lemma 2.7, $\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(\emptyset)$ is closed when I is real radical. Then (4) is a standard duality result for closed cones.

To prove (5) we will argue that $(\text{cl}(\{y : y(1+I) > 0\}))^\circ = (\{y : y(1+I) > 0\})^\circ$ is just the set of non-negative real numbers. If $c \geq 0$, then $y(c+I) = cy(1+I) \geq 0$ whenever $y(1+I) > 0$. Conversely, suppose $f = c_0 + \sum c_j x_j$ is a linear polynomial such that $y(f+I) = c_0 y(1+I) + \sum c_j y(x_j+I) \geq 0$ whenever $y(1+I) > 0$. If some c_j is nonzero then pick y' such that $y'(1) = 1$, $y'(x_j) + I = -\frac{(c_0+1)}{c_j}$ and $y'(x_i+I) = 0$ for all $i \neq 0$. Then $y'(f+I) = -1$ contradicting the assumption. So all c_j are zero, and $y'(f+I) = c_0$ implies c_0 to be a positive number as intended. \square

We close this subsection with a brief discussion of several instances in which the sequence of theta bodies of an ideal $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ is guaranteed to converge (finitely or otherwise) to the closure of $\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I))$.

- (1) If $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I)$ is finite, equivalently, the real radical of I is zero-dimensional, then the results in [5] imply that I is TH_k -exact for some finite k .
 - (a) In particular, zero-dimensional ideals are TH_k -exact for finite k . It will follow from Section 2.2 that k can be bounded above by the maximum degree of a linear basis of $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I$. However, as in $I = \langle x^2 \rangle$, we cannot guarantee that I is $(1, k)$ -sos for any k even when I is zero-dimensional.
 - (b) If I is zero-dimensional and radical then in fact, I is $(1, k)$ -sos for finite k . Parrilo proved that if I is a zero-dimensional radical ideal and f is any polynomial, then $f \geq 0 \pmod I$ if and only if f is sos mod I [16], [9, 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 $|\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(I)| - 1$, I is $(1, k)$ -sos for $k \leq |\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(I)| - 1$. Better bounds follow from Proposition 4.3 in some instances.
- (2) If $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I)$ is compact, Schmüdgen's Positivstellensatz [14, Chapter 3] implies that the theta body sequence of I converges (perhaps not finitely) to $\text{cl}(\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I)))$. When a compact $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I)$ satisfies certain additional smoothness and curvature conditions, results of Helton and Nie [2] guarantee that I is TH_k -exact for finite k .
- (3) Scheiderer [14, Chapter 2] has identified several instances of ideals I with $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I)$ not necessarily compact but of dimension at most two for which every $f \geq 0 \pmod I$ is sos mod I . In all these cases, the theta body sequence of I converges to $\text{cl}(\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I)))$.

The results of Schmüdgen and Scheiderer mentioned above fit within a general framework in real algebraic geometry that is concerned with when an arbitrary polynomial f that is positive or non-negative over a basic semi-algebraic set can be written as a sum of squares modulo certain algebraic objects defined by the set. We only care about real varieties and whether linear polynomials that are non-negative over them are sos mod their ideals. Therefore, it is natural that there are ideals I that are TH_k -exact or $(1, k)$ -sos for which there are non-linear polynomials f such that $f \geq 0 \pmod I$ but f is not sos mod I . For instance, the proof of Theorem 5.6 implies that the ideal $J_n := \langle \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 - 1 \rangle$ is $(1, 1)$ -sos for all n , but a result of Scheiderer [14, Theorem 2.6.3] implies that when $n \geq 4$, there is always some $f \geq 0 \pmod J_n$ (necessarily of degree at least two) that is not sos mod J_n .

2.2. Combinatorial moment matrices. For computations with theta bodies we must work with the truncated quadratic module $\mathcal{M}_{I,k}(\emptyset)$. This requires computing sum of squares decompositions over the quotient $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I$, as described in [18], or dually, using the combinatorial moment matrices introduced by Laurent in [8]. We describe the latter viewpoint here, as it

more directly connects with the theta bodies. 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 2.9. 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 \mathbf{y} indexed by \mathcal{B}_{2k} . These definitions allow a practical characterization of theta bodies, up to closure.

Theorem 2.10. For each positive integer k ,

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

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

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

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

Corollary 2.11. If $\mathcal{B}_1 = \{1 + I, x_1 + I, \dots, x_n + I\}$ and the first $n + 1$ coordinates of a $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{B}_{2k}}$ are denoted y_0, y_1, \dots, y_n , then

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

Example 2.12. Consider again the ideal $I = \langle x^2y - 1 \rangle \subset \mathbb{R}[x, y]$ from Example 1.4. We saw that $\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I)) = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : y > 0\}$ was not closed but $\text{TH}_2(I) = \text{cl}(\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I))) = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : y \geq 0\}$ and I was $(1, 2)$ -sos. Note that $\mathcal{B} = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \{x^k + I, y^k + I, xy^k + I\}$ is a degree-compatible monomial basis for $\mathbb{R}[x, y]/I$ for which

$$\mathcal{B}_4 = \{1, x, y, x^2, xy, y^2, x^3, xy^2, y^3, x^4, xy^3, y^4\} + I.$$

The combinatorial moment matrix $M_{\mathcal{B}_2}(\mathbf{y})$ for $\mathbf{y} = (1, y_1, \dots, y_{11}) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{B}_4}$ is

$$\begin{array}{c} 1 \quad x \quad y \quad x^2 \quad xy \quad y^2 \\ \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ x \\ y \\ x^2 \\ xy \\ y^2 \end{array} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & y_1 & y_2 & y_3 & y_4 & y_5 \\ y_1 & y_3 & y_4 & y_6 & 1 & y_7 \\ y_2 & y_4 & y_5 & 1 & y_7 & y_8 \\ y_3 & y_6 & 1 & y_9 & y_1 & y_2 \\ y_4 & 1 & y_7 & y_1 & y_2 & y_{10} \\ y_5 & y_7 & y_8 & y_2 & y_{10} & y_{11} \end{pmatrix} \end{array}$$

If $M_{\mathcal{B}_2}(\mathbf{y}) \succeq 0$, then the principal minor indexed by x and xy is non-negative which implies that $y_2y_3 \geq 1$ and so in particular, $y_2 \neq 0$ for all $\mathbf{y} \in Q_{I,2}(\emptyset)$. However, since $Q_{I,2}(\emptyset) \supseteq \text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I)) = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : y > 0\}$, it must be that $Q_{I,2}(\emptyset) = \text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I))$ which shows that $Q_{I,2}(\emptyset) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is not closed.

This example can be modified to show that Lasserre relaxations may not be closed even if $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I)$ is finite and hence $\text{conv}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(I))$ is a polytope. To see this, choose sufficiently many pairs of points $(\pm t, 1/t^2)$ on the curve $x^2y = 1$ to form a set S such that the $\mathcal{I}(S)$ has a monomial basis \mathcal{B}' in which \mathcal{B}'_4 equals the \mathcal{B}_4 from above. For instance, $S = \{(\pm t, 1/t^2) : t = 1, \dots, 7\}$ will work. Then $Q_{\mathcal{I}(S),2}(\emptyset)$ coincides with $Q_{I,2}(\emptyset)$ computed above and so is not a closed set. However, $\text{conv}(S)$ is a polytope.

In the particular case of vanishing ideals of 0/1 vectors, the most common setting for combinatorial optimization, the following proposition shows that theta bodies coincide with Lasserre relaxations; closures are not needed.

Proposition 2.13. *If S is a set of 0/1 vectors in \mathbb{R}^n and $I = \mathcal{I}(S)$ then for all integers $k > 0$, $\text{TH}_k(I) = Q_{I,k}(\emptyset)$.*

Proof: By Corollary 2.6 it is enough to show that there is a linear polynomial $g \in \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ such that $g \equiv \mathbf{f}_k^t A \mathbf{f}_k \pmod{I}$ for a positive definite matrix A and some basis of $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I$ with respect to which \mathbf{f}_k was determined. Let \mathcal{B} be a monomial basis for $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I$ such that $\mathcal{B}_1 = \{1, x_1, \dots, x_m\} + I$ and $\mathcal{B}_k = \{1, x_1, \dots, x_m, p_1, \dots, p_l\} + I$. Let $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^{m+l}$ be the vector with the first m entries equal to one and the next l entries equal to -2 , and $D \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+l) \times (m+l)}$ be the diagonal matrix with the first m entries on the diagonal equal to one and the next l entries equal to four. Since $x_i^2 \equiv x_i \pmod{I}$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$ and \mathcal{B} is a monomial basis, for any $f + I \in \mathcal{B}$, $f \equiv f^2 \pmod{I}$

mod I . Therefore,

$$m + l + 1 + 3x_1 + \cdots + 3x_m \equiv \mathbf{f}_k^t \begin{bmatrix} m + l + 1 & \mathbf{c}^t \\ \mathbf{c} & D \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{f}_k \pmod{I},$$

so it is enough to prove that the square matrix in this representation is positive definite. But since D is clearly positive definite it is enough to note that its Schur complement $(m + l + 1) - \mathbf{c}^t D^{-1} \mathbf{c} = 1$ is positive. \square

3. COMBINATORIAL EXAMPLES

In this section, we compute theta bodies for some well known examples from combinatorial optimization.

3.1. Examples from simplicial complexes. Let Δ be an *abstract simplicial complex* with vertex set $[n]$ whose *faces* are recorded as subsets of $[n]$. The *Stanley-Reisner* ideal of Δ is the ideal J_Δ 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 . If $I_\Delta := J_\Delta + C$ 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 $\mathcal{B} := \{\mathbf{x}^T : T \in \Delta\} + I_\Delta$ is a basis for $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I_\Delta$ containing $1 + I_\Delta, x_1 + I_\Delta, \dots, x_n + I_\Delta$. Therefore, by Corollary 2.11 and Proposition 2.13,

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

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 the dimension of Δ is $d - 1$, then I_Δ is $(1, d)$ -sos and therefore, 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. Given an undirected finite graph $G = ([n], E)$, the maximum stable set problem is to find $\alpha(G)$, the size of the largest stable set in G . A set $U \subseteq [n]$ is *stable* if for every $i, j \in U$, $\{i, j\} \notin E$. 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

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

which is a real radical zero-dimensional ideal in $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$. The ideal I_G is I_Δ for the simplicial complex Δ of stable sets in G . Therefore, $\mathcal{B} := \{\mathbf{x}^U + I_G : U \text{ stable set in } G\}$ 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,

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

In [10] Lovász introduced a semidefinite relaxation, $\text{TH}(G)$, of $\text{STAB}(G)$, called the *theta body* of G [1, Chapter 9], and defined the *theta number* of G to be $\vartheta(G) := \max \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} x_i : \mathbf{x} \in \text{TH}(G) \right\}$ which approximates $\alpha(G)$. There are multiple descriptions of $\text{TH}(G)$, but the one in [13, Lemma 2.17], for instance, shows that $\text{TH}(G) = \text{TH}_1(I_G)$, which appears to have motivated Problem 1.2. The following theorem is well-known.

Theorem 3.1. [1, 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.

Corollary 3.2. *The following are equivalent for a graph G .*

- (1) G is perfect.
- (2) I_G is TH_1 -exact.
- (3) $I_{\overline{G}}$ is TH_1 -exact.

Since no monomial in the basis \mathcal{B} of $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]/I_G$ has degree larger than $\alpha(G)$, for any G , I_G is $(1, \alpha(G))$ -sos and $\text{STAB}(G) = \text{TH}_{\alpha(G)}(I_G)$. 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 the theta-rank of I_G is two.

Theorem 3.3. [21, Corollary 65.12a] *If $G = ([n], E)$ is an odd cycle with $n \geq 5$, then $\text{STAB}(G)$ is determined by the following inequalities:*

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

Proposition 3.4. *If G is an odd cycle with at least five vertices, then I_G is $(1, 2)$ -sos and therefore, TH_2 -exact.*

Proof: Let $n = 2k+1$ and G be an n -cycle. Then $I_G = \langle x_i^2 - x_i, x_i x_{i+1} \mid \forall i \in [n] \rangle$ 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 $(1, 2)$ -sos 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 . \square

The above proof uses the inference rules outlined by Lovász in [11] which yields more examples. Schoenebeck [20] has recently shown that there is no constant k such that $\text{STAB}(G) = \text{TH}_k(I_G)$ for all graphs G (as expected, unless $\text{P}=\text{NP}$). A construction remains open.

The Lasserre 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

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

Then $\text{conv}(\text{FRAC}(G) \cap \{0, 1\}^n) = \text{STAB}(G)$. As before, let $C := \langle x_i^2 - x_i : i \in [n] \rangle$ and let $H := \{x_i \mid \forall i \in [n], 1 - x_i - x_j \geq 0 \mid \{i, j\} \in E\}$. 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. In [8], Laurent proves that the usual Lasserre hierarchy is exactly our theta body hierarchy for the stable set problem.

3.1.2. Cuts in graphs. Given an undirected graph $G = ([n], E)$ and a partition of its vertex set $[n]$ into two parts V_1 and V_2 , the set of edges $\{i, j\} \in E$ such that exactly one of i or j is in V_1 and the other in V_2 is the *cut* in

G induced by V_1, V_2 . The cuts in G are in bijection with the 2^{n-1} distinct partitions of $[n]$ into two sets. Let

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

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

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

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

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

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 3.5. *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 , the theta-rank of $\mathcal{I}(SG)$ bounded above by the size of the max cut in G . We state some related observations.

Proposition 3.6. *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 $(2m+1)$ -cycle then in fact, $\text{TH}_1(\mathcal{I}(SG)) = \text{TH}_2(\mathcal{I}(SG)) = \dots = \text{TH}_m(\mathcal{I}(SG))$ is the unit cube in \mathbb{R}^E even though $\text{TH}_m(\mathcal{I}(SG)) \neq \text{conv}(SG)$. Therefore, the k -th theta body need not strictly contain the $(k+1)$ -th body 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. Only an outline of the results are described here. Proofs and further details will appear in a forthcoming paper with Monique Laurent.

Consider a connected undirected graph $G = ([n], E)$ and its 2^{n-1} cuts. Each cut C is recorded by its *cut vector* $\chi^C \in \{\pm 1\}^E$ with $\chi_{\{i,j\}}^C = 1$ if $\{i,j\} \notin C$ and $\chi_{\{i,j\}}^C = -1$ if $\{i,j\} \in C$. Let E_n denote the edge set of the complete graph K_n , and π_G be the natural projection map from \mathbb{R}^{E_n} to \mathbb{R}^E . The *cut polytope* of G is

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

and the weighted max cut problem can 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 $w_{\{i,j\}}$.

Definition 3.7. Let $G = ([n], E)$ be an undirected graph, $T \subseteq [n]$ have even cardinality and $F \subseteq E$. Then F is called a **T -join** if T is exactly the set of vertices of odd-degree in the subgraph of G induced by F .

Let $\mathbb{R}G := \mathbb{R}[x_{\{i,j\}} : \{i,j\} \in E]$ and $IG \subseteq \mathbb{R}G$ be the vanishing ideal of the cut vectors in G . Identify a subgraph F of G with its set of edges $E(F) \subseteq E$. For a subgraph F in G , let \mathbf{x}^F denote the squarefree monomial

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

Theorem 3.8. *For an even subset $T \subseteq [n]$, let F_T be any T -join in G and let $\mathcal{B} := \{\mathbf{x}^{F_T} + IG : T \subseteq [n], |T| \text{ even}\}$. Then \mathcal{B} is a basis of $\mathbb{R}G/IG$.*

Set \mathcal{B} to be a basis as in Theorem 3.8 with the additional stipulation that for each $T \subseteq [n]$ of even cardinality, the T -join F_T chosen to represent a coset in \mathcal{B} is one with smallest number of edges among all T -joins in G .

Example 3.9. For the complete graph K_n , \mathcal{B} could be chosen 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 $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_{2t} \leq n$.

As usual, we denote by \mathcal{B}_k the subset of all monomials in \mathcal{B} of degree at most k . Identify the monomial coset $\mathbf{x}^{F_T} + IG$ with the underlying set T . Then the k -th theta body of IG is

$$\text{TH}_k(IG) = \left\{ \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^E : \begin{array}{l} \exists M \succeq 0, M \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{B}_k| \times |\mathcal{B}_k|} \text{ such that} \\ M_{T,T} = 1 \ \forall T \in \mathcal{B}_k, \\ M_{e,\emptyset} = y_e \ \forall e \in E \\ M_{T,T'} = M_{R,R'} \text{ if } T\Delta T' = R\Delta R' \end{array} \right\}.$$

In particular,

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

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. For $G = ([n], E)$, she defines $Q_t(G) := \pi_G(Q_t(K_n))$ which is a stronger relaxation of $\text{CUT}(G)$ than $\text{TH}_k(IG)$. However, $\text{TH}_k(IG)$ can be much simpler than $Q_{2k-1}(G)$ and often use much smaller matrices in their definition.

4. VANISHING IDEALS OF FINITE SETS OF POINTS

Recall that when $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is finite, its vanishing ideal $\mathcal{I}(S)$ is zero-dimensional and real radical.

Definition 4.1. We say that a finite set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is *exact* if its vanishing ideal $\mathcal{I}(S) \subseteq \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ is TH_1 -exact.

Theorem 4.2 answers Problem 1.2 for vanishing ideals of finite sets.

Theorem 4.2. *For a finite set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, the following are equivalent.*

- (1) S is exact.
- (2) $\mathcal{I}(S)$ is $(1, 1)$ -sos.
- (3) 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 $\mathcal{I}(S)$.
- (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 $\mathcal{I}(S)$.
- (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 $\text{conv}(S)$ is closed, by Proposition 2.8, (1) \Leftrightarrow (2).

If (2) holds then for every linear inequality $g(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ that is valid on $\text{conv}(S)$, $g \geq 0 \text{ mod } \mathcal{I}(S)$, and so g is 1-sos mod $\mathcal{I}(S)$. Since S is finite, $\text{conv}(S)$ has a finite linear inequality description and therefore, (2) implies (3). Now suppose (3) holds. Then since every linear inequality $g(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ valid on $\text{conv}(S)$ is a non-negative linear combination of the finitely many inequalities describing $\text{conv}(S)$, (3) implies (2).

Suppose (3) 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 $g \equiv h_1^2 + \dots + h_l^2 \text{ mod } \mathcal{I}(S)$.

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 $\pmod{\mathcal{I}(S)}$, all linear polynomials can be assumed to define hyperplanes whose normal vectors are parallel to the affine span of S , the proof still holds. Therefore, (3) implies (4). Conversely, since if $g \equiv g^2 \pmod{\mathcal{I}(S)}$ then g is 1-sos $\pmod{\mathcal{I}(S)}$, (4) implies (3).

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

Recall from the end of Section 2.1 that by results of Parrilo, if $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ is a zero-dimensional radical ideal, then the theta-rank of I is at most $|\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(I)| - 1$. Better upper bounds can be derived using the following extension of Parrilo's theorem whose proof is similar.

Proposition 4.3. *Suppose $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a finite point set such that for each facet F of $\text{conv}(S)$ there is a hyperplane H_F such that $H_F \cap \text{conv}(S) = F$ and S is contained in at most $t + 1$ parallel translates of H_F . Then $\mathcal{I}(S)$ is TH_t -exact.*

Remark 4.4. The theta-rank of $\mathcal{I}(S)$ could be much smaller than the upper bound in Proposition 4.3. 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 $\sum_{i \in [n]} x_i = t$. However, Proposition 3.4 shows that $\mathcal{I}(S_G)$ is TH_2 -exact.

In the rest of this section we derive various consequences of Theorem 4.2. Finite point sets with property (5) in Theorem 4.2 have been studied in various contexts. In particular, Corollaries 4.5, 4.9 and 4.11 below were also observed independently by Greg Kuperberg, Raman Sanyal, Axel Werner and Günter Ziegler (personal communication). In their work, $\text{conv}(S)$ is called a **2-level polytope** when property (5) in Theorem 4.2 holds.

If S is a finite subset of \mathbb{Z}^n and \mathcal{L} is the smallest lattice in \mathbb{Z}^n containing S , then the lattice polytope $\text{conv}(S)$ is said to be **compressed** if every *reverse lexicographic* triangulation of the lattice points in $\text{conv}(S)$ is *unimodular* with respect to \mathcal{L} . Compressed polytopes were introduced by Stanley [22]. Corollary 4.5 (4) and Theorem 2.4 in [23] (see also the references after Theorem 2.4 in [23] for earlier citations of part or unpublished versions of this result), imply that a finite set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is exact if and only if $\text{conv}(S)$ is affinely equivalent to a compressed polytope.

Corollary 4.5. *Let $S, S' \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be exact sets. Then*

- (1) *all points of S are vertices of $\text{conv}(S)$,*




FIGURE 1. Convex hulls of exact 0/1 point sets in \mathbb{R}^3 .




FIGURE 2. Convex hulls of non-exact 0/1 point sets in \mathbb{R}^3 .

- (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 4.2 (5). If the dimension of $\text{conv}(S)$ is d ($\leq n$), then $\text{conv}(S)$ has at least d non-parallel facets. If $\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{x} \geq b$ cuts out a facet in this collection, then $\text{conv}(S)$ is supported by both $\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{x} = b\}$ and a parallel translate of it. Taking these two parallel hyperplanes from each of the d facets gives a parallelepiped. By Theorem 4.2, S is contained in the vertices of this parallelepiped intersected with the affine hull of S . This proves (4). \square

By Corollary 4.5 (4), 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.

Example 4.6. The vertices of the following 0/1-polytopes in \mathbb{R}^n are exact for every n : (1) hypercubes, (2) (regular) cross polytopes, (3) hypersimplices (includes simplices), (4) joins of 2-level polytopes, and (5) stable set polytopes of perfect graphs on n vertices.

Theorem 4.7. *If S 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 4.5 and is achieved by $[0, 1]^d$.

For a polytope P with an exact 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, there exists a linear form $h_{F_1, F_2}(\mathbf{x})$ such that $h_{F_1, F_2}(F_1) = 0$ and $h_{F_1, F_2}(F_2) = 1$. We will show that if $\dim P = d$ then P has at most $2^d - 1$ face pairs and 2^d facets.

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 with exact vertex sets and consider a d -polytope P with exact vertex set S . Let F be a facet of P which by Theorem 4.2, 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 4.5, 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} . Suppose (F_1, F_2) is induced by a face pair of P with associated linear form $H(\mathbf{x})$. Since H and h_{F_1, F_2} agree on every vertex of F , a facet of P , $H(\mathbf{x}) = h_{F_1, F_2}(x_1, \dots, x_{d-1}) + cx_d$ for some constant c .

If $h_{F_1, F_2}(x_1, \dots, x_{d-1})$ takes the same value v on all of F' , then $H(F') = v + c = 0$ or 1 which implies that $c = -v$ or $c = 1 - v$. The two possibilities lead to the face pairs $(\text{conv}(F_1 \cup F'), F_2)$ and $(\text{conv}(F_2 \cup F'), F_1)$ of P . 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 these values must be v and $v + 1$ for some v since H takes values 0 and 1 on the vertices of F' . 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

Remark 4.8. Günter Ziegler has pointed out that our proof of Theorem 4.7 can be refined to yield that P (as used above) has $2^d - 1$ face pairs if and only if it is a simplex and 2^d facets if and only if it is a regular cross-polytope.

Recall that Problem 1.2 was inspired by perfect graphs. Theorem 4.2 adds to the characterizations of perfect graphs in Corollary 3.2 as follows.

Corollary 4.9. *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 stable set polytope, $\text{STAB}(G)$, is a 2-level polytope.*

A polytope P in $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ is said to be **down-closed** if whenever $\mathbf{v} \in P$ and $\mathbf{v}' \leq \mathbf{v}$ then $\mathbf{v}' \in P$. For a graph G , $\text{STAB}(G)$ is a down-closed 0/1-polytope, and G is perfect if and only if the vertex set of $\text{STAB}(G)$ is exact. We now

prove that all down-closed 0/1-polytopes with exact vertex sets are stable set polytopes of perfect graphs.

Theorem 4.10. *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 $\{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n\}$.

If all facets of P are of the stated form, using that $S \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$, it is straight forward to check that 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 4.11. *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 4.9 we only need to prove the “only-if” direction. Suppose S is exact. Then by Theorem 4.10, 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, G is perfect by [1, Theorem 9.2.4 iii.]. \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 $f(\mathbf{x}) \equiv g(\mathbf{x}) \pmod{I}$ for some 1-sos $g(\mathbf{x})$ and $g(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}) \in I$ 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 an ideal $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$, $\text{TH}_1(I) = \bigcap \text{TH}_1(\langle F \rangle)$, 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 $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(F)$. 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 $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{R}}(F)$ 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 $\mathbf{x}_0 = 0$, 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

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

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.

Example 5.8. 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 ,

$$\lambda(x^2 - x) + (1 - \lambda)(y^2 - y) - \frac{1}{2}xy \leq 0.$$




FIGURE 3. Example 5.8

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

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}\right) (x^2 - x) + \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}\right) (y^2 - y) - \frac{1}{2}xy \leq 0,$$

and

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}\right) (x^2 - x) + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}\right) (y^2 - y) - \frac{1}{2}xy \leq 0.$$

But this is just the intersection of the convex hull of the two curves obtained by turning the inequalities into equalities. Figure 3 shows this intersection.

REFERENCES

- [1] Martin Grötschel, László Lovász, and Alexander Schrijver. *Geometric algorithms and combinatorial optimization*, volume 2 of *Algorithms and Combinatorics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 1993.
- [2] J. William Helton and Jiawang Nie. Sufficient and necessary conditions for semidefinite representability of convex hulls and sets. arXiv:0709.4017v3 [math.OC], 2007.
- [3] Jean B. Lasserre. Global optimization with polynomials and the problem of moments. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 11(3):796–817, 2001.
- [4] Jean B. Lasserre. An explicit equivalent positive semidefinite program for nonlinear 0-1 programs. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 12(3):756–769, 2002.
- [5] Jean Bernard Lasserre, Monique Laurent, and Philipp Rostalski. Semidefinite characterization and computation of zero-dimensional real radical ideals. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 8(5):607–647, 2008.
- [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] Monique Laurent. Sums of squares, moment matrices and optimization over polynomials. In *Emerging Applications of Algebraic Geometry*, volume 149 of *IMA Volumes in Mathematics and its Applications*. Springer, 2009.

- [10] László Lovász. On the Shannon capacity of a graph. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 25(1):1–7, 1979.
- [11] László Lovász. Stable sets and polynomials. *Discrete Math.*, 124(1-3):137–153, 1994. Graphs and combinatorics (Qawra, 1990).
- [12] 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.
- [13] László Lovász and Alexander Schrijver. Cones of matrices and set-functions and 0-1 optimization. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 1(2):166–190, 1991.
- [14] Murray Marshall. *Positive polynomials and sums of squares*, volume 146 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Math Society, Providence, RI, 2008.
- [15] Pablo A. Parrilo. *Structured semidefinite programs and semialgebraic geometry methods in robustness and optimization*. PhD thesis, California Institute of Technology, May 2000. Available at <http://resolver.caltech.edu/CaltechETD:etd-05062004-055516>.
- [16] Pablo A. Parrilo. An explicit construction of distinguished representations of polynomials nonnegative over finite sets. IfA Tech. Report AUT02-02, ETH Zurich, 2002.
- [17] Pablo A. Parrilo. Semidefinite programming relaxations for semialgebraic problems. *Math. Prog.*, 96(2, Ser. B):293–320, 2003.
- [18] Pablo A. Parrilo. Exploiting algebraic structure in sum of squares programs. In D. Henrion and A. Garulli, editors, *Positive Polynomials in Control*, volume 312 of *Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences*. Springer, 2005.
- [19] Victoria Powers and Claus Scheiderer. The moment problem for non-compact semi-algebraic sets. *Adv. Geom.*, 1(1):71–88, 2001.
- [20] Grant Schoenebeck. Linear level lasserre lower bounds for certain k-csp. In *FOCS*, pages 593–602. IEEE Computer Society, 2008.
- [21] 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.
- [22] Richard P. Stanley. Decompositions of rational convex polytopes. *Ann. Discrete Math.*, 6:333–342, 1980. Combinatorial mathematics, optimal designs and their applications (Proc. Sympos. Combin. Math. and Optimal Design, Colorado State Univ., Fort Collins, Colo., 1978).
- [23] Seth Sullivant. Compressed polytopes and statistical disclosure limitation. *Tohoku Math. J. (2)*, 58(3):433–445, 2006.

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