

Linear algebra of quadratic forms and polynomial identity

Li Chen

Abstract: This paper is motivated by our discovery of a novel polynomial identity (Theorem 3.1) which elegantly incorporates quadratic forms and matrix determinants. It turns out to fit nicely into the proof of an interesting result on linear dependence of quadratic forms (Theorem 1.2) which is equally unexpected.

Keywords: quadratic form; polynomial identity; linear independence

MSC 2020: 11E04. 13B25

1 Introduction

Let d be a positive integer and $\mathbb{C}_d[z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n]$ be the set of degree d homogeneous forms in the polynomial ring $\mathbb{C}[z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n]$. Given a finite set $S_1 = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_l\} \subset \mathbb{C}_d[z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n]$, let $S_k = \{p_{i_1} p_{i_2} \cdots p_{i_k} \mid 1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_k \leq l\}$, $1 \leq k \leq l$ be the set of k -products of distinct polynomials in S_1 . This paper concerns the following

Question 1.1. *How is linear independence of S_1 related to that of S_k , $k > 1$?*

At first glance the question is not of much interest in a general setting: the case $d = 1$ is naive, where linear independence of S_1 justifies one to assume $p_i = z_i$, $1 \leq i \leq l$ up to a linear coordinate change, thus S_k is trivially independent for all $1 \leq k \leq l$. When $d > 1$, this fails in light of easy examples (e.g., the independent $S_1 = \{z_1^2, z_1 z_2, z_1 z_3, z_2 z_3\}$ corresponds to dependent S_2 as $(z_1^2)(z_2 z_3) = (z_1 z_2)(z_1 z_3)$). The converse direction is even less expected as it already fails when $d = 1$ (e.g., the dependent $S_1 = \{z_1, z_2, z_1 + z_2\}$ gives independent S_2). The surprising finding of this paper, which justifies a serious study on Question 1.1, is an “if and only if” relation on powers of linear forms.

As an extensively studied class in algebraic geometry and computation theory [1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10], powers of linear forms are building blocks for general homogeneous polynomials in light of the well-known Waring decomposition: any polynomial in $\mathbb{C}_d[z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n]$ is a finite sum of d -th powers of $\mathbb{C}_1[z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n]$ polynomials. In this paper we work on the quadratic case $d = 2$, that is,

$$S_1 = \{q_1^2, q_2^2, \dots, q_l^2\}$$

where $\{q_i\}_{i=1}^l \subset \mathbb{C}_1[z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n]$ are linear forms.

Let r and $m := l - r$ respectively denote the linear rank and co-rank of $\{q_i\}_{i=1}^l$. Up to a coordinate change, we may assume

$$\{q_i\}_{i=1}^l = \{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_r, f_1, f_2, \dots, f_m\}$$

where $f_i = \sum_{j=1}^r a_{ij}z_j \in \mathbb{C}_1[z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n]$, thus

$$S_1 = \{z_1^2, z_2^2, \dots, z_r^2, (\sum_{j=1}^r a_{1j}z_j)^2, \dots, (\sum_{j=1}^r a_{mj}z_j)^2\}.$$

One easily sees that Question 1.1 can be void for some triples (r, m, k) (for instance, S_1 is unconditionally dependent if $\binom{r}{2} < m$) and we are only interested in cases that both S_1 and S_k are conditionally dependent. In particular, $m = 0$ implies unconditional linear independence of S_k , and $r = 1$ implies unconditional linear dependence of S_1 (unless $m = 0$), hence we assume $r \geq 2, m \geq 1$ in this paper.

Our result states as follows.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $r \geq 2, m \geq 1$ be positive integers and S_1 be as above. Then*

- (i) *When $r = 2$, S_2 is linearly independent if and only if S_1 is linearly independent.*
- (ii) *When $m = 2$, S_2 is linearly independent if and only if S_1 is linearly independent.*
- (iii) *When $r = m = 3$, S_3 is linearly independent if and only if S_1 is linearly independent.*

We present an overview of proof. The first step, which is quite straightforward, is to reduce linear independence of S_1 to a rank condition on a $\binom{r}{2} \times m$ matrix(Proposition 2.1). The hard part is to show that this rank condition is equivalent to linear independence of $S_k, k = 2, 3$. When $r = 2$ or $m = 2$, we have a sufficiently explicit description of the rank condition in terms of $\{a_{ij}\}$ (Corollary 2.2), with which careful technical treatments proves (i)(ii). When both r and m are at least 3, we can not say as much on $\{a_{ij}\}$ and (iii) is proved by a combination of algebraic identities on the determinant of above mentioned $\binom{r}{2} \times m$ matrix(which is now a 3×3 square matrix). In particular, a new polynomial identity(Theorem 3.1) is discovered which is of independent algebraic interest(see Section 3.1 for details) and exactly meets our need.

This paper is much more suggestive than conclusive(how about other rank conditions and $S_k, k \neq 2, 3$?) where quite different technical situations in (i)(ii)(iii) exhibit various aspects of Question 1.1 and convince that the “if and only if” relation is not a coincidence. A possible underlying theory is to be revealed in future works, and an extension of above mentioned polynomial identity(see Question 3.2 below) is a promising first step which might have consequences beyond Question 1.1(for instance, identity (3.5) below as its corollary gives an interesting connection between 3×3 determinant and permanent).

2 The cases $r = 2$ or $m = 2$

In this section we prove (i)(ii) of Theorem 1.2. We begin with a straightforward description for linear independence of S_1 , which will be used both here and next Section 3.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $m \geq 1, r \geq 2$ be positive integers and $f_i = \sum_{j=1}^r a_{ij}z_j$, $1 \leq i \leq m$ be linear forms. The set $S_1 = \{z_1^2, z_2^2, \dots, z_r^2, f_1^2, \dots, f_m^2\}$ is linearly independent if and only if the rank of the following $\binom{r}{2} \times m$ matrix*

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_{11}a_{12} & a_{21}a_{22} & \cdots & a_{m-1,1}a_{m-1,2} & a_{m1}a_{m2} \\ a_{11}a_{13} & a_{21}a_{23} & \cdots & a_{m-1,1}a_{m-1,3} & a_{m1}a_{m3} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ a_{11}a_{1r} & a_{21}a_{2r} & \cdots & a_{m-1,1}a_{m-1,r} & a_{m1}a_{mr} \\ a_{12}a_{13} & a_{22}a_{23} & \cdots & a_{m-1,2}a_{m-1,3} & a_{m2}a_{m3} \\ a_{12}a_{14} & a_{22}a_{24} & \cdots & a_{m-1,2}a_{m-1,4} & a_{m2}a_{m4} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ a_{12}a_{1r} & a_{22}a_{2r} & \cdots & a_{m-1,2}a_{m-1,r} & a_{m2}a_{mr} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ a_{1,r-1}a_{1r} & a_{2,r-1}a_{2r} & \cdots & a_{m-1,r-1}a_{m-1,r} & a_{m,r-1}a_{m,r} \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.1)$$

is m .

Proof. Let \mathbf{b}_i , $1 \leq i \leq m$ denote the i -th column of matrix (2.1). For the ‘‘if’’ part, suppose matrix (2.1) has rank m and there exists scalars λ_i , $1 \leq i \leq r$ and μ_i , $1 \leq i \leq m$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i z_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i f_i^2 = 0. \quad (2.2)$$

Tracing the coefficients of $\{z_i z_j | i \neq j\}$ in (2.2) gives

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i \mathbf{b}_i = \mathbf{0}. \quad (2.3)$$

As (2.1) has rank m , (2.3) forces $\mu_i = 0$, $1 \leq i \leq m$ which combined with (2.2) in turn forces $\lambda_i = 0$, $1 \leq i \leq r$.

For the ‘‘only if’’ part, suppose (2.1) has rank less than m , then (2.3) has not-all-zero solution μ_1, \dots, μ_m which annihilates all $z_i z_j$, $i \neq j$ in (2.2). Fix such μ_1, \dots, μ_m , the sum $\sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i f_i^2$ only contains z_1^2, \dots, z_r^2 thus a proper choice of λ_i , $1 \leq i \leq r$ settles (2.2), giving linear dependence of $\{z_1^2, z_2^2, \dots, z_r^2, f_1^2, \dots, f_m^2\}$. \square

Corollary 2.2. *Under the assumption of Proposition 2.1, the followings hold.*

- (i) *If $r = 2$, then S_1 is independent if and only if $m = 1$ and $a_{11}a_{12} \neq 0$.*
- (ii) *If $m = 2$, then S_1 is dependent if and only if at least one of the following holds*
 - (a) *there exist two elements in S_1 which are linearly dependent;*
 - (b) *there exists $1 \leq M \neq N \leq r$ such that $f_1 = a_{1M}z_M + a_{1N}z_N$, $f_2 = a_{2M}z_M + a_{2N}z_N$ (that is, $a_{1i} = a_{2i} = 0$ for all $i \notin \{M, N\}$).*

Proof. (i) In this case (2.1) is a $1 \times m$ matrix, which has rank m if and only if $m = 1$ and $(2.1) = (a_{11}a_{12}) \neq (0)$.

(ii) When $m = 2$, $S_1 = \{z_1^2, \dots, z_r^2, f_1^2 = (a_{11}z_1 + \dots + a_{1r}z_r)^2, f_2^2 = (a_{21}z_1 + \dots + a_{2r}z_r)^2\}$ and matrix (2.1) has two columns still denoted by $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2$.

For sufficiency, (a) trivially implies dependence of S_1 . If (b) holds, S_1 admits $\{z_M^2, z_N^2, (a_{1M}z_M + a_{1N}z_N)^2, (a_{2M}z_M + a_{2N}z_N)^2\}$ as a linearly dependent subset.

For necessity, suppose S_1 is dependent and (a) does not hold, then we have

- both \mathbf{b}_1 and \mathbf{b}_2 are non-zero columns (otherwise, if $\mathbf{b}_1 = \mathbf{0}$ for instance, then $\{a_{11}, a_{12}, \dots, a_{1r}\}$ admits at most one non-zero element hence f_1 is a multiple of some z_i),
- f_1 and f_2 are linearly independent hence there exists $1 \leq M \neq N \leq r$ such that

$$\begin{vmatrix} a_{1M} & a_{2M} \\ a_{1N} & a_{2N} \end{vmatrix} \neq 0.$$

Without loss of generality, we assume $\begin{vmatrix} a_{11} & a_{21} \\ a_{12} & a_{22} \end{vmatrix} \neq 0$ and show that $a_{13} = a_{14} = \dots = a_{1r} = a_{23} = a_{24} = \dots = a_{2r} = 0$, then (b) holds and the proof is done.

As S_1 is dependent, \mathbf{b}_1 and \mathbf{b}_2 are linearly dependent by Proposition 2.1 hence all 2×2 submatrix of (2.1) have vanishing determinants. In particular, $\begin{vmatrix} a_{11}a_{1i} & a_{21}a_{2i} \\ a_{12}a_{1i} & a_{22}a_{2i} \end{vmatrix} = 0$ for each $i \in \{3, 4, \dots, r\}$, which combined with $\begin{vmatrix} a_{11} & a_{21} \\ a_{12} & a_{22} \end{vmatrix} \neq 0$ implies either $a_{1i} = 0$ or $a_{2i} = 0$. Now one can choose two sets I_1, I_2 of integers with $\{3, 4, \dots, r\} = I_1 \cup I_2$ and $I_1 \cap I_2 = \emptyset$ such that $a_{1i} = 0$ for $i \in I_1$ and $a_{2i} = 0$ for $i \in I_2$. It remains to show that $a_{1i} = 0$ for $i \in I_2$ and $a_{2i} = 0$ for $i \in I_1$.

By symmetry, we only show $a_{1i} = 0$ for $i \in I_2$ (if $I_2 = \emptyset$ there is nothing to prove). Since $a_{2i} = 0$, we have $a_{2i}a_{21} = a_{2i}a_{22} = 0$ which in turn implies $a_{1i}a_{11} = a_{1i}a_{12} = 0$ as \mathbf{b}_1 and \mathbf{b}_2 are linearly dependent and both nonzero. Now a_{1i} must be zero, otherwise $a_{11} = a_{12} = 0$, contradicting $\begin{vmatrix} a_{11} & a_{21} \\ a_{12} & a_{22} \end{vmatrix} \neq 0$. □

We are now ready to prove (i)(ii) of Theorem 1.2

Proof. Sufficiency of (i): By Corollary 2.2, linear independence of S_1 implies that $S_1 = \{z_1^2, z_2^2, (a_{11}z_1 + a_{12}z_2)^2\}$, $a_{11}a_{12} \neq 0$. Now $S_2 = \{z_1^2z_2^2, z_1^2(a_{11}z_1 + a_{12}z_2)^2, z_2^2(a_{11}z_1 + a_{12}z_2)^2\}$ which is obviously linearly independent.

Necessity of (i): Suppose S_1 is linearly dependent and it remains to show S_2 is also dependent. By Corollary 2.2, it holds that either $m = 1, a_{11}a_{12} = 0$ or $m > 1$. In the former case, S_2 is trivially dependent. In the latter case, the set $\{z_1^2, z_2^2, (a_{11}z_1 + a_{12}z_2)^2, (a_{21}z_1 + a_{22}z_2)^2\}$ is contained in S_1 hence the set $\{z_1^2z_2^2, z_1^2(a_{11}z_1 + a_{12}z_2)^2, z_1^2(a_{21}z_1 + a_{22}z_2)^2, z_2^2(a_{11}z_1 + a_{12}z_2)^2, z_2^2(a_{21}z_1 + a_{22}z_2)^2, (a_{11}z_1 + a_{12}z_2)^2(a_{21}z_1 + a_{22}z_2)^2\}$ is contained in

S_2 , which are necessarily dependent as 6 polynomials in a 5-dimensional space spanned by $\{z_1^4, z_1^3 z_2, z_1^2 z_2^2, z_1 z_2^3, z_2^4\}$.

Necessity of (ii): If S_1 is dependent, condition (a) of Corollary 2.2 trivially implies linear dependence of S_2 while condition (b) implies that S_1 contains $\{z_M^2, z_N^2, (a_{1M}z_M + a_{1N}z_N)^2, (a_{2M}z_M + a_{2N}z_N)^2\}$ hence S_2 contains 6 polynomials $\{z_M^2 z_N^2, z_M^2 (a_{1M}z_M + a_{1N}z_N)^2, z_M^2 (a_{2M}z_M + a_{2N}z_N)^2, z_N^2 (a_{1M}z_M + a_{1N}z_N)^2, z_N^2 (a_{2M}z_M + a_{2N}z_N)^2, (a_{1M}z_M + a_{1N}z_N)^2 (a_{2M}z_M + a_{2N}z_N)^2\}$ lying in a 5 dimensional space spanned by $\{z_M^4, z_M^3 z_N, z_M^2 z_N^2, z_M z_N^3, z_N^4\}$.

Sufficiency of (ii): Suppose S_1 is independent and there exists coefficients $\{\alpha_{ij}, 1 \leq i, j \leq r, i \neq j\}, \{\beta_i, 1 \leq i \leq r\}, \{\gamma_i, 1 \leq i \leq r\}$ and λ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq r, i \neq j} \alpha_{ij} z_i^2 z_j^2 + \sum_{i=1}^r \beta_i z_i^2 (a_{11}z_1 + \cdots + a_{1r}z_r)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^r \gamma_i z_i^2 (a_{21}z_1 + \cdots + a_{2r}z_r)^2 \\ & + \lambda (a_{11}z_1 + \cdots + a_{1r}z_r)^2 (a_{21}z_1 + \cdots + a_{2r}z_r)^2 = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

it remains to show that all coefficients are zero.

We observe that it suffices to show $\lambda = 0$. In fact, if $\lambda = 0$, then fix $1 \leq N \leq r$, tracing the coefficient of $z_N^2 z_i z_j, i \neq j$ (here $i = N$ or $j = N$ is allowed) in (2.4) gives

$$\beta_N a_{1i} a_{1j} + \gamma_N a_{2i} a_{2j} = 0, \quad \text{for any } 1 \leq i, j \leq r, i \neq j.$$

In other words,

$$\beta_N \mathbf{b}_1 + \gamma_N \mathbf{b}_2 = \mathbf{0}$$

where \mathbf{b}_1 and \mathbf{b}_2 are the two columns of (2.1).

As S_1 is independent, \mathbf{b}_1 and \mathbf{b}_2 are independent by Proposition 2.1 hence $\beta_N = \gamma_N = 0$. Since N is arbitrarily chosen, $\beta_i = \gamma_i = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq r$. Now (2.4) becomes $\sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq r, i \neq j} \alpha_{ij} z_i^2 z_j^2 = 0$ hence $\alpha_{ij} = 0$ as well.

Next we show $\lambda = 0$. As \mathbf{b}_1 and \mathbf{b}_2 are independent, (2.1) admits a 2×2 sub-matrix with non-zero determinant. Precisely, the following two cases exhaust all possibilities and we will show $\lambda = 0$ in both cases (we assume $r \geq 3$ as $r = 2$ is covered by Theorem 1.2 (i)).

CASE 1: There exists distinct integers $M, N, K \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ such that

$$\begin{vmatrix} a_{1M}a_{1N} & a_{2M}a_{2N} \\ a_{1M}a_{1K} & a_{2M}a_{2K} \end{vmatrix} = a_{1M}a_{2M} \begin{vmatrix} a_{1N} & a_{2N} \\ a_{1K} & a_{2K} \end{vmatrix} \neq 0 \quad (2.5)$$

CASE 2: There exists distinct integers $P, Q, R, S \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ such that

$$\begin{vmatrix} a_{1P}a_{1Q} & a_{2P}a_{2Q} \\ a_{1R}a_{1S} & a_{2R}a_{2S} \end{vmatrix} \neq 0 \quad (2.6)$$

and

$$\begin{vmatrix} a_{1i}a_{1j} & a_{2i}a_{2j} \\ a_{1i}a_{1k} & a_{2i}a_{2k} \end{vmatrix} = a_{1i}a_{2i} \begin{vmatrix} a_{1j} & a_{2j} \\ a_{1k} & a_{2k} \end{vmatrix} = 0 \quad (2.7)$$

for any distinct integers $i, j, k \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$.

In CASE 1, tracing the coefficients of $F_M^4, F_M^3 F_K, F_M^3 F_N$ in (2.4) gives equations

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda a_{1M}^2 a_{2M}^2 + \beta_M a_{1M}^2 + \gamma_M a_{2M}^2 &= 0 \\ \lambda(a_{1M}^2 a_{2M} a_{2K} + a_{2M}^2 a_{1M} a_{1K}) + \beta_M a_{1M} a_{1K} + \gamma_M a_{2M} a_{2K} &= 0 \\ \lambda(a_{1M}^2 a_{2M} a_{2N} + a_{2M}^2 a_{1M} a_{1N}) + \beta_M a_{1M} a_{1N} + \gamma_M a_{2M} a_{2N} &= 0\end{aligned}$$

The determinant of above linear system equals $a_{1M}^3 a_{2M}^3 (a_{2K} a_{1N} - a_{1K} a_{2N})$ which is non-zero by (2.5), forcing $\lambda = \beta_M = \gamma_M = 0$, as desired.

In CASE 2, we first claim that

$$a_{1P} a_{1Q} a_{2P} a_{2Q} a_{1R} a_{1S} a_{2R} a_{2S} = 0. \quad (2.8)$$

In fact, if $a_{1P} a_{1Q} a_{2P} a_{2Q} a_{1R} a_{1S} a_{2R} a_{2S} \neq 0$, then specifying (2.7) to $i = P$ gives $\begin{vmatrix} a_{1j} & a_{2j} \\ a_{1k} & a_{2k} \end{vmatrix} = 0$ for all $1 \leq j \neq k \leq r$ with $P \notin \{j, k\}$. Next, setting $i = Q, j = P$, (2.7) gives $\begin{vmatrix} a_{1P} & a_{2P} \\ a_{1k} & a_{2k} \end{vmatrix} = 0$ for all $1 \leq k \leq r, k \notin \{P, Q\}$. Finally, (2.7) with $i = R, j = P, k = Q$ gives $\begin{vmatrix} a_{1P} & a_{2P} \\ a_{1Q} & a_{2Q} \end{vmatrix} = 0$. Now we have exhausted all $1 \leq j \neq k \leq r$ with $\begin{vmatrix} a_{1j} & a_{2j} \\ a_{1k} & a_{2k} \end{vmatrix} = 0$, which implies linear dependence of f_1 and f_2 , contradicting linear independence of S_1 .

Now by (2.8), we assume, without loss of generality by symmetry, that

$$a_{1P} = 0, \quad (2.9)$$

which in turn implies

$$a_{1R} a_{1S} a_{2P} a_{2Q} \neq 0 \quad (2.10)$$

by (2.6).

Tracing the coefficient of $F_P F_Q F_R F_S$ in (2.4) gives

$$\lambda(a_{1P} a_{1Q} a_{2R} a_{2S} + a_{1P} a_{1R} a_{2Q} a_{2S} + a_{1P} a_{1S} a_{2Q} a_{2R} + a_{1Q} a_{1R} a_{2P} a_{2S} + a_{1Q} a_{1S} a_{2P} a_{2R} + a_{1R} a_{1S} a_{2P} a_{2Q}) = 0, \quad (2.11)$$

which combined with (2.9) gives

$$\lambda(a_{1Q} a_{1R} a_{2P} a_{2S} + a_{1Q} a_{1S} a_{2P} a_{2R} + a_{1R} a_{1S} a_{2P} a_{2Q}) = 0. \quad (2.12)$$

We assert $\lambda = 0$ in the following two sub-cases and the proof is complete.

CASE 2.1 $a_{1Q} = 0$. Now (2.12) becomes $\lambda a_{1R} a_{1S} a_{2P} a_{2Q} = 0$ which combined with (2.10) implies $\lambda = 0$.

CASE 2.1 $a_{1Q} \neq 0$. Specifying (2.7) to $i = Q, j = P, k = S$ and $i = Q, j = P, k = R$ gives

$$a_{1Q} a_{2Q} \begin{vmatrix} a_{1P} & a_{2P} \\ a_{1S} & a_{2S} \end{vmatrix} = a_{1Q} a_{2Q} \begin{vmatrix} a_{1P} & a_{2P} \\ a_{1R} & a_{2R} \end{vmatrix} = 0, \quad (2.13)$$

which combined with $a_{2Q} \neq 0$ (by (2.10)) and $a_{1Q} \neq 0$ gives

$$\begin{vmatrix} a_{1P} & a_{2P} \\ a_{1S} & a_{2S} \end{vmatrix} = \begin{vmatrix} a_{1P} & a_{2P} \\ a_{1R} & a_{2R} \end{vmatrix} = 0 \quad (2.14)$$

Combining (2.14) and (2.9) gives

$$a_{1Q}a_{1R}a_{2P}a_{2S} + a_{1Q}a_{1S}a_{2P}a_{2R} = a_{1Q}a_{2R}a_{1P}a_{2S} + a_{1Q}a_{1P}a_{2S}a_{2R} = 0,$$

which reduces (2.12) into $\lambda a_{1R}a_{1S}a_{2P}a_{2Q} = 0$, hence $\lambda = 0$ by (2.10). \square

3 The case $r = m = 3$

The situation becomes much more complicated when both r and m are at least 3, and this paper works on $r = m = 3$ as a first attack. As both m and r are fixed, to make the presentation more transparent we replace the double-index notation and write

$$f_1 = a_1z_1 + a_2z_2 + a_3z_3, f_2 = b_1z_1 + b_2z_2 + b_3z_3, f_3 = c_1z_1 + c_2z_2 + c_3z_3$$

hence

$$S_1 = \{z_1^2, z_2^2, z_3^2, (a_1z_1 + a_2z_2 + a_3z_3)^2, (b_1z_1 + b_2z_2 + b_3z_3)^2, (c_1z_1 + c_2z_2 + c_3z_3)^2\}.$$

By Proposition 2.1, S_1 is linearly dependent if and only if

$$\begin{vmatrix} a_1a_2 & b_1b_2 & c_1c_2 \\ a_1a_3 & b_1b_3 & c_1c_3 \\ a_2a_3 & b_2b_3 & c_2c_3 \end{vmatrix} = 0.$$

Here the technical difference from Section 2 is that an explicit description for $\begin{vmatrix} a_1a_2 & b_1b_2 & c_1c_2 \\ a_1a_3 & b_1b_3 & c_1c_3 \\ a_2a_3 & b_2b_3 & c_2c_3 \end{vmatrix} = 0$ analogous to Corollary 2.2 no longer exists. In fact, one can easily give examples that $\begin{vmatrix} a_1 & a_2 & a_3 \\ b_1 & b_2 & b_3 \\ c_1 & c_2 & c_3 \end{vmatrix} \neq 0$, $\begin{vmatrix} a_1a_2 & b_1b_2 & c_1c_2 \\ a_1a_3 & b_1b_3 & c_1c_3 \\ a_2a_3 & b_2b_3 & c_2c_3 \end{vmatrix} = 0$, and no entry vanishes (for instance, $\begin{vmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 \\ 5 & 8 & 10 \end{vmatrix} \neq 0$, $\begin{vmatrix} 1 & 2 & 40 \\ 1 & 3 & 50 \\ 1 & 6 & 80 \end{vmatrix} = 0$). To prove Theorem 1.2 (iii), one need to directly relate $\begin{vmatrix} a_1a_2 & b_1b_2 & c_1c_2 \\ a_1a_3 & b_1b_3 & c_1c_3 \\ a_2a_3 & b_2b_3 & c_2c_3 \end{vmatrix}$ to linear structure of S_3 , which is achieved by a series of algebraic identities as mentioned in Section 1.

Precisely, proof of the “if” part follows the naive idea of tracing coefficients in linear sum of S_3 polynomials, which yields a bunch of linear equations whose determinants are equaled to $\begin{vmatrix} a_1a_2 & b_1b_2 & c_1c_2 \\ a_1a_3 & b_1b_3 & c_1c_3 \\ a_2a_3 & b_2b_3 & c_2c_3 \end{vmatrix}$ (up to nonzero factors) by some “dirty” computations. On the contrary, the “only if” part has a simple clean proof based on an elegant polynomial identity presented in Section 3.1 below, where $\begin{vmatrix} a_1a_2 & b_1b_2 & c_1c_2 \\ a_1a_3 & b_1b_3 & c_1c_3 \\ a_2a_3 & b_2b_3 & c_2c_3 \end{vmatrix}$ is related to a particular linear sum of S_3 polynomials with coefficients resembling those in the Laplace determinant expansion.

3.1 A polynomial identity

Theorem 3.1. *The following identity holds.*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \begin{vmatrix} a_1 & a_2 & a_3 \\ b_1 & b_2 & b_3 \\ c_1 & c_2 & c_3 \end{vmatrix}^3 z_1^2 z_2^2 z_3^2 \\
& - c_3 (a_1 b_2 - a_2 b_1)^3 z_1^2 z_2^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2 + c_3 z_3)^2 \\
& + c_2 (a_1 b_3 - a_3 b_1)^3 z_1^2 z_3^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2 + c_3 z_3)^2 \\
& - c_1 (a_2 b_3 - a_3 b_2)^3 z_2^2 z_3^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2 + c_3 z_3)^2 \\
& - b_3 (a_2 c_1 - a_1 c_2)^3 z_1^2 z_2^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2 + b_3 z_3)^2 \\
& + b_2 (a_3 c_1 - a_1 c_3)^3 z_1^2 z_3^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2 + b_3 z_3)^2 \\
& - b_1 (a_3 c_2 - a_2 c_3)^3 z_2^2 z_3^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2 + b_3 z_3)^2 \\
& - a_3 (b_1 c_2 - b_2 c_1)^3 z_1^2 z_2^2 (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2 \\
& + a_2 (b_1 c_3 - b_3 c_1)^3 z_1^2 z_3^2 (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2 \\
& - a_1 (b_2 c_3 - b_3 c_2)^3 z_2^2 z_3^2 (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2 \\
& + c_1^3 (a_2 b_3 - a_3 b_2) z_1^2 (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2 + b_3 z_3)^2 \\
& - c_2^3 (a_1 b_3 - a_3 b_1) z_2^2 (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2 + b_3 z_3)^2 \\
& + c_3^3 (a_1 b_2 - a_2 b_1) z_3^2 (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2 + b_3 z_3)^2 \\
& - b_1^3 (a_2 c_3 - a_3 c_2) z_1^2 (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2 + c_3 z_3)^2 \\
& + b_2^3 (a_1 c_3 - a_3 c_1) z_2^2 (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2 + c_3 z_3)^2 \\
& - b_3^3 (a_1 c_2 - a_2 c_1) z_3^2 (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2 + c_3 z_3)^2 \\
& + a_1^3 (b_2 c_3 - b_3 c_2) z_1^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2 + b_3 z_3)^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2 + c_3 z_3)^2 \\
& - a_2^3 (b_1 c_3 - b_3 c_1) z_2^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2 + b_3 z_3)^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2 + c_3 z_3)^2 \\
& + a_3^3 (b_1 c_2 - b_2 c_1) z_3^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2 + b_3 z_3)^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2 + c_3 z_3)^2 \\
& - \begin{vmatrix} a_1 & a_2 & a_3 \\ b_1 & b_2 & b_3 \\ c_1 & c_2 & c_3 \end{vmatrix} (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2 + b_3 z_3)^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2 + c_3 z_3)^2 \\
& = 6 \begin{vmatrix} a_1 a_2 & b_1 b_2 & c_1 c_2 \\ a_1 a_3 & b_1 b_3 & c_1 c_3 \\ a_2 a_3 & b_2 b_3 & c_2 c_3 \end{vmatrix} z_1 z_2 z_3 (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3) (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2 + b_3 z_3) (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2 + c_3 z_3). \quad (3.1)
\end{aligned}$$

Being of independent interest, we give a few remarks on (3.1) before applying it to the proof of Theorem 1.2 (iii) in next Section 3.2.

- Our contribution is discovery rather than proof of (3.1) which can be checked by elementary algebraic expansion (the left hand side expands into several hundreds of terms). Although a quick verification can be done by computer (such as Mathematica), readers are still recommended to do a hand-check at least partially (for instance, in the next remark it is checked that the left hand side vanishes if $z_i = 0$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, thus admits $z_1 z_2 z_3$ as a factor which appears in the right hand side).

- Identity (3.1) is on 3-products out of 6 polynomials $\{z_1^2, z_2^2, z_3^2, (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2, (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2 + b_3 z_3)^2, (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2 + c_3 z_3)^2\}$, and it is natural to consider

Question 3.2. Give a general version of (3.1) on n -products from $2n$ polynomials $\{z_1^2, \dots, z_n^2, f_1^2, \dots, f_n^2\}$, $f_i \in \mathbb{C}_1[z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n]$, with analogous coefficients for every positive integer n .

Note that there are $\binom{n}{i}^2$ minors of size $i \times i$ in an $n \times n$ determinant (we regard 1 as the minor of size 0×0). By the standard binomial identity $\binom{2n}{n} = \sum_{i=0}^n \binom{n}{i}^2$, the number of n -products equals the total number of minors hence Question 3.2 makes sense. This paper stops at $n = 3$ and the following discussion suggests that an $n - 1$ version should be a “component” of the next n -version.

The $n = 1$ version

$$a_1^3 z_1^2 - a_1 (a_1 z_1)^2 = 0 \quad (3.2)$$

is trivial.

The $n = 2$ version is as follows

$$\begin{aligned} & (a_1 b_2 - a_2 b_1)^3 z_1^2 z_2^2 \\ & - b_2 a_1^3 z_1^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2)^2 - a_1 b_2^3 z_2^2 (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2)^2 + a_2 b_1^3 z_1^2 (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2)^2 + b_1 a_2^3 z_2^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2)^2 \\ & + (a_1 b_2 - a_2 b_1) (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2)^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2)^2 = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

which is also easy to check.

Let us use (3.3) to verify that the left hand side of (3.1) admits $z_1 z_2 z_3$ as a factor, thus “partly proves” (3.1). For instance, set $z_3 = 0$ then the left hand side becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & -c_3 (a_1 b_2 - a_2 b_1)^3 z_1^2 z_2^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2)^2 - b_3 (a_2 c_1 - a_1 c_2)^3 z_1^2 z_2^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2)^2 - a_3 (b_1 c_2 - b_2 c_1)^3 z_1^2 z_2^2 (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2)^2 \\ & + c_1^3 (a_2 b_3 - a_3 b_2) z_1^2 (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2)^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2)^2 - c_2^3 (a_1 b_3 - a_3 b_1) z_2^2 (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2)^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2)^2 \\ & - b_1^3 (a_2 c_3 - a_3 c_2) z_1^2 (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2)^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2)^2 + b_2^3 (a_1 c_3 - a_3 c_1) z_2^2 (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2)^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2)^2 \\ & + a_1^3 (b_2 c_3 - b_3 c_2) z_1^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2)^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2)^2 - a_2^3 (b_1 c_3 - b_3 c_1) z_2^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2)^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2)^2 \\ & - \begin{vmatrix} a_1 & a_2 & a_3 \\ b_1 & b_2 & b_3 \\ c_1 & c_2 & c_3 \end{vmatrix} (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2)^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2)^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

Observe that (3.4) is a linear form in $\{a_3, b_3, c_3\}$, to show (3.4) = 0, it suffices to show that their coefficients as polynomials in other variables are all zero, but this immediately follows from (3.3). In fact, the c_3 coefficient in (3.4) is just the product of $(c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2)^2$ and left hand side of (3.3), and similar for a_3, b_3 coefficients. (stupid exercise: use (3.2) to check that the left hand side of (3.3) vanishes if $z_i = 0, i = 1, 2$ by the same argument).

- The fact that both $n = 1$ and $n = 2$ versions above have zero right hand sides corresponds to “unconditional linear dependence” of the polynomials they involved: the two polynomials $\{z_1^2, (a_1 z_1)^2\}$ in (3.2) are contained in a one-dimensional space spanned by z_1^2 , and the 6 polynomials $\{z_1^2 z_2^2, z_1^2 (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2)^2, z_1^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2)^2, z_2^2 (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2)^2, z_2^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2)^2, (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2)^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2)^2\}$ in (3.3) are contained in a 5 dimensional space spanned by $\{z_1^4, z_1^3 z_2, z_1^2 z_2^2, z_1 z_2^3, z_2^4\}$.

The nonzero right hand side of the $n = 3$ version (3.1) corresponds to conditional linear dependence of the 20 polynomials therein (the precise condition is exactly the concern of Theorem 1.2 (iii)) and it is conceivable that complexity of Question 3.2 will grow rapidly as n grows from 3.

• One may obtain many algebraic identities out of (3.1), some of which appears no less interesting than (3.1) itself. For instance, tracing and re-arranging(details are omitted) the coefficient of $z_1^2 z_2^2 z_3^2$ from both sides of (3.1) yields an interesting connection between 3×3 determinant and permanent as follows.

Corollary 3.3. *The following identity holds.*

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2a_1 a_2 a_3 (b_1 c_2 - b_2 c_1) (b_3 c_1 - b_1 c_3) (b_2 c_3 - b_3 c_2) \\
& + 2b_1 b_2 b_3 (a_2 c_1 - a_1 c_2) (a_1 c_3 - a_3 c_1) (a_3 c_2 - a_2 c_3) \\
& + 2c_1 c_2 c_3 (a_1 b_2 - a_2 b_1) (a_3 b_1 - a_1 b_3) (a_2 b_3 - a_3 b_2) \\
& - (a_3 b_2 c_1 + a_2 b_3 c_1 + a_3 b_1 c_2 + a_1 b_3 c_2 + a_2 b_1 c_3 + a_1 b_2 c_3) \begin{vmatrix} a_1 a_2 & b_1 b_2 & c_1 c_2 \\ a_1 a_3 & b_1 b_3 & c_1 c_3 \\ a_2 a_3 & b_2 b_3 & c_2 c_3 \end{vmatrix} \\
& - (a_2 a_3 b_1 b_3 c_1 c_2 + a_1 a_3 b_2 b_3 c_1 c_2 + a_1 a_3 b_1 b_2 c_2 c_3 + a_1 a_2 b_1 b_3 c_2 c_3 + a_2 a_3 b_1 b_2 c_1 c_3 + a_1 a_2 b_2 b_3 c_1 c_3) \begin{vmatrix} a_1 & a_2 & a_3 \\ b_1 & b_2 & b_3 \\ c_1 & c_2 & c_3 \end{vmatrix} \\
& = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

The so-called Determinant vs. Permanent problem on expressing $n \times n$ permanent as determinant of a different(usually much larger) size is a key concern in algebraic complexity theory which is nontrivial even when $n = 3$ [4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12]. Here (3.5) offers a different perspective by relating determinant and permanent of the same size.

3.2 Completion of proof

We are ready to prove Theorem 1.2 (iii).

Necessity:

Proof. Suppose S_1 is linearly dependent, then $\begin{vmatrix} a_1 a_2 & b_1 b_2 & c_1 c_2 \\ a_1 a_3 & b_1 b_3 & c_1 c_3 \\ a_2 a_3 & b_2 b_3 & c_2 c_3 \end{vmatrix} = 0$ by Proposition 2.1. To show S_3 is also linearly dependent(which trivially holds if $\text{rank}\{f_1, f_2, f_3\} = 1$), it suffices to consider cases $\text{rank}\{f_1, f_2, f_3\} = 2$ or 3. By identity (3.1) whose right hand side is now zero, S_3 will be dependent if there exists a non-zero coefficient in its left hand side.

If $\text{rank}\{f_1, f_2, f_3\} = 3$, $z_1^2 z_2^2 z_3^2$ has nonzero coefficient and we are also done.

If $\text{rank}\{f_1, f_2, f_3\} = 2$, we assume without loss generality that $\text{rank}\{f_2, f_3\} = 2$ hence $f_1 = \lambda f_2 + \mu f_3$, $\lambda \mu \neq 0$ (if $\lambda \mu = 0$, f_1 is a multiple of f_2 or f_3 and S_3 is trivially dependent). Now $\begin{pmatrix} b_1 & b_2 & b_3 \\ c_1 & c_2 & c_3 \end{pmatrix}$ admits a nonzero 2×2 minor and we assume $\begin{vmatrix} b_1 & b_2 \\ c_1 & c_2 \end{vmatrix} \neq 0$.

We show linear dependence of S_3 in the following two cases and the proof is done.

CASE 1. $\{a_3 (b_1 c_2 - b_2 c_1)^3, b_3 (a_2 c_1 - a_1 c_2)^3, c_3 (a_1 b_2 - a_2 b_1)^3\} \neq \{0\}$. In this case, the left hand side of (3.1) admits a nonzero coefficient.

CASE 2. $a_3 (b_1 c_2 - b_2 c_1)^3 = b_3 (a_2 c_1 - a_1 c_2)^3 = c_3 (a_1 b_2 - a_2 b_1)^3 = 0$.

Since $f_1 = \lambda f_2 + \mu f_3$, we have

$$a_3 (b_1 c_2 - b_2 c_1)^3 = b_3 (b_2 c_1 - b_1 c_2)^3 \lambda^3 = c_3 (c_1 b_2 - c_2 b_1)^3 \mu^3 = 0.$$

Combining this with $\lambda \mu \neq 0$ and $\begin{vmatrix} b_1 & b_2 \\ c_1 & c_2 \end{vmatrix} \neq 0$ gives $a_3 = b_3 = c_3 = 0$. Now $f_1 = a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2$, $f_2 = b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2$, $f_3 = c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2$, with which one can give many linearly dependent

subsets in S_3 . For instance, S_3 contains the subset $\{z_1^2 z_2^2 z_3^2, z_1^2 f_1^2 z_3^2, z_2^2 f_1^2 z_3^2, z_1^2 f_2^2 z_3^2, z_2^2 f_2^2 z_3^2, f_1^2 f_2^2 z_3^2\}$ of 6 elements lying in a 5 dimensional space spanned by $z_1^4 z_3^2, z_1^3 z_2 z_3^2, z_1^2 z_2^2 z_3^2, z_1 z_2^3 z_3^2, z_2^4 z_3^2$. \square

Sufficiency:

Proof. Suppose S_1 is linearly independent, we show S_3 is linearly independent. By Proposition 2.1, we have

$$\begin{vmatrix} a_1 a_2 & b_1 b_2 & c_1 c_2 \\ a_1 a_3 & b_1 b_3 & c_1 c_3 \\ a_2 a_3 & b_2 b_3 & c_2 c_3 \end{vmatrix} \neq 0 \quad (3.6)$$

from which one sees that each row or column of $\begin{pmatrix} a_1 & a_2 & a_3 \\ b_1 & b_2 & b_3 \\ c_1 & c_2 & c_3 \end{pmatrix}$ admits at most one zero entry. Precisely, the following 4 cases exhaust all possibilities by symmetry.

- CASE 1. $a_1 a_2 a_3 b_1 b_2 b_3 c_1 c_2 c_3 \neq 0$.
- CASE 2. $a_1 = 0$ and $a_2 a_3 b_1 b_2 b_3 c_1 c_2 c_3 \neq 0$.
- CASE 3. $a_1 = b_2 = 0$ and $a_2 a_3 b_1 b_3 c_1 c_2 c_3 \neq 0$
- CASE 4. $a_1 = b_2 = c_3 = 0$ and $a_2 a_3 b_1 b_3 c_1 c_2 \neq 0$

We show S_3 is linearly independent in all 4 cases. That is, if

$$\begin{aligned} & a_{123} z_1^2 z_2^2 z_3^2 \\ & + a_{124} z_1^2 z_2^2 (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2 + a_{134} z_1^2 z_3^2 (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2 + a_{234} z_2^2 z_3^2 (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2 \\ & + a_{125} z_1^2 z_2^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2 + b_3 z_3)^2 + a_{135} z_1^2 z_3^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2 + b_3 z_3)^2 + a_{235} z_2^2 z_3^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2 + b_3 z_3)^2 \\ & + a_{126} z_1^2 z_2^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2 + c_3 z_3)^2 + a_{136} z_1^2 z_3^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2 + c_3 z_3)^2 + a_{236} z_2^2 z_3^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2 + c_3 z_3)^2 \\ & + a_{145} z_1^2 (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2 + b_3 z_3)^2 \\ & + a_{245} z_2^2 (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2 + b_3 z_3)^2 \\ & + a_{345} z_3^2 (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2 + b_3 z_3)^2 \\ & + a_{146} z_1^2 (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2 + c_3 z_3)^2 \\ & + a_{246} z_2^2 (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2 + c_3 z_3)^2 \\ & + a_{346} z_3^2 (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2 + c_3 z_3)^2 \\ & + a_{156} z_1^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2 + b_3 z_3)^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2 + c_3 z_3)^2 \\ & + a_{256} z_2^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2 + b_3 z_3)^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2 + c_3 z_3)^2 \\ & + a_{356} z_3^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2 + b_3 z_3)^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2 + c_3 z_3)^2 \\ & + a_{456} (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2 + b_3 z_3)^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2 + c_3 z_3)^2 \\ & = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

for coefficients

$$X := \{a_{123}, a_{124}, a_{125}, a_{126}, a_{134}, a_{135}, a_{136}, a_{145}, a_{146}, a_{156}, a_{234}, a_{235}, a_{236}, a_{245}, a_{246}, a_{256}, a_{345}, a_{346}, a_{356}, a_{456}\},$$

then all these coefficients are zero.

The following outline of proof applies to CASE 1, 2, 3, and is slightly modified in CASE 4.

- (1) choose a subset \tilde{Y} from $Y := \{z_1^i z_2^j z_3^k, i + j + k = 6\}$;
- (2) trace the coefficients of \tilde{Y} in (3.7), which yields a linear system in a subset \tilde{X} of X ;

(3) if step (1) is done right in the sense that \tilde{X} and \tilde{Y} have the same cardinality and the determinant of the linear system is nonzero, then all coefficients in \tilde{X} are zero;

(4) starting with a different \tilde{Y} and repeat above steps, until X is exhausted.

It will be seen that Step (1) varies considerably from CASE 1 to CASE 4, which is the “human” part of proof. Once \tilde{Y} is fixed, Step (2) and (3) on coefficient tracing and determinant evaluation are mechanical algebraic computations, and we recommend a computer check when hand verification is tiresome (such as tracing the $z_1^4 z_2 z_3$ coefficient in (3.7), or evaluating determinants of linear systems (3.8)(3.20) as done in CASE 1 and CASE 3 below). Note that the conditions of CASE 1 and 4 are “symmetric”, one will see that their proofs are correspondingly cleaner than that of CASE 2 and 3.

CASE 1. Tracing the coefficients of $z_1^6, z_1^5 z_2, z_1^5 z_3, z_1^4 z_2 z_3$ in (3.7) yields the following linear system in $a_{145}, a_{146}, a_{156}, a_{456}$:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} a_1^2 b_1^2 a_{145} + a_1^2 c_1^2 a_{146} + b_1^2 c_1^2 a_{156} + a_1^2 b_1^2 c_1^2 a_{456} = 0 \\ (a_1^2 b_1 b_2 + a_2 a_1 b_1^2) a_{145} + (a_1^2 c_1 c_2 + a_2 a_1 c_1^2) a_{146} + (b_1 b_2 c_1^2 + b_1^2 c_1 c_2) a_{156} + (a_1^2 b_1 c_1 (b_2 c_1 + b_1 c_2) + a_2 a_1 b_1^2 c_1^2) a_{456} = 0 \\ (a_1^2 b_1 b_3 + a_3 a_1 b_1^2) a_{145} + (a_1^2 c_1 c_3 + a_3 a_1 c_1^2) a_{146} + (b_1 b_3 c_1^2 + b_1^2 c_1 c_3) a_{156} + (a_1^2 b_1 c_1 (b_3 c_1 + b_1 c_3) + a_3 a_1 b_1^2 c_1^2) a_{456} = 0 \\ (a_1 b_2 (2a_3 b_1 + a_1 b_3) + a_2 b_1 (a_3 b_1 + 2a_1 b_3)) a_{145} \\ + (a_1 c_2 (2a_3 c_1 + a_1 c_3) + a_2 c_1 (a_3 c_1 + 2a_1 c_3)) a_{146} \\ + (b_1 c_2 (2b_3 c_1 + b_1 c_3) + b_2 c_1 (b_3 c_1 + 2b_1 c_3)) a_{156} \\ + (a_1^2 b_2 b_3 c_1^2 + 2a_1^2 b_1 b_3 c_1 c_2 + 2a_1^2 b_1 b_2 c_1 c_3 + a_1^2 b_1^2 c_2 c_3 + 2a_3 a_1 b_1 b_2 c_1^2 + 2a_2 a_1 b_1 b_3 c_1^2 + 2a_3 a_1 b_1^2 c_1 c_2 + 2a_2 a_1 b_1^2 c_1 c_3 + a_2 a_3 b_1^2 c_1^2) a_{456} = 0 \end{array} \right. \quad (3.8)$$

The determinant of this system equals

$$3a_1^4 b_1^4 c_1^4 \begin{vmatrix} a_1 a_2 & b_1 b_2 & c_1 c_2 \\ a_1 a_3 & b_1 b_3 & c_1 c_3 \\ a_2 a_3 & b_2 b_3 & c_2 c_3 \end{vmatrix} \quad (3.9)$$

which is non-zero by (3.6) and $a_1 a_2 a_3 b_1 b_2 b_3 c_1 c_2 c_3 \neq 0$, forcing $a_{145} = a_{146} = a_{156} = a_{456} = 0$.

By symmetry, tracing the coefficients of $z_2^6, z_1 z_2^5, z_2^5 z_3, z_1 z_2^4 z_3$ gives $a_{245} = a_{246} = a_{256} = a_{456} = 0$, and tracing those of $z_3^6, z_1 z_3^5, z_2 z_3^5, z_1 z_2 z_3^4$ gives $a_{345} = a_{346} = a_{356} = a_{456} = 0$. Now (3.7) is reduced into

$$\begin{aligned} & a_{123} z_1^2 z_2^2 z_3^2 \\ & + a_{124} z_1^2 z_2^2 (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2 + a_{134} z_1^2 z_3^2 (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2 + a_{234} z_2^2 z_3^2 (a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2 \\ & + a_{125} z_1^2 z_2^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2 + b_3 z_3)^2 + a_{135} z_1^2 z_3^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2 + b_3 z_3)^2 + a_{235} z_2^2 z_3^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_2 z_2 + b_3 z_3)^2 \\ & + a_{126} z_1^2 z_2^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2 + c_3 z_3)^2 + a_{136} z_1^2 z_3^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2 + c_3 z_3)^2 + a_{236} z_2^2 z_3^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2 + c_3 z_3)^2 \\ & = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

Tracing the coefficient of $z_1^3 z_2^3, z_1^3 z_2^2 z_3, z_1^2 z_2^3 z_3$ in (3.10) gives the following linear system in $a_{124}, a_{125}, a_{126}$

$$\begin{cases} a_1 a_2 a_{124} + b_1 b_2 a_{125} + c_1 c_2 a_{126} = 0 \\ a_1 a_3 a_{124} + b_1 b_3 a_{125} + c_1 c_3 a_{126} = 0 \\ a_2 a_3 a_{124} + b_2 b_3 a_{125} + c_2 c_3 a_{126} = 0 \end{cases}$$

whose determinant is non-zero by (3.6), forcing $a_{124} = a_{125} = a_{126} = 0$. By symmetry, $a_{134} = a_{135} = a_{136} = 0$ and $a_{234} = a_{235} = a_{236} = 0$ follows analogously. Finally (3.10) is reduced to $a_{123}z_1^2z_2^2z_3^2 = 0$ hence $a_{123} = 0$ as well.

CASE 2. In this case, we have

$$a_2a_3b_1c_1(b_2c_3 - b_3c_2) \neq 0, \quad (3.11)$$

which is the value of $\begin{vmatrix} a_1a_2 & b_1b_2 & c_1c_2 \\ a_1a_3 & b_1b_3 & c_1c_3 \\ a_2a_3 & b_2b_3 & c_2c_3 \end{vmatrix}$ when $a_1 = 0$. Tracing the coefficient of z_1^6 in (3.7) with $a_1 = 0$ gives $b_1^2c_1^2a_{156} = 0$ which forces $a_{156} = 0$.

Also $a_1 = 0$ implies that the determinant (3.9) is zero, hence at this stage we can not assert $a_{145} = a_{146} = a_{156} = 0$ as in CASE 1. On the other hand, as both $a_2b_2c_2$ and $a_3b_3c_3$ are non-zero, tracing coefficients of $z_2^6, z_1z_2^5, z_2^5z_3, z_1z_2^4z_3$ and $z_3^6, z_1z_3^5, z_2z_3^5, z_1z_2z_3^4$ still give linear systems with non-zero determinants (which equal to $3a_3^4b_3^4c_3^4 \begin{vmatrix} 0 & b_1b_2 & c_1c_2 \\ 0 & b_1b_3 & c_1c_3 \\ a_2a_3 & b_2b_3 & c_2c_3 \end{vmatrix} = 3a_2^5a_3b_1b_2^4c_1c_2^4(b_2c_3 - b_3c_2)$ and $3a_2^4b_2^4c_2^4 \begin{vmatrix} 0 & b_1b_2 & c_1c_2 \\ 0 & b_1b_3 & c_1c_3 \\ a_2a_3 & b_2b_3 & c_2c_3 \end{vmatrix} = 3a_2^5a_3b_1b_2^4c_1c_2^4(b_2c_3 - b_3c_2)$ respectively), forcing $a_{245} = a_{246} = a_{256} = a_{345} = a_{346} = a_{356} = a_{456} = 0$ as in CASE 1.

Now (3.7) is reduced into

$$\begin{aligned} & a_{123}z_1^2z_2^2z_3^2 \\ & + a_{124}z_1^2z_2^2(a_2z_2 + a_3z_3)^2 + a_{134}z_1^2z_3^2(a_2z_2 + a_3z_3)^2 + a_{234}z_2^2z_3^2(a_2z_2 + a_3z_3)^2 \\ & + a_{125}z_1^2z_2^2(b_1z_1 + b_2z_2 + b_3z_3)^2 + a_{135}z_1^2z_3^2(b_1z_1 + b_2z_2 + b_3z_3)^2 + a_{235}z_2^2z_3^2(b_1z_1 + b_2z_2 + b_3z_3)^2 \\ & + a_{126}z_1^2z_2^2(c_1z_1 + c_2z_2 + c_3z_3)^2 + a_{136}z_1^2z_3^2(c_1z_1 + c_2z_2 + c_3z_3)^2 + a_{236}z_2^2z_3^2(c_1z_1 + c_2z_2 + c_3z_3)^2 \\ & + a_{145}z_1^2(a_2z_2 + a_3z_3)^2(b_1z_1 + b_2z_2 + b_3z_3)^2 \\ & + a_{146}z_1^2(a_2z_2 + a_3z_3)^2(c_1z_1 + c_2z_2 + c_3z_3)^2 \\ & = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

Tracing the coefficients of $z_1z_2^3z_3^2, z_1z_2^2z_3^3, z_2^3z_3^3$ in (3.12) yields the following system in $a_{234}, a_{235}, a_{236}$

$$\begin{cases} b_1b_2a_{235} + c_1c_2a_{236} = 0 \\ b_1b_3a_{235} + c_1c_3a_{236} = 0 \\ a_2a_3a_{234} + b_2b_3a_{235} + c_2c_3a_{236} = 0 \end{cases} \quad (3.13)$$

whose determinant is non-zero by (3.11), forcing $a_{234} = a_{235} = a_{236} = 0$.

Now (3.12) is reduced into (we cancel out the common factor z_1^2)

$$\begin{aligned} & a_{123}z_2^2z_3^2 \\ & + a_{124}z_2^2(a_2z_2 + a_3z_3)^2 + a_{134}z_3^2(a_2z_2 + a_3z_3)^2 \\ & + a_{125}z_2^2(b_1z_1 + b_2z_2 + b_3z_3)^2 + a_{135}z_3^2(b_1z_1 + b_2z_2 + b_3z_3)^2 \\ & + a_{126}z_2^2(c_1z_1 + c_2z_2 + c_3z_3)^2 + a_{136}z_3^2(c_1z_1 + c_2z_2 + c_3z_3)^2 \\ & + a_{145}(a_2z_2 + a_3z_3)^2(b_1z_1 + b_2z_2 + b_3z_3)^2 + a_{146}(a_2z_2 + a_3z_3)^2(c_1z_1 + c_2z_2 + c_3z_3)^2 \\ & = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

Tracing the coefficients of $z_1^2z_2z_3, z_1^2z_3^2, z_1z_3^3, z_1z_2z_3^2$ in (3.14) gives the following system in $a_{135}, a_{136}, a_{145}, a_{146}$

$$\begin{cases} a_2a_3b_1^2a_{145} + a_2a_3c_1^2a_{146} = 0 \\ b_1^2a_{135} + c_1^2a_{136} + a_3^2b_1^2a_{145} + a_3^2c_1^2a_{146} = 0 \\ b_1b_3a_{135} + c_1c_3a_{136} + a_3^2b_1b_3a_{145} + a_3^2c_1c_3a_{146} = 0 \\ b_1b_2a_{135} + c_1c_2a_{136} + a_3b_1(a_3b_2 + 2a_2b_3)a_{145} + a_3c_1(a_3c_2 + 2a_2c_3)a_{146} = 0 \end{cases} \quad (3.15)$$

whose determinant equals $2a_2^2a_3^2b_1^2c_1^2(b_1c_3 - b_3c_1)^2$.

Symmetrically, tracing the coefficients of $z_1^2z_2z_3, z_1^2z_2^2, z_1z_2^3, z_1z_2^2z_3$ in (3.14) gives linear system in $a_{125}, a_{126}, a_{145}, a_{146}$ whose determinant equals $2a_2^2a_3^2b_1^2c_1^2(b_1c_2 - b_2c_1)^2$.

We claim that either $b_1c_3 - b_3c_1 \neq 0$ or $b_1c_2 - b_2c_1 \neq 0$. In fact, $b_1c_3 - b_3c_1 = b_1c_2 - b_2c_1 = 0$ combined with $b_1c_1 \neq 0$ implies $b_2c_3 - b_3c_2 = 0$, contradicting (3.11). Without loss of generality, we continue with $b_1c_3 - b_3c_1 \neq 0$.

Now system (3.15) has non-zero determinant which forces $a_{135} = a_{136} = a_{145} = a_{146} = 0$ and reduces (3.14) into

$$\begin{aligned} & a_{123}z_2^2z_3^2 + a_{124}z_2^2(a_2z_2 + a_3z_3)^2 + a_{134}z_3^2(a_2z_2 + a_3z_3)^2 \\ & + a_{125}z_2^2(b_1z_1 + b_2z_2 + b_3z_3)^2 + a_{126}z_2^2(c_1z_1 + c_2z_2 + c_3z_3)^2 = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

Tracing coefficients of $z_1z_2^2z_3$ and $z_1z_2^3$ in (3.16) gives

$$\begin{cases} b_1b_3a_{125} + c_1c_3a_{126} = 0 \\ b_1b_2a_{125} + c_1c_2a_{126} = 0 \end{cases} \quad (3.17)$$

whose determinant $b_1c_1(b_3c_2 - b_2c_3)$ is non-zero by (3.11), forcing $a_{125} = a_{126} = 0$. Now (3.16) becomes

$$a_{123}z_2^2z_3^2 + a_{124}z_2^2(a_2z_2 + a_3z_3)^2 + a_{134}z_3^2(a_2z_2 + a_3z_3)^2 = 0. \quad (3.18)$$

Tracing the coefficients of z_2^4 and z_3^4 gives $a_2^2a_{124} = a_3^2a_{134} = 0$, which combined with $a_2a_3 \neq 0$ gives $a_{124} = a_{134} = 0$. The remaining $a_{123}z_2^2z_3^2 = 0$ gives $a_{123} = 0$ and we are done.

CASE 3. When $a_1 = b_2 = 0$, the coefficients of z_1^6, z_2^6 in (3.7) are $b_1^2c_1^2a_{156}$ and $a_2^2c_2^2a_{246}$ respectively, forcing $a_{156} = a_{246} = 0$. As in CASE 1, tracing coefficients of $z_3^6, z_1z_3^5, z_2z_3^5, z_1z_2z_3^4$ gives linear systems in $a_{345}, a_{346}, a_{356}, a_{456}$ whose determinant is nonzero (which equal to $3a_3^4b_3^4c_3^4 \begin{vmatrix} 0 & 0 & c_1c_2 \\ a_2a_3 & b_1b_3 & c_1c_3 \\ 0 & 0 & c_2c_3 \end{vmatrix} = -3a_2a_3^5b_1b_3^5c_1c_2c_3^4$), forcing $a_{345} = a_{346} = a_{356} = a_{456} = 0$. Now (3.7) is reduced into

$$\begin{aligned} & a_{123}z_1^2z_2^2z_3^2 \\ & + a_{124}z_1^2z_2^2(a_2z_2 + a_3z_3)^2 + a_{134}z_1^2z_3^2(a_2z_2 + a_3z_3)^2 + a_{234}z_2^2z_3^2(a_2z_2 + a_3z_3)^2 \\ & + a_{125}z_1^2z_2^2(b_1z_1 + b_3z_3)^2 + a_{135}z_1^2z_3^2(b_1z_1 + b_3z_3)^2 + a_{235}z_2^2z_3^2(b_1z_1 + b_3z_3)^2 \\ & + a_{126}z_1^2z_2^2(c_1z_1 + c_2z_2 + c_3z_3)^2 + a_{136}z_1^2z_3^2(c_1z_1 + c_2z_2 + c_3z_3)^2 + a_{236}z_2^2z_3^2(c_1z_1 + c_2z_2 + c_3z_3)^2 \\ & + a_{145}z_1^2(a_2z_2 + a_3z_3)^2(b_1z_1 + b_3z_3)^2 + a_{245}z_2^2(a_2z_2 + a_3z_3)^2(b_1z_1 + b_3z_3)^2 \\ & + a_{146}z_1^2(a_2z_2 + a_3z_3)^2(c_1z_1 + c_2z_2 + c_3z_3)^2 + a_{256}z_2^2(b_1z_1 + b_3z_3)^2(c_1z_1 + c_2z_2 + c_3z_3)^2 \\ & = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

Tracing the coefficients of $z_1^4z_2z_3, z_1z_2^4z_3, z_1^2z_2^4, z_1^4z_2^2, z_1^3z_2^3, z_1^3z_2^2z_3, z_1^2z_2^3z_3$ gives the following linear system in $a_{124}, a_{125}, a_{126}, a_{145}, a_{146}, a_{245}, a_{256}$

$$\begin{cases} a_2a_3b_1^2a_{145} + a_2a_3c_1^2a_{146} = 0 \\ a_2^2b_1b_3a_{245} + b_1b_3c_2^2a_{256} = 0 \\ a_2^2a_{124} + c_2^2a_{126} + a_2^2c_2^2a_{146} + a_2^2b_1^2a_{245} + b_1^2c_2^2a_{256} = 0 \\ b_1^2a_{125} + c_1^2a_{126} + a_2^2b_1^2a_{145} + a_2^2c_1^2a_{146} + b_1^2c_1^2a_{256} = 0 \\ c_1c_2a_{126} + a_2^2c_1c_2a_{146} + b_1^2c_1c_2a_{256} = 0 \\ b_1b_3a_{125} + c_1c_3a_{126} + a_2^2b_1b_3a_{145} + a_2c_1(a_2c_3 + 2a_3c_2)a_{146} + b_1c_1(b_3c_1 + b_1c_3)a_{256} = 0 \\ a_2a_3a_{124} + c_2c_3a_{126} + a_2c_2(a_2c_3 + a_3c_2)a_{146} + a_2a_3b_1^2a_{245} + b_1c_2(2b_3c_1 + b_1c_3)a_{256} = 0 \end{cases} \quad (3.20)$$

which forces $a_{124} = a_{125} = a_{126} = a_{145} = a_{146} = a_{245} = a_{256} = 0$ since its determinant equals $-3a_2^6 a_3^2 b_1^6 b_3^2 c_1^3 c_2^3$ which is nonzero.

Now (3.19) is reduced into

$$\begin{aligned}
& a_{123} z_1^2 z_2^2 z_3^2 \\
& + a_{134} z_1^2 z_3^2 (a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2 + a_{234} z_2^2 z_3^2 (a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2 \\
& + a_{135} z_1^2 z_3^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_3 z_3)^2 + a_{235} z_2^2 z_3^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_3 z_3)^2 \\
& + a_{136} z_1^2 z_3^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2 + c_3 z_3)^2 + a_{236} z_2^2 z_3^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2 + c_3 z_3)^2 \\
& = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

Tracing coefficients of $z_1^3 z_2 z_3^2, z_1^2 z_2 z_3^3, z_1^3 z_3^3$ in (3.21) gives $c_1 c_2 a_{136} = c_2 c_3 a_{136} + a_2 a_3 a_{134} = b_1 b_3 a_{135} + c_1 c_3 a_{136} = 0$ which combined with $a_2 a_3 b_1 b_3 c_1 c_2 c_3 \neq 0$ forces $a_{134} = a_{135} = a_{136} = 0$. In the same way, tracing coefficients of $z_1 z_2^3 z_3^2, z_1 z_2^2 z_3^3, z_2^3 z_3^3$ gives $a_{234} = a_{235} = a_{236} = 0$. Finally only $a_{123} z_1^2 z_2^2 z_3^2 = 0$ remains hence $a_{123} = 0$.

CASE 4. Tracing the coefficients of z_1^6, z_2^6, z_3^6 in (3.7) gives $b_1^2 c_1^2 a_{156} = a_2^2 c_2^2 a_{246} = a_3^2 b_3^2 a_{345} = 0$ which combined with $a_2 a_3 b_1 b_3 c_1 c_2 \neq 0$ forces $a_{156} = a_{246} = a_{345} = 0$. Now (3.7) is reduced into

$$\begin{aligned}
& a_{123} z_1^2 z_2^2 z_3^2 \\
& + a_{124} z_1^2 z_2^2 (a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2 + a_{134} z_1^2 z_3^2 (a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2 + a_{234} z_2^2 z_3^2 (a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2 \\
& + a_{126} z_1^2 z_2^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2)^2 + a_{136} z_1^2 z_3^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2)^2 + a_{236} z_2^2 z_3^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2)^2 \\
& + a_{125} z_1^2 z_2^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_3 z_3)^2 + a_{135} z_1^2 z_3^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_3 z_3)^2 + a_{235} z_2^2 z_3^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_3 z_3)^2 \\
& + a_{145} z_1^2 (a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_3 z_3)^2 + a_{245} z_2^2 (a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_3 z_3)^2 \\
& + a_{146} z_1^2 (a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2)^2 + a_{346} z_3^2 (a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2)^2 \\
& + a_{256} z_2^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_3 z_3)^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2)^2 + a_{356} z_3^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_3 z_3)^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2)^2 \\
& + a_{456} (a_2 z_2 + a_3 z_3)^2 (b_1 z_1 + b_3 z_3)^2 (c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2)^2 \\
& = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

Tracing coefficients of $z_1^4 z_2 z_3, z_1 z_2^4 z_3, z_1^3 z_2^2 z_3, z_1^2 z_2^3 z_3, z_1^4 z_2^2, z_1^3 z_2^3, z_1^2 z_2^4$ in (3.22) yields the following linear systems in $a_{124}, a_{125}, a_{126}, a_{145}, a_{146}, a_{245}, a_{256}$

$$\begin{cases}
a_2 a_3 b_1^2 a_{145} + a_2 a_3 c_1^2 a_{146} = -a_2 a_3 b_1^2 c_1^2 a_{456} \\
b_1 b_3 c_2^2 a_{256} + a_2^2 b_1 b_3 a_{245} = -a_2^2 b_1 b_3 c_2^2 a_{456} \\
b_1 b_3 a_{125} + a_2^2 b_1 b_3 a_{145} + 2a_3 a_2 c_1 c_2 a_{146} + b_1 b_3 c_1^2 a_{256} = -(2a_2 a_3 b_1^2 c_1 c_2 + a_2^2 b_3 b_1 c_1^2) a_{456} \\
a_2 a_3 a_{124} + a_2 a_3 c_2^2 a_{146} + a_2 a_3 b_1^2 a_{245} + 2b_3 b_1 c_1 c_2 a_{256} = -(2a_2^2 b_1 b_3 c_1 c_2 + a_3 a_2 b_1^2 c_2^2) a_{456} \\
b_1^2 a_{125} + c_1^2 a_{126} + a_2^2 b_1^2 a_{145} + a_2^2 c_1^2 a_{146} + b_1^2 c_1^2 a_{256} = -a_2^2 b_1^2 c_1^2 a_{456} \\
c_1 c_2 a_{126} + a_2^2 c_1 c_2 a_{146} + b_1^2 c_1 c_2 a_{256} = -a_2^2 b_1^2 c_1 c_2 a_{456} \\
a_2^2 a_{124} + c_2^2 a_{126} + a_2^2 c_2^2 a_{146} + a_2^2 b_1^2 a_{245} + b_1^2 c_2^2 a_{256} = -a_2^2 b_1^2 c_2^2 a_{456}
\end{cases} \tag{3.23}$$

which implies that

$$a_{124} = a_{125} = a_{145} = a_{245} = 0, a_{126} = a_2^2 b_1^2 a_{456}, a_{146} = -b_1^2 a_{456}, a_{256} = -a_2^2 a_{456}. \tag{3.24}$$

In fact, one immediately verifies that (3.24) is a solution of (3.23), while the determinant of (3.23) equals $-a_2^6 a_3^2 b_1^6 b_3^2 c_1^3 c_2^3$ which is nonzero, hence (3.24) is the unique solution.

In the same way, tracing the coefficients of $z_1^4 z_2 z_3, z_1 z_2 z_3^4, z_1^3 z_2 z_3^2, z_1^2 z_2 z_3^3, z_1^4 z_3^2, z_1^3 z_3^3, z_1^2 z_3^4$ in (3.22) gives

$$a_{134} = a_{136} = a_{146} = a_{346} = 0, a_{135} = a_3^2 c_1^2 a_{456}, a_{145} = -c_1^2 a_{456}, a_{356} = -a_3^2 a_{456} \quad (3.25)$$

and tracing the coefficients of $z_1 z_2 z_3^4, z_1 z_2^4 z_3, z_1 z_2^3 z_3^2, z_1 z_2^2 z_3^3, z_2^2 z_3^4, z_2^3 z_3^3, z_2^4 z_3^2$ gives

$$a_{235} = a_{236} = a_{256} = a_{356} = 0, a_{234} = b_3^2 c_2^2 a_{456}, a_{245} = -c_2^2 a_{456}, a_{346} = -b_3^2 a_{456}. \quad (3.26)$$

Combining (3.24)(3.25)(3.26) with $a_2 a_3 b_1 b_3 c_1 c_2 \neq 0$ yields

$$a_{124} = a_{125} = a_{126} = a_{134} = a_{135} = a_{136} = a_{145} = a_{146} = a_{234} = a_{235} = a_{236} = a_{245} = a_{256} = a_{346} = a_{356} = a_{456} = 0,$$

which reduces (3.22) into $a_{123} z_1^2 z_2^2 z_3^2 = 0$ hence $a_{123} = 0$ as well. \square

References

- [1] J. Alexander, A. Hirschowitz, *Polynomial interpolation in several variables*, J. Algebraic Geom. **4**(1995) 201-222
- [2] E. Carlini, M. Catalisano, A. Geramita, *The solution to the Waring problem for monomials and the sum of coprime monomials*, J. Algebra. **370** (2012) 5-14.
- [3] W. Buczyńska, J. Buczyński, *Apolarity, border rank, and multigraded Hilbert scheme*, Duke Math. J. **170**(2021), 3659-3702.
- [4] J. Alper, T. Bogart, M. Velasco, *A lower bound for the determinantal complexity of a hypersurface*, Found. Comput. Math. **17**(2017), 829-836.
- [5] P. Bürgisser, C. Ikenmeyer, J. Hüttenhain, *Permanent versus determinant: not via saturations*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **145**(2017), 1247-1258.
- [6] T. Mignon, N. Ressayre, *A quadratic bound for the determinant and permanent problem*, Int. Math. Res. Not. **79**(2004), 4241-4253.
- [7] C. Ikenmeyer, J. Landsberg, *On the complexity of the permanent in various computational models*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra. **221**(2017), 2911-2927.
- [8] Laura Brustenga I Moncusi, S. Masuti, *The Waring rank of binary binomial forms*, Pacific J. Math. **313**(2021), 327-342.
- [9] E. Ballico, A. De Paris, *Generic power sum decompositions and bounds for the Waring rank*, Discrete Comput. Geom. **57**(2017), 896-914.
- [10] G. Blekherman, Z. Teitler, *On maximum, typical and generic ranks*, Math. Ann. **362**(2015), 1021-1031.

- [11] L. Valiant, *Completeness classes in algebra*, Conference Record of the Eleventh Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (Atlanta, Ga., 1979) 249-261.
- [12] L. Valiant, *The complexity of computing the permanent*, Theoret. Comput. Sci.**8**(1979), 189-201.

Li Chen
SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS
SHANDONG UNIVERSITY
JINAN 250100
CHINA.
Email: **Lchencz@sdu.edu.cn**