

# SIGN PATTERNS OF PRINCIPAL MINORS OF REAL SYMMETRIC MATRICES

TOBIAS BOEGE, JESSE SELOVER, AND MAKSYM ZUBKOV

ABSTRACT. We analyze a combinatorial rule satisfied by the signs of principal minors of a real symmetric matrix. The sign patterns satisfying this rule are equivalent to uniform oriented Lagrangian matroids. We first discuss their structure and symmetries and then study their asymptotics, proving that almost all of them are not representable by real symmetric matrices. We offer several conjectures and experimental results concerning representable sign patterns and the topology of their representation spaces.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $N$  be a finite set of size  $n$  and  $\Sigma \in \text{Sym}_N := \text{Sym}_N(\mathbb{R})$  a real symmetric matrix whose rows and columns are indexed by  $N$ . For any subsets  $I, J \subseteq N$  denote by  $\Sigma_{I,J}$  the submatrix whose rows are indexed by  $I$  and columns by  $J$ . A submatrix  $\Sigma_K := \Sigma_{K,K}$  is called a *principal submatrix*, and we write  $\Sigma[K] := \det \Sigma_K$  for the  $K$ -th *principal minor* of  $\Sigma$ .

In this article we are concerned with the space  $\text{PR}_N := \text{PR}_N(\mathbb{R})$  of real symmetric matrices all of whose principal minors are non-zero. Such a matrix is called *principally regular*. The space  $\text{PR}_N$  appears in a variety of settings. We delve into these connections more in the [Background](#) section below.  $\text{PR}_N$  has a natural decomposition whose pieces correspond to assignments of *signs*  $+$  or  $-$  to each of the principal minors. Formally, a *sign pattern* is a function  $s : 2^N \rightarrow \{+, -\}$ . If there exists  $\Sigma \in \text{PR}_N$  such that  $s(K) = \text{sgn } \Sigma[K]$  for all  $K \subseteq N$ , then  $s$  is called *representable* and we denote it as  $\text{signs}_\Sigma$ . By convention  $\Sigma[\emptyset] = 1$  and hence  $\text{signs}_\Sigma(\emptyset) = +$ . The set  $\{+, -\}$  is naturally a group under the usual rules for multiplication of signs.

To work with sign patterns as combinatorial objects, we adopt some notational conveniences. Subsets of  $N$  are denoted by uppercase letters  $I, J, K, \dots$  and elements correspondingly in lowercase  $i, j, k, \dots$ . The union of  $I, J \subseteq N$  is abbreviated to  $IJ := I \cup J$ . An element  $i \in N$  is not distinguished from its singleton subset  $\{i\} \subseteq N$  and thus an expression  $iK$  is shorthand for  $\{i\} \cup K$ . We use  $I \oplus J$  for the symmetric difference of  $I$  and  $J$  and  $K^c$  for the complement of  $K$  in  $N$ . The notation  $2^N$  for the powerset of  $N$  already appeared above.

For any sign pattern  $s : 2^N \rightarrow \{+, -\}$ , we set  $\text{PR}_N(s)$  to be the fiber of  $\text{signs}$  over  $s$ . That is,

$$\text{PR}_N(s) := \{ \Sigma \in \text{PR}_N : \text{signs}_\Sigma = s \}.$$

Topologically,  $\text{PR}_N$  decomposes into the subspaces  $\text{PR}_N(s)$ , where  $s$  ranges over all representable sign patterns; and these subspaces are disconnected from each other inside  $\text{PR}_N$ . Our aim is to understand the pieces  $\text{PR}_N(s)$  as a window into the topology of the whole space  $\text{PR}_N$ .

Our point of departure is the following observation about the minors of a symmetric matrix. It follows at once from the Desnanot–Jacobi identity and the symmetry of the matrix.

**Lemma.** For any  $\Sigma \in \text{Sym}_N$ ,  $i \neq j$  and  $K \subseteq N \setminus ij$ , the following polynomial identity holds:

$$(\diamond') \quad (\det \Sigma_{iK,jK})^2 = \Sigma[iK] \cdot \Sigma[jK] - \Sigma[ijK] \cdot \Sigma[K].$$

Consequently  $[\text{signs}_\Sigma(iK) \neq \text{signs}_\Sigma(jK)] \implies [\text{signs}_\Sigma(K) \neq \text{signs}_\Sigma(ijK)]$ .

---

*Date:* July 26, 2024.

*2020 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05B20 (primary) 14P10, 14P25, 15A15 (secondary).

*Key words and phrases.* symmetric matrix, principal minors, sign pattern, orientation, Lagrangian matroid, connected components.

The equation  $(\diamond')$  is called a “square trinomial” in [BDKS19]. It shows that the principal minor map  $K \mapsto \Sigma[K]$  is locally log-submodular for a symmetric matrix, a fact also known as the *Koteljanskii inequality*. Motivated by its implication for the signs, we make the following definition.

**Definition 1.1.** A sign pattern  $s : 2^N \rightarrow \{+, -\}$  is *admissible* if  $s(\emptyset) = +$  and if the implication

$$(\diamond) \quad [s(iK) \neq s(jK)] \implies [s(K) \neq s(ijK)]$$

holds for every  $i \neq j$  and  $K \subseteq N \setminus ij$ .

There is one instance of  $(\diamond)$  for every disjoint pair of subsets  $ij$  and  $K$  of  $N$ , where  $i \neq j$ . We denote such a pair by  $(ij|K)$  and call it a *diamond* because the corresponding interval  $[K, ijK]$  in the boolean lattice  $2^N$  looks like a diamond. Correspondingly, we call the implication  $(\diamond)$  the *diamond axiom* for  $(ij|K)$ . Diamonds are in bijection with the 2-dimensional faces of the  $N$ -dimensional hypercube where the four sets  $K, iK, jK, ijK$  in  $[K, ijK]$  correspond to the four vertices of the 2-face, so there are precisely  $\binom{n}{2}2^{n-2}$  diamond axioms over a ground set of size  $n$ . This also explains the name “square trinomial” for  $(\diamond')$ .

**Background.** The principal minors of symmetric matrices have naturally received a lot of attention from various branches of mathematics. Basic combinatorial properties have been derived in the form of constraints on the *characteristic sequences* in [BDOvD12, BCF<sup>+</sup>16, MR18]. These sequences capture information about principal minors  $\Sigma[K]$  grouped by the size of  $K$  which is called the *order* of the principal minor. The *sepr*-characteristic sequence of [MR18] is the closest of these notions to our topic of principal minor sign patterns. It captures for each  $0 \leq k \leq n$  whether all, some or none of the order  $k$  principal minors are positive, negative, zero or non-zero. Crucially, the theory of characteristic sequences makes no assumptions about principal regularity but contains it as a special case.

In algebraic statistics and probabilistic reasoning, principally regular matrices are algebraic models of the covariance matrices of regular multivariate Gaussian probability distributions. They allow an algebraic investigation of abstract properties of Gaussian conditional independence relations using the tools of computer algebra [Boe22, Chapter 3]. In fact, the conditional independence relation of a Gaussian is nothing but the set of all diamonds  $(ij|K)$  such that equality holds in the Koteljanskii inequality  $\Sigma[iK] \cdot \Sigma[jK] \geq \Sigma[ijK] \cdot \Sigma[K]$  (provided that  $\Sigma[K] \neq 0$ ).

Principally regular matrices make yet another appearance in the standard symplectic vector space  $V = \mathbb{R}^n \oplus (\mathbb{R}^n)^*$ . Recall that the Lagrangian Grassmannian  $\text{LGr}(V)$  parametrizes the Lagrangian subspaces of  $V$  and that a Lagrangian subspace can be represented as the row space of a real  $n \times 2n$ -matrix  $M = (A | B)$  of full row rank, where  $A$  and  $B$  are  $n \times n$ -matrices with  $AB^T$  symmetric. By [BGW03, Sections 3.4 & 4.1.3], the Lagrangian Grassmannian has a stratification by representable Lagrangian matroids. We consider its affine patch consisting of matrices of the form  $(I_n | \Sigma)$ , where  $I_n$  is the identity matrix. This patch is parametrized by  $\Sigma \in \text{Sym}_N$  and  $\text{PR}_N$  is the cell corresponding to the uniform Lagrangian matroid. This cell is further stratified by *orientations* which are in turn indexed by our representable sign patterns. Our investigation of admissible sign patterns as a combinatorial model for representable sign patterns is therefore in line with matroid theory: oriented matroids [BLS<sup>+</sup>99] are combinatorial models for the signs attainable by maximal minors of a matrix; and oriented gaussoids [BDKS19] model signs of almost-principal minors of a positive definite matrix. In fact, our admissible sign patterns are equivalent to orientations of the uniform Lagrangian matroid; cf. [BBGW01, Axiom 4].

In its role as a moduli space of Lagrangian subspaces with certain orientation features, the topological structure of  $\text{PR}_N(s)$  becomes interesting. Akin to the famous Ringel isotopy problem for oriented matroids [BLS<sup>+</sup>99, Section 8.6], one may ask if every  $\Sigma \in \text{PR}_N(s)$  can be continuously deformed into any other  $\Sigma' \in \text{PR}_N(s)$  without leaving  $\text{PR}_N(s)$ . It turns out that this is, in general, impossible because  $\text{PR}_N(s)$  is disconnected. In light of our Conjecture 5.4 that each connected component is contractible, we focus on their number of connected components  $\dim H^0(\text{PR}_N(s))$ .

Our construction of the sign pattern  $\text{signs}_\Sigma$  factors through the *principal minor map*

$$\text{pr}_N : \text{Sym}_N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2^N}$$

which sends a real symmetric matrix  $\Sigma$  to the collection  $(p_K = \Sigma[K] : K \subseteq N)$  of all of its principal minors. This is a polynomial map and hence, by the Tarski–Seidenberg theorem, its image is a semialgebraic set. This set is well-studied. We mention the thesis of Oeding [Oed09] as a starting point. More recently, Ahmadi and Vinzant [AV22] gave a uniform algebraic characterization of its image over all unique factorization domains. Over the real numbers, an equivalent description was already known in the information theory literature due to Hassibi and Shadbakht [HS11] following work of Holtz and Sturmfels [HS07].

These descriptions of the image of  $\text{pr}_N$ , however, involve a large number of complicated equations among the principal minors and only a few very elementary inequalities  $p_{ij} \leq p_i p_j$  for all  $i \neq j$ . Although there are many interesting inequalities on the image of  $\text{pr}_N$  with applications to optimization, information theory and combinatorics (see e.g. [BKS<sup>+</sup>23, HJ08, HS11, CGY12]), they are difficult to derive from this description. One source of motivation to study representability of sign patterns is as combinatorial shadows of such inequalities. Namely, every sign pattern  $s$  corresponds to an open orthant in the space  $\mathbb{R}^{2^N}$ . If  $s$  is non-representable, then the image of  $\text{pr}_N$  does not intersect its orthant. But more is true: from the non-representability it follows that there exist  $K_1, \dots, K_t, L \subseteq N$  such that every  $\Sigma \in \text{PR}_N$  satisfies:

$$\bigwedge_{i=1}^t \left[ \text{sgn } \Sigma[K_i] = s(K_i) \right] \implies \left[ \text{sgn } \Sigma[L] = -s(L) \right].$$

By the Positivstellensatz [BCR98, Proposition 4.4.1], the fact that  $\text{sgn } \Sigma[L]$  can only be  $-s(L)$  under the above assumptions on  $\text{sgn } \Sigma[K_i]$  has an algebraic certificate: it is provable from a polynomial identity among principal minors of symmetric matrices with sums of squares coefficients — just like ( $\diamond'$ ). Under the sign assumptions on the  $\Sigma[K_i]$ , such an identity turns into a polynomial inequality which semialgebraically separates  $\text{pr}_N(\text{PR}_N)$  from the orthant associated to  $s$  (and possibly other orthants as well). Knowing which  $s$  are non-representable is a first step towards finding these inequalities. Conjecture 5.1 presents a candidate for the smallest admissible sign pattern which is not representable and a proof of non-representability might translate into one of the inequalities we seek.

**Results and outline.** In Section 2 we introduce various combinatorial operations on sign patterns which are inspired by concepts from matroid theory. The assumption of principal regularity furnishes a particularly rich combinatorial structure. We show that admissible sign patterns are structurally similar to representable ones, in that both classes satisfy natural closure properties with respect to these operations. Moreover, these combinatorial constructions induce continuous maps which give insight into the topology of  $\text{PR}_N(s)$  (Theorem 2.14). Section 3 uses these combinatorial gadgets to give a full account of the representable sign patterns in  $\text{PR}_3$  and their fibers under the signs map.

It is natural to ask whether admissibility is not only necessary for but even equivalent to representability. In Section 4 we show that asymptotically a vanishingly small fraction of admissible sign patterns is representable (Theorem 4.9). Finally, in Section 5 we study representability of sign patterns for small ground sets and collect observations about the topology of  $\text{PR}_N(s)$ . We compute the numbers of admissible and representable sign patterns for  $n \leq 5$ , giving new sequences of combinatorial interest. Generalizations and further topics, including the computational complexity of the representability problem, are discussed briefly in Section 6. All code and data referenced throughout the paper is available on our supplementary repository

<https://mathrepo.mis.mpg.de/SymmetricPrincipalMinorSigns/>.

## 2. MINORS, DUALITY AND SYMMETRY

In this section we introduce various combinatorial constructions on sign patterns which are inspired by matroid theory and come from natural operations on  $\text{PR}_N$ . The fact that admissible sign patterns also have these closure properties motivates their use as a combinatorial model.

**2.1. Minors and duality.** In this section we derive combinatorial analogues to the three operations of taking a principal submatrix, taking Schur complements, and matrix inversion on the level of sign patterns. These three operations are intimately connected by standard results in matrix analysis. The development of the theory in this section follows the templates of matroid and gaussoid theory.

Let  $\Sigma \in \text{PR}_N$ . Then, by definition, every principal submatrix  $\Sigma_K$  is non-singular. Consider  $N$  partitioned into  $K$  and  $K^c$  and  $\Sigma$  as a block matrix:

$$\Sigma = \begin{array}{cc} & \begin{matrix} K & K^c \end{matrix} \\ \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ B^\top & C \end{pmatrix} & \begin{matrix} K \\ K^c \end{matrix} \end{array} = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ B^\top A^{-1} & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & C - B^\top A^{-1} B \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I & A^{-1} B \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since  $A = \Sigma_K$  is non-singular, this is a valid block diagonalization of  $\Sigma$ . The  $K^c \times K^c$  block in the block-diagonal matrix is the *Schur complement* of  $K$  in  $\Sigma$  and it is denoted by  $\Sigma^K \in \text{Sym}_{K^c}$ . This decomposition proves Schur's formula [Zha05]:

$$\det \Sigma = \det \Sigma_K \cdot \det \Sigma^K.$$

It follows that every Schur complement  $\Sigma^K$  in a principally regular matrix is non-singular. Inverting both sides of the matrix equation shows that

$$(2.1) \quad (\Sigma^{-1})_{K^c} = (\Sigma^K)^{-1}$$

and hence  $\Sigma^{-1} \in \text{PR}_N$ . Thus, matrix inversion is an involution on  $\text{PR}_N$  and the sign pattern  $\text{signs}_{\Sigma^{-1}}$  can be computed from  $\text{signs}_\Sigma$  using Schur's formula:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{signs}_{\Sigma^{-1}}(K) &= \text{sgn} \det \Sigma^{K^c} = \text{sgn} \det \Sigma \cdot \text{sgn} \det \Sigma_{K^c} \\ &= \text{signs}_\Sigma(N) \cdot \text{signs}_\Sigma(K^c). \end{aligned}$$

This motivates the following definitions:

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $s$  be a sign pattern on ground set  $N$ . The *dual* of  $s$  is a sign pattern  $s^*$  on  $N$  defined by  $s^*(K) = s(N) \cdot s(K^c)$ . The *co-value at  $K$*  of a sign pattern is  $s^c(K) := s(N) \cdot s(K) = s^*(K^c)$ .

Consider subsets  $K \cap L = \emptyset$  of  $N$ . It is clearly true that  $\Sigma_{KL} \in \text{PR}_{KL}$  with

$$(\Sigma_{KL})_K = \Sigma_K.$$

Similarly, the quotient formula for Schur complements [Zha05, Theorem 1.4] states that  $(\Sigma_{KL})^{K^c}$  is a non-singular principal submatrix of  $\Sigma^K$ , namely with index set  $L$ , and that its Schur complement is

$$(\Sigma^K)^L = \Sigma^{KL}.$$

These observations prove that principal submatrices  $\Sigma_K$  and Schur complements  $\Sigma^K$  of a principally regular matrix  $\Sigma$  are not only non-singular but principally regular themselves. Moreover,  $\text{signs}_{\Sigma_K}$  and  $\text{signs}_{\Sigma^K}$  can be computed from  $\text{signs}_\Sigma$ . For  $\text{signs}_{\Sigma_K}$  this is just a restriction of the function  $\text{signs}_\Sigma$  to the subsets of  $K$ . For  $\text{signs}_{\Sigma^K}$  we use the quotient formula to obtain the co-value  $\text{signs}_{\Sigma^K}^c(L) = \text{signs}_\Sigma^c(KL)$ . The co-values of a sign pattern  $s$  of course completely determine it since  $s^c(L)s^c(\emptyset) = s(L)$ .

The matrix-theoretic operations of taking principal submatrices and Schur complements furnish two combinatorial operations on sign patterns which take a sign pattern  $s$  on  $N$  and produce another one on a subset  $K \subseteq N$ . The patterns which arise in this way are ‘‘minors’’ or ‘‘natural subconfigurations’’ of  $s$  — one is restricting  $s$  to  $K$ , the other projects away from  $K$ .

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $s$  be a sign pattern on  $N$  and  $K \subseteq N$ . The *restriction of  $s$  to  $K$*  is a sign pattern  $s|_K$  on  $K$  with values  $(s|_K)(L) = s(L)$  for  $L \subseteq K$ . The *deletion of  $K$*  is  $s \setminus K := s|_{K^c}$ . The *contraction of  $s$  at  $K$*  is the sign pattern  $s / K$  on  $K^c$  given by  $(s / K)^c(L) = s^c(KL)$  for  $L \subseteq K^c$ . Any sign pattern arising from  $s$  by a sequence of deletions and contractions is a *minor* of  $s$ . A minor on ground set  $K$  of size  $k$  is called a  *$k$ -minor*.

As in matroid theory, restriction and contraction are dual to each other. On the level of matrices, this is precisely captured by the formula (2.1).

**Lemma 2.3.** For any sign pattern  $s$  on  $N$  and  $K \cap L = \emptyset$ , we have  $(s^* \setminus K)^* = s / K$ .

*Proof.* It follows from the definitions of contraction and co-value that  $(s / K)(L) = (s / K)^c(\emptyset) \cdot (s / K)^c(L) = s^c(K) \cdot s^c(KL) = s(K) \cdot s(KL)$  for any  $L \subseteq K^c$ . On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} (s^* \setminus K)^*(L) &= s^*(K^c) \cdot s^*(K^c \setminus L) = s^*(K^c) \cdot s^*((KL)^c) \\ &= s(K) \cdot s(KL). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

The definitions above were made such that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{signs}_\Sigma^* &= \text{signs}_{\Sigma^{-1}}, \\ (\text{signs}_\Sigma \setminus K^c) &= (\text{signs}_\Sigma|_K) = \text{signs}_{\Sigma_K}, \\ (\text{signs}_\Sigma / K) &= \text{signs}_{\Sigma \setminus K}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, minors and duals of representable sign patterns are again representable. We say that the class of representable sign patterns is *closed* under minors and duality.

**Lemma 2.4.** Admissible sign patterns are closed under minors and duality.

*Proof.* By Lemma 2.3 it is enough to show closedness under restriction and duality. If  $s$  is admissible, then  $s|_K$  evaluates to  $s(\emptyset) = +$  on  $\emptyset$  and satisfies all the diamond axioms for subsets of  $K$  already, proving that it is admissible. The dual  $s^*$  evaluates to  $s(N)^2 = +$  on  $\emptyset$ .

Given a diamond  $(ij|K)$  over  $N$ , consider its *dual* diamond  $(ij|K)^* := (ij|N \setminus ijK)$ . By definition of  $s^*$ , the sign pattern  $s^*$  satisfies the axiom corresponding to  $(ij|K)$  if and only if  $s$  satisfies  $(ij|K)^*$ . Since  $s$  satisfies all diamond axioms, and hence all dual diamond axioms,  $s^*$  satisfies all diamond axioms and thus is admissible.  $\square$

**2.2. Negation and the hyperoctahedral symmetry.** We now turn to continuous symmetries of symmetric matrices and the discrete symmetries they induce on sign patterns. Let  $r$  be a non-zero real number. Then  $\text{PR}_N$  is preserved under multiplication with  $r$  and  $\text{signs}_{r\Sigma}(K) = \text{sgn}(r)^{|K|} \text{signs}_\Sigma(K)$ . Thus, only the sign of  $r$  matters and this gives an action of the group  $\{+, -\}$  (isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}/2$ ) on sign patterns.

**Definition 2.5.** The *negative*  $-s$  of  $s$  is given by  $(-s)(K) := (-1)^{|K|} s(K)$ .

The hyperoctahedral group  $\mathfrak{B}_N$  is the Weyl group of type  $B_n$  and the symmetry group of the hypercube  $C_N = [-1, 1]^N$ . There is an action of  $\mathfrak{B}_N$  on  $\text{PR}_N$  which induces an action on principal minor vectors and thus on sign patterns. The action is well-studied, but we describe it here for convenience in analyzing its effect on sign patterns.

As an abstract group,  $\mathfrak{B}_N$  is the semidirect product  $(\mathbb{Z}/2)^N \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_N$  of the group of *swaps*  $(\mathbb{Z}/2)^N$  and the group of *permutations*  $\mathfrak{S}_N$ . Every element in  $\mathfrak{B}_N$  can be written as a product of a swap and a permutation. We proceed to explain these actions on matrices and sign vectors. The symmetric group  $\mathfrak{S}_N$  acts via orthogonal coordinate changes, permuting rows and columns of a symmetric matrix. This induces the corresponding permutation on principal minors and no additional sign changes.

**Definition 2.6.** Let  $s$  be a sign pattern on ground set  $N$  and  $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_N$ . The *permuted sign pattern*  $\pi \cdot s$  is defined via  $(\pi \cdot s)(K) = s(\pi(K))$ . We say two sign patterns which are related by a permutation are *isomorphic*.

The group of swaps is generated by reflections over coordinate hyperplanes which leave the hypercube  $C_N$  invariant. We identify elements  $(z_i : i \in N) \in (\mathbb{Z}/2)^N$  with subsets  $Z \subseteq N$  via  $Z = \{i \in N : z_i = 1\}$ . To describe the action on matrices, let  $Z \subseteq N$  be given and define two diagonal  $N \times N$  matrices:

$$A_{ii} = \begin{cases} 1, & i \notin Z, \\ 0, & i \in Z, \end{cases} \quad B_{ii} = \begin{cases} 0, & i \notin Z, \\ -1, & i \in Z. \end{cases}$$

Then the image of  $\Sigma$  under the swap with  $Z$  is  $Z \cdot \Sigma := (A - \Sigma B)^{-1}(B + \Sigma A)$ . It was shown in [HS07, Lemma 13] (in much greater generality) that this yields another symmetric matrix. The principal minors of  $Z \cdot \Sigma$  are computed in [Boe22, Proposition 3.16] as follows:

$$(2.2) \quad (Z \cdot \Sigma)[K] = (-1)^{|Z \cap K|} \cdot \Sigma[Z]^{-1} \cdot \Sigma[Z \oplus K].$$

**Remark 2.7.** This action of  $\mathfrak{B}_N$  is obtained as a quotient from a discrete subgroup of an  $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})^N$  action on the Lagrangian Grassmannian. For more details, see [BDKS19, Section 3] and [Boe22, Section 3.3].

**Definition 2.8.** Let  $s$  be a sign pattern on ground set  $N$  and  $Z \subseteq N$ . The *swapping of  $Z$*  results in another sign pattern  $Z \cdot s$  defined by  $(Z \cdot s)(K) := (-1)^{|Z \cap K|} \cdot s(Z) \cdot s(Z \oplus K)$ .

**Example 2.9.** It is helpful to write out explicitly what it means to swap a single element  $i$ :

$$(2.3) \quad (i \cdot s)(K) = \begin{cases} -s(i) \cdot s(K \setminus i), & i \in K, \\ s(i) \cdot s(iK), & i \notin K. \end{cases}$$

**Remark 2.10.** One can easily check the equation

$$(2.4) \quad -s^* = N \cdot s$$

relating the three different group actions we have defined on sign patterns.

With these definitions, it is clear that the representable sign patterns are closed under negation and the action of the hyperoctahedral group. We now show that admissible sign patterns are closed under these symmetries as well.

**Lemma 2.11.** Admissible sign patterns are closed under negation and the action of  $\mathfrak{B}_N$ .

*Proof.* The property  $s(\emptyset) = +$  remains unchanged under both actions. The diamond axiom is preserved under negation since the products  $s(K) \cdot s(ijK)$  and  $s(iK) \cdot s(jK)$  remain unchanged. A permutation element of  $\mathfrak{B}_N$  permutes the diamonds on ground set  $N$  and therefore preserves the diamond axioms. All that remains is to check the action of reflections in  $\mathfrak{B}_N$ . Fix an element  $z$  to swap and consider a diamond  $(ij|K)$ . If  $z \notin ij$ , then either all or none of the four sets of the diamond contain  $z$ . This reduces the axiom for  $(ij|K)$  on  $z \cdot s$  to the axiom for  $(ij|z \oplus K)$  on  $s$  which holds by assumption. If  $z \in ij$ , then we may assume without loss of generality that  $i = z$  and compute

$$\begin{aligned} (i \cdot s)(iK) \cdot (i \cdot s)(jK) &= -s(i)s(K) \cdot s(i)s(ijK) = -s(K) \cdot s(ijK), \\ (i \cdot s)(K) \cdot (i \cdot s)(ijK) &= s(i)s(iK) \cdot -s(i)s(jK) = -s(iK) \cdot s(jK). \end{aligned}$$

The diamond axiom states that if the former product is negative, then the latter product must also be negative. This translates to  $s(K) = s(ijK) \implies s(iK) = s(jK)$  which is just the contrapositive of the diamond axiom for  $(ij|K)$  as stated in Definition 1.1.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.12.** Every admissible sign pattern has a  $\mathfrak{B}_N$ -equivalent sign pattern in which all singletons are positively oriented.

*Proof.* In fact, we will prove a slightly stronger statement. Call a sign pattern  $s$  on  $N$  *positive definite* if  $s(I) = +$  for all  $I \subseteq N$ . We prove:

If  $s$  is an admissible sign pattern on  $N = \{1, \dots, n\}$  whose restriction to  $K = \{1, \dots, k-1\}$  is positive definite, then all singletons in  $s$  are positively oriented or  $s$  is  $\mathfrak{B}_N$ -equivalent to a sign pattern whose restriction to  $\{1, \dots, k\}$  is positive definite.

The premise of this statement for  $k = 1$  holds for every sign pattern. Iterated application of it then proves the lemma.

Now we prove this stronger statement. We may freely combine permutations and swaps to modify a given sign pattern until the above property is established. By the hypothesis,  $s|_K$  is positive definite for  $K = \{1, \dots, k-1\}$ . Assume that there is a singleton  $j$  which is not positively oriented, so  $s(j) = -$ . In this case  $j$  must be at least  $k$  and after a transposition we may assume that  $j = k$  without disturbing the positive definiteness of  $s|_K$ . Based on positive definiteness and the fact  $s(k) = -$ , iterated application of the diamond axiom shows that  $s(kA) = -$ . Swapping  $k$  then yields an admissible sign pattern  $k \cdot s$  such that

$$\begin{aligned}(k \cdot s)(A) &= s(k)s(kA) = -s(kA) = +, \\ (k \cdot s)(kA) &= -s(k)s(A) = s(A) = +,\end{aligned}$$

for all  $A \subseteq K$ . Therefore,  $(k \cdot s)(A) = +$  for all  $A \subseteq kK$ .  $\square$

Many more combinatorial operations inspired by matrix- and matroid-theoretic constructions can be introduced and studied; see for example [Whi08, Chapter 7]. This is an open-ended task and we prefer to close the section at this point with a concrete open question. For context, recall that representable and admissible sign patterns are minor-closed. Moreover, a sign pattern on ground set  $N$  of size  $n \geq 2$  is admissible if and only if all of its 2-minors are admissible (on their respective 2-element ground set). This is because of minor-closedness (Lemma 2.4) in one direction and in the other direction because the diamond axiom of  $(ij|K)$  holds for  $s$  if and only if  $(ij|\emptyset)$  holds for  $s/K$  which means that  $(s/K)|_{ij}$  is admissible on ground set  $ij$ . Since the class of admissible sign patterns is minor-closed and can be completely characterized by its  $k$ -minors for a finite  $k$  (in this case  $k = 2$ ), we say that it possesses a *finite forbidden minor description*.

**Question 2.13.** Does the class of representable sign patterns have a finite forbidden minor description?

This question has been studied for various types of combinatorial objects. See [MNW14, MNW18] for a much stronger result in matroid theory, [Mat97] for generalizations of matroids in the context of discrete conditional independence and [Boe22, Section 4.5 & Theorem 6.13] for Gaussians and orientable gaussoids. In view of the arguments of Section 4 (Theorem 4.9), there are admissible sign patterns which are non-representable, and thus there are admissible forbidden minors for representability. In Section 5 we offer Conjecture 5.1 as to the unique smallest such minor, on a ground set of size 5.

**2.3. Actions on representations and topology.** The symmetries from the previous section are all induced by continuous actions on symmetric matrices. The fact that they act on their sign patterns means that if  $s$  and  $s'$  are equivalent sign patterns under any of these group actions, then  $\text{PR}_N(s)$  and  $\text{PR}_N(s')$  are homeomorphic and in particular they have the same numbers of connected components. For minors, we obtain a monotonicity relation.

**Theorem 2.14.** Let  $s$  be a representable sign pattern over  $N$ . If  $s'$  over  $N$  arises from  $s$  by negation, duality or the  $\mathfrak{B}_N$  action, then  $\text{PR}_N(s)$  is homeomorphic to  $\text{PR}_N(s')$ . If  $s'$  is a minor of  $s$  over  $K$ , then  $\dim H^0(\text{PR}_N(s)) \geq \dim H^0(\text{PR}_K(s'))$ .

*Proof.* The homeomorphism assertion was already proved above. The formation of restrictions or contractions of a sign pattern corresponds to a sequence of continuous projections of the representation space via principal submatrices or Schur complements. Hence, we get a continuous surjective map  $\text{PR}_N(s) \rightarrow \text{PR}_K(s')$ . The inequality follows because the number of connected components of the image cannot exceed that of the domain.  $\square$

The positive diagonal matrices  $P_N = \{ \text{diag}(d_1, \dots, d_n) \in \text{PD}_N \}$  give another useful action on symmetric matrices via  $\Sigma \mapsto D \Sigma D$  for  $D \in P_N$ . By the Cauchy–Binet formula,

$$(D \Sigma D)[I] = D[I]^2 \cdot \Sigma[I],$$

and hence this action is trivial on sign patterns. It is useful however, because it provides a strong deformation retraction of  $\text{PR}_N(s)$  which reduces the dimension of this space without changing its homotopy type. Below we prove a stronger version of this claim. This dimension reduction is useful for computations.

**Definition 2.15.** For any sign pattern  $s$ , its *reduced representation space* is the subset  $\widehat{\text{PR}}_N(s)$  of  $\text{PR}_N(s)$  such that all diagonal entries are  $\pm 1$ .

**Proposition 2.16.** If  $s$  is any sign pattern, then  $\text{PR}_N(s)$  is homeomorphic to  $\widehat{\text{PR}}_N(s) \times P_N$ .

*Proof.* Consider the map  $\text{PR}_N(s) \rightarrow \widehat{\text{PR}}_N(s) \times P_N$  sending  $\Sigma \mapsto (D \Sigma D, D)$  where  $D = \text{diag}(1/\sqrt{|\sigma_{ii}|} : i \in N) \in P_N$ . Since  $s$  fixes the signs of  $\sigma_{ii}$ , this is evidently a continuous map and its inverse given by  $(\Sigma', D) \mapsto D^{-1} \Sigma' D^{-1}$  is continuous as well.  $\square$

**Remark 2.17.** Since  $P_N$  is contractible, the orbit  $P_N \cdot \Sigma$  is contractible as well for any principally regular  $\Sigma$ . In particular,  $\text{PR}_N(s)$  and  $\widehat{\text{PR}}_N(s)$  have the same number of connected components.

### 3. CASE STUDY OF $\text{PR}_3$

We are now ready to give a concise but exhaustive treatment of the topological features of the smallest non-trivial case  $\text{PR}_3$ .

The image of the principal minor map  $\text{pr}_3 : \text{Sym}_3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  is a semialgebraic set in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  whose coordinates we denote by  $p_K$ ,  $K \subseteq \{1, 2, 3\}$ . It is entirely contained in the hyperplane  $p_\emptyset = 1$  and inside of this  $\mathbb{R}^7$ , it is cut out by the (dehomogenized)  $2 \times 2 \times 2$  *hyperdeterminant* [HS07]:

$$h := p_{123}^2 - 2 p_{123} p_{13} p_2 + p_{13}^2 p_2^2 - 2 p_1 p_{123} p_{23} + 4 p_{12} p_{13} p_{23} - 2 p_1 p_{13} p_2 p_{23} + \\ p_1^2 p_{23}^2 - 2 p_{12} p_{123} p_3 + 4 p_1 p_{123} p_2 p_3 - 2 p_{12} p_{13} p_2 p_3 - 2 p_1 p_{12} p_{23} p_3 + p_{12}^2 p_3^2.$$

together with the inequalities  $p_{ij} \leq p_i p_j$  for all  $i \neq j$ . The real hypersurface  $h = 0$  intersects precisely  $128 - 24 = 104$  open orthants in  $\mathbb{R}^7$ ; the 24 orthants which it misses correspond to non-admissible sign patterns on  $\{1, 2, 3\}$ . Adding the inequality constraints  $p_{ij} \leq p_i p_j$  completes the description of the image of  $\text{pr}_3$ . The number of orthants that it intersects drops to 38 which correspond exactly to the admissible sign patterns; this proves that all of them are representable.

The hyperdeterminant is a polynomial of degree 4 in 7 variables with 12 terms. For a symbolic algorithm like cylindrical algebraic decomposition which can compute the representable sign patterns from the definition of  $\text{pr}_3$ , these numbers are already quite high (and the situation for  $n = 4$  is much worse). To classify sign patterns according to representability, a better approach is to work in the coordinates of  $\text{PR}_N$  and to exploit the various symmetries described in Section 2.



$\mathfrak{B}_3$ representative	Representation	Orbit size	Connected components
+++++++	(0, 0, 0)	8	1
+++++--	(-2, -2, -1)	8	4
+++++---	(-2, -2, -4)	12	2
++++----	(-2, -4, -4)	8	4
++++-----	(-4, -4, -4)	2	16

TABLE 1. Sign patterns grouped by hyperoctahedral orbits. The sign vector  $s$  is given as a string indexed by  $\emptyset, 1, 2, 3, 12, 13, 23, 123$  in order. The representation only lists off-diagonal entries  $(\sigma_{12}, \sigma_{13}, \sigma_{23})$ ; the diagonal entries are all equal to 3. In total there are 38 sign patterns and 128 connected components.




FIGURE 1. The arrangement of hypersurfaces  $\Sigma[K] = 0$  whose complement is  $\widehat{\text{PR}}_3$  as well as the pieces  $\widehat{\text{PR}}_3(s)$  for the  $\mathfrak{B}_3$  representatives  $s$  from Table 1, together in the middle and separately (on different scales) on the right.

The 38 admissible sign patterns on  $n = 3$  split into only 5 orbits modulo  $\mathfrak{B}_3$ . Since representability is preserved by this group action, the classification task is reduced to only 5 instances which are listed in the first column in Table 1. Furthermore, by Lemma 2.12 we may pick a representative  $s$  of the orbit on which all  $1 \times 1$ -minors are positive. Lastly Proposition 2.16 allows us to fix the diagonals to 1. In this setting, the inequalities  $\Sigma[i] > 0$  are trivial. The  $2 \times 2$ -minor inequality  $s(ij) \cdot \Sigma[ij] > 0$  reduces to whether  $\sigma_{ij}$  lies inside the interval  $(-1, 1)$  or inside the union  $(-\infty, -1) \cup (1, \infty)$ . The last inequality  $s(123) \cdot \Sigma[123] > 0$  has degree 3 in 3 variables and 5 terms which is simpler in every metric than the hyperdeterminant. These systems are solved instantly in *Mathematica*. The entries of particularly simple points in  $\text{PR}_3(s)$  are given in the second column of Table 1.

The reduced representation spaces  $\widehat{\text{PR}}_3(s)$  are 3-dimensional and plotted in Figure 1. Their numbers of connected components can intuitively be seen from these pictures and they are recorded in the last column in Table 1. They match the numbers obtained by symbolic computations using cylindrical algebraic decomposition in *Mathematica*. By the remarks in Section 2.3, the number of connected components of  $\text{PR}_3$  can be computed by taking the dot product of the ‘‘Orbit size’’ and ‘‘Connected components’’ columns of this table. This number is  $128 = 2^7$ . However, the equality with the total number of sign patterns  $s \in \{+, -\}^{2^3}$  (satisfying  $s(\emptyset) = +$ ) is only accidental as we know that not every sign pattern is representable and that representation spaces need not be connected. We pose the following computational problem which asks whether the connected components of  $\text{PR}_3$  are still ‘‘uniformly basic semialgebraic’’.

**Challenge 3.1.** If possible, find 7 semialgebraic functions such that the  $128 = 2^7$  regions defined by placing sign constraints on them are precisely the connected components of  $\text{PR}_3$ . Can these functions be chosen polynomial?

$n$	$a_n$	$a'_n$	$r'_n$
2	6	2	2
3	38	5	5
4	990	24	24
5	395 094	434	$\geq 433$
6	33 433 683 534?	$\leq 7 109 686 748?$	

TABLE 2. The number of admissible sign patterns  $a_n$ , the number of hyperoctahedral orbits  $a'_n$ , and the number of representable hyperoctahedral orbits  $r'_n$  for ground sets of sizes  $n = 2, \dots, 6$ . The numbers  $a_6$  and  $a'_6$  were obtained by the probabilistic model counter **GANAK** [**GANAK**] with risk parameter  $\delta = 0.01$ . The upper bound on  $a'_6$  uses additional axioms implied by Lemma 2.12.

By the asymptotic result in Corollary 4.6, we know that in general the number of connected components of  $\text{PR}_n$  cannot be  $2^{2^n-1}$  (as is the case for  $n = 3$ ). We do not have enough data to conjecture any other closed form expression. Even the number of connected components of  $\text{PR}_4$  is not known.

**Challenge 3.2.** Find a CAD of  $\text{PR}_4$  inside  $\text{Sym}_4 \cong \mathbb{R}^{10}$  (or of  $\widehat{\text{PR}}_4$  in  $\mathbb{R}^6$ ) or of its image under the principal minor map inside  $\mathbb{R}^{16}$ . How many connected components does  $\text{PR}_4$  have?

**Remark 3.3.** We show in Section 5.1 below that all admissible sign patterns on  $n = 4$  are representable. Combining the minor inequality from Theorem 2.14 and the data on representation spaces of their 3-minors in Table 1, one obtains a lower bound of 7 848 for the number of connected components of  $\text{PR}_4$ .

**Remark 3.4.** Joseph Cummings reports in private communication that the algorithm described in [HRSS20, CHHS24] yields an upper bound of 24 352 connected components for  $\text{PR}_4$ , provided that the monodromy loops exhausted all critical points of the associated rational function. However, the amount of critical points makes certification procedures impractical.

#### 4. ENUMERATION AND ASYMPTOTICS

In this section, we study the sequence  $a_n$  counting the number of admissible sign patterns of size  $n$ , and the sequence  $r_n$  counting the number of sign patterns of principally regular real symmetric  $n \times n$  matrices. There are two clear inequalities from the definitions:

$$r_n \leq a_n \leq 2^{2^n-1}$$

since representable sign patterns are admissible and admissible sign patterns satisfy  $s(\emptyset) = +$ . The main result of the section is Theorem 4.9, which states that  $a_n$  grows much quicker than  $r_n$ , but we give the best bounds we can for the asymptotics of both sequences. We begin with explicit computations on small ground sets  $n \leq 5$ .

**4.1. Enumerating sign patterns.** The definition of admissible sign patterns on ground set  $N$  is a simple boolean formula in the  $2^n$  variables  $V_K$ , one for each  $K \subseteq N$ , mapping  $s(K) = +$  to  $V_K = \text{true}$ . The resulting boolean formula in conjunctive normal form (CNF) has  $1 + \binom{n}{2} 2^n$  clauses (four clauses for each diamond). Checking whether a boolean formula in CNF has a satisfying assignment is a well-known problem in computer science called **SAT**. Even though **SAT** is an NP-complete problem, state-of-the-art solvers are extremely efficient pieces of software and are able to (1) produce a satisfying assignment (or a proof of unsatisfiability), (2) count and (3) enumerate all solutions in cases of practical interest.

We have employed the two solvers **GANAK** [**GANAK**] and `nbc_minisat_all` [**AllSAT**] through the `CInet::ManySAT` [**ManySAT**] interface to count and enumerate admissible sign patterns on up to  $n = 5$  and subsequently reduced the listing modulo the hyperoctahedral group. Our results are summarized in the first three columns of Table 2. For  $n = 6$ , the number of admissible sign

patterns is too large to be enumerated and symmetry-reduced. We instead offer the number of admissible sign patterns all of whose singletons are positively oriented. By Lemma 2.12 this gives an upper bound on the number of hyperoctahedral orbits which appears to be quite weak. The predicted upper bound for  $a'_6$  is still too large to enumerate these sign patterns and perform a symmetry reduction modulo  $\mathfrak{B}_6$ .

**Challenge 4.1.** Find hyperoctahedral representatives for the admissible sign patterns on  $n = 6$ .

**4.2. Asymptotics of admissible sign patterns.** Our upper bound on the number of admissible sign patterns comes from the following combinatorial realization: an admissible sign pattern can be recovered from a restriction and a contraction of itself and one additional sign.

**Proposition 4.2.** For all  $n$ :  $a_{n+1} \leq 2a_n^2$ .

*Proof.* Fix any finite set  $N$  of size  $n$ , and  $m \notin N$ . Let  $A_N$  be the set of admissible sign patterns on  $N$ . We inject  $A_{mN}$  into  $\{+, -\} \times A_N \times A_N$  via  $s \mapsto (s(mN), s \setminus m, s / m)$ . Using Definition 2.2, we can reconstruct  $s$  from this data:

$$\begin{aligned} s(K) &= (s \setminus m)(K), \\ s(mK) &= (s / m)(K) \cdot s(mN), \end{aligned}$$

for any  $K \subseteq N$ , proving that it is indeed an injection.  $\square$

Our lower bound is by explicit construction.

**Proposition 4.3.** For all  $n$ :

$$\log_2(a_n) \geq \sum_i \binom{n}{2i+1},$$

and in particular when  $n$  is odd the bound simplifies to  $a_n \geq 2^{2^{n-1}}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $F$  be the set of all sign patterns  $s$  satisfying

$$s(K) = (-1)^{|K|/2} \text{ whenever } |K| \text{ is even.}$$

Since the consequent of the diamond axiom ( $\diamond$ ) is true for any such pattern, all of the patterns in  $F$  are admissible. The number of unconstrained entries of sign patterns in  $F$  is the number of odd-cardinality subsets of  $N$  and thus  $\log_2(a_n) \geq \log_2(F) = \sum_i \binom{n}{2i+1}$  as claimed.  $\square$

We conjecture that the lower bound is essentially responsible for the asymptotic behavior.

**Conjecture 4.4.**

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log_2(a_n)}{2^{n-1}} = 1.$$

We may use the recursive upper bound Proposition 4.2 in conjunction with our experimental data from Section 4.1 to give partial results towards Conjecture 4.4. Namely, we have  $\log_2(a_n) \leq 1 + 2 \log_2(a_{n-1})$ , so defining  $b_n = \frac{\log_2(a_n)}{2^{n-1}}$  we get  $b_n \leq \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} + b_{n-1}$  and thus (iterating, and summing the geometric series)

$$b_n \leq \frac{1}{2^{i-1}} - \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} + b_i \text{ for any } i.$$

Because there are 395 094 admissible sign patterns on  $n = 5$ , we have  $b_5 = 1.1619897757361\dots$  and so we know by experiment that

$$b_n \leq 1.22448977573611\dots$$

for all  $n$ . Our conjecture is that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n = 1$ , which is the lower bound.

**4.3. Asymptotics of representable sign patterns.** Our upper bound on the number of representable sign patterns comes from bounding the algebraic complexity of the minor equations which cut  $\text{PR}_N$  out of  $\text{Sym}_N$ . First we quote a result of Basu, Pollak, and Roy in a simplified form for our case. For any family of polynomials  $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, \dots, P_\ell\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$  we consider the space  $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{P}) := \mathbb{R}^k \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^\ell V(P_i)$  which is the complement of the arrangement of varieties  $P_i = 0$ .

**Proposition 4.5** ([BPR96, Theorem 1]). For any family of  $\ell$  polynomials  $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, \dots, P_\ell\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$ , where each polynomial has degree at most  $d$ , we have

$$\dim H^0(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{P})) \leq \binom{\ell}{k} \mathcal{O}(d)^k.$$

**Corollary 4.6.** The number of connected components of  $\text{PR}_N$  is bounded by

$$\log_2(\dim H^0(\text{PR}_N)) \leq \mathcal{O}(n^3).$$

*Proof.* A real symmetric matrix is given by  $\binom{n+1}{2}$  coordinates. For  $\mathcal{P} = \{\Sigma[I] : I \subseteq N\}$ , we evidently have  $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{P}) = \text{PR}_N$ . The family  $\mathcal{P}$  contains  $2^n$  polynomials of degree at most  $n$ . Plugging into Proposition 4.5 gives

$$\dim H^0(\text{PR}_N) \leq \binom{2^n}{\binom{n+1}{2}} \mathcal{O}(n)^{\binom{n+1}{2}}.$$

Using the upper bound  $\binom{x}{a} \leq \frac{1}{a!} x^a$  yields  $\log_2(\dim H^0(\text{PR}_N)) \leq \mathcal{O}(n^3)$ .  $\square$

The corollary above bounds the sequence  $r_n$  beneath a singly exponential function in  $n$ , while our lower bound on the sequence  $a_n$  is doubly exponential.

**Proposition 4.7.** For all  $n$ :  $\log_2(r_n) \leq \mathcal{O}(n^3)$ .

*Proof.* The map  $\text{signs} : \text{PR}_N \rightarrow \{+, -\}^{2^N}$  is a continuous map to a discrete space, and so the cardinality of the image is bounded by the number of connected components of the domain, which is bounded by Corollary 4.6.  $\square$

**Remark 4.8.** In [Nel18], Nelson shows that almost all matroids are non-representable over *any field* by combining a doubly exponential lower bound for matroids with a newly derived singly exponential upper bound on representable matroids. Interestingly, his bound on the logarithm is  $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$  and matches our bound from Proposition 4.7. The same dichotomy of single vs. double exponential growth also holds in the realm of gaussoids with the same  $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$  bound; cf. [BK20]. For combinatorial objects capturing an “orientation” such as our admissible sign patterns, the ground field needs to be ordered and by Tarski’s transfer principle [Mar08, Section 11.2] only representability over the real numbers needs to be considered to establish an upper bound. In this case, [BPR96] is a very versatile tool. It makes no problem to deduce from it analogous  $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$  upper bounds on the numbers of uniform oriented matroids and uniform oriented gaussoids.

Combining Proposition 4.3 and Proposition 4.7 we get our main result:

**Theorem 4.9.** Let  $p_n$  be the probability that a uniformly chosen admissible sign pattern of size  $n$  is representable. Then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p_n = 0$  and in fact

$$-\log_2(p_n) \geq \Omega(2^n).$$

The asymptotic distinction between the admissible sign patterns and the representable ones appears even when we only consider size 3 minors.

**Theorem 4.10.** Let  $\tilde{p}_n$  be the probability that a uniformly chosen assignment of signs to the size 3 subsets of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  occurs in a representable sign pattern. Then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{p}_n = 0$ .

*Proof.* Let  $c_n$  be the number of connected components of  $\mathcal{C}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}})$  for  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}} = \{\Sigma[I] : I \subseteq N, |I| = 3\}$ . There are only  $\binom{n+1}{3}$  such minors, and so again using Proposition 4.5, we obtain

$$c_n \leq \binom{\binom{n+1}{3}}{\binom{n+1}{2}} c_0^{(n+1)},$$

for some constant  $c_0$ . With the same approximations as in Corollary 4.6 we obtain

$$\log c_n \leq \mathcal{O}(n^2 \log(n))$$

but the number of assignments of signs to size 3 subsets of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  is  $2^{\Omega(n^3)}$ .  $\square$

We note that every assignment of signs to subsets of size 3 occurs in an *admissible* sign pattern, by the construction in Proposition 4.3.

The best lower bound for  $r_n$  that we know of is as follows.

**Remark 4.11.** Given a vector of prescribed signs  $(s(K))_{K:|K|=2}$  for the size 2 principal minors, the matrix  $(c_{ij})$  defined by

$$c_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = j \\ 2 & \text{if } s(ij) = - \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

has principal minors of those signs by construction, and a small perturbation of the entries will give a principally regular matrix. Thus,  $\log_2(r_n) \geq \Omega(n^2)$ .

Finally, we make a remark about the number of equivalence classes under the hyperoctahedral group. Let  $a'_n$  be the number of equivalence classes of size  $n$  sign patterns under the hyperoctahedral group action, and  $r'_n$  the number of representable equivalence classes.

**Remark 4.12.** Since  $|\mathfrak{B}_n| = 2^n n!$ , we have  $\log_2 |\mathfrak{B}_n| \leq \mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ , and both  $\log_2(a_n)$  and  $\log_2(r_n)$  are at least  $\Omega(n^2)$ , the exponential growth rates are unaffected by quotienting by the group action. That is to say,  $\log_2(a'_n) = \Theta(\log_2(a_n))$  and  $\log_2(r'_n) = \Theta(\log_2(r_n))$ .

## 5. REPRESENTABILITY AND TOPOLOGY

We now turn to questions about representability and the topology of the spaces of representations. As in Section 3 we work in the affine space  $\text{Sym}_N$  where a sign pattern  $s$  gives rise to the semialgebraic set  $\text{PR}_N(s)$  in  $\text{Sym}_N$ . This set is defined by the strict determinantal inequalities  $s(K) \cdot \Sigma[K] > 0$  for all  $K \subseteq N$ , and  $s$  is representable if and only if  $\text{PR}_N(s)$  (or, equivalently,  $\widehat{\text{PR}}_N(s)$ ) is non-empty. Since these sets are open, the existence of a real point in them implies existence of a rational point. On our website we provide a database of exact rational points certifying all representability claims made here.

**5.1. Representability for  $n \leq 5$ .** To check if a sign pattern is representable, one may naïvely generate random matrices with rational entries having small numerators and denominators (and fixed diagonal entries via Proposition 2.16). This strategy, which we implemented in `sagemath` [Sage], is surprisingly effective: it finds simple rational representations for all hyperoctahedral orbits on  $n \leq 4$  with little effort. For  $n = 5$ , it yields witnesses for the representability of all but one of the 434  $\mathfrak{B}_5$ -orbits. These results are summarized in column four of Table 2. We conjecture that the last remaining equivalence class is non-representable. This final class is represented by the sign pattern  $s_*$  shown in Figure 2.

We note that  $s_*$  is uniquely determined by its values on subsets of odd order and the assumption that it is admissible. Indeed, the signs assigned to singletons and  $(\diamond)$  imply the negativity of  $s_*(ij)$ , with  $i \in 12$  and  $j \in 345$ . The negativity of  $s_*(12)$  follows from the values at 13, 123 and 1. Similar proofs can be found for the negativity of  $s_*(34)$ ,  $s_*(35)$  and  $s_*(45)$  showing that the values of all principal minors of order two are implied by the values at orders one and




FIGURE 2. An admissible sign pattern  $s_*$  of size 5 for which we have no representation, depicted as a coloring of the lattice of subsets of  $\{1, \dots, 5\}$ . Positive signs are in orange, and negative in blue.

three via  $\diamond$ . The positivity of  $s_*(1234)$  follows directly from the values at 123, 234 and 23; and similar proofs can be found for the remaining 4-minors. As in Section 3, for representability testing it suffices to consider the restricted space  $\widehat{\text{PR}}_5(s_*)$  in which the diagonals are fixed to  $\pm 1$ . The previous discussion shows that  $\widehat{\text{PR}}_5(s_*)$  can equivalently be described by a polynomial system in 10 variables with only 10 sign constraints on order three principal minors and the positivity of the determinant.

Despite these reductions, we can neither find a representation computationally nor prove that there is none. In the search for a representation, we have employed the polynomial programming solver from the SCIP suite [SCIP]. Unfortunately, during the solving of this problem (in its most straightforward formulation), a matrix becomes numerically singular and SCIP aborts. On the other hand, cylindrical algebraic decomposition (CAD) is an exact symbolic algorithm which, given a semialgebraic set, either finds a point inside or conclusively determines that it is empty. We have used the implementation in Mathematica [WMath] via its `FindInstance` function but could not find a formulation on which the algorithm terminates.

We can offer one more insight. The sign pattern  $s'_*$  obtained from  $s_*$  by flipping the sign of 12345 is still admissible and inequivalent to  $s_*$  under the hyperoctahedral group. It is therefore representable according to our computations. A rational representation is given by

$$\Sigma'_* = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & -25/17 & 10/27 & -9/7 & 17/22 \\ -25/17 & -1 & -3/7 & -7/8 & -1 \\ 10/27 & -3/7 & 1 & -22/7 & -7/4 \\ -9/7 & -7/8 & -22/7 & 1 & 8/5 \\ 17/22 & -1 & -7/4 & 8/5 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

This shows that the partial sign pattern  $s_*(K)$ , for all  $|K| \leq 4$ , is consistent and hence if  $s_*$  is not representable, then the inconsistency arises from the constraint  $\det \Sigma > 0$ .

**Conjecture 5.1.** For any  $\Sigma \in \text{PR}_5$ , if  $\text{signs}_\Sigma$  agrees with  $s_*$  on all sets of sizes 1 and 3, then  $\det \Sigma < 0$ . In particular,  $s_*$  is not representable.

The number of negative eigenvalues of  $\Sigma$  depends only on its sign pattern, since it equals the number of sign changes in the principal minors along the complete flag  $\emptyset, 1, 12, 123, \dots, N$ . Thus the claim  $\det \Sigma < 0$  in Conjecture 5.1 is equivalent to  $\Sigma$  having exactly 3 negative eigenvalues.

The Positivstellensatz [BCR98, Proposition 4.4.1] implies that Conjecture 5.1 is true if and only if there exists a polynomial identity  $-q \cdot \det \Sigma = p + h^2$  where  $p, q$  are elements of the preorder generated by the polynomials  $s_*(I) \cdot \Sigma[I]$ , for  $I \subseteq 12345$  with  $|I| \in \{1, 3\}$ , in  $\mathbb{Z}[\Sigma]$  and  $h$  is a product of principal minors.

**5.2. Topology for reducible sign patterns.** The representability of a sign pattern  $s$  gives the most basic geometric information about  $\text{PR}_N(s)$ : whether it is empty or not. At the next step, one may be interested in the topological type of  $\text{PR}_N(s)$ . We have already seen in Section 2.3 that equivalent sign patterns under any of the given group actions have homeomorphic representation spaces, and that the number of connected components can be bounded in terms of the minors of  $s$ . We have one more result of this type:

**Definition 5.2.** A sign pattern  $s$  over  $N$  is *reducible* if there exists a partition  $N = KL$  such that  $s(I) = s|_K(I \cap K) \cdot s|_L(I \cap L)$  for all  $I \subseteq N$ ; otherwise  $s$  is *irreducible*. A *decomposition* of  $s$  is a partition  $N = K_1 \cdots K_m$  such that  $s(I) = \prod_{i=1}^m s|_{K_i}(I \cap K_i)$ .

It is easy to see that if  $N = K_1 \cdots K_m = L_1 \cdots L_p$  are two valid decompositions, then the common refinement of these partitions is also a valid decomposition. This shows that there is a unique minimal decomposition in which all factors  $s|_{K_i}$  are necessarily irreducible.

**Theorem 5.3.** Let  $s$  be a sign pattern over  $N$  and  $N = K_1 \cdots K_m$  its irreducible decomposition. Then  $s$  is representable if and only if each  $s|_{K_i}$  is representable. In this case  $\dim H^0(\text{PR}_N(s)) \geq \prod_{i=1}^m \dim H^0(\text{PR}_{K_i}(s|_{K_i}))$ .

*Proof.* Clearly if  $s$  is representable then so are its restrictions. Conversely, let  $\Sigma_i \in \text{PR}_{K_i}(s|_{K_i})$ . Then the block-diagonal matrix with diagonal blocks  $\Sigma_i$  is a representation for  $s$ .

The same idea also gives the bound on the number of connected components. Consider the map  $\text{PR}_N(s) \rightarrow \times_{i=1}^m \text{PR}_{K_i}(s|_{K_i})$  which sends  $\Sigma \mapsto (\Sigma_{K_i} : i = 1, \dots, m)$ . By the block-diagonal matrix construction, this is a (continuous) surjection inducing a surjection from connected components of the domain onto those of the image.  $\square$

**Conjecture 5.4.** Every connected component of  $\text{PR}_N$  is contractible.

The conjecture implies that the homotopy type of  $\text{PR}_N(s)$  depends only on the number of its connected components. It is true for  $n = 3$  as can be seen from Figure 1. It is also true in another special case. Say that  $s$  is *completely reducible* if it decomposes into sets of size 1.

**Theorem 5.5.** A sign pattern  $s$  is completely reducible if and only if it is representable by a diagonal matrix. In this case  $\text{PR}_N(s)$  is a star-shaped domain (in particular contractible).

*Proof.* If  $s$  is completely reducible, then it is representable by the diagonal matrix  $D$  with diagonal entries  $\pm 1$  as dictated by the signs  $s(i)$ , for  $i \in N$ . For the converse it suffices to observe that the sign pattern of any diagonal matrix is completely reducible.

Take any  $\Sigma$  in  $\text{PR}_N(s)$ . We will show that the line segment  $\gamma(t) = tD + (1-t)\Sigma$  with  $t \in [0, 1]$  is entirely contained in  $\text{PR}_N(s)$ . By using the multilinearity of the determinant for each row of  $\gamma(t)$ , one gets the following formula, in which it is crucial that  $D$  is a diagonal matrix:

$$\det \gamma(t) = \sum_{I \subseteq N} (1-t)^{|I|} \Sigma[I] \cdot t^{|N \setminus I|} D[N \setminus I].$$

But both  $\Sigma$  and  $D$  agree with the completely reducible sign pattern  $s$ , and so the sign of  $\Sigma[I] \cdot D[N \setminus I]$  is  $s(N)$  for all  $I$ . Furthermore, for all  $t \in (0, 1)$ , the product  $(1-t)^{|I|} \cdot t^{|N \setminus I|}$  is positive. Hence, every term in the above sum has constant sign  $s(N)$  which is thus the sign of the sum. The same argument works for any principal minor of  $\gamma(t)$  showing that  $\gamma(t) \in \text{PR}_N(s)$ .  $\square$

**Remark 5.6.** Due to Lemma 2.12 there is exactly one completely reducible sign pattern up to the hyperoctahedral symmetry which we may take to have all signs positive. Hence by Theorem 2.14 the representation spaces of all completely reducible sign patterns are homeomorphic to the convex cone  $\text{PD}_N$  of positive definite matrices and thus contractible. The remarkable aspect of Theorem 5.5 is that all these spaces are even star-shaped.

## 6. FURTHER REMARKS

In this section we comment on the complexity of deciding representability as well as two natural variants of our setup. The first one restricts principal regularity and sign patterns to only *leading principal minors*. In this case, topology and representability turn out to be trivial. Afterwards, we close with some remarks about the generalization to vanishing principal minors.

**6.1. Complexity of representability testing.** Whether or not a given sign pattern is representable by a principally regular matrix is a decision problem which, by definition, reduces to the existence of a solution to a system of strict polynomial inequalities with integer coefficients. The latter is polynomial-time equivalent to a well-known decision problem in computational geometry called ETR (which stands for *existential theory of the reals*). The decision problems which many-one reduce to ETR in polynomial time comprise the complexity class  $\exists\mathbb{R}$ ; cf. [SS17].

**Definition 6.1.** A *partial sign pattern* consists of a finite ground set  $N$  together with a list of pairs  $(K_i, s_i)$  where  $K_i \subseteq N$  and  $s_i \in \{+, -\}$ . The representability problem RepPR asks to decide for a given partial sign pattern (in the obvious encoding) whether there exists  $\Sigma \in \text{PR}_N$  such that  $\text{sgn } \Sigma[K_i] = s_i$  for all  $i$ .

**Proposition 6.2.** RepPR reduces to ETR in polynomial time, and hence  $\text{RepPR} \in \exists\mathbb{R}$ .

*Proof.* We first show how to write out the inequality constraint  $s_i \Sigma[K_i] > 0$  in time polynomial in  $|K_i|$ . Note that merely writing out the determinant using the Leibniz formula will not suffice since it has  $|K_i|!$  terms. We use instead the fact that  $\Sigma_{K_i}$  is symmetric. By the spectral theorem, there exists an orthonormal basis of eigenvectors, which we write into the columns of a matrix  $V_i$ , and a diagonal matrix of eigenvalues  $D_i$  such that

$$\Sigma_{K_i} = V_i^\top D_i V_i.$$

This matrix equation as well as the stipulation that it is the spectral decomposition of  $\Sigma_{K_i}$  can be written down using polynomial equations which are polynomially sized in the number of elements in  $K_i$ . Then  $\Sigma[K_i]$  is equal to the product of the diagonal elements in  $D_i$ .

Writing out these equations for all given pairs  $(K_i, s_i)$  results in a system of polynomial equations and strict inequalities whose solutions are symmetric matrices representing the given partial sign pattern. Since this space of matrices is open and  $\text{PR}_N$  is dense in  $\text{Sym}_N$ , the existence of a general symmetric matrix solution is equivalent to the existence of a solution in  $\text{PR}_N$ .  $\square$

A decision problem is  $\exists\mathbb{R}$ -complete if it is in  $\exists\mathbb{R}$  and every  $\exists\mathbb{R}$  problem reduces to it in polynomial time. Thus it occupies the most difficult stratum of problems in  $\exists\mathbb{R}$ . In light of the growing body of literature on  $\exists\mathbb{R}$ -complete problems, e.g. [Boe22, AAM22, MS24, KMM24], the following is a natural question:

**Question 6.3.** Is RepPR  $\exists\mathbb{R}$ -complete?

**6.2. Space of leading principal minors.** Instead of  $\text{PR}_N$  requiring all principal minors to be non-zero, one could also consider the space  $\text{LPR}_N$  of real symmetric  $N \times N$  matrices whose *leading* principal minors are non-zero. Their corresponding sign vectors are functions  $\ell : \{0, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \{+, -\}$  given by  $\ell(k) = \text{sgn } \Sigma[1 \cdots k]$ ; they all satisfy  $\ell(0) = +$ . Given any sign pattern  $s : 2^N \rightarrow \{+, -\}$ , its leading sign pattern is obtained as  $\ell(k) = s(\{1, \dots, k\})$ . Hence, each  $\text{PR}_N(s)$  is contained in exactly one of the spaces  $\text{LPR}_N(\ell)$  which only imposes leading principal minor signs.

However,  $\text{LPR}_N(\ell)$  also contains matrices with vanishing principal minors, as long as they are not leading. Hence, the natural  $\mathfrak{S}_N$  action on symmetric matrices does not induce a sensible action on leading principal minor sign patterns. Moreover, we can show that all  $\text{LPR}_N(\ell)$  are non-empty and topologically trivial. In short, the reason is that  $\text{LPR}_N(\ell)$  is under-constrained



as it is defined by  $n$  strict inequalities in  $\binom{n+1}{2}$  unknowns. In particular, by Schur complement, the statement  $\text{sgn } \Sigma[1 \cdots k] = \ell(k)$  can be written as

$$(*) \quad \ell(k) \cdot p_k = \ell(k) \cdot p_{k-1} \cdot (\sigma_{kk} - h_{k-1}) > 0,$$

where  $p_k = \Sigma[1 \cdots k]$ , and  $h_{k-1} = \Sigma_{k,1 \dots (k-1)} \text{adj}(\Sigma_{1 \dots (k-1)}) \Sigma_{1 \dots (k-1),k}$ , the latter of which is a polynomial in variables  $\sigma_{ij}$  with  $(i, j) < (k, k)$  in the lexicographic order from the right.

**Proposition 6.4.** Every leading principal minor sign pattern  $\ell : \{0, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \{+, -\}$  is representable by a matrix  $\Sigma \in \text{PR}_N$ . Moreover, its space of representations  $\text{LPR}_N(\ell)$  is homeomorphic to  $\text{PD}_N$ , the convex cone of positive definite matrices, and therefore contractible.

*Proof.* Let  $\ell : \{0, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \{+, -\}$  be arbitrary. It is easy to explicitly construct a diagonal matrix with  $\pm 1$  on the diagonal which represents the leading principal minor sign sequence  $\ell$ . This matrix is moreover a hyperoctahedral image of the identity matrix.

For the second claim, we construct a homeomorphism between any two  $\text{LPR}_N(\ell)$  and  $\text{LPR}_N(\ell')$  inductively, mapping  $\Sigma$  to  $\Sigma'$ . In this map, all off-diagonal entries of  $\Sigma$  are preserved; only the diagonal entries change, i.e.,  $\sigma'_{ij} = \sigma_{ij}$  for all  $i \neq j$ . We use the notation  $h_k$  from  $(*)$  to refer to the polynomial in  $\Sigma$  and  $h'_k$  for the respective polynomial in  $\Sigma'$ . Setting

$$\sigma'_{kk} := h'_{k-1} + \ell(k) \cdot \ell(k-1) \cdot \ell'(k) \cdot \ell'(k-1) \cdot (\sigma_{kk} - h_{k-1})$$

turns the assumption that  $\text{sgn } p_k = \ell(k)$  into the conclusion that  $\text{sgn } p'_k = \ell'(k)$  via  $(*)$  and using that, by induction,  $\text{sgn } p'_{k-1} = \ell'(k-1)$ . Note that  $h_0 = 0$  and  $\sigma'_{11} = \pm \sigma_{11}$  and so, inductively,  $h'_{k-1}$ ,  $\sigma'_{kk}$  and hence the entire  $\Sigma'$  are continuous functions of  $\Sigma$ . By exchanging the roles of  $\ell$  and  $\ell'$  in this construction, one constructs the inverse of this map, proving that it is indeed a homeomorphism.  $\square$

**Remark 6.5.** Viewing the inequality  $(*)$  as constraining  $\sigma_{kk}$  in terms of  $p_{k-1}$  and  $h_{k-1}$  which are polynomials in lexicographically lower entries of  $\Sigma$ , one can also show that the  $\text{LPR}_N(\ell)$  are the cells of a cylindrical algebraic decomposition of  $\text{LPR}_N$  with respect to the lexicographic ordering.

**6.3. Sign patterns with zeros.** A generic symmetric matrix is principally regular in the sense that the complement  $\text{Sym}_N \setminus \text{PR}_N$  is an affine subvariety of  $\text{Sym}_N$  of codimension 1. As demonstrated in Section 2, the assumption that all principal minors are invertible furnishes a well-behaved combinatorial theory with minors and duality. In applications to algebraic statistics it has been observed that principal regularity is responsible for other remarkable combinatorial effects: for example, the *intersection property* of Gaussian conditional independence can be proved directly from Equation  $(\diamond')$  and the assumption of principal regularity [Mat05, Corollary 1]; while for singular Gaussian measures, the combinatorial theory of conditional independence becomes much more involved resulting, in particular, in the failure of the intersection property; compare [LM07] and [Šim06].

On the other hand, from a matroid theory perspective, principal minor sign patterns of principally regular matrices correspond to orientations of only a single Lagrangian matroid — the uniform one; as defined in [BBGW01]. By allowing principal minors to vanish, the resulting sign patterns with image in  $\{0, +, -\}$  represent more Lagrangian matroids and the corresponding representation spaces decompose the entire affine space  $\text{Sym}_N$ . We note that in this more general setting, the upper bound on connected components (Corollary 4.6) remains valid because [BPR96, Theorem 1] also accounts for zero constraints on polynomials.

The combinatorial interplay of principal minor signs is more complex when vanishing is allowed. A coarse analogue of such sign patterns stratified by the order of principal minors is studied in [MR18]. To illustrate the effect of vanishing principal minors, we quote here the NN Theorem of [MR18]: if  $\text{sgn } \Sigma[K] = 0$  for all sets  $K$  with  $k \leq |K| \leq k+1$ , then this holds for all  $|K| \geq k$ . It already seems interesting to determine the representable *PSD* sign patterns,

i.e., those  $s : 2^N \rightarrow \{0, +\}$  which are representable by positive semidefinite matrices. These sign patterns give a natural stratification of the PSD cone which is relevant in the algebraic approach to semidefinite programming [NRS10].

**Acknowledgements.** Tobias Boege was partially supported by the Academy of Finland grant number 323416 and by the Wallenberg Autonomous Systems and Software Program (WASP) funded by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation. The authors are grateful for the hospitality of the Max-Planck Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences where this project was initiated. We would like to thank Bernd Sturmfels for helpful suggestions. Part of this research was performed while some of the authors were visiting the Institute for Mathematical and Statistical Innovation (IMSI), which is supported by the National Science Foundation (Grant No. DMS-1929348).

## REFERENCES

- [AAM22] Mikkel Abrahamsen, Anna Adamaszek and Tillmann Miltzow: *The Art Gallery Problem is  $\exists\mathbb{R}$ -complete*. *J. ACM*, 69(1):70 (2022). DOI: [10.1145/3486220](https://doi.org/10.1145/3486220).
- [AV22] Abeer Al Ahmadi and Cynthia Vinzant: *Determinantal representations and the image of the principal minor map* (2022). ARXIV: [2205.05267](https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.05267) [math.AG].
- [BBGW01] Richard F. Booth, Alexandre V. Borovik, Israel M. Gelfand and Neil White: *Oriented Lagrangian matroids*. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 22(5):639–656 (2001). DOI: [10.1006/eujc.2000.0485](https://doi.org/10.1006/eujc.2000.0485).
- [BCF<sup>+</sup>16] Steve Butler, Minerva Catral, Shaun M. Fallat, H. Tracy Hall, Leslie Hogben, Pauline van den Driessche and Michael Young: *The enhanced principal rank characteristic sequence*. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 498:181–200 (2016). DOI: [10.1016/j.laa.2015.03.023](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.laa.2015.03.023).
- [BCR98] Jacek Bochnak, Michel Coste and Marie-Françoise Roy: *Real algebraic geometry*, vol. 36 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge*. Springer (1998).
- [BDKS19] Tobias Boege, Alessio D’Alì, Thomas Kahle and Bernd Sturmfels: *The geometry of gaussoids*. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 19(4):775–812 (2019). DOI: [10.1007/s10208-018-9396-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10208-018-9396-x).
- [BDOvD12] Richard A. Brualdi, Louis Deaett, D. Dale Olesky and Pauline van den Driessche: *The principal rank characteristic sequence of a real symmetric matrix*. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 436(7):2137–2155 (2012). DOI: [10.1016/j.laa.2011.11.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.laa.2011.11.013).
- [BGW03] Alexandre V. Borovik, I. M. Gelfand and Neil White: *Coxeter matroids*, vol. 216 of *Prog. Math.* Boston, MA: Birkhäuser (2003).
- [BK20] Tobias Boege and Thomas Kahle: *Construction methods for gaussoids*. *Kybernetika*, 56(6):1045–1062 (2020). DOI: [10.14736/kyb-2020-6-1045](https://doi.org/10.14736/kyb-2020-6-1045).
- [BKS<sup>+</sup>23] Grigoriy Blekherman, Mario Kummer, Raman Sanyal, Kevin Shu and Shengding Sun: *Linear principal minor polynomials: hyperbolic determinantal inequalities and spectral containment*. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, 2023(24):21346–21380 (2023). DOI: [10.1093/imrn/rnac291](https://doi.org/10.1093/imrn/rnac291).
- [BLS<sup>+</sup>99] Anders Björner, Michel Las Vergnas, Bernd Sturmfels, Neil White and Günter Ziegler: *Oriented matroids*, vol. 46 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, 2nd ed. (1999).
- [Boe22] Tobias Boege: *The Gaussian conditional independence inference problem*. Ph.D. thesis, OVGU Magdeburg (2022). DOI: [10.25673/86275](https://doi.org/10.25673/86275).
- [BPR96] Saugata Basu, Richard Pollak and Marie-Françoise Roy: *On the number of cells defined by a family of polynomials on a variety*. 43(1):120–126 (1996). DOI: [10.1112/S0025579300011621](https://doi.org/10.1112/S0025579300011621).
- [CGY12] Terence H. Chan, Dongning Guo and Raymond W. Yeung: *Entropy functions and determinant inequalities*. In *2012 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory Proceedings*, pp. 1251–1255. Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) (2012). DOI: [10.1109/ISIT.2012.6283057](https://doi.org/10.1109/ISIT.2012.6283057).
- [CHHS24] Joseph Cummings, Jonathan D. Hauenstein, Hoon Hong and Clifford D. Smyth: *Smooth connectivity in real algebraic varieties* (2024). ARXIV: [2405.18578](https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.18578) [math.AG].
- [HJ08] H. Tracy Hall and Charles R. Johnson: *Bounded ratios of products of principal minors of positive definite matrices* (2008). ARXIV: [0806.2645](https://arxiv.org/abs/0806.2645) [math.CO].
- [HRSS20] Hoon Hong, James Rohal, Mohab Safey El Din and Eric Schost: *Connectivity in semi-algebraic sets I* (2020). ARXIV: [2011.02162](https://arxiv.org/abs/2011.02162) [math.AG].
- [HS07] Olga Holtz and Bernd Sturmfels: *Hyperdeterminantal relations among symmetric principal minors*. *J. Algebra*, 316(2) (2007). DOI: [10.1016/j.jalgebra.2007.01.039](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jalgebra.2007.01.039).
- [HS11] Babak Hassibi and Sormeh Shadbakht: *On the entropy region of Gaussian random variables* (2011). ARXIV: [1112.0061](https://arxiv.org/abs/1112.0061) [cs.IT].
- [KMM24] Eun Jung Kim, Arnaud de Mesmay and Tillmann Miltzow: *Representing matroids over the reals is  $\exists\mathbb{R}$ -complete* (2024). ARXIV: [2301.03221](https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.03221) [cs.CC].
- [LM07] Radim Lněnička and František Matúš: *On Gaussian conditional independence structures*. *Kybernetika*, 43(3):327–342 (2007).

- [Mar08] Murray Marshall: *Positive polynomials and sums of squares*, vol. 146 of *Math. Surv. Monogr.* American Mathematical Society (AMS) (2008).
- [Mat97] František Matúš: *Conditional independence structures examined via minors.* *Ann. Math. Artif. Intell.*, 21(1):99–30 (1997). DOI: [10.1023/A:1018957117081](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1018957117081).
- [Mat05] František Matúš: *Conditional independences in gaussian vectors and rings of polynomials.* In Gabriele Kern-Isberner, Wilhelm Rödder and Friedhelm Kulmann, eds.: *Conditionals, Information, and Inference*, pp. 152–161. Springer (2005).
- [MNW14] Dillon Mayhew, Mike Newman and Geoff Whittle: *Is the missing axiom of matroid theory lost forever?* *Q. J. Math.*, 65(4):1397–1415 (2014). DOI: [10.1093/qmath/hat031](https://doi.org/10.1093/qmath/hat031).
- [MNW18] Dillon Mayhew, Mike Newman and Geoff Whittle: *Yes, the “missing axiom” of matroid theory is lost forever.* *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.*, 370(8):5907–5929 (2018). DOI: [10.1090/tran/7408](https://doi.org/10.1090/tran/7408).
- [MR18] Xavier Martínez-Rivera: *The signed enhanced principal rank characteristic sequence.* *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, 66(7):1484–1503 (2018). DOI: [10.1080/03081087.2017.1363149](https://doi.org/10.1080/03081087.2017.1363149).
- [MS24] Tillmann Miltzow and Reinier F. Schmiermann: *On classifying continuous constraint satisfaction problems.* *TheoretCS*, 3:54 (2024). DOI: [10.46298/theoretics.24.10](https://doi.org/10.46298/theoretics.24.10). Id/No 10.
- [Nel18] Peter Nelson: *Almost all matroids are non-representable.* *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 50:245–248 (2018). DOI: [10.1112/blms.12141](https://doi.org/10.1112/blms.12141).
- [NRS10] Jiawang Nie, Kristian Ranestad and Bernd Sturmfels: *The algebraic degree of semidefinite programming.* *Math. Program.*, 122(2 (A)):379–405 (2010). DOI: [10.1007/s10107-008-0253-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-008-0253-6).
- [Oed09] Luke Oeding: *G-varieties and the principal minors of symmetric matrices.* Ph.D. thesis, Texas A&M University (2009).
- [Šim06] Petr Šimeček: *Gaussian representation of independence models over four random variables.* In *COMPSTAT conference* (2006).
- [ŠŠ17] Marcus Schaefer and Daniel Štefankovič: *Fixed points, Nash equilibria, and the existential theory of the reals.* *Theory Comput. Syst.*, 60(2):172–193 (2017). DOI: [10.1007/s00224-015-9662-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00224-015-9662-0).
- [Whi08] Neil White, ed.: *Theory of matroids*, vol. 26 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its Applications.* Cambridge University Press (2008).
- [Zha05] Fuzhen Zhang, ed.: *The Schur complement and its applications.* Springer (2005).

#### MATHEMATICAL SOFTWARE

- [AllSAT] Takahisa Toda and Takehide Soh: *Implementing efficient all solutions SAT solvers.* *Journal of Experimental Algorithmics*, 21:1.12:1–44 (2016). DOI: [10.1145/2975585](https://doi.org/10.1145/2975585).
- [GANAK] Shubham Sharma, Subhjit Roy, Mate Soos and Kuldeep S. Meel: *GANAK: A scalable probabilistic exact model counter.* In *Proceedings of International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)* (2019). Version 1.0.1.
- [ManySAT] Tobias Boege: *CInet::ManySAT: A collection of SAT solvers* (2023). URL: <https://github.com/CInet/ManySAT>. Version 1.1.0.
- [Sage] The Sage Developers: *SageMath, the Sage Mathematics Software System* (2024). URL: <https://www.sagemath.org>. Version 10.4.
- [SCIP] Ksenia Bestuzheva, Mathieu Besançon, Wei-Kun Chen, Antonia Chmiela, Tim Donkiewicz, Jasper van Doornmalen, Leon Eifler, Oliver Gaul, Gerald Gamrath, Ambros Gleixner, Leona Gottwald, Christoph Graczyk, Katrin Halbig, Alexander Hoen, Christopher Hojny, Rolf van der Hulst, Thorsten Koch, Marco Lübbecke, Stephen J. Maher, Frederic Matter, Erik Mühmer, Benjamin Müller, Marc E. Pfetsch, Daniel Rehfeldt, Steffan Schlein, Franziska Schlösser, Felipe Serrano, Yuji Shinano, Boro Sofranac, Mark Turner, Stefan Vigerske, Fabian Wegscheider, Philipp Wellner, Dieter Weninger and Jakob Witzig: *Enabling research through the SCIP Optimization Suite 8.0.* *ACM Trans. Math. Softw.*, 49(2) (2023). DOI: [10.1145/3585516](https://doi.org/10.1145/3585516). Version 8.0.4.
- [WMath] Wolfram Research, Inc.: *Mathematica* (2023). Champaign, IL, 2023. Version 13.3.

TOBIAS BOEGE, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, KTH ROYAL INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, SWEDEN

*Email address:* [post@taboegel.de](mailto:post@taboegel.de)

JESSE SELOVER, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST, AMHERST, USA

*Email address:* [jselover@umass.edu](mailto:jselover@umass.edu)

MAKSYM ZUBKOV, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY, USA

*Email address:* [mzubkov@berkeley.edu](mailto:mzubkov@berkeley.edu)