

# Multideterminantal measures

Richard Kenyon\*

## Abstract

We define multideterminantal probability measures, a family of probability measures on  $[k]^n$  where  $[k] = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ , generalizing determinantal measures (which correspond to the case  $k = 2$ ). We give examples coming from the positive Grassmannian, from the dimer model and from the spanning tree model.

We also define and completely characterize determinantal probability measures on the permutation group  $S_n$ .

## 1 Multideterminantal measures

A *determinantal measure* is a probability measure  $\mu$  on  $\{0, 1\}^n$  defined by an  $n \times n$  matrix, the *kernel*  $T$ . Point probabilities for  $\mu$  are determinants of matrices constructed from  $T$ , and in particular determinants of principal minors of  $T$  are probabilities of “index inclusion” events: for any subset  $S \subset [n]$ ,

$$\Pr(\{x_i = 1 \ \forall i \in S\}) = \det(T_S^S). \quad (1)$$

Determinantal measures were introduced by Macchi in [10]. They occur naturally in a number of settings, such as the edge inclusion probabilities in random spanning trees [3], in the planar bipartite dimer model [6], and even in integer addition [2]. Continuous versions include the fermionic gas, and random matrix ensembles such as GUE, CUE and the Ginibre ensembles: see [14]. See [9, 1] for more background. Despite their ubiquity, determinantal measures remain mysterious: even classifying kernels of determinantal measures is an open problem.

---

\*Department of Mathematics, Yale University, New Haven; richard.kenyon at yale.edu.

We study here a generalization of determinantal measures to probability measures on  $[k]^n$  where  $[k] = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$  is a finite set. We refer to  $[k]$  as the set of *colors*. We call these measures *k-determinantal measures*. In this case we have  $k$  matrices  $A_1, \dots, A_k$ , summing to the identity, and probabilities of individual events are given by determinants of matrices formed from the  $A_i$ . Specifically, the probability of the single element  $(i_1, \dots, i_n) \in [k]^n$  is

$$\Pr((i_1, \dots, i_n)) = \det(A_{i_1}^1, A_{i_2}^2, \dots, A_{i_n}^n), \quad (2)$$

the determinant of the  $n \times n$  matrix whose  $j$ th column is the  $j$ th column of matrix  $A_{i_j}$ . (We use superscripts on matrices to denote columns of the matrix.) Probabilities of marginals like “coordinates 1 and 3 have, respectively, colors 4 and 2” are also given by determinants, see Section 2.1. The classical determinantal measure is the case  $k = 2$  (after translating indices  $\{0, 1\} \mapsto \{1, 2\}$ ) where the kernel is the matrix  $A_2$ , and  $A_1 = I - A_2$ .

We give naturally occurring examples of  $k$ -determinantal measures, one family arising from the positive Grassmannian  $\text{Gr}_{n, kn}$ , another arising from the dimer model on a bipartite planar graph, and a third arising from the uniform spanning tree model (on a general connected graph). See Figure 1 for a random sample from a 3-determinantal point process on the vertices in a triangular grid, coming from a spanning tree process (see Section 3.3 for details.)

We also discuss *symmetric*  $k$ -determinantal measures, which have the additional property that each matrix  $A_i$  is symmetric. For  $k = 2$  it is known that a symmetric matrix  $A_1$  is the kernel of a determinantal process if and only if all its eigenvalues are in  $[0, 1]$ , see [10]. For  $k \geq 3$  we don't have an analogous characterization of matrices defining symmetric  $k$ -determinantal processes. However an analog of this eigenvalue property for  $k \geq 3$  relates to the *characteristic polynomial* of the process, whose zero set is necessarily a *Vinnikov curve* (for  $k = 3$ ) and a higher dimensional “Vinnikov variety” for larger  $k$ , see Section 4.1.

If the  $A_i$  are symmetric and commute for  $k \geq 3$ , we have an analog of the “sum of Bernoulli's” property for determinantal measures (Section 4.2).

If the  $A_i$  have ranks summing to  $n$ , we call  $\mu$  a *pure*  $k$ -determinantal measure. In this case we can encode the measure in a single  $n \times n$  matrix  $L$ , and we can give a concise description of point probabilities in terms of products of minors of  $L$ , see Theorem 7. For  $k = 2$  this gives




Figure 1: A 3-determinantal process (with 3 colors, red, blue and green) on the vertices of a large triangular region in the triangular grid. This example arises from a random spanning tree on the triangular grid with inhomogeneous conductances.

a construction of a general pure 2-determinantal measure from a pair of elements in the Grassmannian  $\text{Gr}_{n_1, n}$  having Plücker coordinates of the same signs. See Section 6.2.

When  $k = n$  and each of the  $A_i$  is of rank 1, a  $n$ -determinantal process is a probability measure on the group  $S_n$  of permutations of  $[n]$ . We thus naturally construct *determinantal random permutations*. We give a complete classification of such measures, as those arising from Pfaffian bipartite graphs: see Theorem 6. Natural examples are given in Section 5.

**Acknowledgments.** We thank Omer Angel, Persi Diaconis and Nicholas Ovenhouse for discussions. This research was supported by NSF grant DMS-1940932 and the Simons Foundation grant 327929.

## 2 Basics

We collect here a few basic facts about  $k$ -determinantal measures.

## 2.1 Marginals

Note that from (2), using the multilinearity of the determinant and the fact that the sum of the  $A_i$  is  $I$ , the sum of all probabilities is 1:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in [k]^n} \Pr(x) &= \sum_{x \in [k]^n} \det(A_{x_1}^1, A_{x_2}^2, \dots, A_{x_n}^n) \\ &= (A_1^1 + \dots + A_k^1) \wedge \dots \wedge (A_1^n + \dots + A_k^n) \quad (3) \\ &= e_1 \wedge \dots \wedge e_n \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

The marginal probabilities also have a simple form. For example,  $\Pr(x_i = j) = (A_j)_{ii}$ . This follows by restricting the  $i$ th term in the wedge product (3) to be  $A_j^i$  instead of the sum  $A_1^i + \dots + A_k^i$ . Likewise restricting the  $i_1$  term to be  $A_{j_1}^{i_1}$  and the  $i_2$  term to be  $A_{j_2}^{i_2}$  gives

$$\Pr(x_{i_1} = j_1, x_{i_2} = j_2) = \det \begin{pmatrix} (A_{j_1})_{i_1, i_1} & (A_{j_2})_{i_1, i_2} \\ (A_{j_1})_{i_2, i_1} & (A_{j_2})_{i_2, i_2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4)$$

and a similar expression holds for larger marginals. This illustrates the most useful property of  $k$ -determinantal processes: their marginals can be quickly computed even when  $n$  is large.

## 2.2 $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{R})_+$ -Invariance

If we have  $k$  matrices  $A_1, \dots, A_k$  for which the quantities in (2) are all nonnegative (and not all zero), but for which the sum  $A_1 + \dots + A_k$  is not necessarily the identity, we can construct a  $k$ -determinantal process by replacing each  $A_i$  with  $\tilde{A}_i := MA_i$  where  $M = (A_1 + \dots + A_k)^{-1}$ ; these new matrices  $\tilde{A}_i$  now sum to the identity and the point probabilities are

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr((i_1, \dots, i_n)) &= \det((MA_{x_1})^1, (MA_{x_2})^2, \dots, (MA_{x_n})^n) \\ &= \det(M(A_{x_1}^1), M(A_{x_2}^2), \dots, M(A_{x_n}^n)) \quad (5) \\ &= \det M \det(A_{x_1}^1, A_{x_2}^2, \dots, A_{x_n}^n) \end{aligned}$$

which are nonnegative since  $\det M > 0$ .

We call  $A_1, \dots, A_k$  an *unnormalized*  $k$ -determinantal process.

As an example when  $k = 2$  we have the following.

**Proposition 1** ([1]). *Matrices  $A$  and  $I$  form an unnormalized 2-determinantal process if and only if  $A$  is a matrix with nonnegative principal minors.*

*Proof.* When  $A_1 = A$  and  $A_2 = I$ , each determinant (2) is a principal minor of  $A$ , and all principal minors appear.  $\square$

Thus when  $A$  has nonnegative principal minors, not all zero, the matrix  $(I + A)^{-1}A$  is the kernel of a determinantal process. Moreover note that if  $K$  is the kernel of a determinantal process, then  $K$  has nonnegative principal minors, since these are marginals, by (1).

## 2.3 Characteristic polynomial

The *characteristic polynomial*  $P(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_k]$  of a  $k$ -determinantal measure is defined to be

$$P(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \det(x_1 A_1 + x_2 A_2 + \dots + x_k A_k).$$

It is homogeneous of degree  $n$ .

**Lemma 2.** *We have*

$$P(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \sum_{i_1 + \dots + i_k = n} C_{i_1, \dots, i_k} x_1^{i_1} \dots x_k^{i_k}$$

where  $C_{i_1, \dots, i_k}$  is the probability that, for each  $j$ , color  $j$  occurs exactly  $i_j$  times.

*Proof.* This follows from (2): the coefficient of  $x_1^{i_1} \dots x_k^{i_k}$  in  $P$  corresponds to summing over all determinants of matrices formed from  $i_1$  of the columns of  $A_1$ ,  $i_2$  of the columns of  $A_2$ , etc., in some order. This is the probability that, for each  $j$ , index  $j$  occurs  $i_j$  times.  $\square$

A  $k$ -determinantal measure  $\mu$  induces a probability measure  $\rho = \rho(\mu)$  on  $\{0, 1, 2, \dots\}^k$  obtained by counting the number of occurrences of each color. In other words  $\rho$  is the measure whose probability generating function is  $P$ :  $\Pr_\rho(i_1, \dots, i_k) = C_{i_1, \dots, i_k}$ .

**Open question 1.** *What polynomials  $P$  arise as characteristic polynomials of  $k$ -determinantal measures?*

This is open even for  $k = 2$ .

## 2.4 Pure determinantal measures

A  $k$ -determinantal measure on  $[k]^n$  is *pure* if the sum of the ranks of the  $A_i$  is exactly  $n$ . Then a point  $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in [k]^n$  has nonzero probability if and only if each index  $i$  occurs exactly  $n_i := \text{rank}(A_i)$  times. In particular the characteristic polynomial  $P$  is a monomial:  $P = \prod_{i=1}^k x_i^{n_i}$ . In this case moreover we have

**Lemma 3.** *For a pure  $k$ -determinantal measure each  $A_i$  is a projection matrix.*

*Proof.* Define  $B_i = \sum_{j \neq i} A_j$  so that  $A_i + B_i = I$ . Then  $A_i B_i = B_i A_i$ . But the images of  $A_i$  and  $B_i$  are complementary subspaces, so  $A_i B_i = 0$ . Multiplying  $A_i + B_i = I$  by  $A_i$  on both sides we see that  $A_i^2 = A_i$ .  $\square$

Section 6 contains more information about pure  $k$ -determinantal measures.

## 2.5 Subdeterminantal measures

Note that if  $\mu$  is a  $k$ -determinantal measure and  $S \subset [n]$  then  $\mu$  restricted to  $[k]^S$  is again  $k$ -determinantal, with matrices  $(A_i)_S^S$ , the submatrices of  $A_i$  with rows and columns indexed by  $S$ . This follows from the marginals property generalizing (4).

## 2.6 Forgetful maps

Given a  $k$ -determinantal measure with matrices  $A_1, \dots, A_k$ , and a surjective map  $\phi : [k] \rightarrow [\ell]$ , we can define an  $\ell$ -determinantal measure  $B_1, \dots, B_\ell$  where  $B_j = \sum_{i : \phi(i)=j} A_i$ . It is the image of  $\mu$  under the map  $[k]^n \rightarrow [\ell]^n$  induced by  $\phi$ . The fact that the image is a determinantal measure follows from (2) and the multilinearity.

As an example, if  $\ell = 2$  and  $\phi(j) = 1$  for all  $j$  except  $j_0$ , and  $\phi(j_0) = 2$ , then the image of  $\mu$  is a determinantal measure. This shows that each  $A_j$ , and more generally the sum of any subset of  $A_j$ s, is the kernel of a usual determinantal measure.

### 3 Natural examples

#### 3.1 Grassmannian examples

The Grassmannian  $\text{Gr}_{n,N}(\mathbb{R})$  is the space of  $n$ -planes in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . It can be presented as the space of  $n \times N$  real matrices of rank  $n$ , modulo action on the left by  $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{R})$ .

The totally nonnegative Grassmannian  $\text{Gr}_{n,N}^{\geq}$  is the subset of  $\text{Gr}_{n,N}$  whose Plücker coordinates ( $n \times n$  minors) are nonnegative. Likewise define the totally positive Grassmannian  $\text{Gr}_{n,N}^+$  to be the subset of  $\text{Gr}_{n,N}$  whose Plücker coordinates are positive.

Suppose  $N = kn$  for some integer  $k$ . Given a generic element  $M \in \text{Gr}_{n,kn}^{\geq}$ , represented as an  $n \times kn$  matrix, for  $i \in [k]$  let  $A'_i$  be the  $n \times n$  matrix formed from the columns  $i, i+n, \dots, i+(k-1)n$  of  $M$ . Let  $S = \sum_{i=1}^k A'_i$ , and suppose  $S$  is invertible. Define  $A_i := S^{-1}A'_i$ . Note that the  $A_i$  are determined by and uniquely determine  $M$ , since  $S^{-1}M = M$  as elements of  $\text{Gr}_{n,kn}$ .

The  $k$ -tuple  $(A_1, \dots, A_k)$  forms a  $k$ -determinantal measure: all point probabilities (2) are nonnegative and add up to one by construction.

We define  $\text{DET}_{n,kn} \subset \text{Gr}_{n,kn}$  to be the subset consisting of  $k$ -determinantal measures, that is, the set of matrices  $M \in \text{Gr}_{n,kn}$  such that forming the  $A_i$  as above results in a  $k$ -determinantal measure. Note that  $\text{Gr}_{n,kn}^{\geq} \subset \text{DET}_{n,kn} \subset \text{Gr}_{n,kn}$ .

Since elements of  $\text{Gr}_{n,kn}^+$  have a nice parameterization in terms of planar networks [12], they provide a tractable subclass of  $k$ -determinantal measures.

See Section 6 for a different construction, of a pure  $k$ -determinantal measure from a set of  $k$  Grassmannian elements  $M_i \in \text{Gr}_{n_i,n}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , subject to certain sign restrictions.

#### 3.2 Dimer examples

Let  $\mathcal{G} = (B \cup W, E)$  be a bipartite planar graph having a dimer cover (a perfect matching). Let  $\nu : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  be a positive edge weight function.

Let  $K$  be a Kasteleyn matrix for  $\mathcal{G}$ : this is a matrix with rows indexing the white vertices and columns indexing the black vertices,

with entries

$$K(w, b) = \begin{cases} \pm \nu_e & w \sim b \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

where the signs are chosen according to the Kasteleyn rule [5]: a face of length  $\ell$  has  $\frac{\ell}{2} + 1 \pmod{2}$  minus signs. Kasteleyn proved that in this setting  $|\det K|$  is the weighted sum of dimer covers of  $\mathcal{G}$ , where the weight of a dimer cover is the product of its edge weights. See [7] for more information on dimers.

For edges  $e = wb$  and  $e' = w'b'$ , let

$$\mathbb{K}(e, e') = K(w, b)K^{-1}(b', w).$$

Note that the right-hand side does not depend on  $w'$ . By [6],  $\mathbb{K}$  is the kernel of a determinantal measure  $\tau$  on  $\{0, 1\}^E$ . This is the inclusion measure for dimers on edges of  $\mathcal{G}$ : for a point  $(x_1, \dots, x_E) \in \{0, 1\}^E$ , the quantity  $\tau((x_1, \dots, x_E))$  is the probability that a random dimer cover of  $\mathcal{G}$  covers exactly the edges  $e$  for which  $x_e = 1$ .

Define for each  $i \in [k]$  and each edge  $e \in E$  a nonnegative edge weight  $\nu_i(e)$ , satisfying  $\nu(e) = \sum_i \nu_i(e)$ . For a random dimer cover using edge  $e$ , color edge  $e$  with color  $i$  with probability proportional to  $\nu_i(e)$ , independently for all edges, that is, with probability  $p_i(e) = \frac{\nu_i(e)}{\nu_1(e) + \dots + \nu_k(e)}$ .

Now consider the induced measure  $\mu$  on  $[k]^W$  which records the color of the dimer connected to  $w$ . We compute

$$\Pr_\mu(w \text{ has color } i) = \sum_{b \sim w} p_i(bw) \Pr_\tau(bw) = \sum_{b \sim w} p_i(bw) K(w, b) K^{-1}(b, w).$$

Likewise for two vertices

$$\Pr_\mu(w_1 \text{ has color } i_1 \text{ and } w_2 \text{ has color } i_2) = \sum_{b_1 \sim w_1} \sum_{b_2 \sim w_2} p_{i_1}(b_1 w_1) p_{i_2}(b_2 w_2) \Pr_\tau(b_1 w_1, b_2 w_2)$$

where  $b_1$  runs over neighbors of  $w_1$  and  $b_2$  runs over neighbors of  $w_2$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sum_{b_1} \sum_{b_2} p_{i_1}(b_1 w_1) p_{i_2}(b_2 w_2) \det \begin{pmatrix} K(w_1, b_1) K^{-1}(b_1, w_1) & K(w_2, b_2) K^{-1}(b_2, w_1) \\ K(w_1, b_1) K^{-1}(b_1, w_2) & K(w_2, b_2) K^{-1}(b_2, w_2) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \det \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{b_1} p_{i_1}(b_1 w_1) K(w_1, b_1) K^{-1}(b_1, w_1) & \sum_{b_2} p_{i_2}(b_2 w_2) K(w_2, b_2) K^{-1}(b_2, w_1) \\ \sum_{b_1} p_{i_1}(b_1 w_1) K(w_1, b_1) K^{-1}(b_1, w_2) & \sum_{b_2} p_{i_2}(b_2 w_2) K(w_2, b_2) K^{-1}(b_2, w_2) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \det \begin{pmatrix} (A_{i_1})_{w_1, w_1} & (A_{i_2})_{w_1, w_2} \\ (A_{i_1})_{w_2, w_1} & (A_{i_2})_{w_2, w_2} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$



where  $A_i$  is the matrix with

$$(A_i)_{w_2, w_1} := \sum_{b_1 \sim w_1} p_i(b_1 w_1) K(w_1, b_1) K^{-1}(b_1, w_2) = (K D_i K^{-1})^t$$

where  $D_i$  is the diagonal matrix with entries  $p_i(b w_1)$  for  $b \in B$ .

A similar argument works for all marginals, so the matrices  $A_1, \dots, A_k$  form a  $k$ -determinantal measure on white vertices. This proves:

**Theorem 4.** *The induced measure on  $[k]^W$  is  $k$ -determinantal.*

For a simple example, color the black vertices of  $\mathcal{G}$  with arbitrary colors in  $[k]$ , and assign edges adjacent to them with full weight of that color (other colors give that edge weight zero). For the graph of Figure 2 with edge weights 1 we have a Kasteleyn matrix




Figure 2: A small bipartite graph with Kasteleyn signs (edges without labels have sign  $+$ ) and colored “black” vertices.

$$K = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

With the indicated coloring of black vertices this leads to

$$\begin{aligned} A_r &= \left[ K \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} K^{-1} \right]^t = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{2}{3} & \frac{2}{3} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{3} & -\frac{1}{3} & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{3} & -\frac{1}{3} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ A_g &= \left[ K \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} K^{-1} \right]^t = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{3} & -\frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} \\ -\frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & -\frac{1}{3} \\ \frac{1}{3} & -\frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} \end{pmatrix} \\ A_b &= \left[ K \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} K^{-1} \right]^t = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\frac{1}{3} & -\frac{1}{3} \\ 0 & \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} \\ 0 & \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

The probability that white vertices 1, 2, 3 are colored  $r, b, g$  respectively is then

$$\Pr_\mu((r, b, g)) = \det(A_r^1, A_b^2, A_g^3) = \det \begin{pmatrix} \frac{2}{3} & -\frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} \\ \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & -\frac{1}{3} \\ -\frac{1}{3} & \frac{2}{3} & \frac{1}{3} \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{3}$$

and indeed, of the three dimer covers of  $\mathcal{G}$ , exactly one of them induces this coloring of the white vertices.

### 3.3 Spanning tree examples

Let  $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$  be an arbitrary connected graph, with  $V = \{v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}\}$  where  $v_0$  is a distinguished root vertex. Let  $V' = V \setminus \{v_0\}$  the non-root vertices. Let  $c : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  be a nonnegative ‘‘conductance’’ function on edges. Let  $\Delta : \mathbb{R}^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^V$  be the corresponding Laplacian:

$$(\Delta f)(v) = \sum_{u \sim v} c_{uv}(f(v) - f(u)).$$

We define the reduced Laplacian  $\Delta' : \mathbb{R}^{V'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{V'}$  similarly:

$$(\Delta' f)(v) = \sum_{u \sim v} c_{uv}(f(v) - f(u))$$

where the sum is over  $u \in V$ , and  $f(v_0) = 0$  by definition. In terms of matrices in the standard basis indexed by vertices, the matrix of the reduced Laplacian is obtained from the matrix of the Laplacian by removing row and column  $v_0$ . The reduced Laplacian is invertible; its determinant is the weighted sum of spanning trees of  $\mathcal{G}$ , where the weight of a tree is the product of its edge conductances [8].

For each edge  $e \in E$  and each  $i \in [k]$  define  $c_i(e) \geq 0$  such that  $\sum_{i=1}^k c_i(e) = c(e)$ . Let  $\Delta'_i$  be the Laplacian of  $\mathcal{G}$ , rooted at  $v_0$ , with conductances  $c_i$ . Note that  $\sum \Delta'_i = \Delta'$ . Let

$$A_i := (\Delta')^{-1/2} \Delta'_i (\Delta')^{-1/2}.$$

Then  $\sum A_i = I$ .

**Theorem 5.** *The matrices  $A_i$  define a  $k$ -determinantal process on  $V \setminus \{v_0\}$ .*

*Proof.* Replace each edge of  $\mathcal{G}$  with  $k$  parallel edges with the same endpoints, one of each color, with the  $i$ th edge having conductance  $c_i(e)$ . Let  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$  be the new graph. There is a map from spanning trees of  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$  to vertex colorings defined as follows. Given a spanning tree  $T$  of  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$  rooted at  $v_0$ , color each vertex  $v \neq v_0$  according to the color of the first edge on the unique path in  $T$  from  $v$  to the root.

This mapping defines a measure  $\mu$  on  $[k]^{V'}$ ; it is the image of the weighted spanning tree measure on  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ . We claim that  $\mu$  is  $k$ -determinantal, with matrices  $A_i$ .

For any coloring  $\sigma \in [k]^{V'}$ , the Directed Matrix Tree Theorem (see e.g. [4]) says that the determinant

$$\det(\Delta_{\sigma(1)}^1, \dots, \Delta_{\sigma(n-1)}^{n-1})$$

of the matrix formed from the corresponding columns of the  $\Delta_i$ , is the weighted sum of spanning trees of  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$  in which for each vertex  $v$ , the edge out of vertex  $v$  (and in the direction of the unique path to  $v_0$ ) has color  $\sigma(v)$ .

The sum over all trees is  $\det \Delta$ , so

$$\det(A_{\sigma(1)}^1, \dots, A_{\sigma(n-1)}^{n-1})$$

is the probability of coloring  $\sigma$ , as desired.  $\square$

An example is shown in Figure 1 (for the point process) and Figure 3 (for the spanning tree). We took a large triangle in the triangular grid, centered at the origin, with wired boundary conditions, and conductances which depend on position and orientation of edges: for a fixed parameter  $q > 0$ , horizontal edges at coordinate  $(x, y)$  have conductance  $q^y$ , edges of slope  $\sqrt{3}$  have conductances  $q^{\frac{x\sqrt{3}}{2} - \frac{y}{2}}$ , and edges of slope  $-\sqrt{3}$  have conductances  $q^{-\frac{x\sqrt{3}}{2} - \frac{y}{2}}$ . Such a spanning tree can be sampled quickly using Wilson's algorithm [17]. Each vertex is then colored according to the direction of its outgoing edge (edge in the direction of the path to the wired outer boundary).

## 4 Symmetric $k$ -determinantal measures

A  $k$ -determinantal process is *symmetric* if each  $A_i$  is a symmetric matrix.




Figure 3: A spanning tree with wired boundary and nonuniform conductances.

If  $B_1, \dots, B_k$  are any real symmetric matrices, then for  $\lambda > 0$  large enough,  $A_i := B_i + \lambda I$  will form an unnormalized symmetric  $k$ -determinantal process.

Another example is provided by the spanning tree example of Section 3.3.

## 4.1 Characteristic polynomial

When the  $A_i$  are symmetric, the characteristic polynomial  $P$  has some additional properties. For  $\vec{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{k-1}$ , and  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , along any line  $t \mapsto (1, tu_2, \dots, tu_k)$ , the polynomial  $P = P(t)$  as a function of  $t$  has all real roots. This follows from the definition of  $P$ , since (letting  $B = u_2 A_2 + \dots + u_k A_k$ ) the one-variable polynomial  $P(t) = \det(A_1 + tB) = \det B \det(B^{-1}A_1 + tI)$  is a multiple of the characteristic polynomial of the symmetric matrix  $B^{-1}A_1$ , which has real eigenvalues. Moreover since  $A_1, B \geq 0$  the roots of  $P(t)$  are negative.

In particular in the case  $k = 2$ ,  $P(x_1, x_2)$  factors as

$$P = c \prod_{i=1}^k (x_1 + a_i x_2)$$

for constants  $c, a_i \geq 0$ .

In the case  $k = 3$ ,  $P$  defines a Vinnikov curve [16], which is by definition the zero set of a polynomial  $P(x, y) = \det(A + Bx + Cy)$  where  $A, B, C$  are symmetric and positive (semi)definite. A Vinnikov curve is a “generalized hyperbola”, see Figure 4. It has generically  $n$  real components (which may touch for nongeneric parameter values), and  $n$  linear asymptotes whose slopes are the eigenvalues of  $-C^{-1}B$ ; it intersects the  $x$ -axis at eigenvalues of  $-C^{-1}A$  and the  $y$ -axis at eigenvalues of  $-B^{-1}A$ .

For larger  $k$ , we define a *Vinnikov variety* to be the zero set of an expression

$$Q(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \det(x_1 A_1 + x_2 A_2 + \dots, x_k A_k)$$

where the  $A_i$  are symmetric and positive semidefinite. The zero set of the characteristic polynomial of a symmetric  $k$ -determinantal process is a Vinnikov variety.

If  $S \subset [n]$  is of size  $|S| = n - 1$  then by the interlacing property for eigenvalues of symmetric matrices, the polynomial  $P_S$  for the subdeterminantal measure has roots interlaced with those of  $P$ , as illustrated in figure 5.




Figure 4: A Vinnikov curve of degree  $n = 7$  arising from the spanning tree 3-determinantal process on  $K_8$  with randomly chosen conductances.




Figure 5: The Vinnikov curve from a 3-determinantal process on  $[3]^4$  (in blue) and an interlaced Vinnikov curve from the process on  $[3]^3$  in red.

## 4.2 Commuting Symmetric $k$ -determinantal measures

If in addition to being symmetric the matrices  $A_1, \dots, A_k$  from a  $k$ -determinantal measure commute with each other, then the characteristic polynomial  $P$  factors into linear factors  $P = \prod_{i=1}^k (a_{1i}x_1 + a_{2i}x_2 + \dots + a_{ki}x_k)$ . We can conclude that the measure  $\rho$ , which counts the number of occurrences of each color, has the distribution of a sum of  $n$  independent  $k$ -sided die rolls, where the  $i$ th die is biased proportional to the  $i$ th eigenvalues of the  $A_j$ .

## 5 Determinantal random permutations

Let  $S_n$  be the permutation group on  $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . An  $S_n$ -*determinantal measure* is an  $n$ -determinantal measure on  $[n]^n$  in which each  $A_i$  has rank 1. The rank-1 condition implies that each color occurs exactly once, so the measure is supported on permutations in  $S_n$ . See below for an example.

Since  $A_i$  has rank 1, we can write  $A_i = u_i v_i^t$  where  $u_i, v_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Since  $\sum A_i = I$ , the  $u_i$  are a basis for  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . We have

$$u_j = \sum_{i=1}^n A_i u_j = \sum_{i=1}^n u_i (v_i \cdot u_j)$$

which implies that  $v_i \cdot u_j = \delta_{i,j}$ . If we let  $U$  be the matrix whose columns are  $u_1, \dots, u_n$ , and  $V$  the matrix whose rows are  $v_1^t, \dots, v_n^t$ , then  $VU = I$ , and the measure  $\mu$  is defined by the matrix  $U$  (or  $V$ ).

By (2), the probability of a permutation  $\sigma \in S_n$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_\mu(\sigma) &= \det((u_{\sigma(1)} v_{\sigma(1)}^1), \dots, (u_{\sigma(n)} v_{\sigma(n)}^n)) \\ &= (\det U) (-1)^\sigma v_{\sigma(1)}^1 \dots v_{\sigma(n)}^n. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Assume  $\det U > 0$ . The non-negativity of the probabilities puts strong constraints on the matrix  $V$ . If we write the usual expansion of the determinant of  $V$ :

$$\det V = \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} (-1)^\sigma V_{1\sigma(1)} \dots V_{n\sigma(n)},$$

each term in this expansion is nonnegative, since after scaling by  $\det U$  it is equal, by (6), to the probability of permutation  $\sigma^{-1}$ . By the result

of [15],  $V$  must be a Kasteleyn matrix of a bipartite *Pfaffian graph* (a bipartite graph which admits a Kasteleyn signing).

Conversely, every edge-weighted bipartite Pfaffian graph with  $n$  white and  $n$  black vertices determines a determinantal measure on  $S_n$ : letting  $V = K$  the Kasteleyn matrix, and  $U = V^{-1}$ , the matrices  $A_i$  are given by  $A_i = u_i v_i^t$ .

**Theorem 6.** *Determinantal permutation measures are exactly those constructed as above from bipartite Pfaffian graphs with positive edge weights.*

Although the set of all bipartite Pfaffian graphs does not have a particularly simple description, it includes all bipartite planar graphs. In [13] a structural description is given, and an algorithm is presented to determine whether or not a graph is bipartite Pfaffian. The simplest nonplanar example is given by the Heawood graph, Figure 6. Its Kasteleyn matrix when all edge weights are 1 is just the bipartite adjacency matrix:

$$K = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The resulting determinantal measure on  $S_7$  is uniform on its support, which is the set of the 24 permutations in  $S_7$  where for each  $i$ ,  $\sigma(i) \in \{i+1, i, i-2\}$  modulo 7. For example  $\sigma = 1732645$ .

## 6 Projections and pure $k$ -determinantal measures

Recall that a  $k$ -determinantal measure  $\mu$  is *pure* if the ranks of the  $A_i$  add up to  $n$ . In this case, by Lemma 3, each  $A_i$  is a projection matrix. Let  $V_i$  the subspace which is the image of  $A_i$ . As shown in that lemma,  $A_i$  is the projection to  $V_i$  along the span of the other  $V_j$ 's.

Let  $n_i$  be the rank of  $A_i$ . Let  $M$  be an  $n \times n$  matrix whose first  $n_1$  columns span  $V_1$ , next  $n_2$  columns span  $V_2$ , and so on. This matrix






Figure 6: The Heawood graph.

$M$  is well-defined up to the right action by  $\mathrm{GL}_{n_1}(\mathbb{R}) \times \cdots \times \mathrm{GL}_{n_k}(\mathbb{R})$ , which performs column operations on the first  $n_1$  columns of  $M$ , the next  $n_2$  columns of  $M$ , and so on. Note that  $M$  has full rank.

We have

$$A_i = M \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_{n_i} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} M^{-1}, \quad (7)$$

where the central matrix has the  $n_i \times n_i$  identity matrix  $I_{n_i}$  occurring starting at the appropriate index  $n_1 + \cdots + n_{i-1} + 1$ .

Let  $L = M^{-1}$ . We partition  $[n]$  into subsets  $U_1, \dots, U_k$ , with

$$U_1 = \{1, 2, \dots, n_1\}, U_2 = \{n_1+1, \dots, n_1+n_2\}, \dots, U_k = \{n-n_k+1, \dots, n\}.$$

Given a point  $\pi \in [k]^n$  in the support of  $\mu$ , for each  $j$  let  $\pi(U_j) \subset [n]$  denote the locations of the indices  $j$  in  $\pi$ .

**Theorem 7.** *Single point probabilities for  $\mu$  are products of minors of  $L$ , up to a multiplicative constant: we have*

$$\mathrm{Pr}(\pi) = (-1)^\pi Q \prod_{i=1}^k L_{U_i}^{\pi(U_i)} \quad (8)$$

where  $Q = \det M$  and  $(-1)^\pi$  is the signature of the mapping  $\pi$ , thought of as a permutation from  $[n]$  to  $[n]$ .

For example when  $k = 3$ , and  $(n_1, n_2, n_3) = (2, 2, 2)$  we have the point probability

$$\mathrm{Pr}((2, 1, 1, 3, 2, 3)) = -QL_{12}^{23}L_{34}^{15}L_{56}^{46}. \quad (9)$$

Here  $\pi : 112233 \rightarrow 211323$  has corresponding permutation  $123456 \rightarrow 231546$  and signature  $-1$ .

Note that conjugating  $L$  by a nonsingular diagonal matrix does not change  $\mu$ .

*Proof.* The general pattern can be seen by working out a sufficiently general example such as (9). Using (2), we have  $\Pr((2, 1, 1, 3, 2, 3)) =$

$$= \det(A_2^1, A_1^2, A_1^3, A_3^4, A_2^5, A_3^6) \\ = \det \left( \left[ \begin{array}{c} \left[ \begin{array}{cccccc} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right] L \\ M \end{array} \right]^1, \dots, \left[ \begin{array}{c} \left[ \begin{array}{cccccc} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{array} \right] L \\ M \end{array} \right]^6 \right).$$

We can factor the  $M$ 's out from the left. What remains is

$$\det M \det \begin{pmatrix} 0 & L_{12} & L_{13} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & L_{22} & L_{23} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ L_{31} & 0 & 0 & 0 & L_{35} & 0 \\ L_{41} & 0 & 0 & 0 & L_{45} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & L_{54} & 0 & L_{56} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & L_{64} & 0 & L_{66} \end{pmatrix},$$

which can be evaluated in block form as  $\pm QL_{12}^{23}L_{34}^{15}L_{56}^{46}$ . The sign is the sign of the permutation of  $112233 \rightarrow 211323$ , acting on columns (in this case the sign is  $-1$ ).  $\square$

## 6.1 Supports of pure $k$ -determinantal measures, $k \geq 3$

Theorem 7 implies that, for  $k \geq 3$ , the supports of pure  $k$ -determinantal measures have certain restrictions: they cannot be supported on all  $\binom{n}{n_1, \dots, n_k}$  sequences. Take any three distinct indices  $i_1, i_2, i_3 \in [n]$ . Let  $x \in [k]^n$  have 3 distinct color values at  $i_1, i_2, i_3$ , for example  $x_{i_1} = 1, x_{i_2} = 2, x_{i_3} = 3$ . Consider the other two points  $x', x''$  obtained by cyclically permuting the values at these three indices, that is,  $x', x'' = x$  at all indices except  $i_1, i_2, i_3$  and  $x'_{i_1} = 2, x'_{i_2} = 3, x'_{i_3} = 1$ , and  $x''_{i_1} = 3, x''_{i_2} = 1, x''_{i_3} = 2$ . Then we claim that  $\Pr(x), \Pr(x'), \Pr(x'')$  cannot all be positive. To see this, let  $y, y', y''$  be the other three points

agreeing with  $x$  off of  $i_1, i_2, i_3$  (and thus having the other three permutations of 1, 2, 3 at  $i_1, i_2, i_3$ ). By (8),

$$\Pr(x)\Pr(x')\Pr(x'') = -\Pr(y)\Pr(y')\Pr(y'')$$

(both sides have the same  $L$  minors but differing signs), a contradiction to the positivity of either side, so both sides must be zero.

This fact can be used to give a different proof, for  $S_3$ , of Theorem 6.

## 6.2 Characterization of pure 2-determinantal measures

Contrary to the previous section, one can construct pure 2-determinantal measure with full support. We give a construction arising from a pair of matrices in the Grassmannian, with Plücker coordinates of the same sign. This construction is general in the sense that it characterizes *all* pure 2-determinantal measures.

We first give the construction for a pair of elements in the positive Grassmannian (so all Plücker coordinates are positive). Let  $n_1 + n_2 = n$ , and let

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} I_{n_1} & A \\ B & I_{n_2} \end{pmatrix} \quad (10)$$

where the submatrix of the first  $n_1$  rows is in the positive Grassmannian:  $(I_{n_1} \ A) \in \text{Gr}_{n_1, n}^+$ , and, after negating  $B$ , the submatrix of the first  $n_1$  columns is in the positive Grassmannian:

$$(I_{n_1} \ -B^t) \in \text{Gr}_{n_1, n}^+. \quad (11)$$

For example

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & -2 & -4 & -6 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ 2 & -2 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 4 & -3 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 6 & -4 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then we claim that  $A_1, A_2$  defined by (7) (with  $L = M^{-1}$ ) form a 2-determinantal process. From Theorem 7 we have for all  $x \in [2]^n$

$$\Pr(x) = (-1)^\pi Q L_{U_1}^{\pi(U_1)} L_{U_2}^{\pi(U_2)}. \quad (12)$$

Here  $L_{U_1}^{\pi(U_1)} > 0$  since  $(I_{n_1} \ A)$ , the first  $n_1$  rows of  $L$ , is in the positive Grassmannian. It suffices then to prove that the sign of  $L_{U_2}^{\pi(U_2)}$  is  $(-1)^\pi$ , or equivalently, the sign of the maximal minor of  $(B \ I_{n_2})$  defined by columns  $\pi(U_2)$ , is  $(-1)^\pi$ .

The signature  $(-1)^\pi$  can be computed as the parity of the total displacement of 1s, or equivalently the total displacement of 2s:  $(-1)^\pi = (-1)^s$  where  $s = \sum_{i \in U_1} \pi(i) - i = \sum_{j \in U_2} j - \pi(j)$ , since each term in the sum is the number of  $12 \rightarrow 21$  crossings each index makes.

Maximal minors of  $R := (B \ I_{n_2})$  are complementary maximal minors of  $(I_{n_1} \ B^t)$ . By (11), the signs of these minors have a simple form. Let  $D$  be the diagonal  $n \times n$  matrix with diagonal entries  $D_{ii} = (-1)^i$ . Then multiplying by  $D$  on the right, (11) implies that  $RD$  is in the positive Grassmannian  $\text{Gr}_{n_2, n}^+$ . Thus maximal minors of  $R$  have sign given by the parity of the number of their odd columns, that is, exactly  $(-1)^\pi$  as desired.

Now consider the general case of two elements  $W_1, W_2 \in \text{Gr}_{n_1, n}$  with the property that their corresponding Plücker coordinates have the same signs (or at least one is 0). Build  $L$  as above in (10) with  $(I_{n_1} \ A) \sim W_1$  and  $(I_{n_1} \ -B^t) \sim W_2$ . The signs of point probabilities in (12) cancel as in the previous case, so all point probabilities will yield nonnegative quantities.

It is unclear, however, how to explicitly parameterize all such pairs  $W_1, W_2$ . Indeed, if we include 0 as a potential sign (that is, allow some minors to be zero), the Mnëv Universality Theorem [11] says that subsets of  $\text{Gr}_{n_1, n}$  having Plücker coordinates of predetermined signs in  $\{-1, 0, 1\}$  can be arbitrarily complicated, essentially equivalent to any semialgebraic set. So in this sense there seems to be no reasonable parameterization of such pairs  $W_1, W_2$ .

## References

- [1] Alexei Borodin. Determinantal point processes. In *The Oxford handbook of random matrix theory*, pages 231–249. Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, 2011.
- [2] Alexei Borodin, Persi Diaconis, and Jason Fulman. On adding a list of numbers (and other one-dependent determinantal processes). *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 47(4):639–670, 2010.

- [3] Robert Burton and Robin Pemantle. Local characteristics, entropy and limit theorems for spanning trees and domino tilings via transfer-impedances. *Ann. Probab.*, 21(3):1329–1371, 1993.
- [4] Seth Chaiken. A combinatorial proof of the all minors matrix tree theorem. *SIAM Journal on Algebraic Discrete Methods*, 3(3):319–329, 1982.
- [5] Pieter W Kasteleyn. Dimer statistics and phase transitions. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 4(2):287–293, 1963.
- [6] Richard Kenyon. Local statistics of lattice dimers. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.*, 33(5):591–618, 1997.
- [7] Richard Kenyon. Lectures on dimers. In *Statistical mechanics*, volume 16 of *IAS/Park City Math. Ser.*, pages 191–230. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2009.
- [8] Gustav Kirchhoff. Über die Auflösung der Gleichungen, auf welche man bei der Untersuchung der linearen Verteilung galvanischer Ströme geführt wird. *Ann. Phys.*, 148(12):497–508, 1847.
- [9] Russell Lyons. Determinantal probability measures. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.*, (98):167–212, 2003.
- [10] Odile Macchi. The coincidence approach to stochastic point processes. *Advances in Appl. Probability*, 7:83–122, 1975.
- [11] N. E. Mnev. The universality theorems on the classification problem of configuration varieties and convex polytopes varieties. In *Topology and geometry—Rohlin Seminar*, volume 1346 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 527–543. Springer, Berlin, 1988.
- [12] Alexander Postnikov. Total positivity, grassmannians, and networks. *arXiv preprint math/0609764*, 2006.
- [13] Neil Robertson, P. D. Seymour, and Robin Thomas. Permanents, Pfaffian orientations, and even directed circuits. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 150(3):929–975, 1999.
- [14] A. Soshnikov. Determinantal random point fields. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk*, 55(5(335)):107–160, 2000.
- [15] Vijay V. Vazirani and Mihalis Yannakakis. Pfaffian orientations, 0-1 permanents, and even cycles in directed graphs. volume 25, pages 179–190. 1989. *Combinatorics and complexity* (Chicago, IL, 1987).

- [16] Victor Vinnikov. Complete description of determinantal representations of smooth irreducible curves. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 125:103–140, 1989.
- [17] David Bruce Wilson. Generating random spanning trees more quickly than the cover time. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-eighth Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing (Philadelphia, PA, 1996)*, pages 296–303. ACM, New York, 1996.