

# Noncommutative Semialgebraic Geometry and Convexity vs LMI's

J William Helton\*†Scott McCullough‡§Victor Vinnikov¶||

June 19, 2003

## 1 Introduction

This is an expanded version of an IFAC 2005 paper of Helton, McCullough, Vinnikov surveying one type of qualitative and algebraic results on Matrix Inequalities (MI) as found in systems engineering. Here we have added open questions and references.

Arguably, the biggest revolution in linear control theory of the 1990's is the realization that most linear control problems convert directly to matrix inequalities, abbreviated MIs. Many of these are badly behaved but a classical core of problems convert to linear matrix inequalities (LMIs) which are nicely behaved. Systems problems very directly and by routine methods produce lists of messy matrix inequalities, so it would be valuable to develop computer algebra methods to convert them to nice ones or prove this impossible. Typically nice means "convex". A basic question in light of preponderance in the systems literature of LMIs and the fact that convexity, a seemingly much weaker condition than being an LMI, guarantees numerical success is: *How much more restricted are LMIs than Convex MIs?*

There are two fundamentally different classes of linear systems problems. Ones whose statements do depend on the dimension of the system "explicitly" and ones whose statements do not. **Dimension dependent systems problems** lead to traditional semialgebraic geometry problems, while **dimensionless systems problems** lead directly to a new area which might be called noncommutative semialgebraic geometry, cf. [HMVpre]. The classic results of control such as laid out in the book of Zhou-Doyle-Glover, or for LMIs in the 1997 book of Skelton-Iwasaki-Grigoriadis, have dimensionless matrix unknowns, so lead to what we are calling noncommutative problems. In this article we shall emphasize dimensionless systems problems in which case formulas involve matrices of noncommutative polynomials or rational functions.

### 1.1 A Familiar Example

For sake of orientation with respect to noncommutativity let us begin with the most ancient and ubiquitous formula in classical linear control theory: the Riccati inequality,

$$AX + XA^T - XBB^T X + C^T C \geq 0, \tag{1}$$

where " $\geq$ " means positive semidefinite as a matrix. Also there is the LMI (linear in  $X$ )

$$\begin{pmatrix} AX + XA^T + C^T C & XB \\ B^T X & I \end{pmatrix} \geq 0. \tag{2}$$

---

\*Dept. of Mathematics, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093-0112, USA, helton@math.ucsd.edu.

†Partly supported by NSF and the Ford Motor Co.

‡Department of Mathematics, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, 32611-8105, USA, sam@math.ufl.edu.

§Partly supported by the NSF grant DMS-0140112.

¶Department of Mathematics, Ben Gurion Univ. of the Negev, Beer Sheva, Israel, vinnikov@math.bgu.ac.il.

||Partially supported by the Israel Science Foundation (Grant No. 322/00).

We could think of the left side as being polynomials (resp. a matrix containing linear polynomials) in noncommuting variables  $A, B, C, X$ . The inequalities (1) and (2) are equivalent in that when matrices  $A, B, C$  are plugged in for the corresponding noncommuting variables they have the same set of solution matrices  $X$ . Distinguishing between  $A$  as a variable and  $A$  as a matrix might sound pedantic, but we must do this, since we are interested in developing computer algebra algorithms to handle  $A$  without breaking it into entries  $A_{ij}$ ; of course we ultimately would like to at formulas which are vastly more complicated than Riccatis. Soon our notation will enshrine this in that lower case  $a$  will denote the variable and capital  $A$  will denote the matrix.

What is done here often bears on properties of algorithms programmed to run under our package NCAlgebra <http://math.ucsd.edu/~ncalg/download.shtml> which is a general noncommutative algebra package running under Mathematica. See §6.

## 2 Dimensionless Case: Convexity

This section focuses on symmetric polynomials in noncommuting variables and sets the stage for more general results.

### 2.1 NC Polynomials

We consider noncommutative (hereafter denoted NC) polynomials with real numbers as coefficients in variables  $x = \{x_1, \dots, x_g\}$ . While this class does not include Riccatis the theory, even for the case we treat, is new, rich, very challenging and indicative of Riccatis and much more general cases

**Example 2.1** Some such polynomials are:

$$p(x) = x_1 x_2 x_1 + x_1 x_2 + x_2 x_1 \quad x_1^T = x_1 \quad x_2^T = x_2.$$

Here we took the variables  $x_j$  to be formally symmetric. Next

$$p(x) = x_1^T x_2 x_1 + x_1^T x_2 + x_2 x_1 \quad x_2^T = x_2.$$

Here we took the variable  $x_2$  to be formally symmetric, but  $x_1$  is not.

A NC polynomial  $p$  is symmetric provided that it is formally symmetric with respect to the involution  $T$ . Often we shall substitute  $n \times n$  matrices  $X_1, \dots, X_g$  into  $p$  for the variables  $x_1, \dots, x_g$ . If the  $x_j$  are designated as symmetric variables the matrices  $X_1, \dots, X_g$  must be taken to be symmetric; then the resulting matrix  $p(X_1, \dots, X_g)$  is symmetric. The variables  $x_j$  which are not declared symmetric, if substituted by the matrix  $X_j$ , also result in the variables  $x_j^T$  being substituted by  $X_j^T$ . Henceforth, to save space and confusion, the formal definitions and theorems we state are all for functions in symmetric variables.

Denote the  $n \times n$  matrices with real entries by  $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ , and the subspace of symmetric  $n \times n$  matrices by  $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ . Similarly, denote the set of all  $g$ -tuples  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_g)$  of (resp. symmetric)  $n \times n$  matrices by  $(\mathbb{R}^{n \times n})^g$  (resp.  $(\mathbb{S}\mathbb{R}^{n \times n})^g$ ).

A symmetric NC polynomial in symmetric variables is **matrix-convex** provided that for any tuples  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_g)$  and  $Y = (Y_1, \dots, Y_g)$  of square symmetric matrices of the same dimension  $n$  and any  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ , the matrix

$$tp(X) + (1-t)p(Y) - p(tX + (1-t)Y) \tag{3}$$

is positive semidefinite. We emphasize that we test with matrices of all dimensions  $n$ . A less stringent condition is matrix convexity in a NC open set, where an example of this is **matrix-convex near 0**. This means there is a positive number  $\varepsilon$  such that if tuples  $X, Y$  each lie in the ball

$$\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon := \{Z \in (\mathbb{S}\mathbb{R}^{n \times n})^g : Z_1^2 + \dots + Z_g^2 < \varepsilon^2 I\},$$

then the inequality (3) holds. **Matrix convexity** is defined analogously for NC rational functions, a class of expressions discussed below, see §3.1.

## 2.2 NC Linear Pencils

At the core of an LMI is a linear pencil. Given a matrix  $W$  with entries  $W_{ij}$  and a variable  $x_\ell$ , let  $Wx_\ell = x_\ell W$  denote the matrix with entries given by

$$(Wx_\ell)_{ij} = W_{ij}x_\ell.$$

A  $m \times d$  **NC linear pencil** (in  $g$  indeterminates) is an expression of the form

$$M(x) := M_0 + M_1x_1 + \dots + M_gx_g$$

and  $M_0, M_1, \dots, M_g$  are  $m \times d$  matrices. A **monic** pencil is one with  $M_0 = I$ . As an example, for

$$M_0 := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \quad M_1 := \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 2 \\ 2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad M_2 := \begin{pmatrix} 5 & 4 \\ 4 & 2 \end{pmatrix},$$

the pencil is

$$M(x) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + 3x_1 + 5x_2 & 2x_1 + 4x_2 \\ 2x_1 + 4x_2 & -1 + x_1 + 2x_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We reiterate that our set up in this brief note does not allow terms linear in  $x_j$  like  $ax_1 + x_1a^T + c^Tc$  because the coefficients are indeterminates  $a, c^Tc$ , however we think our theory is indicative of the behavior there.

An "ordinary", meaning commutative, pencil is one where the variables  $x'_j$ s all commute.

## 2.3 NC Convex Polynomials are Trivial

**Theorem 2.2** [HM04] *Every symmetric NC polynomial which is matrix convex near 0 has degree two or less. Indeed,*

1.  $r$  must be matrix convex everywhere, and
2.  $r$  is a Schur Complement of an associated NC linear pencil.

Even in the one variable ( $g = 1$ ) case this result, due to Ando twenty years ago, has content since the  $X$  and  $Y$  in the definition of convex need not commute. For an idea of how to prove Theorem 2.2 see §4.1.

## 3 Convexity for NC Rationals

Since LMIs are linear it is easily proved that formulas based on them via Schur complements are convex. One would think that the reverse is not true, but in this section we give a result which presents strong evidence that the reverse is true; namely, "dimensionless" systems problems which are convex correspond precisely to LMIs. Specifically, we describe how the convex NC polynomial theorem extends to NC rational functions which are convex near the origin, see [HMPpre].

### 3.1 NC Rational Functions

We shall discuss the notion of a NC rational function in terms of rational expressions. There is a technicality, "analytic at 0", which we include for sake of precision which casual readers can ignore.

A **NC rational expression analytic at 0** is defined recursively. NC polynomials  $p$  are NC rational expressions as are all sums and products of NC rational expressions. If  $r$  is a NC rational expression and  $r(0) \neq 0$ , then the inverse of  $r$  is a rational expression.

The notion of the **formal domain of a rational expression**  $r$ , denoted  $\mathcal{F}_{r,\text{formal}}$ , and the evaluation  $r(X)$  of the rational expression at a tuple  $X \in (\mathbb{S}\mathbb{R}^{n \times n})^g \cap \mathcal{F}_{r,\text{formal}}$  are also defined recursively<sup>1</sup>. Example 3.1 below is illustrative.

An example of a NC rational expression is, the Riccati expression for discrete-time systems:

$$r = a^T p a - p + c^T c + (a^T p b + c^T d)(I - d^T d - b^T p b)^{-1}(b^T p a + d^T c)$$

Here some variables are symmetric some are not. A difficulty is two different expressions, such as

$$r_1 = x_1(1 - x_2 x_1)^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad r_2 = (1 - x_1 x_2)^{-1} x_1$$

that can be converted into each other with algebraic manipulation. Thus they are the same function and one needs to specify an equivalence relation on rational expressions to arrive at what are typically called **NC rational functions**. (This is standard and simple for commutative (ordinary) rational functions.) There are many alternate ways to describe the NC rational functions and they go back 50 years or so in the algebra literature. For engineering purposes one need not be too concerned, since what happens is that two expressions  $r_1$  and  $r_2$  are equivalent whenever the usual manipulations you are accustomed to with matrix expressions convert  $r_1$  to  $r_2$ .

For  $\mathfrak{r}$  a rational function, that is, an "equivalence class of rational expressions  $r$ ", define its **domain** by

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{r}} := \cup_{\{r \text{ represents } \mathfrak{r}\}} \mathcal{F}_{r,\text{formal}}.$$

Let  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{r}}^0$  denote the arcwise connected component of  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{r}}$  containing 0. We call  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{r}}^0$  the **principal component** of  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{r}}$ . Henceforth we do not distinguish between the rational functions  $\mathfrak{r}$  and rational expressions  $r$ , since this causes no confusion.

#### Example 3.1

$$r(x_1, x_2) = (1 + x_1 - (3 + x_2)^{-1})^{-1},$$

where we take  $x_1 = x_1^T, x_2 = x_2^T$  is a symmetric NC rational expression. The domain  $\mathcal{F}_{r,\text{formal}}$  is

$$\cup_{n>0} \{X_1, X_2 \text{ in } \mathbb{S}\mathbb{R}^{n \times n} :$$

$$1 + X_1 - (3 + X_2)^{-1} \text{ and } 3 + X_2 \text{ are invertible}\}.$$

Its principal component  $\mathcal{F}_r^0$  is

$$\{X_1, X_2 : 1 + X_1 - (3 + X_2)^{-1} > 0 \text{ and } 3 + X_2 > 0\}$$

---

<sup>1</sup>The formal domain of a polynomial  $p$  is all of  $(\mathbb{S}\mathbb{R}^{n \times n})^g$  and  $p(X)$  is defined just as before. The formal domain of sums and products of rational expressions is the intersection of their respective formal domains. If  $r$  is an invertible rational expression analytic at 0 and  $r(X)$  is invertible, then  $X$  is in the the formal domain of  $r^{-1}$ .

### 3.2 Convexity vs LMIs

**Theorem 3.2** [HMPVpre] *Suppose  $r$  is a NC symmetric rational function which is convex near the origin. Then*

(1)  *$r$  has a representation*

$$r(x) = r_0 + r_1(x) + \ell(x)\ell(x)^T + \Lambda(x)(I - L(x))^{-1}\Lambda(x)^T, \quad (4)$$

where

$$L(x), \ell(x), \Lambda(x), r_0 + r_1(x)$$

are linear pencils in  $x_1, \dots, x_g$  satisfying

$$L(0) = 0, \ell(0) = 0, \Lambda(0) = 0, r_1(0) = 0.$$

In addition  $L$  and  $r_1$  are symmetric, for example,  $L(x)$  has the form  $L(x) = A_1x_1 + \dots + A_gx_g$  for symmetric matrices  $A_j$ .

Thus for  $\gamma$  any real number  $r - \gamma$  is a Schur complement of the noncommutative linear pencil

$\mathcal{M}_\gamma(x) :=$

$$\begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & \ell(x)^T \\ 0 & -(I - L(x)) & \Lambda(x)^T \\ \ell(x) & \Lambda(x) & r_0 - \gamma + r_1(x) \end{pmatrix}.$$

(2) *The principal component of the domain of  $r$  is a convex set, indeed it is the positivity set of the pencil  $I - L(x)$ . Indeed this holds for any  $r$  of the form (4).*

This gives a tight enough correspondence between properties of the pencil and properties of  $r$ , so that

**Corollary 3.3** *For any  $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ , principal component,  $\mathcal{G}_\gamma^0$ , of the set of solutions  $X$  to the matrix inequality*

$$r(X) < \gamma I$$

*equals the set of solutions to an LMI based on a certain linear pencil  $\mathcal{M}_\gamma(x)$ .*

That is, numerically solving matrix inequalities based on  $r$  is equivalent to numerically solving an LMI associated to  $r$ .

### 3.3 Proof of Corollary 3.3

By item (2) of Theorem 4.2 the upper  $2 \times 2$  block of  $\mathcal{M}_\gamma(X)$  is negative definite if and only if  $I - L(X) > 0$  if and only if  $X$  is in the component of 0 of the domain of  $r$ . Given that the upper  $2 \times 2$  block of  $\mathcal{M}_\gamma(X)$  is negative, definite, by the  $LDL^T$  (Cholesky) factorization,  $0 > \mathcal{M}_\gamma(X)$  is negative definite if and only if  $\gamma I > r(X)$ . ■

### 3.4 Proof of Theorem 3.2

We will say little about the proof, since at this early stage of the subject it requires about 50 pages. However, a point of general interest is that the technique for obtaining a representation for  $r$  as a Schur Complement of a linear pencil is classical. In fact the following representation of any symmetric NC rational expression  $r$  is the symmetric version of the one due originally to Schützenberger and Fliess (who were motivated by automata and formal languages, and bilinear systems) and extended recently by C. Beck and by Ball–Groenewald–Malakorn. See [HMPVpre] for references.

**Theorem 3.4**  $r$  has a minimal **Descriptor Realization**, namely,

$$r(x) = r_0 + C(J - \sum_j^g \mathcal{A}_j x_j)^{-1} C^T, \quad (5)$$

with  $J$  is a "signature matrix", that is,  $J$  is symmetric and  $J^2 = I$ , and  $\mathcal{A}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  are symmetric.

For example, a polynomial of degree 10 can be represented in this form. However, convexity of  $r$  forces  $J$  to be within rank one of  $I$  and then algebraic manipulations give Theorem 3.2 item (1). The proof of item (2) is yet more gruelling.

## 4 NC Semialgebraic Geometry (SAG)

A NC symmetric polynomial  $p$  is **matrix positive polynomial** provided  $p(X_1, \dots, X_g)$  is a positive semidefinite for every  $X \in (\mathbb{S}\mathbb{R}^{n \times n})^g$  (and every  $n$ ). An example of a matrix positive NC polynomial is a **Sum of Squares** of NC polynomials, meaning an expression of the form

$$p(x) = \sum_{j=1}^c h_j(x)^T h_j(x).$$

Clearly, when  $X$  in  $(\mathbb{S}\mathbb{R}^{n \times n})^g$  is substituted into  $p(X)$  we get  $\sum_{j=1}^c h_j(X)^T h_j(X)$  which is a PSD matrix. Remarkably these are the only positive NC polynomials:

**Theorem 4.1** *Every matrix positive NC polynomial is a sum of squares.*

Those familiar with conventional "commutative" semialgebraic geometry will recognize that this NC behavior is much cleaner. See [P00, L00] for a beautiful treatment of applications of commutative SAG.

This theorem is just a sample of the structure of NC semialgebraic geometry. Indeed, there is a strong NC Positivstellensatz recently proved in conjunction with M. Putinar. References containing this and the results alluded to in this section can be found in the bibliography of [HM04b].

### 4.1 Application of NC SAG to NC Convexity

To give an idea of how one proves Theorem 2.2, we prove that the symmetric NC polynomial  $p(x) = x^4$  is not matrix convex. While far weaker than the full Theorem 2.2 it is a good illustration of how NC positivity (i.e., NC semialgebraic geometry) is related to NC convexity. It is easy to show that matrix convexity of an NC rational function on a "convex domain" is equivalent to its NC second directional derivative being matrix positive. This is the link between NC convexity and NC positivity. First we define NC directional derivatives, then we turn to convexity of  $p(x) = x^4$ .

**Symbolic Differentiation of NC Functions** The *first directional derivative* of a noncommutative rational function  $r(x)$  with respect to  $x$  in the direction  $h$  is defined in the usual way

$$Dr(x)[h] := \frac{d}{dt} r(x + th) \Big|_{t=0}.$$

Likewise, the *second directional derivative* is

$$\mathcal{H}r(x)[h] = \frac{d^2}{dt^2} r(x + th) \Big|_{t=0}. \quad (6)$$

For example, take  $x = \{x_1\}$  and  $p(x) = x^4$ . Get

$$Dp(x)[h] = hxx + xhx + xxh + xxxh$$

and get  $\mathcal{Hr}(x)[h]$

$$= 2(hhxx + hxhx + hxxh + xhhx + xhxh + xxhh)$$

**Nonconvexity of  $x^4$**  If  $p(x) = x^4$  is matrix convex, then  $\mathcal{Hr}(x)[h]$  is matrix positive and by Theorem 4.1 is a sum of squares,

$$hhxx + hxhx + hxxh + xhhx + xhxh + xxhh = f_1(x, h)^T f_1(x, h) + \cdots + f_k(x, h)^T f_k(x, h).$$

One can show that each  $f_j(x, h)$  is linear in  $h$ . Thus one term, say  $f_1^T f_1$ , must contain  $hhxx$ . Thus  $f_1 = hxx + h + \text{more}$ . However then

$$f_1^T f_1 = xxhhxx + \text{much more}.$$

Moreover, the term  $xxhhxx$  can not be cancelled out, contradicting that  $\mathcal{H}(x)[h]$  is of degree 4. ■

## 5 Dimension Dependent Case: Convexity

In this section only we treat commutative  $x$  and corresponding linear pencils  $M(x)$  in commutative variables  $x \in \mathbb{R}^g$ .

### 5.1 Two Closely Related Questions

**Q1.** We say a set  $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{R}^g$  has a **Linear Matrix Inequality (LMI) Representation** provided that there is a linear pencil  $M(x)$  for which

$$\{x \in \mathbb{R}^g : M(x) \text{ is PosSemiDef}\} \tag{7}$$

equals the set  $\mathcal{C}$ . Without loss of generality we may take the pencil to be monic, that is  $M(0) = I$ . Parrilo and Sturmfels (see [PSpre] in [HV03]) formally ask:

**Which sets have an LMI representation?**

**Q2.** Define a polynomial  $\check{p}$  by

$$\check{p}(x) := \det[I + M_1 x_1 + \cdots + M_g x_g], \tag{8}$$

where the  $M_j$  are symmetric  $d \times d$  matrices. This is said to be a **monic determinantal representation** for  $\check{p}$  and  $d$  is called the **size** of the representation.

**Which polynomials have a monic determinantal representation?**

As we shall see an answer to Q2 also answers Q1. This section describes work in [HV03] which settles the questions for  $g = 2$ .

### 5.2 Obvious Necessary Conditions

#### 5.2.1 $p$ Satisfies the Real Zeroes Condition

For a determinantal representation to exist there is an obvious condition. Observe from (8) that

$$\check{p}(\mu x) := \mu^d \det\left[\frac{I}{\mu} + M_1 x_1 + \cdots + M_g x_g\right].$$

Since (for real numbers  $x_j$ ) all eigenvalues of the symmetric matrix  $M_1x_1 + \dots + M_gx_g$  are real we see that, while  $p(\mu x)$  is a complex valued function of the complex number  $\mu$ , it vanishes only at  $\mu$  which are real numbers. This condition is critical enough that we formalize it in a definition.

A **Real Zero polynomial (RZ polynomial)** is defined to be a polynomial in  $g$  variables satisfying, for each  $x \in R^g$ ,

$$p(\mu x) = 0 \quad \text{for } \mu \text{ a complex number}$$

implies

$$\text{(RZ)} \quad \mu \text{ is actually a real number}$$

**Example 5.1**  $p(x) := 1 - (x_1^4 + x_2^4)$ . Then

$$p(\mu x) = [1 - \mu^2(x_1^4 + x_2^4)^{\frac{1}{2}}][1 + \mu^2(x_1^4 + x_2^4)^{\frac{1}{2}}]$$

which for any  $x_1, x_2$  has 2 complex (not real zeroes) which are  $\mu_{\pm} := i(x_1^4 + x_2^4)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ . Thus  $p$  does not satisfy the Real Zero condition.

### 5.2.2 LMI Representations

Suppose we are given a monic pencil  $M(x)$  which represents a set  $\mathcal{C}$  as in (7). Clearly

1.  $\mathcal{C}$  is a convex set (with 0 in  $\mathcal{C}$ ).
2. The boundary of  $\mathcal{C}$  is contained in the zero set of the polynomial  $\check{p}(x) := \det M(x)$ , so the boundary of  $\mathcal{C}$  lies on an algebraic curve.

In addition,  $\mathcal{C}$  is what we call an **Algebraic Interior**, that is, it is a set  $\mathcal{C}$  in  $R^g$  for which there is a polynomial  $p$  in  $g$  variables (normalized by  $p(0) = 1$ ), such that  $\mathcal{C}$  equals the closed arcwise connected set containing 0, with  $p(x) > 0$  on its interior and  $p(x) = 0$  on its boundary. Such a  $p$  is called a **defining polynomial** for  $\mathcal{C}$ .

## 5.3 Main Representation Results

It is shown in [HV03] that:

*The minimal degree defining polynomial  $p$  for an Algebraic Interior  $\mathcal{C}$  is unique;*

let  $d$  denote the degree of  $p$  and say that  $\mathcal{C}$  is an **Algebraic Interior of Degree  $d$** . Moreover,  $\mathcal{C}$  will be called **rigidly convex** provided that its minimal degree defining polynomial satisfies the Real Zero condition.

## 5.4 Geometrical Version of the Necessary Conditions: Rigid Convexity

In this section we give a geometric characterization of the Real Zeroes Condition.

### 5.4.1 Rigid Convexity

Consider an algebraic interior  $\mathcal{C}$  of degree  $d$  in  $R^g$  with minimal defining polynomial  $p$ ; suppose it contains 0. Then  $\mathcal{C}$  will be called **rigidly convex** provided that, for almost every line  $\ell$  through 0,  $\ell$  intersects the (affine) real algebraic surface  $p(x) = 0$  in exactly  $d$  points.<sup>2</sup> In this counting one ignores lines which go thru 0 and hit the boundary of  $\mathcal{C}$  at  $\infty$ .

---

<sup>2</sup>One can replace here “almost every line” by “every line” if one takes multiplicities into account when counting the number of intersections, and also counts the intersections at infinity, i.e., replaces the affine real algebraic hypersurface  $p(x) = 0$  by the projective real algebraic hypersurface  $p(x) = 0$ .

**Proposition 5.2** (See [HV03] ) *If the line test which defines rigid convexity holds for one point  $x^0$  inside  $\mathcal{C}$  then it holds at all points inside  $\mathcal{C}$ , thereby implying rigid convexity.*

Obviously this proposition simplifies testing for rigid convexity, since we just need to pass lines through one point, not all points. Although we do not prove it here, rigid convexity implies convexity.

**Lemma 5.3** *Rigid convexity of an Algebraic Interior  $\mathcal{C}$  is the same as its minimal degree defining polynomial  $p$  having the Real Zero Property.*

**Theorem 5.4** *If  $\mathcal{C}$  has an LMI representation, then it is rigidly convex.*

*The converse is true in two dimensions, that is, when  $g = 2$ . Furthermore, in this case there exists an LMI representation of the size equal to the degree of  $\mathcal{C}$ .*

**Conjecture 5.5** *We conjecture that for any dimension  $g$  if  $\mathcal{C}$  is rigidly convex, then it has an LMI representation.*

**Remark 5.6** When  $g > 2$ , the minimal size of an LMI representation in Conjecture 5.5 is in general larger than the degree of  $\mathcal{C}$ .

Conjecture 5.5 follows from

**Conjecture 5.7** [ [HV03]] *Every Real Zero polynomial has a monic determinantal representation.*

*For  $g = 2$  this is proved true in [HV03].*

This might be called a modified Lax conjecture in that Lewis, Parrilo and Ramana [LPRpre] settled a 1958 conjecture of Peter Lax affirmatively for  $g = 2$ , using the  $g = 2$  monic determinantal representation mentioned above. They proved the Lax conjecture false for  $g > 2$  but our conjecture is a natural modification.

## 6 Software

Here is a list of software running under NCAAlgebra (which runs under Mathematica) that implements and experiments on symbolic algorithms pertaining to NC Convexity and LMIs.

<http://www.math.ucsd.edu/~ncalg>

**LMI producing:** A symbolic algorithm of N. Slinglend has been implemented by J. Shopples under NCAAlgebra to construct the linear pencil  $\mathcal{M}$  in Theorem 3.2 symbolically from  $r$ . While it provably always associates an LMI with a convex  $r$  it works now only on small problems. Also to flexibly handle control problems more generality is needed and work is in progress. However, these results establish that the correspondence between dimensionless systems problems which are convex and LMIs is very strong.

**Convexity Checker:** Camino, Helton, Skelton have an (algebraic) algorithm for determining the region on which a rational expression is convex. This is implemented in a command

```
NCCConvexityRegion[fun, list-of-variables]
```

where **fun** is a rational function in the NC variables given in **list-of-variables**. The output is a list of formal inequalities with the property that if a set  $\mathcal{R}$  of matrices satisfy them, then the function **fun** is "matrix convex" with respect to the variables in **list-of-variables** on  $\mathcal{R}$ .

**Classical Production of LMIs:** There are two Mma notebooks by de Oliveira and Helton. The first is based on algorithms for implementing the 1997 approach of Skelton, Iwasaki and Grigonidas associating LMIs to many control problems. The second (requires C++) produces LMIs by symbolically implementing the 1997 change of variables method of C. Scherer et. al.

## 7 Conclusions and Questions

### 7.1 Commutative:

Semialgebraic geometry is a subject which goes back 75 years.

For sets convexity is different from having an LMI representation, which [HV03] conjectures is the same as rigid convexity. It is proved in dimension 2.

Which convex algebraic interiors lift to an LMI representable set, [?]? Informally Parrilo speculated that all will lift.

Change of variables to make a problem convex is classically analyzed (via Morse theory) and understood, but what one finds seems not to be profoundly practical.

### 7.2 Noncommutative:

NC semialgebraic geometry is only a few years old and while challenging is developing well into a mathematically rich area.

Helton and McCullough, have proved (in preparation) that convexity of a NC set,  $\mathcal{C}$ , is the same as having an infinite dimensional NC LMI representation. The main issue now when the LMI is finite dimensional. When  $\mathcal{C}$  is the positivity domain of an NC polynomial, NC rational or matrix of NC rationals we conjecture, see [HM04] [HMVpre] [DHMprept], the representing LMI is finite dimensional. While far from proved, evidence for that conclusion is strong.

Further needed is a theory

- (a) with "letters as coefficients" (as opposed to real numbers); and
- (b) for matrices with NC rational entries.

The first of these while messy has been done in many situations, e.g., [CHSY03] and in some of the software.

Changing variables to make a NC problem convex is an open area. It is possible that NC changes of variables will behave better than changes of variables do classically. Study is just beginning.

### 7.3 NC SAG vs SAG

Suppose  $p$  is an NC symmetric defining polynomial, for domain  $\mathcal{D}_p$ , that is,  $\mathcal{D}_p = \bigcup_n \mathcal{D}_p^n$  where

$$\mathcal{D}_p^n := \text{closure}\{X : p(X) \text{ is Pos Def}\}.$$

We call  $\mathcal{D}_p$  the **positivity domain for  $p$**  and  $p$  a **defining polynomial** for it. Basic issues are open regarding "regularity" of the boundary of positivity domains. Here are a few examples.

Q1. Suppose  $p$  is a minimal degree defining polynomial for  $\mathcal{D}_p$ . Then is

$$\delta^n(X) := \det p(X)$$

the minimal degree defining polynomial for  $\mathcal{D}_p^n$ , whenever  $n$  is large enough?  
(Helton-McCullough-Vinnikov)

Q2. What is the correct notion of NC smoothness for surfaces? For example, the surface of the unit ball  $\mathcal{B}^n$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  we probably want to think of  $\partial\mathcal{B}$  as NC smooth even though  $\partial\mathcal{B}^n$  for  $n > 1$  is topologically not smooth. If we intersect two balls  $\mathcal{D}^n = \mathcal{B}^n \cap (I + \mathcal{B}^n)$  and consider its boundary  $\partial\mathcal{D}^n$ , then intuitively this has some much more severe corners than does  $\partial\mathcal{B}^n$  and we would not want to say that  $\partial\mathcal{D}$  is NC smooth.

(Helton-McCullough-Vinnikov)

Next comes a list of references, which contains more than what is essential for the above.

## References

- [A79] Ando, T., Concavity of certain maps on positive definite matrices and applications to Hadamard products, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **26**(1979), 203-241.
- [BMGprept] Ball, J. A., Malakorn, T. and Groenewalde, G. Structured noncommutative multidimensional linear systems, preprint.
- [BCR98] Real Algebraic Geometry. J. Bochnak, M. Coste, M.F. Roy, *Real algebraic geometry*, Translated from the 1987 French original. Revised by the authors. *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)]*, **36**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, pp 1-430 1998.
- [CHSY03] J. F Camino, J. W. Helton, and R. E. Skelton and J. Ye, Matrix inequalities: A Symbolic Procedure to Determine Convexity Automatically, *Integral Equations and Operator Theory* Vol 46, issue 4, August 2003 on pp. 399-454
- [DHMprept] H.Dym, J.W. Helton, and S. McCullough: Two papers on NC polynomials vs the signature of their Hessians.
- [ESLSL00] El Ghaoui, Laurent and Niculescu, Silviu-Lilian eds. *Advances in Linear Matrix Inequality Methods in Control*, Adv. Des. and Control, SIAM, 2000.
- [GNLC95] P. Gahinet, P. and Nemirovskii, A. and Laub, A. J. and Chilali M., *LMI Control Toolbox*, The Math Works, Inc., USA, 1995
- [H03] Helton J. W., Manipulating Matrix Inequalities Autmatically, volume of Plenary Talks at the MTNS 2002, *Inst Math Analysis Series on math and Appl.*, vol 134 pp237-257, Springer Verlag
- [H02] J. W. Helton, "Positive" Noncommutative Polynomials are a Sum of Squares, *Annals of Mathematics* vol 56 num 2, Sept 2002 pp. 675-694
- [HM04] Helton, J. W. and McCullough, S.A., Convex polynomials Degree Two or Less, *SIAM Journal of Matrix Analysis*, **25**(2004) no. 4, pp. 1124-1139.
- [HM04b] J. W. Helton and S. McCullough, A Positivstellensatz for NC Polynomials, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 356:9 (2004), 3721–3737.
- [HMP04] J. W. Helton, S. McCullough and M. Putinar, A NC Positivstellensatz on Isometries, *J. reine angew. Math.* 568 (2004), 1–9.
- [HMer98] Helton J. W., and Merino O., Sufficient Conditions for Optimization of Matrix Functions, pp. 1-5, *Conf on Decision and Control* 98.
- [HV03] Helton, J. W. and V. Vinnikov, Linear Matrix Inequality Representation of Sets, prept. <http://arXiv.org> posted June 2003, pp1-22. to appear *Com. of Pure and Appl Math*
- [HMPpre] J.W. Helton, S. McCullough, V. Vinnikov *NonCommutative convexity arises from linear matrix inequalities*,
- [K36] Kraus, F., Über Konvexe Matrixfunktionen, *Math. Z.*, **41**(1936), 18-42.
- [L00] Lasserre, J. B.: Global optimization with polynomials and the problem of moments, *SIAM J. on Optimization*, 2001, 11, 3, pp796–817,

- [LPRpre] A. S. Lewis, P. A. Parrilo and M. V. Ramana, The Lax Conjecture is True, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. (to appear).
- [PSpre] P. A. Parrilo and B. Sturmfels, Pablo FILL IN??
- [LM00] Li, Chi-Kwong and Mathias, Roy, Extremal characterizations of the Schur complement and resulting inequalities, SIAM Rev., **42**(2000), no. 2, 233-246.
- [NN94] Yurii Nesterov and Arkadii Nimmerovski, *Interior Point Polynomial Algorithms in Convex Programming*, SIAM Studies 13, 1994, pp. 405.
- [P00] Parrilo, Pablo : Thesis Cal Tech May 2000
- [Put93] M. Putinar. Positive polynomials on compact semi-algebraic sets. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 42(3):969–984, 1993.
- [SIG97] R. E. Skelton, T. Iwasaki, and K. M. Grigoriadis. *A Unified Algebraic Approach to Linear Control Design*. Taylor & Francis, 1997.
- [Sprept] N. Slinglend, Towards computing LMIs Automatically. Preprint.
- [S99] J. F. Sturm, J. F., "Using SeDuMi 1.02, a MATLAB toolbox for optimization over symmetric cones", j-OMS, 1999, vol. 11/12, number 1-4, p.625–653