Universität Konstanz Fachbereich Mathematik und Statistik Prof. Dr. Salma Kuhlmann Mitarbeiter: Dr. Mickaël Matusinski Büroraum F 409 mickael.matusinski@uni-konstanz.de



Übungen zur Vorlesung Reelle algebraische Geometrie

Blatt 4 - Solution.

1. By induction on n, it suffices to consider a field K endowed with an order P, and to show that it extends to an order on K(x).

(a) The refered result is:

Let L/K be a field extension and P an order on K. Consider the set

$$T_L(P) := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n a_i y_i^2 \mid n \in \mathbb{N}, a_i \in P, y_i \in L \right\}.$$

Then P admits an extension to an order on L if $-1 \notin T_L(P)$.

We reason by absurd: suppose that $-1 \in T_{K(x)}(P)$, then we have $p_0^2 + a_1 p_1^2 + \dots + a_n p_n^2 = 0$ for some $a_i \in P \subset K$ and $p_i \in K[x]$. The leading coefficient of the left term of this equality is of the form $b_0^2 + \sum a_i b_i^2 = 0$ with $b_i \in K$, which would mean that $-1 \in P \rightarrow$ contradiction.

(b) For every $f(x),g(x) \in K[x]$ with $f(x) = d_m x^m + \dots + d_k x^k$ $(m \ge k)$ and $g(x) \neq 0$, define

$$f(x) \ge 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad d_k \ge 0;$$

$$\frac{f(x)}{g(x)} \ge 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad f(x)g(x) \ge 0$$

and show that this is an order on K(x) extending the one on K, by showing that the set of positive elements is a positive cone containing *P*.

Note that *x* is positive infinitesimal with respect to *K*, i.e. 0 < x < a for all $a \in K$. Thus the order on $K(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ that we get is such that x_{i+1} is infinitesimal with respect to $K(x_1, \ldots, x_i)$ for any $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$.

2. Consider $x \in R$ with $|x| \ge D$. We write

$$f(x) = dx^{m} \left(1 + \frac{d_{m-1}}{d} x^{-1} + \dots + \frac{d_{0}}{d} x^{-m} \right).$$

Consider

$$\left|\frac{d_{m-1}}{d}x^{-1}+\cdots+\frac{d_0}{d}x^{-m}\right|.$$

Since $|x| \ge D \ge 1$, we have $1 \ge D^{-1} \ge |x^{-1}| \ge |x^{-2}| \ge \cdots \ge |x^{-m}|$. Moreover applying the triangular inequality, we get that:

$$\left|\frac{d_{m-1}}{d}x^{-1} + \dots + \frac{d_0}{d}x^{-m}\right| \le \left(\left|\frac{d_{m-1}}{d}\right| + \dots + \left|\frac{d_0}{d}\right|\right)D^{-1}$$

Since by definition

$$D := 1 + \sum_{i=m-1}^{0} \left| \frac{d_i}{d} \right| > \sum_{i=m-1}^{0} \left| \frac{d_i}{d} \right|.$$

we have

$$\left|\frac{d_{m-1}}{d}x^{-1}+\cdots+\frac{d_0}{d}x^{-m}\right|<1$$

We deduce that

$$\left|1 + \frac{d_{m-1}}{d}x^{-1} + \dots + \frac{d_0}{d}x^{-m}\right| > 0$$

and so

$$|f(x)| = |dx^{m}| \left| 1 + \frac{d_{m-1}}{d}x^{-1} + \dots + \frac{d_{0}}{d}x^{-m} \right| > 0.$$

3. Let $f(x) = x^m + d_{m-1}x^{m-1} + \dots + d_0 \in R[x]$ with roots $a_1, \dots, a_m \in R$.

If $a_i \ge 0$, for all i = 1, ..., m, denote *n* the number of positive roots. Then $n \le m$. If n = m, then by Descartes lemma, there are at least *m* sign changes in the sequence $(1, d_{m-1}, ..., d_0)$ which is only possible if for any *i*, there is a sign change between 1 and d_{m-1} , which implies that $d_{m-1} < 0 \Leftrightarrow (-1)d_{m-1} > 0$, and between d_{i+1} and d_i , which implies by a straightforward induction that $(-1)^{m-i}d_i \ge 0$ for all *i*. If n < m, it means that 0 is a root with multiplicity m - n. Equivalently, we can factor x^{m-n} in f(x). Then we obtain a polynomial of degree *n* with *n* positive roots, as in the preceding case.

If $(-1)^{m-i}d_i \ge 0$ for all i = 0, ..., m - 1, suppose that there exists a negative root a < 0. Then $\beta := -a > 0$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} f(a) &= 0 \\ &= f(-\beta) \\ &= (-1)^m \beta^m + (-1)^{m-1} d_{m-1} \beta^{m-1} + \dots + (-1) d_1 \beta + d_0 \\ &= (-1)^m \left[\beta^m + (-1) d_{m-1} \beta^{m-1} + \dots + (-1)^{m-1} d_1 \beta + (-1)^m d_0 \right] \end{aligned}$$

But a sum of non negative terms is zero if and only if each term is zero \rightarrow contradiction.

4. Consider $f(x) = dx^m + d_{m-1}x^{m-1} + \dots + d_0 \in R[x]$. We write its decomposition in irreducible factors as

$$f(x) = d \prod (x - a_i)^{k_i} \prod [(x - b_j)^2 + c_j^2]^{l_j}.$$

We show that $(a) \Rightarrow (b)$. Suppose that $f \ge 0$ on *R* and that there exists a factor $(x - a_i)$ with multiplicity k_i odd (ungerade), say i = 1 for instance. Consider

$$\frac{f(x)}{(x-a_1)^{k_1}} = d \prod_{i \ge 2} (x-a_i)^{k_i} \prod [(x-b_j)^2 + c_j^2]^{l_j}.$$

Since $(x - a_1)^{k_1}$ has a (unique) sign change at a_1 and $f(x) \ge 0$, we should have a sign change at a_1 in the right term of this equality, which is a polynomial. By the Intermediate Value Theorem, this polynomial would have a_1 as a root. Equivalently $(x - a_1)$ would be a factor of it, which contradicts the fact that k_1 is the multiplicity of a_1 for f. Thus all the k_i 's are even, so $\prod (x - a_i)^{k_i} \prod [(x - b_j)^2 + c_j^2]^{l_j} \ge 0$ and consequently d > 0.

We show that $(b) \Rightarrow (c)$. We suppose that $k_i = 2m_i$ for all *i*. Then we write

$$f(x) = \left[\sqrt{d} \prod_{i \ge 2} (x - a_i)^{m_i}\right]^2 \prod [(x - b_j)^2 + c_j^2]^{l_j}.$$

Now use the fact that for any a,b,c,d, $(a^2 + b^2)(c^2 + d^2) = (ac - bd)^2 + (ad - bc)^2$, to rewrite $\prod [(x - b_j)^2 + c_j^2]^{l_j}$ as a sum of squares of polynomials.

The remaining $(c) \Rightarrow (a)$ is obvious.