



**HAL**  
open science

# The boundary of the orbit of the 3 by 3 determinant polynomial

Jesko Hüttenhain, Pierre Lairez

► **To cite this version:**

Jesko Hüttenhain, Pierre Lairez. The boundary of the orbit of the 3 by 3 determinant polynomial. Comptes Rendus. Mathématique, 2016, 10.1016/j.crma.2016.07.002 . hal-01239906v2

**HAL Id: hal-01239906**

**<https://hal.science/hal-01239906v2>**

Submitted on 27 Jul 2016

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

**THE BOUNDARY OF THE ORBIT OF  
THE 3 BY 3 DETERMINANT POLYNOMIAL**

**LA FRONTIÈRE DE L'ORBITE  
DU POLYNÔME DÉTERMINANT 3 PAR 3.**

JESKO HÜTTENHAIN AND PIERRE LAIREZ

ABSTRACT. We consider the  $3 \times 3$  determinant polynomial and we describe the limit points of the set of all polynomials obtained from the determinant polynomial by linear change of variables. This answers a question of J. M. Landsberg.

RÉSUMÉ. Nous étudions le polynôme donné par le déterminant  $3 \times 3$  et décrivons l'adhérence de l'ensemble des polynômes obtenus par changements de variables linéaires à partir de ce déterminant, ce qui répond à une question de J. M. Landsberg.

INTRODUCTION

Mulmuley and Sohoni (2001) propose, in their *geometric complexity theory*, to study the geometry of the orbit closure of some polynomials under linear change of variables, and especially, the determinant polynomial. Yet, very few explicit results describing the geometry are known in low dimension. The purpose of this work is to describe the boundary of the orbit of the  $3 \times 3$  determinant, that is, the set of limit points of the orbit that are not in the orbit.

Let  $\det_3$  be the polynomial

$$\det_3 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \det \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & x_3 \\ x_4 & x_5 & x_6 \\ x_7 & x_8 & x_9 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_9],$$

which we consider as a homogeneous form of degree 3 on the space  $\mathbb{C}^{3 \times 3}$  of  $3 \times 3$  matrices, denoted  $W$ . Let  $\mathbb{C}[W]_3$  denote the 165-dimensional space of all homogeneous forms of degree 3 on  $W$ . The group  $\text{GL}(W)$  acts on  $\mathbb{C}[W]_3$  by right composition. For a nonzero  $P \in \mathbb{C}[W]_3$ , let  $\Omega(P)$  denote the (projective) orbit of  $P$ , namely the set of all  $[P \circ a] \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}[W]_3)$ , with  $a \in \text{GL}(W)$ . The *boundary* of the orbit of  $P$ , denoted  $\partial\Omega(P)$ , is  $\overline{\Omega(P)} \setminus \Omega(P)$ , where  $\overline{\Omega(P)}$ , denoted also  $\overline{\Omega}(P)$ , is the Zariski closure of the orbit in  $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}[W]_3)$ .

Our main result is a description of  $\partial\Omega(\det_3)$  that answers a question of Landsberg (2015, Problem 5.4): The two known components are the only ones. In §1 we explain the construction of the two components. Our contribution lies in §2 where we show that there is no other component.

**Theorem 1.** *The boundary  $\partial\Omega(\det_3)$  has exactly two irreducible components:*

- *The orbit closure of the determinant of the generic traceless matrix, namely*

$$P_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \det \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & x_3 \\ x_4 & x_5 & x_6 \\ x_7 & x_8 & -x_1 - x_5 \end{pmatrix};$$

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14L35 (14E05).

Partially funded by the research grant BU 1371/2-2 of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft.

- *The orbit closure of the universal homogeneous polynomial of degree two in three variables, namely*

$$P_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x_4 \cdot x_1^2 + x_5 \cdot x_2^2 + x_6 \cdot x_3^2 + x_7 \cdot x_1x_2 + x_8 \cdot x_2x_3 + x_9 \cdot x_1x_3.$$

The two components are different in nature: the first one is the orbit closure of a polynomial in only eight variables and is included in the orbit of  $[\det_3]$  under the action of  $\text{End } W$ ; the second is more subtle and is not included in the  $\text{End } W$ -orbit of  $[\det_3]$ . Both components have analogues in higher dimension and some results are known about them (Landsberg, Manivel, and Ressayre 2013).

**Acknowledgment.** We are grateful to Peter Bürgisser for his many insightful comments about this work.

### 1. CONSTRUCTION OF TWO COMPONENTS OF THE BOUNDARY

For  $P \in \mathbb{C}[W]_3 \setminus \{0\}$ , let  $H(P) \subset \text{GL}(W)$  denote its stabilizer, that is

$$H(P) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{a \in \text{GL}(W) \mid P \circ a = P\}.$$

The stabilizer  $H(\det_3)$  is generated by the transposition map  $A \mapsto A^T$  and the maps  $A \mapsto UAV$ , with  $U$  and  $V$  in  $\text{SL}(\mathbb{C}^3)$  (Dieudonné 1949).

**Lemma 2.** *For any  $P \in \mathbb{C}[W]_3$ ,  $\dim \Omega(P) = 80 - \dim H(P)$ , In particular,  $\dim \Omega(\det_3) = 64$  and  $\dim \Omega(P_1) = \dim \Omega(P_2) = 63$ .*

*Proof.* An easy application of the fiber dimension theorem to the map  $a \in \text{GL}(W) \mapsto P \circ a \in \mathbb{C}[W]_3$  gives that the dimension of the orbit of  $P$  in  $\mathbb{C}[W]_3$  is  $81 - \dim H(P)$ . Since the projective orbit in  $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}[W]_3)$  has one dimension less, the first claim follows.

The stabilizer  $H(\det_3)$  has dimension 16, hence  $\dim \Omega(\det_3) = 64$ . To compute the dimension of  $H(P_i)$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq 2$ , one can compute the dimension of its Lie algebra defined as

$$T_1H(P_i) = \{a \in \text{End}(W) \mid P(x + ta(x)) = P(x) + O(t^2)\}.$$

It amounts to computing the nullspace of a  $165 \times 81$  matrix, which is easy using a computer.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.** *The boundary  $\partial\Omega(\det_3)$  is pure of dimension 63.*

*Proof.* Let  $\Omega'(\det_3)$  be the affine orbit of  $\det_3$  in  $\mathbb{C}[W]_3$  under the action of  $\text{GL}(W)$ . It is isomorphic to  $\text{GL}(W)/H(\det_3)$ , which is an affine variety because  $H(\det_3)$  is reductive (Popov and Vinberg 1994, §4.2). Therefore  $\Omega'(\det_3)$  is an affine open subset of its closure, it follows that the complement of  $\Omega'(\det_3)$  in its closure is pure of codimension 1 (Grothendieck 1967, Corollaire 21.12.7), and the same holds true after projectivization.  $\square$

Let  $\varphi$  be the rational map

$$(1) \quad \varphi : [a] \in \mathbb{P}(\text{End } W) \dashrightarrow [\det_3 \circ a] \in \overline{\Omega}(\det_3).$$

Let also  $Z$  be the irreducible hypersurface of  $\mathbb{P}(\text{End } W)$

$$Z \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{[a] \in \mathbb{P}(\text{End } W) \mid \det(a) = 0\}.$$

Note the difference between  $\det_3 \circ a$ , which is a regular function of  $W$ , and  $\det(a)$ , which is a scalar. The indeterminacy locus of  $\varphi$  is a strict subset of  $Z$ . By definition,  $\Omega(\det_3) = \varphi(\mathbb{P}(\text{End } W) \setminus Z)$ . Let  $\varphi(Z)$  denote the image of the set of the points of  $Z$  where  $\varphi$  is defined.

**Lemma 4.** *The closure  $\overline{\varphi(Z)}$  is an irreducible component of  $\partial\Omega(\det_3)$ . Furthermore  $\overline{\varphi(Z)} = \overline{\Omega}(P_1)$ .*

*Proof.* The closure  $\overline{\varphi(Z)}$  is clearly contained in  $\overline{\Omega}(\det_3)$  since  $\mathrm{GL}(W)$  is dense in  $\mathrm{End}(W)$ . The image  $\varphi(Z)$  does not intersect  $\Omega(\det_3)$ : To show this, let us consider the function  $\nu : \mathbb{C}[W]_3 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  which associates to  $P$  the dimension of the linear subspace of  $\mathbb{C}[W]_2$  spanned by the partial derivatives  $\frac{\partial P}{\partial x_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial P}{\partial x_9}$ . The function  $\nu$  is invariant under the action of  $\mathrm{GL}(W)$ . Because every form in  $\varphi(Z)$  can be written as a polynomial in at most 8 linear forms,  $\nu(P) \leq 8$  for all  $P \in \varphi(Z)$ . On the other hand,  $\nu(\det_3) = 9$  and so  $\nu(P) = 9$  for any  $P \in \Omega(\det_3)$ . This shows that  $\varphi(Z) \cap \Omega(\det_3) = \emptyset$ . Thus  $\overline{\varphi(Z)}$  is contained in the boundary  $\partial\Omega(\det_3)$ . Moreover  $\overline{\varphi(Z)}$  is irreducible because  $Z$  is.

Clearly  $P_1 \in \varphi(Z)$  and by Lemma 2,  $\overline{\Omega}(P_1)$  has dimension 63. Since

$$\overline{\Omega}(P_1) \subset \overline{\varphi(Z)} \subset \partial\Omega(\det_3),$$

they all three have dimension 63 and  $\overline{\Omega}(P_1) = \overline{\varphi(Z)}$  because the latter is irreducible. This gives a component of  $\partial\Omega(\det_3)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.** *The orbit closure  $\overline{\Omega}(P_2)$  is an irreducible component of  $\partial\Omega(\det_3)$  and is distinct from  $\overline{\Omega}(P_1)$ .*

*Proof.* We first prove that  $[P_2] \in \partial\Omega(\det_3)$ . Let

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_1 & -x_2 \\ -x_1 & 0 & x_3 \\ x_2 & -x_3 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } S = \begin{pmatrix} 2x_6 & x_8 & x_9 \\ x_8 & 2x_5 & x_7 \\ x_9 & x_7 & 2x_4 \end{pmatrix}.$$

By Jacobi's formula,  $\det(A + tS) = \det A + \mathrm{Tr}(\mathrm{adj}(A)S)t + o(t)$ , where  $\mathrm{adj}(A)$  is the adjugate matrix of  $A$ , which equals  $u^T u$  with  $u = (x_3, x_2, x_1)$ . Since  $\det(A) = 0$ , the projective class of the polynomial  $\det(A + tS)$  tends to  $[\mathrm{Tr}(\mathrm{adj}(A)S)]$  when  $t \rightarrow 0$ , and by construction, this limit is a point in  $\overline{\Omega}(\det_3)$ . Besides

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\mathrm{adj}(A)S) = uSu^T = 2P_2,$$

thus  $[P_2] \in \overline{\Omega}(\det_3)$ . Yet  $[P_2]$  is not in  $\Omega(\det_3)$ , because its orbit has dimension 63, by Lemma 2, whereas the orbit of every point of  $\Omega(\det_3)$  is  $\Omega(\det_3)$  itself. Therefore  $[P_2]$  is in the boundary  $\partial\Omega(\det_3)$ . Since  $\overline{\Omega}(P_2)$  has dimension 63, this gives a component of  $\partial\Omega(\det_3)$ . It remains to show that  $[P_2]$  is not in  $\overline{\Omega}(P_1)$ , and indeed  $\nu(P_2) = 9$  whereas  $\nu(P_1) = 8$ , where  $\nu$  is the function introduced in the proof of Lemma 4.  $\square$

Note that Lemma 5 generalizes to higher dimensions: the limit of the determinant on the space of skew-symmetric matrices always leads to a component of the boundary of the orbit of  $\det_n$ , when  $n \geq 3$  is odd, as shown by Landsberg, Manivel, and Ressayre (2013, Prop. 3.5.1).

## 2. THERE ARE ONLY TWO COMPONENTS

Let  $E$  denote  $\mathrm{End}(W)$  and recall the rational map  $\varphi : \mathbb{P}(E) \dashrightarrow \overline{\Omega}(\det_3)$  defined in (1). Let  $B \subset \mathbb{P}(E)$  denote the indeterminacy locus of  $\varphi$ , that is, the set of all  $[a] \in \mathbb{P}(E)$  whose image  $a(W) \subset W$  contains only singular matrices. The locus  $B$  is a subset of  $Z$  because every  $a$  not in  $Z$  is surjective and thus has invertible matrices in its image. One way to describe the orbit closure  $\overline{\Omega}(\det_3)$  is to give a resolution of the indeterminacies of the rational map  $\varphi$ , that is a, projective birational morphism  $\rho : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(E)$  such that  $\varphi \circ \rho$  is a regular map. In this case, the regular map  $\varphi \circ \rho$  is projective and therefore its image is closed and equals  $\overline{\Omega}(\det_3)$ . As we will see, it is actually enough to resolve the indeterminacies of  $\varphi$  on some open subset of  $\mathbb{P}(E)$ .

Let  $H = H(\det_3) \subset \mathrm{GL}(W)$  denote the stabilizer of  $\det_3$  described above. The group  $H$  acts on  $\mathbb{P}(E)$  by left multiplication and the rational map  $\varphi$  is  $H$ -invariant: for  $a \in \mathrm{End}(W)$  and  $h \in H$ ,  $\varphi([ha]) = [\det_3 \circ h \circ a] = \varphi([a])$ . Let  $\mathbb{P}(E)^{\mathrm{ss}}$  be the

open subset of all semistable points in  $\mathbb{P}(E)$  under the action of  $H$ , that is the set of all  $[a] \in \mathbb{P}(E)$  such that there exists a non-constant homogeneous  $H$ -invariant regular function  $f \in \mathbb{C}[E]^H$  on  $E$  such that  $f(a) \neq 0$ . Equivalently (Popov and Vinberg 1994, §4.6), the complement of  $\mathbb{P}(E)^{\text{ss}}$  is the set of all  $[a] \in \mathbb{P}(E)$  such that  $0$  is in the closure of  $Ha$  in  $E$ . Let  $X$  be the closure in  $\mathbb{P}(E)^{\text{ss}} \times \overline{\Omega}(\det_3)$  of the graph of the rational map  $\varphi$ , namely

$$X \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Closure} \{([a], [P]) \in \mathbb{P}(E)^{\text{ss}} \times \overline{\Omega}(\det_3) \mid [P] = [\det_3 \circ a]\}.$$

Let  $\rho : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(E)^{\text{ss}}$  denote the first projection. By construction, it is the blowup of  $\mathbb{P}(E)^{\text{ss}}$  along the ideal sheaf defined by the condition  $\det_3 \circ a = 0$ , whose support is the indeterminacy locus  $B \cap \mathbb{P}(E)^{\text{ss}}$ . (The condition  $\det_3 \circ a = 0$  expands into 165 homogeneous polynomials of degree 3 in the 81 coordinates of  $a$ .)

The variety  $X$  also carries a regular map  $\psi : X \rightarrow \overline{\Omega}(\det_3)$  given by the second projection. By construction, it resolves the indeterminacies of  $\varphi$  on  $\mathbb{P}(E)^{\text{ss}}$ : the rational map  $\varphi \circ \rho : X \rightarrow \overline{\Omega}(\det_3)$  extends to a regular map which equals  $\psi$ .

**Lemma 6.**  $\psi(X) = \overline{\Omega}(\det_3)$ .

*Proof.* The image of  $\varphi$ , which is  $\Omega(\det_3)$ , is included in  $\psi(X)$  and  $\psi(X) \subset \overline{\Omega}(\det_3)$ . Thus, it is enough to show that  $\psi(X)$  is closed.

Let  $T$  be the projective variety  $\mathbb{P}(E) \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}[W]_3)$ . The group  $H$  acts on  $T$  by  $h \cdot (a, P) = (h \cdot a, P)$ . Let  $T^{\text{ss}}$  the open subset of semi-stable points for this action; clearly  $T^{\text{ss}} = \mathbb{P}(E)^{\text{ss}} \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}[W]_3)$ . The GIT quotient  $T^{\text{ss}}//H$  is a projective variety and the canonical morphism  $\pi : T^{\text{ss}} \rightarrow T^{\text{ss}}//H$  maps  $H$ -invariant closed subsets to closed subsets (e.g. Popov and Vinberg 1994, §4.6), in particular  $\pi(X)$  is closed. Moreover, the map  $\psi$  is  $H$ -invariant so it factors as  $\psi' \circ \pi$  for some regular map  $\psi' : T^{\text{ss}}//H \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}[W]_3)$ . The image  $\pi(X)$  is closed in the projective variety  $T^{\text{ss}}//H$  thus  $\psi'(\pi(X))$  is closed. This proves the claim since the latter is just  $\psi(X)$ .  $\square$

The construction of  $X$  follows a general method to resolve the indeterminacies of a rational map, and as such, it gives little information. In fact  $X$  is a blowup of  $\mathbb{P}(E)^{\text{ss}}$  along a smooth variety.

First of all, the indeterminacy locus  $B$  is precisely known, thanks to the classification of the maximal linear subspaces of  $E$  containing only singular matrices (Atkinson 1983; Fillmore, Laurie, and Radjavi 1985; Eisenbud and Harris 1988). Let  $H^0$  denote the connected component of 1 in  $H$  — due to the transposition map,  $H$  has two components. For every  $[a] \in B$ , there is a  $h \in H^0$  such that  $(ha)(W)$  is a subset of one of the following spaces of singular matrices:

$$\begin{pmatrix} * & * & * \\ * & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} * & * & 0 \\ * & * & 0 \\ * & * & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} * & * & * \\ * & 0 & 0 \\ * & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \alpha & -\beta \\ -\alpha & 0 & \gamma \\ \beta & -\gamma & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{C}.$$

The first three are called *compression spaces*, and the fourth is the space of  $3 \times 3$  skew-symmetric matrices, denoted  $\Lambda_3$ . They give four components of  $B$ . Let  $B_1, B_2, B_3$  and  $B_{\text{skew}}$  denote them, respectively. For example

$$B_{\text{skew}} = \{[a] \in \mathbb{P}(E) \mid \exists U, V \in \text{SL}(\mathbb{C}^3) : \forall p \in W : Ua(p)V \in \Lambda_3\}.$$

**Lemma 7.** We have  $B \cap \mathbb{P}(E)^{\text{ss}} = B_{\text{skew}} \cap \mathbb{P}(E)^{\text{ss}} \neq \emptyset$ .

*Proof.* It is easy to check that the three matrices

$$\begin{pmatrix} t & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & t & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & t^{-2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} * & * & * \\ * & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} * & * & 0 \\ * & * & 0 \\ * & * & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} t & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & t & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & t^{-2} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} t^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & t^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & t^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} * & * & * \\ * & 0 & 0 \\ * & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} t^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & t^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & t^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

all tend to 0 when  $t \rightarrow 0$ , for any constants  $*$ . This proves that  $B_1, B_2$  and  $B_3$  do not meet  $\mathbb{P}(E)^{\text{ss}}$ .

To show that  $B \cap \mathbb{P}(E)^{\text{ss}}$  is not empty, pick any three points  $p_1, p_2$  and  $p_3$  in  $W$ . The function

$$\tau : a \in E \mapsto \text{Tr} (a(p_1) \cdot \text{adj}(a(p_2)) \cdot a(p_3) \cdot \text{adj}(a(p_1 + p_2 + p_3))) \in \mathbb{C},$$

is  $H^0$ -invariant: if  $h \in H$  is the map  $A \mapsto UAV$ , for some  $U, V \in \text{SL}(\mathbb{C}^3)$ , then

$$\tau(ha) = \text{Tr} (Ua(p_1)V \cdot V^{-1} \text{adj}(a(p_2))U^{-1} \cdot Ua(p_3)V \cdot V^{-1} \text{adj}(a(p_1 + p_2 + p_3))U^{-1}),$$

which equals  $\tau(a)$ . It follows that the function  $a \mapsto \tau(a) + \tau(Ta)$  is  $H$ -invariant, where  $T : A \mapsto A^T$  is the transposition map. Consider the function  $b : W \rightarrow W$  defined by

$$(2) \quad b = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_1 & -x_2 \\ -x_1 & 0 & x_3 \\ x_2 & -x_3 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where the  $x_i$ 's are linear forms  $W \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ . This gives a point  $[b]$  in  $B_{\text{skew}}$ . If the points  $p_i$ 's are generic, then a simple computation shows that  $\tau(b) + \tau(Tb) \neq 0$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 8.** *The subvariety  $B_{\text{skew}} \cap \mathbb{P}(E)^{\text{ss}}$  is smooth and  $\rho : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(E)^{\text{ss}}$  is the blowup of  $\mathbb{P}(E)^{\text{ss}}$  along it.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be the ideal sheaf generated by the condition  $\det_3 \circ a = 0$ . Its support is clearly  $B \cap \mathbb{P}(E)^{\text{ss}}$ , which is also  $B_{\text{skew}} \cap \mathbb{P}(E)^{\text{ss}}$ , by Lemma 7. By definition,  $X$  is the blowup of  $\mathbb{P}(E)^{\text{ss}}$  along  $\mathcal{I}$ . By contrast, the blowup of  $\mathbb{P}(E)^{\text{ss}}$  along  $B_{\text{skew}} \cap \mathbb{P}(E)^{\text{ss}}$  is defined to be the blowup of the *reduced* ideal sheaf whose support is  $B_{\text{skew}} \cap \mathbb{P}(E)^{\text{ss}}$ . Thus, it is enough to check that  $\mathcal{I}$  is smooth (which implies reduced). Let  $[b] \in B_{\text{skew}}$  be the point defined in (2).

We first observe that  $B_{\text{skew}} \cap \mathbb{P}(E)^{\text{ss}} = [H \cdot b \cdot \text{GL}(W)]$ , the orbit of  $[b]$  under the left action of  $H$  and the right action of  $\text{GL}(W)$  by multiplication. The right-to-left inclusion is clear because the left-hand side is invariant under both actions and contains  $[b]$ . Conversely, let  $[a] \in B_{\text{skew}} \cap \mathbb{P}(E)^{\text{ss}}$ . By definition of  $B_{\text{skew}}$ , we may assume that the image of  $a$  is included in  $\Lambda_3$ , up to replacing  $a$  by another point in its orbit  $Ha$ . If the image of  $a$  had dimension 2 or less, then  $a$  would also lie in some of the  $B_i$ 's,  $1 \leq i \leq 3$  (Bürgin and Draisma 2006).<sup>1</sup> Since  $[a] \in \mathbb{P}(E)^{\text{ss}}$ , Lemma 7 ensures that  $a$  is not in one of the  $B_i$ 's, thus  $a$  has rank 3 and its image is  $\Lambda_3$ . Then there is a  $g \in \text{GL}(W)$  such that  $a = bg$ , and thus  $a \in H \cdot b \cdot \text{GL}(W)$ .

Regarding the smoothness, since  $\mathcal{I}$  is invariant under the action of  $H$  and  $\text{GL}(W)$  and since  $B_{\text{skew}} \cap \mathbb{P}(E)^{\text{ss}}$  is an orbit under the same action, it is enough to check that  $\mathcal{I}$  is smooth at one point, say  $[b]$ . By the Jacobian criterion (Eisenbud and Harris 2000, §V.3), it is enough to check that the dimension of the tangent space

$$T = \{c \in T_{[b]}\mathbb{P}(E) \mid \forall p \in W, \det(b(p) + tc(p)) = O(t^2)\},$$

equals the dimension of  $B_{\text{skew}}$  at  $[b]$ . The dimension of  $T$  is easily computed using a computer: it is equal to 34. To compute the dimension of  $B_{\text{skew}}$ , we use again the fact that it is an orbit under a group action: it is smooth and the tangent space at  $[b]$  equals

$$\begin{aligned} T_{[b]}B_{\text{skew}} &= \{mb + bc \mid m \in T_1H, c \in T_1\text{GL}(W)\} \subset T_{[b]}\mathbb{P}(E) \\ &= \{p \in W \mapsto Mp(p) + b(p)N + b(c(p)) \in W \mid M, N \in W, c \in \text{End}(W)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Using a computer, we find that this space has also dimension 34, which terminates the proof.  $\square$

<sup>1</sup>Bürgin and Draisma (2006, Theorem 2 and the discussion above it), states that a subspace of  $E$  of dimension 2 containing only singular matrices is contained in a compression space.

*Proof of Theorem 1.* Let  $D$  be the inverse image of the hypersurface  $Z$  by the blowup  $\rho$ .  $D$  is a hypersurface with exactly two irreducible components because  $\mathbb{P}(E)$  is smooth and because the center of the blowup  $\rho$  is also smooth and included in  $Z$  (Harris 1995, Lecture 7). Respectively, the two components are the exceptional divisor  $\rho^{-1}(B_{\text{skew}})$  and the strict transform of  $Z$ , i.e. the closure of  $\rho^{-1}(Z \setminus B_{\text{skew}})$ .

On the other hand  $\psi(X \setminus D) = \varphi(\text{GL}(W)) = \Omega(\det_3)$ , thus  $\partial\Omega(\det_3) \subset \psi(D)$ , by Lemma 6. This proves that  $\partial\Omega(\det_3)$  has at most two components: The components found in §1 are the only ones.<sup>2</sup> This finishes the proof of Theorem 1.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- M. D. Atkinson (1983). “Primitive spaces of matrices of bounded rank. II”. In: *J. Austral. Math. Soc. A* 34.3, pp. 306–315.
- M. Bürgin and J. Draisma (2006). “The Hilbert null-cone on tuples of matrices and bilinear forms”. In: *Math. Z.* 254.4, pp. 785–809. DOI: 10.1007/s00209-006-0008-0.
- J. Dieudonné (1949). “Sur une généralisation du groupe orthogonal à quatre variables”. In: *Arch. Math.* 1, pp. 282–287. DOI: 10.1007/BF02038756.
- D. Eisenbud and J. Harris (1988). “Vector spaces of matrices of low rank”. In: *Adv. in Math.* 70.2, pp. 135–155. DOI: 10.1016/0001-8708(88)90054-0.
- (2000). *The geometry of schemes*. Vol. 197. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, New York. DOI: 10.1007/b97680.
- P. Fillmore, C. Laurie, and H. Radjavi (1985). “On matrix spaces with zero determinant”. In: *Linear and Multilinear Algebra* 18.3, pp. 255–266. DOI: 10.1080/03081088508817691.
- A. Grothendieck (1967). “Éléments de géométrie algébrique. IV. Étude locale des schémas et des morphismes de schémas IV”. In: *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.* 32.
- J. Harris (1995). *Algebraic geometry*. Vol. 133. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. A first course, Corrected reprint of the 1992 original. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- J. Landsberg, L. Manivel, and N. Ressayre (2013). “Hypersurfaces with degenerate duals and the Geometric Complexity Theory Program”. In: *Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici* 88.2, pp. 469–484. DOI: 10.4171/CMH/292.
- J. M. Landsberg (2015). “Geometric complexity theory: an introduction for geometers”. In: *Ann. Univ. Ferrara. Sez. VII Sci. Mat.* 61.1, pp. 65–117. DOI: 10.1007/s11565-014-0202-7.
- K. D. Mulmuley and M. Sohoni (2001). “Geometric complexity theory. I. An approach to the P vs. NP and related problems”. In: *SIAM J. Comput.* 31.2, pp. 496–526. DOI: 10.1137/S009753970038715X.
- V. L. Popov and E. B. Vinberg (1994). “Invariant theory”. In: *Algebraic geometry IV*. Ed. by A. N. Parshin and I. R. Shafarevich. Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences 55. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, pp. 123–278. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-662-03073-8\_2.

TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT BERLIN, STRASSE DES 17. JUNI 136, 10623 BERLIN, GERMANY  
 E-mail address, J. Hüttenhain: `jesko@math.tu-berlin.de`  
 E-mail address, P. Lairez: `pierre@lairez.fr`

<sup>2</sup>Though it is not necessary, we check easily that the image of the exceptional divisor is  $\overline{\Omega}(P_2)$  while the image of the strict transform of  $Z$  gives  $\overline{\Omega}(P_1)$ .