

On the Conjectures Regarding the 4-Point Atiyah Determinant

Mazen N. BOU KHUZAM[†] and Michael J. JOHNSON[‡]

[†] American University of Iraq, Suleimaniya, Street 10, Quarter 410,
Ablakh area Building no. 7 Sul, Iraq
E-mail: mazen.boukhuzam@auis.edu.iq

[‡] Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Kuwait University, Kuwait
E-mail: yohnson1963@hotmail.com

Received January 15, 2014, in final form June 23, 2014; Published online July 05, 2014

<http://dx.doi.org/10.3842/SIGMA.2014.070>

Abstract. For the case of 4 points in Euclidean space, we present a computer aided proof of Conjectures II and III made by Atiyah and Sutcliffe regarding Atiyah's determinant along with an elegant factorization of the square of the imaginary part of Atiyah's determinant.

Key words: Atiyah determinant; Atiyah–Sutcliffe conjectures

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 51K05; 51P99

1 Introduction

The Atiyah determinant is a complex-valued determinant function $\text{At}(P_1, \dots, P_n)$ associated with n distinct points P_1, \dots, P_n of \mathbb{R}^3 . It was constructed by M.F. Atiyah in [1] in his attempt at answering a natural geometric question posed in [3] and arising from the study of the spin statistics theorem using classical quantum theory. The original conjecture of Atiyah was that At does not vanish for all configurations of distinct points $P_1, \dots, P_n \in \mathbb{R}^3$. The conjecture was verified in the linear case (all points lie on a straight line) and in the case $n = 3$ by Atiyah in [1]. However, the case $n \geq 4$ turned out to be notoriously difficult. In a subsequent paper [2], Atiyah and Sutcliffe studied the function At and added two new conjectures (after normalizing At) which imply the original conjecture of Atiyah. They provided compelling numerical evidence of the validity of all three conjectures. The three conjectures can be stated as follows: For all distinct points P_1, \dots, P_n of \mathbb{R}^3 (and all $n \geq 1$) we have:

- (I) $\text{At}(P_1, \dots, P_n) \neq 0$,
- (II) $|\text{At}(P_1, \dots, P_n)| \geq \prod_{i < j} (2r_{ij})$, where $r_{ij} = \|\overrightarrow{P_i P_j}\|$,
- (III) $|\text{At}(P_1, \dots, P_n)|^{n-2} \geq \prod_{k=1}^n |\text{At}(P_1, \dots, P_{k-1}, P_{k+1}, \dots, P_n)|$.

From the statement of these conjectures we can see that $\text{III} \implies \text{II} \implies \text{I}$. The three conjectures have been very resistant since their inauguration time. The first conjecture was proved by Eastwood and Norbury [5] for the case $n = 4$. Other attempts were successful only on special configurations (see [4] and [6]). In this paper, we build on the work of Eastwood and Norbury by presenting a computer aided proof of Conjectures II and III in the case $n = 4$ and we also give an elegant factorization of the square of the imaginary part of the Atiyah determinant.

The construction of the determinant is as follows: One starts with n distinct points $P_1, \dots, P_n \in \mathbb{R}^3$. By considering P_j as an observer of the other $n - 1$ points we obtain $n - 1$ vectors $\overrightarrow{P_j P_1}, \dots, \overrightarrow{P_j P_{j-1}}, \overrightarrow{P_j P_{j+1}}, \dots, \overrightarrow{P_j P_n}$ in \mathbb{R}^3 . We lift each of these vectors from \mathbb{R}^3 to \mathbb{C}^2 using




Figure 1. Three points.

the Hopf map $h : \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ given by $h(z, w) = ((|z|^2 - |w|^2)/2, z\bar{w})$ to obtain $n - 1$ points of \mathbb{C}^2 . Note that the lifts are not unique and are defined up to phase because $h(\lambda z, \lambda w) = |\lambda|^2 h(z, w)$. Consequently, our lifts can be considered as points of \mathbb{CP}^1 . Taking the symmetric product of these lifts gives a vector V_j in \mathbb{CP}^n because $\odot_n \mathbb{CP}^1 = \mathbb{CP}^n$. Atiyah's first conjecture was that $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$ is a linearly independent set. In other words, the determinant of the matrix having the vector V_j as its j th column is nonzero. This determinant is well-defined up to a phase factor. To get rid of the phase factor ambiguity, we apply the following normalization imposed by Atiyah: If (z, w) is the chosen lift of $\overrightarrow{P_i P_j}$ and $i < j$, then $(-\bar{w}, \bar{z})$ must be the lift of $\overrightarrow{P_j P_i}$. After this normalization, this determinant is called the Atiyah determinant and is denoted by At .

It is immediate from the above construction that At is coordinate free and is independent of solid motion. In other words, the determinant function At is invariant under translations and rotations in \mathbb{R}^3 . Furthermore, the Atiyah determinant is built so that it is independent of the order of the points. In other words, if (j_1, \dots, j_n) is a permutation of $(1, \dots, n)$ then $\text{At}(P_{j_1}, \dots, P_{j_n}) = \text{At}(P_1, \dots, P_n)$. Another property is that At gets conjugated under a plane reflection of the points (see [1]). As a consequence, At must be real-valued if the set of points $\{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$ is symmetric relative to a plane (e.g. if the points are co-planar) since a reflection in the plane leaves the set of points unchanged.

Let us start computing At in the cases $n = 2$ and $n = 3$. For the case $n = 2$, we have two distinct points A and B . We can identify \mathbb{R}^3 with $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{C}$ and assume (possibly after a solid motion) that A and B have coordinates $(0, 0)$ and $(0, x)$ respectively, where $x > 0$ is the distance from A to B . By choosing (\sqrt{x}, \sqrt{x}) as a lift of \overrightarrow{AB} , we are forced to take $(-\sqrt{x}, \sqrt{x})$ as a lift of \overrightarrow{BA} . Consequently, Atiyah's determinant is:

$$\text{At}(A, B) = \begin{vmatrix} \sqrt{x} & -\sqrt{x} \\ \sqrt{x} & \sqrt{x} \end{vmatrix} = 2x, \quad \text{where } x = \|\overrightarrow{AB}\|.$$

Let us now consider the case $n = 3$. Assume (possibly after a solid motion) that $A = (0, 0)$, $B = (0, x)$, and $C = (0, ze^{I\alpha})$ where I denotes $\sqrt{-1}$, $y = \|\overrightarrow{BC}\|$, $z = \|\overrightarrow{AC}\|$, $x = \|\overrightarrow{AB}\|$ and α, β, γ are the angles indicated in Fig. 1. When the first point is considered as a vision point we obtain $\overrightarrow{AB} = (0, x)$, $\overrightarrow{AC} = (0, ze^{I\alpha})$ whose lifts under the Hopf map h are (\sqrt{x}, \sqrt{x}) and $(\sqrt{z}, \sqrt{z}e^{-I\alpha})$. And when $B = (0, x)$ is the vision point, we obtain the vectors $\overrightarrow{BA} = (0, -x)$ and $\overrightarrow{BC} = (0, -ye^{I\beta})$ whose lifts are $(-\sqrt{x}, \sqrt{x})$ and $(-\sqrt{y}, \sqrt{y}e^{I\beta})$. Similarly, the lifts corresponding to the vision point C are $(-\sqrt{z}e^{I\alpha}, \sqrt{z})$ and $(-\sqrt{y}e^{-I\beta}, -\sqrt{y})$. The symmetric tensor product of the vectors are then $\sqrt{xz}(1, 1 + e^{-I\alpha}, e^{-I\alpha})$, $\sqrt{xy}(1, -1 - e^{I\beta}, e^{I\beta})$ and $\sqrt{yz}(e^{I(\alpha-\beta)}, e^{I\alpha} - e^{-I\beta}, -1)$, respectively. Consequently, we obtain the Atiyah determinant for three points as

$$\text{At}(A, B, C) = xyz \begin{vmatrix} 1 & 1 & e^{I(\alpha-\beta)} \\ 1 + e^{-I\alpha} & -1 - e^{I\beta} & e^{I\alpha} - e^{-I\beta} \\ e^{-I\alpha} & e^{I\beta} & -1 \end{vmatrix}$$




Figure 2. Four points.

This determinant expands to $xyz[6 + 2(\cos \alpha + \cos \beta + \cos \gamma)]$, which can be written as $xyz[8 + 8 \sin \frac{\alpha}{2} \sin \frac{\beta}{2} \sin \frac{\gamma}{2}]$. Using the identity $\sin \frac{\alpha}{2} = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{(a+b-c)(a+c-b)}{bc}}$ and similar identities for $\sin \frac{\beta}{2}$ and $\sin \frac{\gamma}{2}$, we can rewrite the Atiyah determinant for three points as

$$\text{At}(A, B, C) = 8xyz + d_3(x, y, z), \quad (1.1)$$

where d_3 is the polynomial defined by $d_3(x, y, z) = (-x + y + z)(x + y - z)(x + y + z)$. From the triangle inequality it follows that $d_3(x, y, z)$ is nonnegative, and so Conjecture III is verified for three points. (Note that there is no need to use $|\text{At}|$ because in this case At is real.)

2 The case of four points

Given four points A, B, C, D in \mathbb{R}^3 , the vector $u = U(A, B, C, D)$ in \mathbb{R}^6 , called the *vector of pair-wise distances*, is defined by $u = (a, b, c, x, y, z)$ where $a = \|\overrightarrow{AD}\|$, $b = \|\overrightarrow{BD}\|$, $c = \|\overrightarrow{CD}\|$, $x = \|\overrightarrow{AB}\|$, $y = \|\overrightarrow{BC}\|$, $z = \|\overrightarrow{AC}\|$ (see Fig. 2). The function U , as defined above, maps $\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 4}$ into \mathbb{R}^6 , and it is clear that U is neither injective nor surjective. A vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^6$ is said to be *geometric* if it belongs to the range of U . For convenience, we adopt the convention that $\text{At}(A, B, C, D)$ equals 0 when the points A, B, C, D are not distinct, and Conjecture II (for four points) becomes

$$(II) \quad |\text{At}(A, B, C, D)| \geq 64abcxyz \quad \text{for all points } A, B, C, D \in \mathbb{R}^3.$$

Atiyah's determinant is designed to be invariant under permutations of the points. Each of the 24 possible permutations of the four points A, B, C, D results in a permutation of the pair-wise distances a, b, c, x, y, z . Specifically, if $u = (a, b, c, x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^6$, then the 24 resultant permutations are

$$\begin{aligned} u_0 &= (a, b, c, x, y, z), & u_1 &= (a, x, z, b, y, c), & u_2 &= (b, c, a, y, z, x), & u_3 &= (x, b, y, a, c, z), \\ u_4 &= (c, a, b, z, x, y), & u_5 &= (z, y, c, x, b, a), & u_6 &= (y, z, c, x, a, b), & u_7 &= (c, b, a, y, x, z), \\ u_8 &= (x, y, b, z, c, a), & u_9 &= (a, c, b, z, y, x), & u_{10} &= (z, x, a, y, b, c), & u_{11} &= (b, a, c, x, z, y), \\ u_{12} &= (z, c, y, a, b, x), & u_{13} &= (x, z, a, y, c, b), & u_{14} &= (x, a, z, b, c, y), & u_{15} &= (y, x, b, z, a, c), \\ u_{16} &= (y, b, x, c, a, z), & u_{17} &= (y, c, z, b, a, x), & u_{18} &= (c, y, z, b, x, a), & u_{19} &= (z, a, x, c, b, y), \\ u_{20} &= (b, x, y, a, z, c), & u_{21} &= (c, z, y, a, x, b), & u_{22} &= (a, z, x, c, y, b), & u_{23} &= (b, y, x, c, z, a). \end{aligned}$$

A function $f : \mathbb{R}^6 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be *symmetric* if $f(u) = f(u_i)$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, 23$ and is *skew-symmetric* if $f(u) = (-1)^i f(u_i)$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, 23$. The *symmetric average* of f is the symmetric function $\text{av}[f]$ defined by

$$\text{av}[f](u) = \frac{1}{24} \sum_{i=0}^{23} f(u_i).$$

Using Maple, Eastwood and Norbury have found that the real part of $\text{At}(A, B, C, D)$ can be expressed as $\Re \text{At}(A, B, C, D) = d_4(u)$, where d_4 is the homogeneous polynomial of degree 6 given by

$$d_4(u) = 60p_4(u) + 4n_4(u) + 2z_4(u) + 12 \operatorname{av} [a((b+c)^2 - y^2)d_3(x, y, z)], \quad (2.1)$$

where $p_4(u) = abcx yz$, d_3 is defined in (1.1), $n_4(u) = p_4(u) - d_3(xc, ay, bz)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} z_4(u) = & a^2y^2(b^2 + c^2 + x^2 + z^2) + b^2z^2(a^2 + c^2 + x^2 + y^2) + c^2x^2(a^2 + b^2 + y^2 + z^2) \\ & - (a^4y^2 + a^2y^4 + b^4z^2 + b^2z^4 + c^4x^2 + c^2x^4) \\ & - (a^2b^2x^2 + a^2c^2z^2 + b^2c^2y^2 + x^2y^2z^2). \end{aligned}$$

Eastwood and Norbury use the notation $144V^2$ in place of $z_4(u)$. If $u = U(A, B, C, D)$, the value $z_4(u)$ equals $144V^2$, where V denotes the volume of the tetrahedron formed by the points A, B, C, D , and it therefore follows that $z_4(u) \geq 0$. It would be erroneous to infer from this that the polynomial z_4 is nonnegative on all of \mathbb{R}^6 ; the above statement implies only that z_4 is nonnegative on geometric vectors.

Having expressed $\Re \text{At}(A, B, C, D) = d_4(u)$ as in (2.1), Eastwood and Norbury then invoke the inequalities $z_4(u) \geq 0$, $(b+c)^2 \geq y^2$, $d_3(x, y, z) \geq 0$ and $abcx yz \geq d_3(xc, ay, bz)$ (i.e. $n_4(u) \geq 0$) to conclude that

$$|\text{At}(A, B, C, D)| \geq \Re \text{At}(A, B, C, D) = d_4(u) \geq 60p_4(u),$$

which proves Conjecture I and comes close to proving Conjecture II.

Regarding the imaginary part of $\text{At}(A, B, C, D)$, Eastwood and Norbury have shown that its square can be written as $(\Im \text{At}(A, B, C, D))^2 = F_4(u)$, where F_4 is a symmetric homogeneous polynomial of degree 12. Whereas d_4 seems unwilling to be expressed in a simple manner, we have found that F_4 factors elegantly as

$$F_4 = w_4^2 z_4,$$

where w_4 is the skew-symmetric homogeneous polynomial of degree 3 given by

$$\begin{aligned} w_4(u) = & (a^2 + y^2)(b - c - x + z) + (b^2 + z^2)(-a + c + x - y) + (c^2 + x^2)(a - b + y - z) \\ & + 2(cx + yz)(-a + b) + 2(ay + xz)(-b + c) + 2(bz + xy)(a - c). \end{aligned}$$

Note that since w_4 is skew-symmetric it follows that w_4^2 is symmetric. As mentioned in the introduction, the imaginary part of $\text{At}(A, B, C, D)$ vanishes whenever the set of four points $\{A, B, C, D\}$ is symmetric about a plane. Interestingly, this property can be derived from the above factorization: Assuming $\{A, B, C, D\}$ is symmetric about a plane, it then follows that $u = U(A, B, C, D)$ is invariant under some odd permutation of the four points A, B, C, D . Since w_4 is skew-symmetric, we must have $w_4(u) = 0$ and hence $F_4(u) = 0$.

3 A linear program related to Conjecture II

Since $|\text{At}(A, B, C, D)| \geq \Re \text{At}(A, B, C, D) = d_4(u)$, in order to prove Conjecture II, it suffices to show that the polynomial d_4 satisfies

$$d_4(u) \geq 64p_4(u) \quad \text{for all geometric vectors } u. \quad (3.1)$$

If one has in hand a collection f_1, f_2, \dots, f_k of symmetric homogeneous polynomials of degree 6 which are known to be nonnegative on geometric vectors, then one can ‘have a go’ at (3.1) by solving the linear program

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} \quad \alpha, \\ & \text{subject to} \quad d_4 = \alpha p_4 + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j f_j, \quad \text{with} \quad \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_k \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

If (3.2) is feasible and if the optimal objective value is $\alpha = 64$ (we will see later that $\alpha > 64$ is impossible), then we immediately obtain (3.1). The remaining difficulty is that of finding suitable polynomials $\{f_j\}$. One means of generating a large collection of such polynomials, which we now describe, stems from the triangle inequality.

The four points A, B, C, D contain four (possibly degenerate) triangles and each triangle, by means of the triangle inequality, gives rise to three linear polynomials which are nonnegative when $u = (a, b, c, x, y, z)$ is geometric. For example, the triangle A, B, C yields $-x + y + z$, $x - y + z$ and $x + y - z$. In all, there are twelve such linear polynomials which we refer to as *triangular variables* and use the notation $t = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{12})$, where

$$\begin{aligned} t_1 &= -a + b + x, & t_4 &= -b + c + y, & t_7 &= -a + c + z, & t_{10} &= -x + y + z, \\ t_2 &= a - b + x, & t_5 &= b - c + y, & t_8 &= a - c + z, & t_{11} &= x - y + z, \\ t_3 &= a + b - x, & t_6 &= b + c - y, & t_9 &= a + c - z, & t_{12} &= x + y - z. \end{aligned}$$

A vector $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{12}$ is called a *multi-index* with *order* $|\alpha| = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \dots + \alpha_{12}$. Employing the standard notation $t^\alpha = t_1^{\alpha_1} t_2^{\alpha_2} \dots t_{12}^{\alpha_{12}}$, we see that t^α represents a homogeneous polynomial of degree $|\alpha|$ in the variables (a, b, c, x, y, z) . Applying the symmetric average, we conclude that $\text{av}[t^\alpha]$ represents a symmetric homogeneous polynomial of degree $|\alpha|$ which is nonnegative on geometric vectors. For integers $\ell \geq 0$, we define \mathbb{T}_ℓ to be the set of all polynomials $\text{av}[t^\alpha]$ with $|\alpha| = \ell$:

$$\mathbb{T}_\ell = \{\text{av}[t^\alpha] : |\alpha| = \ell\}.$$

Numerically, we have found that if one chooses $\{f_j\}$ equal to \mathbb{T}_6 , then the linear program (3.2) is feasible and has optimal objective value $\alpha = 32$. The formulation (2.1) of Eastwood and Norbury can be understood in the context of (3.2) as the result of including, in addition to \mathbb{T}_6 , the two symmetric polynomials z_4 and n_4 which are nonnegative on geometric vectors. Numerically solving (3.2) with $\{f_j\}$ equal to $\{z_4, n_4\} \cup \mathbb{T}_6$, we have found that the optimal objective value is $\alpha = 60$, and (2.1) is indeed an optimal solution of (3.2) as the term $\text{av}[a((b+c)^2 - y^2)d_3(x, y, z)]$ can be written as a nonnegative linear combination of polynomials in \mathbb{T}_6 .

In order to further increase the optimal objective value α in (3.2), we need other symmetric polynomials which are nonnegative on geometric vectors. In pursuit of this, we have identified the following twenty-one geometric vectors u where $d_4(u) = 64p_4(u)$ (all are obtained as $u = U(A, B, C, D)$ with A, B, C, D collinear or non-distinct):

$$\begin{aligned} & (0, 1, 4, 1, 4, 4), & (0, 4, 8, 4, 7, 8), & (0, 6, 0, 6, 6, 0), \\ & (0, 1, 1, 1, 2, 1), & (0, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5), & (0, 8, 8, 8, 1, 8), \\ & (0, 1, 3, 1, 4, 3), & (0, 6, 3, 6, 8, 3), & (0, 6, 7, 6, 3, 7), \\ & (0, 6, 6, 6, 9, 6), & (0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1), & (0, 5, 3, 5, 3, 3), \\ & (3, 3, 1, 0, 2, 2), & (9, 9, 7, 0, 2, 2), & (13, 13, 7, 0, 6, 6), \\ & (19, 11, 7, 8, 4, 12), & (17, 13, 4, 4, 9, 13), & (15, 8, 7, 7, 1, 8), \\ & (9, 8, 1, 1, 7, 8), & (11, 9, 8, 2, 1, 3), & (17, 9, 2, 8, 7, 15). \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

Both d_4 and p_4 vanish on the first fifteen of these vectors (counting horizontally), but are nonzero on the remaining six. In particular, since $d_4(9, 8, 1, 1, 7, 8) = 64p_4(9, 8, 1, 1, 7, 8) = 258048 > 0$, it follows that there are no feasible solutions of (3.2) with $\alpha > 64$. On the other hand, if a feasible solution of (3.2) has been obtained with $\alpha = 64$, then it follows that f_j vanishes on all of the vectors in (3.3), whenever $\lambda_j > 0$. It has been verified that z_4 vanishes on all of these vectors, but n_4 does not. Therefore, the coefficient of n_4 will be 0 if (3.2) has been solved with $\alpha = 64$. We have considered numerous symmetric homogeneous polynomials of degree 6 which vanish on the vectors in (3.3), but only one of these has resulted in an improvement. Let v_4 denote the skew-symmetric homogeneous polynomial of degree 3 defined by

$$v_4(u) = (b + z - c - x)(c + x - a - y)(a + y - b - z).$$

Then v_4 vanishes on the vectors in (3.3), and numerically solving (3.2) with $\{f_j\}$ equal to $\{z_4, n_4, v_4^2\} \cup \mathbb{T}_6$, we have found that the optimal objective value is $\alpha = 188/3$. Our obtained identity, which has been verified in Maple¹, is the following:

$$d_4(u) = \frac{188}{3}p_4(u) + \frac{10}{3}z_4(u) + \frac{4}{3}n_4(u) + \frac{2}{3}v_4^2(u) + \frac{1}{3} \sum_{|\alpha|=6} \lambda_\alpha \text{av}[t^\alpha],$$

where the six nonzero coefficients λ_α and corresponding multi-indices α are given by

α	λ_α	α	λ_α	α	λ_α
000,001,010,112	6	000,001,011,111	18	000,001,110,102	6
001,001,001,111	14	001,001,010,111	24	001,011,100,110	24

4 Proof of Conjecture II for four points

Let m_4 be the symmetric homogeneous polynomial of degree 6 defined by $m_4 = d_4 - (64p_4 + 4z_4 + v_4^2)$, so that

$$d_4 = 64p_4 + 4z_4 + v_4^2 + m_4. \quad (4.1)$$

We will show that m_4 is nonnegative on geometric vectors, but unfortunately, we have been unable to formulate a proof using only polynomials of degree 6. Rather, we have had to multiply m_4 by p_4 and then work with polynomials of degree 12.

Theorem 1. *The product p_4m_4 can be written as a nonnegative linear combination of polynomials in \mathbb{T}^{12} .*

Proof. Using Maple, we have verified that $64p_4m_4$ can be written as

$$64p_4(u)m_4(u) = \sum_{|\alpha|=12} \lambda_\alpha \text{av}[t^\alpha], \quad (4.2)$$

where the sixty-four nonzero coefficients $\{\lambda_\alpha\}$ are all positive integers as given in the following table:

α	λ_α	α	λ_α	α	λ_α
001,012,211,112	12	011,021,201,121	6	011,111,220,102	6
001,012,211,121	12	011,021,201,211	18	011,112,102,210	12
				011,112,120,210	39

¹The sources of our codes are available at <http://www.emis.de/journals/SIGMA/2014/070/codes.zip>.

001, 112, 112, 012	12	011, 021, 221, 110	54	011, 112, 210, 210	42
001, 121, 121, 012	21	011, 022, 011, 121	6	011, 120, 011, 212	27
002, 110, 111, 212	9	011, 022, 111, 102	84	011, 120, 011, 221	24
002, 110, 111, 221	9	011, 022, 111, 210	18	011, 120, 012, 112	3
011, 011, 021, 221	30	011, 022, 211, 110	6	011, 121, 021, 201	24
011, 011, 101, 222	56	011, 101, 021, 212	54	011, 121, 102, 210	6
011, 011, 110, 222	48	011, 102, 012, 211	6	011, 121, 120, 210	24
011, 011, 112, 220	6	011, 102, 022, 111	36	011, 201, 012, 211	3
011, 011, 120, 212	18	011, 102, 112, 102	18	011, 201, 021, 211	45
011, 011, 122, 102	57	011, 102, 112, 201	24	012, 012, 012, 111	24
011, 011, 201, 221	36	011, 102, 201, 121	33	012, 012, 102, 111	8
011, 011, 222, 011	6	011, 102, 210, 112	75	012, 111, 012, 021	36
011, 012, 102, 112	120	011, 102, 210, 121	12	011, 021, 220, 210	6
011, 012, 112, 210	18	011, 110, 021, 221	48	011, 120, 012, 202	21
011, 012, 120, 121	12	011, 111, 012, 202	21	011, 120, 021, 202	24
011, 012, 211, 102	84	011, 111, 021, 202	18	011, 201, 012, 202	18
011, 012, 211, 201	72	011, 111, 021, 220	54	011, 210, 021, 202	3
011, 021, 011, 122	3	011, 111, 022, 102	75	012, 012, 120, 102	3
011, 021, 112, 012	69	011, 111, 202, 210	12		

Corollary 1. *The polynomial m_4 is nonnegative on geometric vectors and consequently (3.1) holds, which proves Conjecture II for four points.*

Proof. Let $u = U(A, B, C, D)$ be a geometric vector. It follows from (4.2) that $p_4(u)m_4(u) \geq 0$. If the points A, B, C, D are distinct, then $p_4(u) > 0$ and hence $m_4(u) \geq 0$. On the other hand, if A, B, C, D are not distinct, then they can be approximated by distinct points A', B', C', D' and it will then follow from the continuity of m_4 that $m_4(u) \geq 0$. ■

5 Proof of Conjecture III for four points

Let P_4 denote the symmetric homogeneous polynomial of degree 12 given by

$$P_4(u) := (8xyz + d_3(x, y, z))(8abx + d_3(a, b, x))(8acz + d_3(a, c, z))(8bcy + d_3(b, c, y)),$$

whereby $\text{At}(A, B, C) \text{At}(A, B, D) \text{At}(A, C, D) \text{At}(B, C, D) = P_4(u)$ when $u = U(A, B, C, D)$. Since $|\text{At}(A, B, C, D)|^2 \geq (\Re \text{At}(A, B, C, D))^2 = d_4^2(u)$, in order to prove Conjecture III, it suffices to show that

$$d_4^2(u) \geq P_4(u) \quad \text{for all geometric vectors } u. \quad (5.1)$$

Recall from (4.1) that d_4 has been written as $d_4 = 64p_4 + m_4 + (4z_4 + v_4^2)$, so it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} d_4^2 &= (4z_4 + v_4^2)d_4 + (64p_4 + m_4)d_4 \\ &= (4z_4 + v_4^2)d_4 + (64p_4 + m_4)^2 + (64p_4 + m_4)(4z_4 + v_4^2) \\ &= (4z_4 + v_4^2)(d_4 + 32p_4 + m_4) + (64p_4 + m_4)^2 + 32p_4(4z_4 + v_4^2). \end{aligned}$$

With M_4 denoting the symmetric homogeneous polynomial of degree 12 defined by $M_4 = (64p_4 + m_4)^2 + 32p_4(4z_4 + v_4^2) - P_4$, we then have

$$d_4^2 = P_4 + (4z_4 + v_4^2)(d_4 + 32p_4 + m_4) + M_4. \quad (5.2)$$

Theorem 2. *The polynomial M_4 is nonnegative on geometric vectors, and consequently (5.1) holds, which proves Conjecture III for four points.*

Proof. Using Maple, we have verified that $128M_4$ can be written as

$$128M_4(u) = (4z_4(u) + v_4^2(u)) \sum_{|\alpha|=6} \mu_\alpha \text{av}[t^\alpha] + \sum_{|\alpha|=12} \nu_\alpha \text{av}[t^\alpha], \quad (5.3)$$

where the coefficients $\{\mu_\alpha\}$ and $\{\nu_\alpha\}$ are nonnegative integers: The 6 nonzero coefficients μ_α and corresponding monomials α are given in the following table:

000,001,111,110	1236	000,101,101,101	3594	001,010,011,011	300
000,100,101,111	60	000,101,110,101	114	001,011,101,001	1014

The 114 nonzero coefficients ν_α and corresponding monomials α are given in the following table:

000,112,121,112	2019	011,120,021,112	2184	001,120,202,121	76
001,012,121,112	369	011,121,021,201	228	001,121,201,220	6
001,012,211,121	138	011,121,210,210	72	001,121,220,021	3174
001,012,211,211	666	011,201,021,211	936	001,121,220,120	1266
001,021,211,121	3087	012,012,012,111	3072	001,122,210,120	1428
001,022,111,112	3009	012,111,021,201	1308	001,201,220,112	822
001,022,111,121	1074	012,111,210,012	5374	001,210,221,021	612
001,022,112,111	42	000,012,111,222	60	001,211,220,012	300
001,022,211,111	12114	000,012,112,212	1776	001,211,220,120	3072
001,101,211,122	240	001,001,112,222	138	002,002,112,112	1536
001,111,122,102	4056	001,001,122,212	1398	002,011,221,021	1176
001,111,210,221	444	001,002,122,112	3072	002,012,110,212	1662
001,120,121,112	144	001,002,211,122	1236	002,012,210,121	5136
001,121,210,112	714	001,010,112,222	768	002,012,210,211	762
001,121,210,211	1146	001,010,122,212	384	002,012,211,021	2178
001,211,220,111	1866	001,010,212,122	384	002,022,110,112	1188
002,011,111,122	2808	001,011,102,222	2568	002,022,110,121	150
002,011,211,121	3207	001,011,222,012	1224	002,022,211,011	2178
002,012,111,112	3654	001,012,110,222	2634	002,101,101,222	1245
002,012,111,121	3252	001,012,120,212	66	002,101,122,102	246
002,021,111,112	276	001,012,122,102	822	002,101,221,012	528
002,022,111,111	720	001,021,112,220	840	002,102,121,102	222
002,111,212,011	516	001,022,120,112	4542	002,110,122,102	7548
002,112,210,111	1206	001,022,211,120	2928	002,121,210,012	1074
002,112,211,011	1662	001,022,220,111	6546	002,122,210,011	60
011,011,012,212	10110	001,101,102,222	2898	011,012,120,220	3072
011,011,021,212	1164	001,101,201,222	804	011,021,210,220	342
011,011,201,212	5472	001,101,220,122	1398	011,021,220,120	4668
011,012,012,211	342	001,102,110,222	690	011,021,220,210	4608

011, 012, 112, 201	2178	001, 102, 122, 102	1770	011, 022, 120, 102	768
011, 012, 122, 101	192	001, 102, 202, 112	5532	011, 022, 120, 210	1536
011, 021, 211, 120	5472	001, 102, 202, 121	612	011, 022, 201, 120	1890
011, 022, 111, 120	2376	001, 102, 210, 212	390	011, 022, 210, 102	1152
011, 022, 121, 110	696	001, 102, 221, 102	2634	011, 022, 210, 210	6648
011, 101, 022, 112	2628	001, 110, 201, 222	192	011, 120, 022, 102	10752
011, 102, 201, 112	372	001, 112, 220, 120	600	011, 210, 012, 202	168
011, 110, 012, 122	3558	001, 112, 221, 002	60	011, 210, 120, 202	522
011, 112, 021, 201	948	001, 120, 201, 221	774	012, 120, 012, 201	4440

It now follows from (5.3) that M_4 is nonnegative on geometric vectors and we obtain (5.1) as a consequence of (5.2). ■

References

- [1] Atiyah M., The geometry of classical particles, in *Surveys in Differential Geometry*, *Surv. Differ. Geom.*, VII, Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2000, 1–15.
- [2] Atiyah M., Sutcliffe P., The geometry of point particles, *Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A* **458** (2002), 1089–1115, [hep-th/0105179](#).
- [3] Berry M.V., Robbins J.M., Indistinguishability for quantum particles: spin, statistics and the geometric phase, *Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A* **453** (1997), 1771–1790.
- [4] Doković D.Ž., Verification of Atiyah’s conjecture for some nonplanar configurations with dihedral symmetry, *Publ. Inst. Math. (Beograd) (N.S.)* **72** (2002), 23–28.
- [5] Eastwood M., Norbury P., A proof of Atiyah’s conjecture on configurations of four points in Euclidean three-space, *Geom. Topol.* **5** (2001), 885–893, [math.MG/0109161](#).
- [6] Mazur M., Petrenko B.V., On the conjectures of Atiyah and Sutcliffe, *Geom. Dedicata* **158** (2012), 329–342, [arXiv:1102.4662](#).