

INEQUALITIES INVOLVING THE INVERSES OF POSITIVE DEFINITE MATRICES¹

by RUSSELL MERRIS

(Received 8th November 1976, revised 26th May 1977)

Notation. Let G be a permutation group of degree m . Let χ be an irreducible complex character of G . If $A = (a_{ij})$ is an m -square matrix, the generalised matrix function of A based on G and χ is defined by

$$d(A) = \sum_{g \in G} \chi(g) \prod_{i=1}^m a_{ig(i)}$$

For example if $G = S_m$, the full symmetric group, and χ is the alternating character, then $d =$ determinant. If $G = S_m$ and χ is identically 1, then $d =$ permanent.

Let n be a positive integer. Denote by Γ the set of all functions from $\{1, \dots, m\}$ to $\{1, \dots, n\}$. If $X = (x_{ij})$ is an n -square matrix and $\beta, \gamma \in \Gamma$, then $X[\beta|\gamma]$ is the m -square matrix whose i, j entry is $x_{\beta(i), \gamma(j)}$. Fix $\alpha \in \Gamma$. Let f be the function of the n -square nonsingular matrices defined by $f(X) = d(X^{-1}[\alpha|\alpha])$. Finally, let H_n denote the (convex) set of positive definite Hermitian n -square matrices.

Theorem. *Let λ and μ be nonnegative numbers which sum to 1. If $A, B \in H_n$, then*

$$f(\lambda A + \mu B) \leq f(A)^\lambda f(B)^\mu \tag{1}$$

This result was obtained in (10) when $d =$ determinant. If a and b are nonnegative numbers, then

$$a^\lambda b^\mu \leq \lambda a + \mu b \tag{2}$$

(1). It follows that f is convex on H_n . If we specialise to the case $n = m$, $\alpha =$ identity, then (1) becomes

$$d((\lambda A + \mu B)^{-1}) \leq d(A^{-1})^\lambda d(B^{-1})^\mu. \tag{3}$$

Further specialisation to $d = \det$ yields

$$\det(\lambda A + \mu B) \geq (\det A)^\lambda (\det B)^\mu,$$

an inequality attributed to H. Bergström (10; 1; 2; 8).

If X is m -square and p is an integer, $1 \leq p \leq m$, let X_p be the leading p -square principal submatrix of X .

¹The research leading to this article was supported in part by National Science Foundation Grant No. MCS 76-05946.

Corollary. Let $A \in H_m$. Let p be a positive integer, $p \leq m$. Then

$$d[(A_p)^{-1}] \leq d(A^{-1})_p. \tag{4}$$

Specialising to $d = \det$, we obtain

$$1 \leq \det(A^{-1})_p \det A_p,$$

an inequality of N. G. de Bruijn (3, Theorem 10.6), (10, Inequality (5.3)).

Proof. Let V be an n -dimensional complex inner product space. Let $\otimes^m V$ be the m th tensor power of V and denote by $v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_m$ the decomposable (or pure) tensor product of the indicated vectors. The inner product in V induces an inner product in $\otimes^m V$ which has the following effect on decomposable tensors:

$$(v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_m, w_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes w_m) = \prod_{i=1}^m (v_i, w_i) \tag{5}$$

For each $g \in S_m$, let $P(g)$ denote the action of g on $\otimes^m V$, i.e., $P(g^{-1})v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_m = v_{g(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{g(m)}$ for all decomposable $v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_m$. Then with respect to the inner product (5), $P(g)^* = P(g^{-1})$ (4). It follows that

$$T(G, \chi) = \frac{\chi(\text{id})}{o(G)} \sum_{g \in G} \chi(g) P(g)$$

is Hermitian. By the generalised orthogonality relations (11, p. 16) and the fact that $P(g_1 g_2) = P(g_1) P(g_2)$, $T(G, \chi)$ is idempotent.

If $E = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ is an orthonormal basis of V , then $\{e_\gamma^\otimes = e_{\gamma(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes e_{\gamma(m)} : \gamma \in \Gamma\}$ is a basis of $\otimes^m V$. It follows that $\{e_\gamma^* = T(G, \chi) e_\gamma^\otimes : \gamma \in \Gamma\}$ spans $V_\chi(G)$, the range of $T(G, \chi)$.

For each $\gamma \in \Gamma$, define $G_\gamma = \{g \in G : \gamma g = \gamma\}$. Compute

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_\gamma^*\|^2 &= (T(G, \chi) e_\gamma^\otimes, T(G, \chi) e_\gamma^\otimes) \\ &= (e_\gamma^\otimes, T(G, \chi) e_\gamma^\otimes) \\ &= \frac{\chi(\text{id})}{o(G)} \sum_{g \in G} \chi(g) \prod_{i=1}^m (e_{\gamma(i)}, e_{\gamma g(i)}) \\ &= \frac{\chi(\text{id})}{o(G)} \sum_{g \in G_\gamma} \chi(g). \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\Omega = \left\{ \gamma \in \Gamma : \sum_{g \in G_\gamma} \chi(g) \neq 0 \right\}.$$

Then $e_\gamma^* \neq 0$ if and only if $\gamma \in \Omega$.

If S is a linear operator on V , let $K(S)$ denote the induced linear operator on $\otimes^m V$, i.e.,

$$K(S)(v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_m) = (Sv_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes (Sv_m),$$

for all $v_1, \dots, v_m \in V$. Suppose now that $A = (a_{ij})$ is an n by n matrix. Let S be the linear operator on V whose matrix representation with respect to E is A^T , i.e.,

$(Se_i, e_j) = a_{ij}$. Since $K(S)$ commutes with $T(G, \chi)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (K(S)e_{\beta}^*, e_{\gamma}^*) &= \frac{\chi(\text{id})}{o(G)} \sum_{g \in G} \chi(g) (Se_{\beta(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes Se_{\beta(m)}, e_{\gamma(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes e_{\gamma(m)}) \\ &= \frac{\chi(\text{id})}{o(G)} \sum_{g \in G} \chi(g) \prod_{i=1}^m (Se_{\beta(i)}, e_{\gamma(i)}) \\ &= \frac{\chi(\text{id})}{o(G)} d(A[\beta|\gamma]). \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

It follows from (6) that $d(A[\beta|\gamma])$ is zero if either γ or β fails to lie in Ω . (In case $G = S_m$ and χ is the alternating character, Ω is the set of one-to-one functions.)

Lemma. (Generalised Cauchy-Binet Theorem). *Let A and B be n -square matrices. Let G be a subgroup of S_m and suppose χ is an irreducible character of G . If $\beta, \gamma \in \Gamma$, then*

$$d((AB)[\beta|\gamma]) = \frac{\chi(\text{id})}{o(G)} \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} d(A[\beta|\omega]) d(B[\omega|\gamma]),$$

and both sides are zero if either β or γ fails to lie in Ω .

Proof. Let S and T be the linear operators on V whose matrix representations with respect to E are, respectively, A^T and B^T . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\chi(\text{id})}{o(G)} d((AB)[\beta|\gamma]) &= (K(TS)e_{\beta}^*, e_{\gamma}^*) \\ &= (K(S)e_{\beta}^*, K(T^*)e_{\gamma}^*) \\ &= \sum_{\omega \in \Gamma} (K(S)e_{\beta}^*, e_{\omega}^{\otimes})(e_{\omega}^{\otimes}, K(T^*)e_{\gamma}^*) \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

by Parseval's Identity. Since $T(G, \chi)$ is Hermitian and idempotent, e_{ω}^{\otimes} in (7) can be replaced with e_{ω}^* . But, $e_{\omega}^* = 0$ unless $\omega \in \Omega$. We proceed:

$$= \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \frac{\chi(\text{id})^2}{o(G)^2} d(A[\beta|\omega]) \overline{d(B^*[\gamma|\omega])}$$

Since $B^*[\gamma|\omega] = B[\omega|\gamma]^*$ and $d(X^*) = \overline{d(X)}$, the proof is complete.

To complete the proof of the Theorem, we follow the technique employed by Muir: First observe that there exists a nonsingular matrix P such that $P^*AP = I$ and $P^*BP = C = \text{diag}(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n)$ with $c_i > 0, 1 \leq i \leq n$. It follows that $(\lambda A + \mu B)^{-1} = P(\lambda I + \mu C)^{-1}P^*$. Let $H = \text{diag}(h_1, h_2, \dots, h_n)$, where $h_i = (\lambda + \mu c_i)^{-1}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} d((\lambda A + \mu B)^{-1}[\alpha|\alpha]) &= d((PHP^*)[\alpha|\alpha]) \\ &= \frac{\chi(\text{id})^2}{o(G)^2} \sum_{\beta, \gamma \in \Omega} d(P[\alpha|\beta]) d(H[\beta|\gamma]) d(P^*[\gamma|\alpha]). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that, since H is diagonal,

$$d(H[\beta|\gamma]) = \begin{cases} \sum_{\sigma \in G_\beta} \chi(\tau^{-1}\sigma) \prod_{i=1}^m h_{\beta(i)}, & \text{if } \gamma = \beta\tau \text{ for some } \tau \in G \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} d((\lambda A + \mu B)^{-1}[\alpha|\alpha]) &= \frac{\chi(\text{id})^2}{o(G)^2} \sum_{\beta \in \Omega} \frac{1}{o(G_\beta)} \sum_{\tau \in G} d(P[\alpha|\beta]) \overline{d(P[\alpha|\beta\tau])} \sum_{\sigma \in G_\beta} \chi(\tau^{-1}\sigma) \prod_{i=1}^m h_{\beta(i)} \\ &= \sum_{\beta \in \Omega} u_{\alpha\beta} \prod_{i=1}^m h_{\beta(i)}, \quad \text{where} \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

$$\begin{aligned} u_{\alpha\beta} &= \frac{\chi(\text{id})^2}{o(G)^2 o(G_\beta)} \sum_{\tau \in G} d(P[\alpha|\beta]) \overline{d(P[\alpha|\beta\tau])} \sum_{\sigma \in G_\beta} \chi(\tau^{-1}\sigma) \\ &= \frac{\chi(\text{id})^2}{o(G)^2 o(G_\beta)} \sum_{\sigma \in G_\beta} \sum_{\pi \in G} \chi(\pi) d(P[\alpha|\beta]) \overline{d(P[\alpha|\beta\sigma\pi^{-1}])} \\ &= \frac{\chi(\text{id})^2}{o(G)^2} \sum_{\pi \in G} \chi(\pi) d(P[\alpha|\beta]) \overline{d(P[\alpha|\beta\pi^{-1}])} \end{aligned}$$

because $\beta\sigma = \beta$ for all $\sigma \in G_\beta$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} d(P[\alpha|\beta\pi^{-1}]) &= \sum_{\tau \in G} \chi(\tau) \prod_{k=1}^m P_{\alpha(k)\beta\pi^{-1}\tau(k)} \\ &= \sum_{\tau \in G} \chi(\pi\tau) \prod_{k=1}^m P_{\alpha(k)\beta\tau(k)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} u_{\alpha\beta} &= \frac{\chi(\text{id})^2}{o(G)^2} d(P[\alpha|\beta]) \sum_{\tau \in G} \left(\sum_{\pi \in G} \chi(\pi)\chi(\pi\tau) \right) \prod_{k=1}^m \bar{P}_{\alpha(k)\beta\tau(k)} \\ &= \frac{\chi(\text{id})}{o(G)} d(P[\alpha|\beta]) \sum_{\tau \in G} \overline{\chi(\tau)} \prod_{k=1}^m \bar{P}_{\alpha(k)\beta\tau(k)} \\ &= \frac{\chi(\text{id})}{o(G)} |d(P[\alpha|\beta])|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Continuing from (8) and substituting for H , we obtain

$$d((\lambda A + \mu B)^{-1}[\alpha|\alpha]) = \sum_{\beta \in \Omega} \left(u_{\alpha\beta} / \prod_{k=1}^m (\lambda + \mu c_{\beta(k)}) \right) \tag{9}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \sum_{\beta} u_{\alpha\beta} \left(\prod_k c_{\beta(k)} \right)^{-\mu} \quad \text{by (2)} \\ &= \sum_{\beta} u_{\alpha\beta}^\lambda \left(u_{\alpha\beta} / \prod_k c_{\beta(k)} \right)^\mu \\ &\leq \left\{ \sum_{\beta} u_{\alpha\beta} \right\}^\lambda \left\{ \sum_{\beta} \left(u_{\alpha\beta} / \prod_k c_{\beta(k)} \right)^\mu \right\} \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

by Hölder's Inequality. Successively choosing $\lambda = 1, \mu = 0$ and $\lambda = 0, \mu = 1$ in (9), we obtain

$$d(A^{-1}[\alpha|\alpha]) = \sum_{\beta} u_{\alpha\beta}, \quad \text{and} \tag{11}$$

$$d(B^{-1}[\alpha|\alpha]) = \sum_{\beta} \left(u_{\alpha\beta} / \prod_k c_{\beta(k)} \right). \quad (12)$$

A combination of (10)–(12) yields the result.

The proof of the corollary exactly parallels the development in (10, §5).

REFERENCES

- (1) RICHARD BELLMAN, *Introduction to Matrix Analysis*, 2nd ed. (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1970).
- (2) RICHARD BELLMAN, Notes on matrix theory II, *Amer. Math Monthly* **60** (1953), 173–175.
- (3) N. G. DE BRUIJN, Inequalities concerning minors and eigenvalues, *Nieuw Arch. Wiskunde* **4** (1956), 18–35.
- (4) MARVIN MARCUS, *Finite Dimensional Multilinear Algebra*, Part 1 (Marcel Dekker, New York, 1973).
- (5) MARVIN MARCUS and HENRYK MINC, An inequality for Schur functions, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **5** (1972), 19–28.
- (6) MARVIN MARCUS and HENRYK MINC, Generalized matrix functions, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **116** (1965), 316–329.
- (7) MARVIN MARCUS and HERBERT ROBINSON, On exterior powers of endomorphisms, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **14** (1976), 219–225.
- (8) RUSSELL MERRIS and STEPHEN PIERCE, Monotonicity of positive semidefinite Hermitian matrices, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **31** (1972), 437–440.
- (9) LEON MIRSKY, An inequality for positive definite matrices, *Amer. Math. Monthly* **62** (1955), 428–430.
- (10) W. W. MUIR, Inequalities concerning the inverses of positive definite matrices, *Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc.* (2) **19** (1974), 109–113.
- (11) MORRIS NEWMAN, *Matrix Representations of Groups* (U.S. National Bureau of Standards Applied Math. Series 60, Washington D.C., 1968).
- (12) WILLIAM WATKINS, Convex matrix functions, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **44** (1974), 31–34.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
HAYWARD CA 94542