

Provided for non-commercial research and educational use.
Not for reproduction, distribution or commercial use.

Serdica

Bulgariacae mathematicae
publicationes

Сердика

Българско математическо
списание

The attached copy is furnished for non-commercial research and education use only.
Authors are permitted to post this version of the article to their personal websites or
institutional repositories and to share with other researchers in the form of electronic reprints.
Other uses, including reproduction and distribution, or selling or
licensing copies, or posting to third party websites are prohibited.

For further information on
Serdica Bulgariacae Mathematicae Publicationes
and its new series Serdica Mathematical Journal
visit the website of the journal <http://www.math.bas.bg/~serdica>
or contact: Editorial Office
Serdica Mathematical Journal
Institute of Mathematics and Informatics
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
Telephone: (+359-2)9792818, FAX:(+359-2)971-36-49
e-mail: serdica@math.bas.bg

A THEOREM FOR THE IRREDUCIBLE MATRICES WITH A SLIGHTLY DOMINANT PRINCIPAL DIAGONAL

E. CHAKUROV, R. CHAKUROVA

ABSTRACT. This paper considers irreducible matrices with a slightly dominant principal diagonal. The theorem of O. Taussky giving a sufficient condition for non-singularity of such matrices is generalized. A new sufficient condition for convergence of Jackoby's method for solving systems of linear equations for which the matrix of coefficients has a slightly dominant principal diagonal is proved.

Theorem of O. Taussky [1]. *Let matrix D of n -th order satisfy the following conditions:*

- (i) D is irreducible;
- (ii) D has a slightly dominant principal diagonal, i.e.

$$H_i = |d_{ii}| - \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n |d_{ij}| \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n;$$

(iii) *There is a strict inequality at least for one i in above inequalities, i.e. there exists i_0 , $1 \leq i_0 \leq n$, for which $H_{i_0} > 0$.*

Then the matrix D is non-singular.

Corollary. *Let $A = \{a_{ij}\}$ be an irreducible matrix for which the following conditions are satisfied:*

- a) $a_{ii} = 0$, $i = 1, \dots, n$;
- b) $\sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n |a_{ij}| \leq 1$,
- c) *There exists i_0 , for which $\sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i_0}}^n |a_{i_0j}| < 1$.*

Then the matrix A has no eigenvalue λ , with $|\lambda| = 1$.

Assertion 1. In the inequalities of the triangle $|x - y| \geq ||x| - |y||$ and $|x + y| \leq |x| + |y|$ an equality is obtained iff $\bar{x}y = |\bar{x}y|$.

Lemma. Consider the matrix $A = \{a_{ij}\}$ with a slightly dominant principal diagonal and $a_{11} \neq 0$. We denote

$$H_i = |a_{ii}| - \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n |a_{ij}|, \quad i = 1, \dots, n;$$

$$H_i^1 = |a_{ii}^1| - \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n |a_{ij}^1|, \quad i = 1, \dots, n;$$

where $a_{i1}^1 = 0$, ($i = 2, \dots, n$); $a_{1j}^1 = a_{1j}$, ($j = 1, \dots, n$); and a_{ij}^1 ($i = 2, \dots, n$, $j = 2, \dots, n$) are obtained after the first step of reducing the matrix A to the upper - triangular form by Gauss method. Then

$$H_i^1 - H_i \geq \left| \frac{a_{i1}}{a_{11}} \right| H_1 \geq 0, \quad i = 2, \dots, n.$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} H_i^1 - H_i &= |a_{ii}^1| - \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n |a_{ij}^1| - |a_{ii}| + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n |a_{ij}| \\ &= \left| a_{ii} - \frac{a_{1i}a_{i1}}{a_{11}} \right| - \sum_{\substack{j=2 \\ j \neq i}}^n \left| a_{ij} - \frac{a_{1j}a_{i1}}{a_{11}} \right| - |a_{ii}| + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n |a_{ij}| \\ &\geq |a_{ii}| - \left| \frac{a_{1i}a_{i1}}{a_{11}} \right| - \sum_{\substack{j=2 \\ j \neq i}}^n \left(|a_{ij}| + \left| \frac{a_{1j}a_{i1}}{a_{11}} \right| \right) - |a_{ii}| + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n |a_{ij}| \\ &= - \left| \frac{a_{1i}a_{i1}}{a_{11}} \right| + |a_{i1}| - \left| \frac{a_{i1}}{a_{11}} \right| \sum_{\substack{j=2 \\ j \neq i}}^n |a_{1j}| \\ &= \left| \frac{a_{i1}}{a_{11}} \right| \left(|a_{11}| - \sum_{j=2}^n |a_{1j}| \right) = \left| \frac{a_{i1}}{a_{11}} \right| H_1 \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Note. It follows from the proof above and from Assertion 1 that the equality $H_i^1 - H_i = 0$ is obtained for

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\bar{a}_{ij}a_{1j}a_{i1}}{a_{11}} &= - \left| \frac{\bar{a}_{ij}a_{1j}a_{i1}}{a_{11}} \right| \text{ for } i, j = 2, \dots, n; i \neq j \text{ and} \\ \frac{\bar{a}_{ii}a_{1i}a_{i1}}{a_{11}} &= \left| \frac{\bar{a}_{ii}a_{1i}a_{i1}}{a_{11}} \right| \text{ for } i = 2, \dots, n. \end{aligned}$$

Consider a matrix A , which satisfies the following conditions :

- (1) $a_{ii} = 0, i = 2, \dots, n;$
- (2) $\sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n |a_{ij}| = 1, i = 2, \dots, n;$
- (3) Matrix A is irreducible.

Theorem 1. *If matrix A satisfies the conditions (1), (2), (3) and has an eigenvalue $\lambda = 1$, then*

- (4) $\bar{a}_{ij}a_{i1}a_{1j} = |\bar{a}_{ij}a_{i1} \cdot a_{1j}|$
 $\left(\begin{array}{l} i, j = 2, \dots, n \\ i \neq j \end{array} \right).$
- (5) $a_{i1}a_{1i} = |a_{i1}a_{1i}| = |a_{i1}a_{1i}|$

Proof. Let $\Delta = |A - E| = 0$. Let a step be carried out by the Gauss method for reducing the matrix $A - E$ to an upper triangular form, i.e. for $k = 1, \dots, n$ we multiply the first row of Δ by a_{k1} and add it to the k -th row. We obtain $\Delta = \det\{S_{ij}\}$, for which :

$$\begin{aligned} S_{11} &= -1, \\ S_{i1} &= 0, S_{1i} = a_{i1} \quad (i = 2, \dots, n); \\ S_{ii} &= -1 + a_{1i}a_{i1} \quad (i = 2, \dots, n); \\ S_{ki} &= a_{ki} + a_{k1}a_{1i} \quad (i, k = 2, \dots, n; i \neq k). \end{aligned}$$

Consider matrix $S = \{S_{ij}\}_{i,j=2}^n$. According to the Lemma matrix S has a slightly dominant principal diagonal, i.e $H_i \geq 0$, for $i = 2, \dots, n$. We are going to prove that S is an irreducible matrix.

Let us assume that S is a reducible matrix. This assumption presupposes the existence of irreducible matrices $S_{11}, S_{22}, \dots, S_{pp}$ with dimensions l_1, l_2, \dots, l_p respectively so that after some permutations of rows and columns, if necessary, we obtain matrix S

$$S = \left\| \begin{array}{cccc} S_{11} & S_{12} & \dots & S_{1n} \\ S_{21} & S_{22} & \dots & S_{2n} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ S_{n1} & S_{n2} & \dots & S_{nn} \end{array} \right\|$$

with determinant $0 = \Delta = \det S = \det S_{11} \times \det S_{22} \times \dots \times \det S_{pp}$.

We assume that $\det S_{kk} = 0$, for any k , $1 \leq k \leq p$. We denote $N_k = l_1 + l_2 + \dots + l_{k-1}$ for $k > 1$, $N_1 = 0$. The matrix S_{kk} is irreducible. If it is singular in terms of O Taussky's theorem, the following conditions are satisfied:

$$|a_{ii}^1| - \sum_{\substack{j=N_k+1 \\ j \neq 1}}^{N_k+l_k} |a_{ij}^1| = 0 \text{ for } i = N_k + 1, \dots, N_k + l_k.$$

However, from the Lemma and conditions (1), (2) it follows that

$$0 = |a_{ii}^1| - \sum_{\substack{j=N_k+1 \\ j \neq 1}}^{N_k+l_k} |a_{ij}^1| \geq |a_{ii}^1| - \sum_{\substack{j=N_k+1 \\ j \neq i}}^{N_k+l_k} |a_{ij}^1| \geq 1 - \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n |a_{ij}^1| = 0.$$

Therefore $a_{ij} = 0$ for $i = N_k + 1, \dots, N_k + l_k$, $j = 1, \dots, N_k$ and $j = N_k + 1, \dots, n$ and matrix A is of the following form

$$A = \left\| \begin{array}{cccccc} A_{11} & A_{12} & \dots & A_{1k} & \dots & \dots & A_{1p} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & A_{kk} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ A_{p1} & A_{p2} & \dots & A_{pk} & \dots & \dots & A_{pp} \end{array} \right\|$$

i.e. A is reducible. The derived contradiction with (3) shows that matrix S_{kk} is non-singular and therefore, if matrix S is reducible, then it is non-singular. This contradiction proves that matrix S is irreducible. However, S has a slightly dominant principal diagonal and therefore $H_i^1 = H_i = 0$ for $i = 2, \dots, n$ should be satisfied (from Taussky's Theorem). According to the Lemma

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\bar{a}_{ij} a_{1j} a_{i1}}{-1} &= - \left| \frac{\bar{a}_{ij} a_{1j} a_{i1}}{-1} \right| \text{ for } i, j = 2, \dots, n; i \neq j \\ \text{and } \frac{-\bar{1} a_{1i} a_{i1}}{-1} &= \left| \frac{-\bar{1} a_{1i} a_{i1}}{-1} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Evidently conditions (4), (5) follow from this. Thus the theorem has been proved.

We shall call a complex square matrix A ε -matrix if $A = \varepsilon\alpha\bar{\varepsilon}$, where the real matrix $\alpha = (\alpha_{ij})$ has only nonnegative elements and $\varepsilon = \text{diag}(1, \varepsilon_2, \dots, \varepsilon_n)$ with $|\varepsilon_i| = 1, i = 2, \dots, n$. It is evident that every ε -matrix satisfies conditions (4), (5). So, the following theorem is to a certain extent opposite to Theorem 1.

Theorem 2. *If A is an ε -matrix and A satisfies conditions (1), (2) and (3), it has an eigenvalue $\lambda = 1$.*

Consider the determinant $\Delta = |A - E|$. By multiplying the i -th column of the determinant Δ by ε_i and adding it to the first one, we obtain $\Delta = \det\{S_{ij}\}$, for which, according to the ε -matrix definition and condition (2), we obtain the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{11} &= -1 + \sum_{j=2}^n a_{1j}\varepsilon_j = -1 + \sum_{j=2}^n \alpha_{1j}\varepsilon_j\bar{\varepsilon}_j = -1 + \sum_{j=2}^n \alpha_{1j} = 0; \\ S_{i1} &= a_{i1} + \sum_{\substack{j=2 \\ j \neq i}}^n a_{ij}\varepsilon_j - \varepsilon_i = \varepsilon_i\alpha_{i1} + \sum_{\substack{j=2 \\ j \neq i}}^n \alpha_{ij}\varepsilon_i\bar{\varepsilon}_j\varepsilon_j - \varepsilon_i \\ &= \varepsilon_i \left(-1 + \alpha_{i1} + \sum_{\substack{j=2 \\ j \neq i}}^n \alpha_{ij} \right) = \varepsilon_i \left(-1 + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n \alpha_{ij} \right) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

for $i = 2, \dots, n$. Thus $S_{i1} = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Hence $\Delta = 0$.

Corollary 1. *If matrix A satisfies conditions (1), (2), (3) and has an eigenvalue λ by module equal to 1, then there exists $\theta, \theta \in [0, 2\pi]$, so that for every $i, j, p = 1, \dots, n, i \neq j, i \neq p, p \neq j$ the following equations are satisfied:*

$$(6) \quad \bar{a}_{ij} \cdot a_{ip} \cdot a_{pj} = e^{i\theta} \cdot |\bar{a}_{ij} \cdot a_{ip} \cdot a_{pj}|$$

$$(7) \quad a_{ip} \cdot a_{pi} = e^{2i\theta} \cdot |a_{ip} \cdot a_{pi}|$$

Conversely, if matrix A satisfies conditions (1), (2), (3) and $A = \varepsilon \cdot \alpha \cdot \bar{\alpha} \cdot e^{i\theta}$, then it has an eigenvalue $\lambda = e^{i\theta}$ by module equal to 1.

The simple corollary from Theorem 1 is a generalization of Taussky's theorem. A number of variants of such generalizations are known (e.g. see [2], [3], [4], [5], [6]). Let us consider the case when all H_i are equal to zero. In other words let us eliminate condition (iii) from Taussky's theorem.

Corollary 2. *Let matrix $B = \{b_{ij}\}$ of n order satisfy the conditions:*

1. B is irreducible.
2. For each $i = 1, \dots, n$ it is true that

$$H_i = b_{ii} - \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n |b_{ij}| = 0.$$

3. At least one of the conditions

$$(8) \quad \frac{\bar{b}_{ij} b_{pj} b_{ip}}{b_{pp}} = - \left| \frac{\bar{b}_{ij} b_{pj} b_{ip}}{b_{pp}} \right| \left(\begin{array}{l} i, j, p = 1, \dots, n \\ i \neq j, i \neq p, j \neq p \end{array} \right).$$

$$(9) \quad \frac{b_{ip} b_{pi}}{b_{ii} b_{pp}} = \left| \frac{b_{ip} b_{pi}}{b_{ii} b_{pp}} \right|$$

is not satisfied.

Then matrix B is non-singular.

Consider three diagonal matrices

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & a_0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ b_1 & 1 & a_1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & b_2 & 1 & a_2 & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & b_{n-1} & 1 & a_{n-1} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & b_n & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Such matrices are used for example in some numerical methods for differential equations (see [7], 6.3.5). Matrix T has a slightly dominant principal diagonal when $|a_0| \leq 1$, $|b_n| \leq 1$ and $|a_i| + |b_i| \leq 1$. ($i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$). The conditions of Corollary 2 in this case are

- (a) for irreducibility $a_i \cdot b_{i+1} \neq 0$, ($i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$);
- (b) for 2.: $|a_0| = |b_n| = 1$, $|a_i| + |b_i| = 1$, ($i = 1, \dots, n-1$).

Conditions (8) are satisfied for every matrix T and the conditions (9) in this case are equivalent to $a_i b_{i+1} > 0$, ($i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$). Therefore, if conditions (a) and (b) are satisfied, matrix T is non singular, iff $a_i b_{i+1} < 0$ at least for one i ($i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$).

Corollary 3. *The method of Jacoby for solving the system of linear equations $Bx = f$ by the formula $x^k = Ax^{k-1} + g$ is convergent if matrix $A = (\text{diag} B)^{-1} B - E$ satisfies the conditions (2) and (3) and does not satisfy conditions (6) and (7). For matrix B these conditions are:*

$$\frac{\bar{b}_{ij}b_{pj}b_{ip}}{b_{pp}} = e^{i\theta} \left| \frac{\bar{b}_{ij}b_{pj}b_{ip}}{b_{pp}} \right| \left(\begin{array}{l} i, j, p = 1, \dots, n \\ i \neq j, i \neq p, j \neq p \end{array} \right).$$

$$\frac{b_{ip}b_{pi}}{b_{ii}b_{pp}} = e^{2i\theta} \left| \frac{b_{ip}b_{pi}}{b_{ii}b_{pp}} \right|$$

Corollary 4. Consider the method of Gauss–Zeidel for solving the system of linear equations $Bx = f$ by the formula

$$(D + L)x^k = -Ux^{k-1} + f,$$

where L , D and U are strict lower triangular, diagonal, and strict upper triangular matrices respectively, so that $B = D + L + U$. It is known that a necessary and sufficient condition for convergence of this method is that all roots λ of the equation $\det(U + \lambda(D + L)) = 0$ must be in the unit circle. It holds if matrix B satisfies both the first and the second condition of Corollary 2 and there exist no $\theta \in [0, \pi]$ for which the following conditions are satisfied:

$$\frac{\bar{b}_{ij}b_{pj}b_{ip}}{b_{pp}} = -e^{i\theta} \left| \frac{\bar{b}_{ij}b_{pj}b_{ip}}{b_{pp}} \right| \quad \text{at } (i - j)(j - p)(i - p) > 0$$

$$\frac{\bar{b}_{ij}b_{pj}b_{ip}}{b_{pp}} = - \left| \frac{\bar{b}_{ij}b_{pj}b_{ip}}{b_{pp}} \right| \quad \text{at } (i - j)(j - p)(i - p) < 0$$

$$\frac{b_{ip}b_{pi}}{b_{ii}b_{pp}} = e^{2i\theta} \left| \frac{b_{ip}b_{pi}}{b_{ii}b_{pp}} \right| \left(\begin{array}{l} i, j, p = 1, \dots, n \\ i \neq j, i \neq p, j \neq p \end{array} \right).$$

It is necessary to evaluate the checking algorithm for the practical elucidation of the singularity of matrix B or the convergence of the methods of Jacoby and Gauss–Zeidel. It is evident that apart from the n conditions $H_i = 0$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$), one has to check the validity of other $(n - 1) + (n - 1).(n - 2) = (n - 1)^2$ equations, i.e. to carry out no more than $(n - 1)^2$ number of multiplications, but in general, considerably less than $(n - 1)^2$. In comparison, for one step of the Jacoby method $(n - 1)^2$ multiplications are necessary.

REFERENCES

- [1] O. TAUSSKY, A Recurring Theorem of Determinants, *Amer. Math. Monthly* **56** (1949), 672-676.

- [2] G. KIROV and M. PETKOV, Some Properties of Matrices with Weakly Dominating Diagonal, *Mathematics and Education in Mathematics*, 1984, Sofia 1984 (in Bulgarian).
- [3] M. PARODY, Localization of the eigenvalue of matrices and its applications, Moscow, 1960 (in Russian).
- [4] T. SZULC, A criterion for the nonsingularity of irreducible matrices, *Proc. of the International Conference on numerical methods and applications*, Sofia, 1988, 492-495.
- [5] V. A. PUPKOV, Some sufficient conditions for the nonsingularity of the matrices, *J. Vychisl. Mat. Mat. Fiz.* **24** (1984), 1733-1737 (in Russian).
- [6] D. CARLSON and T. MARKHAM, Shur complements of diagonally dominant matrices, *Czech. Math. J.* **29** (1979), 246-251.
- [7] BL. SENDOV and V. POPOV, Numerical methods. Part II. Sofia, 1978 (in Bulgarian).

E. Chakurov
Department of Mathematics
Technical University
9000 Varna
BULGARIA

R. Chakurova
Public Library "P. P. Slavejkov"
46 Slivnitza Str.
9000 Varna
BULGARIA

Received 21.05.92

Revised 22.09.92