

Lecture 2

2-1

The "maximal number of linearly independent vectors in S ":

k if there exists a linearly independent set of k vectors from S , but no such set of $k+1$.

($k=0$ if $S = \{\vec{0}\}$)

Def. The rank $r(\vec{A})$ of a matrix \vec{A} , is the maximal number of linearly independent column vectors of \vec{A} .

Fact: equals the max # of lin. indep row vectors of \vec{A}

and

equals the "order" $\leftarrow k$ if the minor is $k \times k$
of the largest nonzero minor of \vec{A}

(with $r(\vec{0}) = 0$.)

The first fact follows from the second, which indicates how to calculate.

An $m \times n$ matrix has rank $\leq \min\{m, n\}$.

If the rank equals $\min\{m, n\}$: "full rank".

(Otherwise: "rank-deficient".)

(If you ever see e.g. "full row rank",
it means $r(\vec{A}) = m \leq n$)

Example 1: $\vec{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 4 & 7 \\ 2 & 5 & 8 \\ 3 & 6 & 9 \end{pmatrix}$ has rank equal to 2.

< 3 because the only 3×3 minor
(namely $|\vec{A}|$) is zero

≥ 2 because $\begin{vmatrix} 1 & 4 \\ 2 & 5 \end{vmatrix} \neq 0$. (for " ≥ 2 " it
suffices that one 2×2 minor is $\neq 0$)

Example 2: $\vec{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 11 & 21 & 31 & \dots & 91 \\ 12 & 22 & 32 & \dots & 92 \\ 13 & 23 & 33 & \dots & 93 \\ 14 & 24 & 34 & \dots & 94 \end{pmatrix}$

has rank two as well,

Err... you don't want to calculate all 4×4
and all 3×3 minors to find out...?

Rank and linear eq. systems $\vec{A} \vec{x} = \vec{b}$

(Important!) fact: we have the equivalence

$\vec{A} \vec{x} = \vec{b}$ has solution

if and only if

$r(\vec{A}) = r(\vec{A} | \vec{b})$

the augmented coeff. matrix.

I

In II and III, assume $\vec{b} = \vec{b}$ is a vector.

Assume $r(\vec{A}) = r(\vec{A} | \vec{b}) = r$
so a solution exists.

Let \vec{A} be $m \times n$. Then

II

- * there are $n - r$ degrees of freedom
- * there are $m - r$ superfluous eq's.

But there is more. Assume we do have solution, $r(\vec{A}) = r(\vec{A} | \vec{b}) = r$

III

- Let an $r \times r$ submatrix \vec{M} of \vec{A} have $|\vec{M}| \neq 0$. (that is, $|\vec{M}|$ is one $r \times r$ minor).
← not of $(\vec{A} | \vec{b})!$
- Mark off the elements of \vec{M} in \vec{A} . Then:
 - the "other" rows (not intersecting \vec{M}) can be deleted
 - the "other" col's correspond to x_i : we can choose freely.

Why (I)? You don't need proof, but you should catch what goes on:

$$\vec{A}\vec{x} = x_1 \vec{a}^{(1)} + \dots + x_n \vec{a}^{(n)}$$

R columns of \vec{A}

- If some $\vec{a}^{(i)}$ can be written as linear combination of the others, then do that [eliminating a degree of freedom, if there is solution!]

Repeat until r linearly indep. col's remain.

- If $\sum x_i \vec{a}^{(i)} = \vec{b}$ then \vec{b} can be written as a linear combination.

[Fancy math speaks: $\vec{b} \in$ the span of the col's]

So augmenting with \vec{b} cannot increase the # of lin. indep. vectors, if there is a sol'n; conversely, if it does not do so, we do have a solution.

- Solution $\Leftrightarrow \vec{A}$ and $(\vec{A}:\vec{b})$ have same # of lin. indep. col's \Leftrightarrow same rank.

- For $\vec{A}\vec{x} = \vec{b}$, this must hold for \vec{A} vs $(\vec{A}:\vec{b}_i)$, every column \vec{b}_i of \vec{B} .

Why (II) and (IV)?

Loosely:

- * # of lin. indep rows = # lin. indep col's.
- rows — i.e. eq's — that can be written in terms of the others, can be deleted.
- An $r \times r$ minor has the largest possible number of "lin. indep left-hand sides" and thus also "right-hand sides" since we assume we have solution!

Delete these superfluous eq's.

- Left with r eq's in n unknowns.
- If after "moving $n-r$ var's to the RHS" we have an invertible eq. system, then no matter how we choose those $n-r$, we have unique values for the rest.

Picture: If $r(\vec{A}) = r(\vec{A} : \vec{b})$ and, e.g.

$$\vec{A} = \begin{pmatrix} \cdot & \odot & \cdot & \cdot & \odot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \odot & \cdot & \cdot & \odot & \cdot \end{pmatrix}$$

where the circled elements form a largest nonzero minor, then we have 4 deg's of freedom

and

• we can delete eq #2

• we can choose x_1, x_3, x_4, x_6 freely.

Example: Consider
$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 6 & 2 & 1 \\ -2 & -5 & 0 & -1 \\ 3 & 4 & p & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \\ x_4 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ q \\ 2 \end{pmatrix}$$

For each p, q , decide the number of solutions / degrees of freedom. [Can there possibly be unique sol'n?]

- $r(\vec{A}) \geq 2$ (e.g., $\begin{vmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 \end{vmatrix} \neq 0$.)

- $\vec{a}^{(4)} = \frac{1}{7} (\vec{a}^{(1)} + \vec{a}^{(2)})$ so

$$r(\vec{A}) = r \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 6 & 2 \\ -2 & -5 & 0 \\ 3 & 4 & p \end{pmatrix} = \begin{cases} 3 & \text{for } p \neq -2 \\ 2 & \text{for } p = -2 \end{cases}$$

has determinant $7p + 14$

Solution with 1 df. (x_4 can be free) for $p \neq -2$.

Let $p = -2$ $r(\vec{A} | \vec{b}) = r(\vec{a}^{(1)} | \vec{a}^{(2)} | \vec{b})$ (WHY?)

$$= r \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 6 & 1 \\ -2 & -5 & q \\ 3 & 4 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{matrix} +1 \\ \leftarrow \\ \leftarrow \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} -2 \\ \leftarrow \\ \leftarrow \end{matrix} = r \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 6 & 1 \\ -2 & -5 & q \\ 0 & -13 & q \end{pmatrix}$$

determinant $7q + 13(q+2) = 20q + 26$.

So for $p = -2, q \neq -\frac{13}{10}$: no solution

For $p = -2, q = -\frac{13}{10}$: $r(\vec{A}) = r(\vec{A} | \vec{b}) = 2$

and solution with two degrees of freedom (e.g. x_3 and x_4)

Example: Does $\begin{pmatrix} 9 & 41 \\ 8 & 42 \\ 7 & 43 \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ 1 & 49 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ have

no, one or infinitely many solutions?
if so: only one degree of freedom!
(WHY?)

Non-prop col's, so $r(\vec{A}) = 2$. (what can we say already?)

$$r(\vec{A} \mid \vec{b}) = r \begin{pmatrix} 9 & 41 & 1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 1 & 49 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = 2$$

+1 \uparrow
second col becomes
so. third

So the eq. system is \Leftrightarrow to

$$\begin{pmatrix} 9 & 41 \\ 8 & 42 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \text{ unique sol'n.}$$

Eigenvalues & eigenvectors

[This is both an exam topic on its own right, and something used for other topics!]

The big Q: When is $\vec{A}\vec{x} = \lambda\vec{x}$ ~~(*)~~
for some $\vec{x} \neq \vec{0}$ and some number λ ?

Def. Fix a matrix \vec{A} , (necessarily square).
If for some $\vec{x} \neq \vec{0}$ there exists a number
such that $\vec{A}\vec{x} = \lambda\vec{x}$, we say that
 $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \vec{x} \text{ is an eigenvector of } \vec{A} \\ \text{with corresponding} \\ \text{eigenvalue } \lambda \end{array} \right.$

Why bother?

Ex 1: We shall cover the following facts.

in this course: Let $f \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. We have

the Hessian has all eigenvalues
positive everywhere

$\Rightarrow f$ strictly convex $\Rightarrow f$ convex

\Rightarrow the Hessian has all eigenvalues
nonnegative everywhere.

Ex. 2 Let $\vec{x} = \vec{x}(t)$ follow the differential eq. \leftarrow constant matrix.

$$\frac{d}{dt} \vec{x}(t) = \vec{A} \vec{x}(t)$$

If some eigenvalue of \vec{A} is > 0 , then some particular solutions diverge (instability)

Ex. 3: See this link to BI's "Math 2" course, pp 1-8.

<http://www.dr-eriksen.no/teaching/GRA6035/2010/lecture3-hand.pdf>

(We will not cover his slides 17-18, and barely touch his pp 20 ff.)

Back on track:

$$\vec{A} \vec{x} = \lambda \vec{x}$$

Example: Show that $\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -3 \end{pmatrix}$ is
an eigenvalue for $\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 3 \\ 3 & -6 \end{pmatrix}$.

Solution: $\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 3 \\ 3 & -6 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -7 \\ 21 \end{pmatrix} = -7 \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -3 \end{pmatrix}$
OK, with $\lambda = -7$.

Verifying that was easy.

Example: Show that $\mu=3$ is an eigenvalue
of $\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 3 \\ 3 & -6 \end{pmatrix}$.

We need to show that there exists $\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \neq \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$
such that

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 3 \\ 3 & -6 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} = 3 \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix}$$

We could: Rewrite as $\begin{matrix} 2x + 3y - 3x = 0 & \textcircled{a} \\ 3x - 6y - 3y = 0 \end{matrix}$
and solve. That would give
us $\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix}$ (one degree of freedom)

But as we were not asked for $\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix}$, only
to show some $\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \neq \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ exists: Eq.

\textcircled{a} has non-invertible coeff. matrix!

$$\begin{vmatrix} -1 & 3 \\ 3 & -9 \end{vmatrix} = 0 \quad \text{Non-unique sol'n.}$$

So how to find from scratch?

Note: $\vec{A} \vec{x} = \lambda \vec{x}$

$$\Leftrightarrow (\vec{A} - \lambda \vec{I}) \vec{x} = \vec{0}.$$

We want those λ for which there is a nonzero - i.e., non-unique! - solution.

That is: When $\det(\vec{A} - \lambda \vec{I}) = 0$ \textcircled{c}

\textcircled{c} is called the characteristic equation of \vec{A} .

$p(\lambda) := \det(\vec{A} - \lambda \vec{I})$ is called the

characteristic polynomial. It is

an n^{th} order polynomial when \vec{A} is $n \times n$.

Leading coefficient: $(-1)^n$.

So, "method" for finding eigenvalues:

- calculate $p(\lambda) = \det(\vec{A} - \lambda \vec{I})$

- Solve $p(\lambda) = 0$ for λ .

But ... if $n > 2$... ? Or even > 4 ?

If we have found such a λ , its associated eigenvector is found by:

solving $(\vec{A} - \lambda \vec{I}) \vec{x} = \vec{0}$ for \vec{x} ,

with this λ here.