

## On Convertible Complex Matrices\*

Suk-Geun Hwang  
*Department of Mathematics Education*  
*Kyungpook University*  
*Taegu 702-701, Republic of Korea*

Si-Ju Kim  
*Department of Mathematics Education*  
*Andong University*  
*Kyungpook 760-749, Republic of Korea*

and

Seok-Zun Song  
*Department of Mathematics*  
*Cheju University*  
*Cheju 690-756, Republic of Korea*

Submitted by Richard A. Brualdi

---

### ABSTRACT

A complex square matrix  $A$  is called *convertible* if there is a matrix  $B$  obtained by  $A$  from affixing  $\pm$  signs to entries of  $A$  such that  $\text{per } A = \det B$ . In this note it is proved that a complex matrix all of whose entries are taken from a fixed sector of angle  $\pi/n$  is convertible if and only if its support is.

---

---

\* This research was supported by TGRC-Kosef in 1992.

*LINEAR ALGEBRA AND ITS APPLICATIONS* 233:167-173 (1996)

© Elsevier Science Inc., 1996  
655 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10010

0024-3795/96/\$15.00  
SSDI 0024-3795(94)00065-L

## 1. INTRODUCTION

For a field  $F$  of characteristic 0, let  $F^{n \times n}$  denote the vector space of all  $n \times n$  matrices over  $F$ . For  $A = [a_{ij}] \in F^{n \times n}$ , the permanent of  $A$ ,  $\text{per } A$ , is defined by

$$\text{per } A = \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} a_{1\sigma(1)} a_{2\sigma(2)} \cdots a_{n\sigma(n)},$$

where  $S_n$  stands for the symmetric group on  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ .

Conversion of the permanent into the determinant is a classical problem. In 1913, Pólya [7] posed a problem of determining whether or not there exists a method of uniformly affixing  $\pm$  signs to entries of matrices in  $F^{n \times n}$  so that the permanent is converted into the determinant. Pólya's problem was solved by Szegő [9]. Generalizing Pólya and Szegő's result, Marcus and Minc [6] proved that there is no linear transformation  $T: F^{n \times n} \rightarrow F^{n \times n}$  such that  $\text{per } A = \det T(A)$  for all  $A \in F^{n \times n}$ .

However, there are matrices  $A$  such that  $\text{per } A = \det B$  for some matrix  $B$  obtained from  $A$  by affixing  $\pm$  signs to entries of  $A$ , i.e., such that  $\text{per } A = \det(H \circ A)$  for some  $(1, -1)$  matrix  $H$  of the same size as  $A$ , where  $H \circ A$  denotes the Hadamard (entrywise) product of  $H$  and  $A$ . If that is the case, the matrix  $A$  is called *convertible* and the matrix  $H$  is called a *converter* of  $A$  [4].

For matrices  $A, B$  of the same size,  $A$  is said to be permutation-equivalent to  $B$  if there exist permutation matrices  $P, Q$  such that  $PAQ = B$ . If both  $A$  and  $B$  are real, we denote by  $A \leq B$  that every entry of  $A$  is less than or equal to the corresponding entry of  $B$ .

Let  $T_n = [t_{ij}]$  be the  $n \times n$   $(0, 1)$  matrix defined by  $t_{ij} = 0$  if and only if  $j > i + 1$ . Gibson proved that every  $n \times n$  real matrix  $A$  such that  $A \leq T_n$  is convertible [3] and also that the number of 1's of an  $n \times n$  convertible  $(0, 1)$  matrix  $B$  is less than or equal to  $(n^2 + 3n - 2)/2$ , with equality if and only if  $B$  is permutation-equivalent to  $T_n$  [2]. A graph theoretical characterization of convertible  $(0, 1)$  matrices was obtained by Little [5]. An  $n \times n$  real matrix  $S$  is called *sign-nonsingular* if every  $n \times n$  real matrix with the same sign pattern as  $S$  is nonsingular. It is noted in [1] that an  $n \times n$   $(0, 1)$  matrix is convertible if and only if there exists an  $n \times n$   $(1, -1)$  matrix  $H$  such that  $H \circ A$  is sign-nonsingular. The convertibility of complex matrices does not seem to be easily linked to something like sign-nonsingularity.

In this paper we study the convertibility of complex matrices in connection with that of their supports.

## 2. MAIN RESULTS

Let  $\mathbf{R}$  and  $\mathbf{C}$  denote the real field and the complex field respectively. For  $A = [a_{ij}] \in \mathbf{C}^{n \times n}$ , the  $n \times n$  matrix  $\text{supp } A = [s_{ij}]$  defined by

$$s_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } a_{ij} \neq 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } a_{ij} = 0 \end{cases}$$

is called the *support* of  $A$ . It is proved in [4] that an  $n \times n$  real matrix  $A$  is convertible if there is an  $n \times n$  convertible  $(0, 1)$  matrix  $B$  such that  $\text{supp } A \leq B$ . However, given a complex (or even real) matrix  $A$ , it is not easy to decide whether  $A$  is convertible or not by checking only the support of  $A$ . This is possible for some special classes of complex matrices. In the following we prove a theorem which may be used as a convertibility test for certain class of complex matrices. From now on in the sequel, for any real number  $\alpha$ ,  $0 \leq \alpha < 2\pi$ , let  $R_{\alpha, n}$  denote the subset of  $\mathbf{C}$  defined by

$$R_{\alpha, n} = \left\{ z \in \mathbf{C} \mid z \neq 0, \alpha - \frac{\pi}{2n} < \arg z < \alpha + \frac{\pi}{2n} \right\} \cup \{0\}.$$

We call such a set  $R_{\alpha, n}$  an  $n$ -sector.

**THEOREM 1.** For  $A = [a_{ij}] \in \mathbf{C}^{n \times n}$ , the following holds:

- (1) If  $\text{supp } A$  is convertible, then so is  $A$ .
- (2) If there is an  $\alpha$ ,  $0 \leq \alpha < 2\pi$ , such that  $a_{ij} \in R_{\alpha, n}$  for all  $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ , then the converse of (1) holds.

*Proof.* (1): Suppose that  $\text{supp } A = [s_{ij}]$  is convertible with converter  $H = [h_{ij}]$ . Then

$$\sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \left( \prod_{i=1}^n s_{i\sigma(i)} \right) \left( 1 - (\text{sgn } \sigma) \prod_{i=1}^n h_{i\sigma(i)} \right) = 0.$$

Since  $s_{1\sigma(1)}, \dots, s_{n\sigma(n)} \geq 0$  and  $(\text{sgn } \sigma)h_{1\sigma(1)} \cdots h_{n\sigma(n)} \geq 0$  for all  $\sigma \in S_n$ , it follows that  $(\text{sgn } \sigma)h_{1\sigma(1)} \cdots h_{n\sigma(n)} = 1$  for all  $\sigma \in S_n$  such that  $s_{1\sigma(1)} \cdots s_{n\sigma(n)} = 1$ . So, since  $s_{1\sigma(1)} \cdots s_{n\sigma(n)} = 1$  whenever  $a_{1\sigma(1)} \cdots a_{n\sigma(n)} \neq 0$ , it

follows that

$$\sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \left( \prod_{i=1}^n a_{i\sigma(i)} \right) \left( 1 - (\text{sgn } \sigma) \prod_{i=1}^n h_{i\sigma(i)} \right) = 0$$

and hence that  $\text{per } A = \det(H \circ A)$ .

(2): Conversely, suppose that  $A = [a_{ij}]$  is convertible and also that there is an  $\alpha$ ,  $0 \leq \alpha < 2\pi$ , such that  $a_{ij} \in R_{\alpha, n}$  for all  $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . We prove the convertibility of  $\text{supp } A$  for the case  $\alpha = 0$  first and then do the general case.

*Case (i):*  $\alpha = 0$ . For each  $(i, j) \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \times \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , we can choose  $r_{ij} \geq 0$  and  $\theta_{ij}$ ,  $-\pi/2n < \theta_{ij} < \pi/2n$ , such that  $a_{ij} = r_{ij} \exp(\sqrt{-1} \theta_{ij})$ . Let  $H = [h_{ij}]$  be a converter of  $A$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \text{per } A - \det(H \circ A) \\ &= \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \left( 1 - (\text{sgn } \sigma) \prod_{i=1}^n h_{i\sigma(i)} \right) \left( \prod_{i=1}^n a_{i\sigma(i)} \right) \\ &= \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \left( 1 - (\text{sgn } \sigma) \prod_{i=1}^n h_{i\sigma(i)} \right) \left( \prod_{i=1}^n r_{i\sigma(i)} \right) \exp\left(\sqrt{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_{i\sigma(i)}\right), \end{aligned}$$

from which it follows that

$$\sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \left( 1 - (\text{sgn } \sigma) \prod_{i=1}^n h_{i\sigma(i)} \right) \left( \prod_{i=1}^n r_{i\sigma(i)} \right) \left( \cos \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_{i\sigma(i)} \right) = 0.$$

Since  $-\pi/2n < \theta_{i\sigma(i)} < \pi/2n$  for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$  and all  $\sigma \in S_n$ , it follows that

$$-\frac{\pi}{2} < \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_{i\sigma(i)} < \frac{\pi}{2}$$

for all  $\sigma \in S_n$  and hence that

$$\cos \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_{i\sigma(i)} > 0$$

for all  $\sigma \in S_n$ . Thus  $(\text{sgn } \sigma)h_{1\sigma(1)} \cdots h_{n\sigma(n)} = 1$  for all  $\sigma \in S_n$  such that  $r_{1\sigma(1)} \cdots r_{n\sigma(n)} \neq 0$ . Therefore we see that the support of the matrix  $\mathcal{B} = [r_{ij}]$  is convertible and hence that  $\text{supp } A$  is convertible because  $\text{supp } A = \text{supp } \mathcal{B}$ .

*Case (ii): General case.* Let  $\beta = \exp(-\sqrt{-1}\alpha)$ , and let  $X = \beta A$ . Then  $X$  is also convertible, and all the entries of  $X$  are in the  $n$ -sector  $R_{0,n}$ . So, by case (i),  $\text{supp } X$ , which equals  $\text{supp } A$ , is convertible, and the proof is complete. ■

**COROLLARY.** *A real nonnegative square matrix is convertible if and only if its support is.*

The converse of assertion (1) of Theorem 1 does not, in general, hold for complex (or even real) matrices. In the following we give examples of convertible matrices with nonconvertible supports. Let

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \omega & \omega^2 \\ 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 2 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $\omega = \exp(2\pi\sqrt{-1}/3)$ , and let

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then  $\text{per } A = 2 = \det(H \circ A)$ , so that  $A$  is convertible, while  $\text{supp } A$  is the  $3 \times 3$  matrix of 1's, which is well known to be nonconvertible [8]. Let

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then  $B$  is a real matrix with nonconvertible support: however, it is convertible, since  $\text{per } B = 4 = \det(K \circ B)$ , where

$$K = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The condition in (2) of Theorem 1 which enables a convertible complex matrix to have a convertible support can be weakened a bit, as we see in the following

**THEOREM 2.** *Let  $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  be such that all the components of each column vector (or row vector) come from an  $n$ -vector. If  $A$  is convertible, then  $\text{supp } A$  is convertible.*

*Proof.* Let  $A = [\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n]$ , and let  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in [0, 2\pi)$  be such that all the components of  $\mathbf{a}_j$  are in  $R_{\alpha_j, n}$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, n$ . Let  $D = \text{diag}(\exp(-\sqrt{-1}\alpha_1), \dots, \exp(-\sqrt{-1}\alpha_n))$ , and let  $B = AD$ . Then since  $\text{per } B = \exp(\sqrt{-1}\beta) \text{per } A$  and  $\det B = \exp(\sqrt{-1}\beta) \det A$  where  $\beta = -\alpha_1 - \dots - \alpha_n$ , we see that  $B$  is also convertible. It is clear that  $\text{supp } A = \text{supp } B$ . Now since each entry of  $B$  lies in the sector  $R_{0, n}$ , we see that  $\text{supp } B$  is convertible by Theorem 1. ■

As we mentioned earlier, our Theorem 2 can be used to test the nonconvertibility of complex matrices of a certain type from that of their supports. For example, since the  $3 \times 3$  matrix of 1's is not convertible, no matrices  $A = [a_{ij}] \in \mathbb{C}^{3 \times 3}$  such that  $a_{ij} \neq 0$  for all  $i, j = 1, 2, 3$  and such that

$$\max_{1 \leq j < l \leq 3} |\arg a_{ij} - \arg a_{il}| < \frac{\pi}{3}$$

for each  $i = 1, 2, 3$  are convertible.

*The authors wish to thank the referee for pointing out a technical error in the original manuscript and for some valuable comments.*

#### REFERENCES

- 1 R. A. Brualdi and B. L. Shader, On sign-nonsingular matrices and the conversion of the permanent into the determinant, *Appl. Geom. and Discrete Math.* 4:117-134 (1991).
- 2 P. M. Gibson, Conversion of the permanent into the determinant, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 27:471-476 (1971).
- 3 —, An identity between permanents and determinants, *Amer. Math. Monthly* 76:270-271 (1969).
- 4 S.-G. Hwang and S.-H. Kim, On convertible nonnegative matrices, *Linear and Multilinear Algebra* 32:311-318 (1992).

- 5 C. H. C. Little, A characterization of convertible  $(0, 1)$ -matrices, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B.* 18:187–208 (1975).
- 6 M. Marcus and H. Minc, On the relation between the determinant and the permanent, *Illinois J. Math.* 5:376–381 (1961).
- 7 G. Pólya, Aufgabe 424, *Arch. Math. Phys. Ser. 3* 20:271 (1913).
- 8 R. Reich, Another solution of an old problem of Pólya, *Amer. Math. Monthly* 78:649–650 (1971).
- 9 G. Szegő, Lösung zu Aufgabe 424, *Arch. Math. Phys. Ser. 3* 21:291–292 (1913).

*Received 10 December 1993; final manuscript accepted 1 March 1994*