

## Practice Problems

1. Remember that a matrix  $Q$  is *unitary* if  $Q^H Q = I$ . A matrix is *orthogonal* if it is real and unitary; that is, if it is real and  $Q^T Q = I$ .

a) Find the flaw in this argument:

**False Claim:** all eigenvalues of an orthogonal matrix are  $\pm 1$ . Indeed, if  $Qx = \lambda x$ ,

$$\lambda^2 x^T x = (Qx)^T (Qx) = x^T (Q^T Q)x = x^T x,$$

therefore  $\lambda^2 = 1$ , so  $\lambda = \pm 1$ . If you want, you can think about what happens for a rotation matrix

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{pmatrix}.$$

b) Correct the proof to show

**True Claim:** all eigenvalues of a unitary matrix have magnitude 1 (e.g.  $\lambda = e^{i\phi}$  for some  $\phi$ ).

c) Show that the eigenvectors for different eigenvalues of a unitary matrix are orthogonal.

d) Show that the determinant of any real unitary matrix (e.g., an orthogonal matrix) is  $\pm 1$  using eigenvalues. (Note: you already proved this on a previous pset in a different way.)

*Solution.* a) Let's think through this carefully. The equality

$$\lambda^2 x^T x = x^T x$$

from the argument above is true. This equality tells us that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^2 x^T x - x^T x &= 0 \\ x^T x(\lambda^2 - 1) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

However, the second equality here tells us that either  $\lambda^2 = 1$  or  $x^T x = 0$ . We are used to thinking about real vectors; if  $x$  is real, then  $x^T x = \|x\|^2 > 0$  since  $x$  cannot be the zero vector here (it is an eigenvector). However, here it's possible that  $x$  is complex, and if  $x$  is complex, it's easy for  $x^T x = 0$  even if  $x$  is not the zero vector! For example, if

$$x = \begin{pmatrix} i \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

then  $x^T x = i^2 + 1 = 0$ . So the flaw in the proof is the assumption that  $x^T x = 0$ .

b) To get a proof of the true claim, we switch every  $T$  in sight to an  $H$  (that is, we take the adjoint rather than the transpose.) So the proof of the true claim goes like this:

If  $Qx = \lambda x$ , then

$$\lambda \bar{\lambda} x^H x = (Qx)^H (Qx) = x^H (Q^H Q)x = x^H x.$$

This means that

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda \bar{\lambda} x^H x - x^H x &= 0 \\ x^H x (\lambda \bar{\lambda} - 1) &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

Since  $x^H x = \|x\|^2 > 0$ , we see that  $\lambda \bar{\lambda} = |\lambda|^2 = 1$ . This means that  $\lambda$  has magnitude 1, that is,  $\lambda = e^{i\theta}$ .

- c) Say  $x_1, x_2$  are eigenvectors with eigenvalues  $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$ . We want to show that  $x_1^H x_2 = 0$ . We'll mimic the argument from b), but using  $x_1, x_2$  rather than just a single eigenvector.

So we have

$$\bar{\lambda}_1 \lambda_2 x_1^H x_2 = (Qx_1)^H (Qx_2) = x_1^H (Q^H Q)x_2 = x_1^H x_2.$$

This tells us that

$$x_1^H x_2 (\bar{\lambda}_1 \lambda_2 - 1) = 0.$$

So either  $x_1^H x_2 = 0$  or  $\bar{\lambda}_1 \lambda_2 = 1$ . The second situation is impossible: remember that since  $\lambda_1 = e^{i\theta}$ , its conjugate  $\bar{\lambda}_1 = e^{-i\theta} = 1/\lambda_1$ . So if we were in the second situation, we would have  $\bar{\lambda}_1 = 1/\lambda_2$ , which would imply  $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$ . We assumed the two eigenvalues were *not* equal, so this is impossible, as claimed.

In summary, we must have  $x_1^H x_2 = 0$ , so the vectors are orthogonal.

- d) Say  $Q$  is an  $m \times m$  orthogonal matrix, with eigenvalues  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m$ . Since it's unitary, its eigenvalues must have the form  $e^{i\theta}$ . Since it's real, its complex eigenvalues must come in complex conjugate pairs. So the eigenvalues are  $p$  1's,  $q$   $(-1)$ 's and then  $r$  pairs of conjugate complex numbers. Remember that  $\lambda \bar{\lambda} = |\lambda|^2$ , so the product of the complex conjugate pairs is just 1.

We know

$$\det(Q) = \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \cdots \lambda_m = 1^p \cdot (-1)^q 1^r = \pm 1.$$

2. Here is a quick "proof" that the eigenvalues of **every** real matrix  $A$  are real:

$$\textbf{False Proof: } Ax = \lambda x \text{ gives } x^T Ax = \lambda x^T x, \quad \text{so } \lambda = \frac{x^T Ax}{x^T x} = \frac{\text{real}}{\text{real}}.$$

Find the flaw in this reasoning – a hidden assumption that is not justified. You can test those steps on the  $90^\circ$  rotation matrix

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lambda = i, \quad x = \begin{pmatrix} i \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

*Solution.* There are a couple of flaws in this argument. First, as we saw in the previous problem, it's possible for  $x^T x = 0$  even if  $x \neq 0$ , so this division at the end might be dividing by zero. Even if we're not dividing by zero,  $x^T Ax$  and  $x^T x$  are not necessarily real, so the final equality is also not true.

3. a) If  $S$  is a positive definite matrix, show that  $S^{-1}$  is also positive definite.

- b) If  $S$  and  $T$  are positive definite, show that their sum  $S + T$  is also positive definite. If  $S = A^H A$  and  $T = B^H B$  for full-column-rank matrices  $A$  and  $B$ , then can you write down a full column-rank matrix  $C$  so that  $S + T = C^T C$ ?

*Solution.* a) Remember that a matrix  $A$  is *positive definite* if it is Hermitian  $A^H = A$  and its eigenvalues are all positive (or a couple of other equivalent conditions). So we know that  $S^H = S$  and the eigenvalues of  $S$  are all positive. We need to check that the same properties hold for  $S^{-1}$ .

The eigenvalues of  $S^{-1}$  are just the reciprocals of eigenvalues of  $S$ , so they are all positive. We should also check that  $(S^{-1})^H = S^{-1}$ . We check this by starting with the true equation  $S^{-1}S = I$  and taking the adjoint of both sides:

$$\begin{aligned}(S^{-1}S)^H &= I^H \\ S^H(S^{-1})^H &= I \\ S(S^{-1})^H &= I\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that  $S^H = S$ .

- b) It's easiest to use a different characterization of positive definite matrices for this problem:  $S^H = S$  and  $x^H S x > 0$  for all vectors  $x \neq 0$ . We check these two properties for  $S + T$ :

$$(S + T)^H = S^H + T^H = S + T \quad \text{and} \quad x^H(S + T)x = x^H S x + x^H T x > 0.$$

The answer to the question is: you can write down the matrix  $C$ , but it's hard to relate it to  $A, B$ . In particular, from lecture, one way to get the matrix  $C$  (resp.,  $A$  and  $B$ ) is to look at the diagonalization of  $S + T$  (resp.,  $S$  and  $T$ ). But the diagonalization of  $S + T$  is hard to relate to the diagonalization of  $S$  and  $T$  separately; the eigenvectors and eigenvalues might be completely unrelated. (If anyone has a better answer to this question, I'd be happy to hear it!)

4. Say  $A$  is a  $3 \times 3$  real matrix. The matrix  $B = A + A^T$  has eigenvalues  $\lambda_1 = 2, \lambda_2 = 0, \lambda_3 = 1$ , with corresponding eigenvectors  $x_1 = [1 \ 2 \ 1]$ ,  $x_2 = [-2 \ 1 \ 0]$  and  $x_3 = [1 \ 2 \ -5]$ .

- a) What is  $e^B$ ? (It's fine to leave your answer as a product of several matrices, as long as each matrix is written down explicitly)
- b) Let  $C = (I - B)(I + B)^{-1}$ . What are the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of  $C$ ?
- c) Give a good approximation for

$$y = C^{100} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

in terms of a single eigenvector.

*Solution.* See <https://github.com/mitmath/1806/blob/fall18/exams/exam3sol.pdf>, Problem 3.

---

This is similar to problems we've done before in section. The only new part is to remember that  $B$  is a symmetric matrix, so the eigenbasis can be chosen to be orthogonal (you can also see by inspection that  $x_1, x_2, x_3$  are orthogonal). This simplifies computing the diagonalization of  $B$ , and expanding  $y$  in terms of the eigenbasis.