



Math for the people, by the people.

# proof of the determinant condition for a sequence of vectors

Canonical name	ProofOfTheDeterminantConditionForASequenceOfVectors
Date of creation	2013-03-22 14:33:46
Last modified on	2013-03-22 14:33:46
Owner	GeraW (6138)
Last modified by	GeraW (6138)
Numerical id	5
Author	GeraW (6138)
Entry type	Proof
Classification	msc 15A15

**Theorem.** Let  $x_1, x_2, \dots$  be a sequence of  $d$  dimensional vectors. Assume that there is  $C : \mathbb{N}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$  such that

$$\sum_{\substack{n_1 + \dots + n_d = n \\ 0 < n_1 < \dots < n_d}} C(n_1, \dots, n_d) \det[x_{n_1}, x_{n_2}, \dots, x_{n_d}] = 0 \quad (1)$$

for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then  $\det[x_{n_1}, x_{n_2}, \dots, x_{n_d}] = 0$  for all  $(n_1, \dots, n_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d$ .

*Proof.* Introduce a linear order over the set of ordered tuples:  $(n_1, n_2, \dots, n_d) \prec (\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2, \dots, \hat{n}_d)$  if  $(\sum_{i=1}^d n_i, \hat{n}_d, \hat{n}_{d-1}, \dots, \hat{n}_1)$  precedes  $(\sum_{i=1}^d \hat{n}_i, n_d, n_{d-1}, \dots, n_1)$  lexicographically. Let  $(n_1, n_2, \dots, n_d)$  be the minimal (according to the above order) ordered tuple for which

$$\det[x_{n_1}, x_{n_2}, \dots, x_{n_d}] \neq 0. \quad (2)$$

Take another ordered tuple,  $(\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2, \dots, \hat{n}_d)$ , such that  $\sum_{i=1}^d n_i = \sum_{i=1}^d \hat{n}_i$ . By minimality, if  $(n_d, n_{d-1}, \dots, n_1)$  precedes  $(\hat{n}_d, \hat{n}_{d-1}, \dots, \hat{n}_1)$  lexicographically then  $\det[x_{\hat{n}_1}, x_{\hat{n}_2}, \dots, x_{\hat{n}_d}] = 0$ . Otherwise, let  $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, d-1\}$  be the first index such that  $n_{d-i} \neq \hat{n}_{d-i}$  (more specifically,  $n_{d-i} > \hat{n}_{d-i}$ ). Then,  $\hat{n}_{d-j} = n_{d-j}$  for  $j = 0, \dots, i-1$  and  $\hat{n}_{d-j} < n_{d-i}$  for  $j = i, \dots, d-1$ . Therefore,

$$\det[x_{n_1}, \dots, x_{n_{d-i-1}}, x_{\hat{n}_m}, x_{n_{d-i+1}}, \dots, x_{n_d}] = 0$$

for all  $m = 1, 2, \dots, d$  (some because of repeated columns and the others because  $\sum_{j=1}^d n_j - n_{d-i} + \hat{n}_m < \sum_{j=1}^d n_j$ ). Since the vectors  $x_{n_1}, x_{n_2}, \dots, x_{n_d}$  are linearly independent, we get that

$$\{x_{\hat{n}_1}, x_{\hat{n}_2}, \dots, x_{\hat{n}_d}\} \subset \text{span}(\{x_{n_1}, x_{n_2}, \dots, x_{n_d}\} \setminus \{x_{n_{d-i}}\}).$$

In particular  $\det[x_{\hat{n}_1}, x_{\hat{n}_2}, \dots, x_{\hat{n}_d}] = 0$ . Therefore, (??) reduces to  $\det[x_{n_1}, x_{n_2}, \dots, x_{n_d}] = 0$  which contradicts (??).

□