# Polytope of Matrices with Invariant Row- and Column- Sums

Pramod Mathai *

June 10, 2019

Motivated by Aaronson's [1] description of the role of transition matrices in restricting hidden variable theories (HVTs) of quantum mechanics, we address the following general question:
(i) Given $\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n\times 1}$, with $\mathbf{1}^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{1}^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{c} = \gamma$, how does one construct $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n\times n}$ with row and column sums satisfying $\mathbf{S1} = \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{S}^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{1} = \mathbf{c}$? Here, $\mathbf{1}$ is the vector of all ones and the "+" subscript indicates nonnegative matrix elements. The case $\gamma = 1$ corresponds to requiring that $\mathbf{S}$ be a transition matrix.

$\mathcal{S}_{(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{c})}$, the set of of all solutions to (i), is convex. We explicitly construct $\mathcal{V}_{(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{c})}$, the set of vertices of a polytope $\mathcal{P}_{(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{c})} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{c})}$.

## 1 Constructing $\mathcal{P}_{(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{c})}$

Without loss of generality, we assume that the elements of $\mathbf{r}$ and $\mathbf{c}$ are arranged in increasing order: $r_i \le r_{i+1}$ for $i \in [n-1]$, likewise for $\mathbf{c}$ ($[k]$ denotes the set of positive integers not exceeding $k$). If one solves for this case, then the rows and columns of $\mathbf{P}$ can always be permuted back to their original order without changing the values of the respective sums.

We define $m_i := \min(r_i, c_i)$ and $\mathbf{e}_i$ as the column vector with 1 in the $i^{th}$ position and zeros in the other $(n-1)$ positions.

The polytope $\mathcal{P}_{(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{c})}$ is then defined as the convex hull of the set

$$\mathcal{V}_{(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{c})} = \mathbf{P}^* \bigcup_{\substack{i,j\in[n],\\ i<j}} \mathbf{P}_{(i,j)} \tag{❖}$$

of, in general, $1 + \frac{n(n-1)}{2}$ distinct matrices where $\mathbf{P}_{(i,j)} = \mathbf{P}^* + m_i \cdot (\mathbf{e}_i\mathbf{e}_j^{\mathrm{T}} + \mathbf{e}_j\mathbf{e}_i^{\mathrm{T}} - \mathbf{e}_i\mathbf{e}_i^{\mathrm{T}} - \mathbf{e}_j\mathbf{e}_j^{\mathrm{T}})$ and $\mathbf{P}^*$ has entries $p^*_{i,j}$ equal to zero except for the following elements:
$p^*_{i,i} = m_i,\;\; p^*_{n,i} = c_i - m_i,\;\; p^*_{i,n} = r_i - m_i$ for $i \in [n-1]$ and
$p^*_{n,n} = r_n + c_n - \gamma + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} m_i$.

For example, in the case $n = 3$ with ordering $r_1 \le c_1 \le c_2 \le r_2 \le r_3 \le c_3$, we have $m_1 = r_1, m_2 = c_2$ and $m_3 = r_3$. So every element in the polytope defined by the four matrices

$$\mathbf{P}^* = \begin{bmatrix} r_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & c_2 & r_2 - c_2 \\ c_1 - r_1 & 0 & r_3 + c_3 - \gamma + (r_1 + c_2) \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{P}_{(1,2)} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & r_1 & 0 \\ r_1 & c_2 - r_1 & r_2 - c_2 \\ c_1 - r_1 & 0 & r_3 + c_3 - \gamma + (r_1 + c_2) \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\mathbf{P}_{(1,3)} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & r_1 \\ 0 & c_2 & r_2 - c_2 \\ c_1 & 0 & r_3 + c_3 - \gamma + c_2 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } \mathbf{P}_{(2,3)} = \begin{bmatrix} r_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & r_2 \\ c_1 - r_1 & c_2 & r_3 + c_3 - \gamma + r_1 \end{bmatrix}$$

will be a solution to (i). This is generalized for any $n$ and ordering in the following.

*pramod.m@gmail.com

**Lemma 1.1.** *(a)*$\mathcal{P}_{(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{c})} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{c})}$. *(b) Upto permutation,* $\mathcal{P}_{(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{c})} = \mathcal{S}_{(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{c})}$ *for* $n = 2$.

*Proof.* (a) The convexity of $\mathcal{P}_{(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{c})}$ makes it sufficient to show that matrices in $\mathcal{V}_{(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{c})}$ are solutions to (i). The construction (❖) makes it clear that any $\mathbf{P}_{(i,j)}$ has the same row and columns sums as $\mathbf{P}^*$ and has nonnegative off-diagonal terms. So it suffices to verify that $\mathbf{P}^*$ satisfies (i) and that $p^*_{i+1,i+1} \geq p^*_{i,i}$ for $i \in [n-1]$; the latter inequality ensures that the diagonal elements of every $\mathbf{P}_{(i,j)}$ are nonnegative. We verify these properties of $\mathbf{P}^*$ in order ($n > 1$ is assumed):

- *Verifying row sums*: Denote $\mathbf{P}^*_{i,.}$ to be the $i^{th}$ row of $\mathbf{P}^*$. For $i \in [n-1]$, $\mathbf{P}^*_{i,.}\mathbf{1} = m_i + r_i - m_i = r_i$. $\mathbf{P}^*_{n,.}\mathbf{1} = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1}(c_i - m_i) + p^*_{n,n} = r_n + (\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i) - \gamma = r_n$.
- *Verifying column sums*: Analogous to verifying row sums.
- *Verifying Nonnegativity of off-diagonal terms*: Follows from the definition of $\mathbf{P}^*$ in (❖).
- *Verifying* $p^*_{i+1,i+1} \geq p^*_{i,i}$ *for* $i \in [n-2]$ *with* $n > 2$: Without loss of generality, let $m_{i+1} = r_{i+1}$. We have $p^*_{i+1,i+1} = m_{i+1} = r_{i+1} \geq r_i \geq \min(r_i, c_i) = m_i = p^*_{i,i}$ where the first inequality is assumed in (❖).
- *Verifying* $p^*_{n,n} \geq p^*_{n-1,n-1} = m_{n-1}$ *for* $n \geq 2$:
  $n = 2$: Requiring $p^*_{2,2} \geq m_1$ is equivalent to requiring that $r_2 + c_2 \geq \gamma$, which is satisfied since $\gamma = \frac{r_2+c_2}{2} + \frac{r_1+c_1}{2}$ and the orderings $r_1 \leq r_2$ and $c_1 \leq c_2$ are assumed in (❖).

  $n > 2$: Requiring $p^*_{n,n} \geq m_{n-1}$ is equivalent to requiring $r_n + c_n + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} m_i \geq \gamma$. By the inequality of arithmetic and geometric means, the left hand side is minimized when each of the $n$ terms is equal to, say, $M$. The orderings $r_i \leq r_{i+1}$ and $c_i \leq c_{i+1}$ then imply that $r_i = c_i = M$ for $i \in [n]$. Since $\sum_{i=1}^{n} r_i = \gamma$, it follows that $nM = \gamma$.

(b)$\mathcal{V}_{(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{c})}$ contains two elements $\mathbf{P}^*$ and $\mathbf{P}_{(1,2)}$. For any $\mathbf{S} \in \mathcal{S}_{(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{c})}$, construct $\mathbf{S}' = \mathbf{P_R}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{P_C}$ where $\mathbf{P_R}$ and $\mathbf{P_C}$ are permutation matrices which are chosen to ensure that the row and column sums of $\mathbf{S}'$ are in ascending order, as required in (❖). Assuming $m_1 > 0$, $\mathbf{S}' = \phi\mathbf{P}^* + (1-\phi)\mathbf{P}_{(1,2)}$ where $0 \leq \phi = \frac{s'_{11}}{m_1} \leq 1$ and $s'_{11}$ is the $(1,1)$ entry of $\mathbf{S}'$. The case $m_1 = 0$ is trivial.

□

# 2 Regarding $\mathcal{S}_{(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{c})} \setminus \mathcal{P}_{(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{c})}$

- For $n > 2$, $\mathcal{P}_{(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{c})}$ does not, in general, contain *all* solutions to (i) since its construction shows that any $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_{(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{c})}$ has a symmetric principal minor of order $n-1$ (this does not matter for the $n \leq 2$). But, can one extend the above procedure to construct *any* matrix $\mathbf{S} \in \mathcal{S}_{(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{c})}$?
- Define the *diameter* of a bounded convex set of matrices as the maximum of $\|\mathbf{M}_i - \mathbf{M}_j\|_\infty$, for any two matrices $\mathbf{M}_i$ and $\mathbf{M}_j$ in the set. Does $\mathcal{S}_{(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{c})}$ have a larger diameter than $\mathcal{P}_{(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{c})}$?
- $\mathbf{P}^*$ has at most $2n-1$ nonzero entries and any solution in $\mathcal{S}_{(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{c})}$ must in general have at least as many. Does $\mathcal{S}_{(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{c})} \setminus \mathcal{P}_{(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{c})}$ contain matrices of equal sparsity?

# References


[1] S. Aaronson, "Quantum computing and hidden variables", *Physical Review A*, vol. 71, no. 3, Mar. 2005. DOI: `10.1103/physreva.71.032325`. [Online]. Available: `https://doi.org/10.1103/physreva.71.032325`.