

# Eigenvalue eigenvector

Instructor: Dr. Avijit Pal

Linear algebra- II (IC152)

We first recall the following theorem:

## Theorem

*Let  $A = [a_{ij}]$  be an  $n \times n$  matrix with eigenvalues  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n$ , not necessarily distinct. Then  $\det(A) = \prod_{i=1}^n \lambda_i$  and  $\text{tr}(A) = \sum_{i=1}^n a_{ii} = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i$ .*

As a consequence of the above Theorem, we will describe the following corollary

## Corollary

*Suppose  $A$  is a singular matrix. Then 0 is an eigen value of  $A$ .*

## Theorem

*If  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_k$  are distinct eigenvalues of a matrix  $A$  with corresponding eigenvectors  $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k$ , then the set  $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k\}$  is linearly independent.*

## Outline of the proof

- The proof is by induction on the number  $m$  of eigenvalues. The result is obviously true if  $m = 1$  as the corresponding eigenvector is non-zero and we know that any set containing exactly one non-zero vector is linearly independent.
- Let the result be true for  $m$ ,  $1 \leq m < k$ . We prove the result for  $m + 1$ . We consider the equation

$$c_1x_1 + c_2x_2 + \cdots + c_{m+1}x_{m+1} = \mathbf{0} \quad (1)$$

for the unknowns  $c_1, c_2, \dots, c_{m+1}$ .

- We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{0} &= A\mathbf{0} \\ &= A(c_1x_1 + c_2x_2 + \cdots + c_{m+1}x_{m+1}) \\ &= c_1Ax_1 + c_2Ax_2 + \cdots + c_{m+1}Ax_{m+1} \\ &= c_1\lambda_1x_1 + c_2\lambda_2x_2 + \cdots + c_{m+1}\lambda_{m+1}x_{m+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

- From Equations (1) and (2), we get

$$c_2(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)\mathbf{x}_2 + c_3(\lambda_3 - \lambda_1)\mathbf{x}_3 + \cdots + c_{m+1}(\lambda_{m+1} - \lambda_1)\mathbf{x}_{m+1} = \mathbf{0}.$$

- This is an equation in  $m$  eigenvectors. So, by the induction hypothesis, we have

$$c_i(\lambda_i - \lambda_1) = 0 \quad \text{for } 2 \leq i \leq m + 1.$$

- But the eigenvalues are distinct implies  $\lambda_i - \lambda_1 \neq 0$  for  $2 \leq i \leq m + 1$ . We therefore get  $c_i = 0$  for  $2 \leq i \leq m + 1$ .
- Also,  $\mathbf{x}_1 \neq \mathbf{0}$  and therefore (1) gives  $c_1 = 0$ .
- Thus, we have the required result.

We are thus lead to the following important corollary.

### Corollary

*The eigenvectors corresponding to distinct eigenvalues of an  $n \times n$  matrix  $A$  are linearly independent.*

- Let  $A$  be a square matrix of order  $n$  and let  $T_A : \mathbb{F}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{F}^n$  be the corresponding linear transformation.
- We ask the question “does there exist a basis  $\mathcal{B}$ ” of  $\mathbb{F}^n$  such that  $T_A[\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{B}]$ , the matrix of the linear transformation  $T_A$ , is in the simplest possible form.”
- We know that, the simplest form for a matrix is the identity matrix and the diagonal matrix.
- We show that for a certain class of matrices  $A$ , we can find a basis  $\mathcal{B}$  such that  $T_A[\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{B}]$  is a diagonal matrix, consisting of the eigenvalues of  $A$ .
- This is equivalent to saying that  $A$  is similar to a diagonal matrix. To show the above, we need the following definition.

## Definition (Matrix Diagonalisation)

A matrix  $A$  is said to be diagonalisable if there exists a non-singular matrix  $P$  such that  $P^{-1}AP$  is a diagonal matrix.

## Remark

*Let  $A$  be an  $n \times n$  diagonalisable matrix with eigenvalues  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n$ . By definition,  $A$  is similar to a diagonal matrix  $D$ . Observe that  $D = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)$  as similar matrices have the same set of eigenvalues and the eigenvalues of a diagonal matrix are its diagonal entries.*



## Example 1

- Let  $A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ .
- Consider  $P = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$ . Note that  $\det P = -2 \neq 0$ . Hence,  $P$  is invertible.
- Observe that  $P^{-1} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ .
- $AP = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} = PD$ .
- Since  $P$  is invertible, we get  $P^{-1}AP = D$ .

## Example 2

- Let  $A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ .
- We will show that there does not exist an invertible matrix  $P$  such that  $P^{-1}AP = D$ .
- We will show it by contradiction. Suppose there exist an invertible matrix  $P$  such that  $P^{-1}AP = D$ , that is,

$$P^{-1}AP = \begin{bmatrix} d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{bmatrix} = D$$

which is equivalent to say that  $A = P \begin{bmatrix} d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{bmatrix} P^{-1}$ .

- Also,

$$A^2 = P \begin{bmatrix} d_1^2 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2^2 \end{bmatrix} P^{-1}. \quad (3)$$

## Example 2 cont.

- Note that

$$A^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (4)$$

- From (3) and (4), we have

$$P^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} P = \begin{pmatrix} d_1^2 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2^2 \end{pmatrix},$$

which implies  $d_1 = d_2 = 0$ .

- This shows that  $P^{-1}AP = \mathbf{0}_{2 \times 2}$ , which gives  $A = P \mathbf{0}_{2 \times 2} P^{-1} = \mathbf{0}_{2 \times 2}$ , which is a contradiction, because  $A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \neq \mathbf{0}_{2 \times 2}$ .
- This shows that  $A$  is not a diagonalizable matrix.

# Consequences of the rank-nullity theorem

The following are some of the consequences of the rank-nullity theorem. The proof is left as an exercise for the reader.

## Theorem

*The following are equivalent for an  $m \times n$  real matrix  $A$ .*

- *Rank  $(A) = k$ .*
- *There exist exactly  $k$  rows of  $A$  that are linearly independent.*
- *There exist exactly  $k$  columns of  $A$  that are linearly independent.*
- *There is a  $k \times k$  submatrix of  $A$  with non-zero determinant and every  $(k + 1) \times (k + 1)$  submatrix of  $A$  has zero determinant.*
- *The dimension of the range space of  $A$  is  $k$ .*
- *There is a subset of  $\mathbb{R}^m$  consisting of exactly  $k$  linearly independent vectors  $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \dots, \mathbf{b}_k$  such that the system  $A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k$  is consistent.*
- *The dimension of the null space of  $A = n - k$ .*

## Definition

A polynomial  $f(t)$  in  $P(\mathbb{F})$  splits over  $\mathbb{F}$  if there are scalars  $c, a_1, \dots, a_n$  (not necessarily distinct) in  $\mathbb{F}$  such that

$$f(t) = c(t - a_1) \cdots (t - a_n).$$

- For example,  $t^2 - 1 = (t + 1)(t - 1)$  splits over  $\mathbb{R}$ .
- But  $(t^2 + 1)(t - 2)$  does not split over  $\mathbb{R}$ .
- However,  $(t^2 + 1)(t - 2)$  splits over  $\mathbb{C}$ .
- If  $f(t)$  is the characteristic polynomial of any matrix over a field  $\mathbb{F}$ , then the statement that  $f(t)$  splits is understood to mean that it splits over  $\mathbb{F}$ .

## Theorem

*The characteristic polynomial of any diagonalizable matrix splits.*

- From the above theorem, it is clear that if  $A$  is a  $n \times n$  diagonalizable matrix that fails to have distinct eigenvalues, the characteristic polynomial of  $A$  must have repeated zeros.

## Definition

Let  $\lambda$  be an eigenvalue of a matrix  $A$  with characteristic polynomial  $f(t)$ . The algebraic multiplicity of  $\lambda$  is the largest positive integer  $k$  for which  $(t - \lambda)^k$  is a factor of  $f(t)$ .

By using previous theorem, we will prove the following theorem. The following theorem states the necessary and sufficient condition for diagonalizability of a matrix.

## Theorem

*let  $A$  be an  $n \times n$  matrix. Then  $A$  is diagonalisable if and only if  $A$  has  $n$  linearly independent eigenvectors.*

- Let  $A$  be diagonalisable. Then there exist matrices  $P$  and  $D$  such that

$$P^{-1}AP = D = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n).$$

Or equivalently,  $AP = PD$ .

- Let  $P = [\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n]$ . Then  $AP = PD$  implies that

$$A\mathbf{u}_i = d_i\mathbf{u}_i \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

- Since  $\mathbf{u}_i$  's are the columns of a non-singular matrix  $P$ , they are non-zero and so for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , we get the eigenpairs  $(d_i, \mathbf{u}_i)$  of  $A$ .
- Since,  $\mathbf{u}_i$  's are columns of the non-singular matrix  $P$ , using Theorem (6), we get  $\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n$  are linearly independent.
- Thus we have shown that if  $A$  is diagonalisable then  $A$  has  $n$  linearly independent eigenvectors.



## Outline of the proof cont. Converse part

- Conversely, suppose  $A$  has  $n$  linearly independent eigenvectors  $\mathbf{u}_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$  with eigenvalues  $\lambda_i$ . Then  $A\mathbf{u}_i = \lambda_i\mathbf{u}_i$ .
- Let  $P = [\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n]$ . Since  $\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n$  are linearly independent, by Theorem (6),  $P$  is non-singular.
- Also,

$$\begin{aligned}AP &= [A\mathbf{u}_1, A\mathbf{u}_2, \dots, A\mathbf{u}_n] \\&= [\lambda_1\mathbf{u}_1, \lambda_2\mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \lambda_n\mathbf{u}_n] \\&= [\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n] \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & \lambda_n \end{bmatrix} \\&= PD.\end{aligned}$$

- Therefore the matrix  $A$  is diagonalisable.

As a consequence of the above theorem, we will prove the following lemma.

### Corollary

*let  $A$  be an  $n \times n$  matrix. Suppose that the eigenvalues of  $A$  are distinct. Then  $A$  is diagonalisable.*

- As  $A$  is an  $n \times n$  matrix, it has  $n$  eigenvalues. Since all the eigenvalues of  $A$  are distinct, by Corollary (4), the  $n$  eigenvectors are linearly independent.
- Hence, by Theorem (10),  $A$  is diagonalisable.

## Corollary

*Let  $A$  be an  $n \times n$  matrix with  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_k$  as its distinct eigenvalues and  $p(\lambda)$  as its characteristic polynomial. Suppose that for each  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq k$ ,  $(x - \lambda_i)^{m_i}$  divides  $p(\lambda)$  but  $(x - \lambda_i)^{m_i+1}$  does not divide  $p(\lambda)$  for some positive integers  $m_i$ . Then*

*$A$  is diagonalisable if and only if  $\dim(\ker(A - \lambda_i I)) = m_i$  for each  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq k$ .*

*Or equivalently*

*$A$  is diagonalisable if and only if  $\text{rank}(A - \lambda_i I) = n - m_i$  for each  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq k$ .*

- As  $A$  is diagonalisable, by Theorem (10),  $A$  has  $n$  linearly independent eigenvalues.
- Also,  $\sum_{i=1}^k m_i = n$  as  $\deg(p(\lambda)) = n$ .
- Hence, for each eigenvalue  $\lambda_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq k$ ,  $A$  has exactly  $m_i$  linearly independent eigenvectors.
- Thus, for each  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , the homogeneous linear system  $(A - \lambda_i I)\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$  has exactly  $m_i$  linearly independent vectors in its solution set.
- Therefore,  $\dim(\ker(A - \lambda_i I)) \geq m_i$ . Indeed  $\dim(\ker(A - \lambda_i I)) = m_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k$  follows from a simple counting argument.

- Now suppose that for each  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq k$ ,  $\dim(\ker(A - \lambda_i I)) = m_i$ .
- Then for each  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , we can choose  $m_i$  linearly independent eigenvectors.
- Also by Corollary (4), the eigenvectors corresponding to distinct eigenvalues are linearly independent.
- Hence  $A$  has  $n = \sum_{i=1}^k m_i$  linearly independent eigenvectors.
- Hence by Theorem (10),  $A$  is diagonalisable.

Let  $A$  be  $n \times n$  matrix. Then  $A$  is diagonalisable if and only if both of the following conditions hold:

- The characteristic polynomial of  $A$  splits.
- For each eigenvalue  $\lambda$  of  $A$ , the multiplicity of  $\lambda$  equals  $n - \text{rank}(A - \lambda I)$ .

## Example 1

- Let  $A = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ .
- Then  $\det(A - \lambda I) = (2 - \lambda)^2(1 - \lambda)$ . Hence,  $A$  has eigenvalues 1, 2, 2.
- $A - 2I = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$  has rank 2, we see that  $3 - \text{rank}(A - \lambda I) = 1$ , which is not multiplicity of 2.
- It is easily seen that  $(1, (1, 0, -1)^t)$  and  $((2, (1, 1, -1)^t)$  are the only eigenpairs.
- That is, the matrix  $A$  has exactly one eigenvector corresponding to the repeated eigenvalue 2.
- Hence, by Theorem (10), the matrix  $A$  is not diagonalisable.



## Example 2

- Let  $A = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$ . Then  $\det(A - \lambda I) = (4 - \lambda)(1 - \lambda)^2$ . Hence,  $A$  has eigenvalues  $1, 1, 4$ .
- It can be easily verified that  $(1, -1, 0)^t$  and  $(1, 0, -1)^t$  correspond to the eigenvalue  $1$  and  $(1, 1, 1)^t$  corresponds to the eigenvalue  $4$ .
- Note that the set  $\{(1, -1, 0)^t, (1, 0, -1)^t\}$  consisting of eigenvectors corresponding to the eigenvalue  $1$  are not orthogonal.
- This set can be replaced by the orthogonal set  $\{(1, 0, -1)^t, (1, -2, 1)^t\}$  which still consists of eigenvectors corresponding to the eigenvalue  $1$  as  $(1, -2, 1) = 2(1, -1, 0) - (1, 0, -1)$ .
- Also, the set  $\{(1, 1, 1), (1, 0, -1), (1, -2, 1)\}$  forms a basis of  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . So, by Theorem (10), the matrix  $A$  is diagonalisable.
- Also, if  $U = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & \frac{-2}{\sqrt{6}} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \end{bmatrix}$  is the corresponding unitary matrix then  $U^*AU = \text{diag}(4, 1, 1)$ .

- Observe that the matrix  $A$  is a symmetric matrix. In this case, the eigenvectors are mutually orthogonal.
- In general, for any  $n \times n$  real symmetric matrix  $A$ , there always exist  $n$  eigenvectors and they are mutually orthogonal. This result will be proved later.

*Thank You*