# **Problem Set 9**

## D. Zack Garza

November 26, 2019

### **Contents**

1	Problem 1	1
	1.1 Part 1	
2	Problem 2         2.1 Part 1          2.2 Part 2	
3	Problem 3	4
4	Problem 4	4
5	Problem 5         5.1 Part 1          5.2 Part 2          5.3 Part 3          5.4 Part 4	7
6	Problem 6	8

Note: I use the convention that **a** denotes a column vector and  $\mathbf{a}^t$  a row vector, and if A is a matrix, then  $(A)_{ij} = a_{ij}$  denotes the entry in the ith row and jth column.

### 1 Problem 1

### 1.1 Part 1

Let  $A = (a_{ij})$  and consider  $\epsilon_{ij}$ , the matrix with a 1 in the *i*th row and *j*th column and zeros elsewhere.

Then, for a fixed (i, j), if we write  $A = [\mathbf{a}_1^t, \mathbf{a}_2^t, \cdots, \mathbf{a}_n^t]$  as a block matrix of column vectors, we have

$$A\mathbf{e}_{ij} = [0, 0, \cdots, \mathbf{a}_i^t, 0, \cdots, 0]$$

as a block matrix where  $\mathbf{a}_i^t$  occurs as the jth column.

In other words, right-multiplication by  $\mathbf{e}_{ij}$  selects column i from A, placing it in column j of a matrix of zeros.

For example, for (i, j) = (3, 2) we have

$$A\mathbf{e}_{32} = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & a_{13} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{23} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{33} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a_{13} & 0 \\ 0 & a_{23} & 0 \\ 0 & a_{33} & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

which is a matrix that contains column 3 of A (the i value) as its 2nd column (the j value).

On the other hand, *left* multiplication by  $\mathbf{e}_{ij}$  selects the *j*th **row** of A and places it the *i*th **row** of a zero matrix, so for example we have

$$\mathbf{e}_{32}A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & a_{13} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{23} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{33} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{23} \end{pmatrix}$$

In general, these two products will not be equal, since the first has a nontrivial column and the latter has a nontrivial row. If  $A \in Z(M_n(R))$ , these two must be equal, so we can equate corresponding entries to find that

- $a_{21} = 0$ , from comparing entries in row 3, column 1,
- $a_{23} = 0$ , from comparing entries in row 3, column 3
- $a_{22} = a_{33}$  by comparing entries in row 3, column 2.

Letting the multiplication run over all possibilities for  $\mathbf{e}_{ij}$  yields  $a_{ii} = a_{jj}$  for every pair i, j and  $a_{ij} = 0$  whenever  $i \neq j$ . Setting  $r = a_{ii} = a_{jj}$  for all  $1 \leq i, j \leq n$  forces A to be a matrix of the form

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} r & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & r & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & r \end{pmatrix} := rI_n.$$

To see that we must have  $r \in Z(R)$ , let  $sI_n \in Z(M_n(R))$  be arbitrary, where s is not assumed to be in Z(R). Then  $(rI_n)(sI_n) = (sI_n)(rI_n)$  by assumption, since these are matrices in the center of  $M_n(R)$ . But  $M_n(R)$  is an R-module, and so the scalars r, s commute with the module elements  $I_n$ . This means that we in fact have

$$(rI_n)(sI_n) = (rs)I_n^2 = (rs)I_n,$$
  

$$(sI_n)(rI_n) = (sr)I_n^2 = (sr)I_n$$
  

$$\implies (rs)I_n = (sr)I_n$$
  

$$\implies (rs - sr)I_n = 0_n,$$

the  $n \times n$  zero matrix.

But then by equating (for example) the 1, 1 entry of the matrix  $(rs - sr)I_n$  with the corresponding entry in  $0_n$ , we find  $rs - sr = 0_R$ , which means  $rs = sr \in R$ .

Now since  $s \in R$  was arbitrary, we find that  $r \in Z(R)$  as desired.

#### 1.2 Part 2

Define a map

$$\phi: Z(R) \to Z(M_n(R))$$
$$r \mapsto rI_n.$$

By part 1, this map is surjective. To see that it is also injective, we can consider  $\ker \phi = \{r \in Z(r) \ni rI_n = 0_n\}$ , which clearly forces  $r = 0_R$ . It is also a homomorphism of R-modules, since  $\phi(rx + y) = (rx + y)I_n = r(xI_n) + yI_n$ .

Thus by the first isomorphism theorem, we have  $Z(R) \cong Z(M_n(R))$ .

### 2 Problem 2

#### 2.1 Part 1

If A, B are (skew)-symmetric, then  $A^t = \pm A$  and  $B^t = \pm B$  respectively. But then

$$(A+B)^t = A^t + B^t = \pm A + \pm B = \pm (A+B),$$

which shows that A + B is (skew)-symmetric.

#### 2.2 Part 2

 $\implies$ : Suppose that whenever A, B are symmetric then AB is symmetric as well.

We then have  $(AB)^t = AB$  by assumption, and then by calculation we have  $(AB^t) = B^t A^t = BA$ , so AB = BA.

 $\Leftarrow$ : Suppose that AB = BA and A, B are symmetric. We want to show that AB is also symmetric, so we compute

$$(AB)^t = B^t A^t = BA = BA.$$

Now let  $B \in M_n(R)$  be arbitrary. We have

- $(BB^t)^t = (B^t)^t B^t = BB^t$ , so  $BB^t$  is symmetric,
- $(B+B^t)^t = B^t + (B^t)^t = B^t + B = B + B^t$ , so  $B+B^t$  is symmetric,
- $(B-B^t)^t = B^t B = -(B+B^t)$ , so  $B-B^t$  is skew-symmetric

### 3 Problem 3

**Definition:** We say  $A \sim B$  in  $M_n(R) \iff$  there exists an invertible P such that  $B = PAP^{-1}$ .

- Reflexive,  $A \sim A$ : Take  $P = I_n$  the identity matrix.
- Symmetric,  $A \sim B \implies B \sim A$ :  $B = PAP^{-1} \implies BP = PA \implies P^{-1}BP = A, \text{ so we can take } Q = P^{-1} \text{ to yield } A = QBQ^{-1}.$
- Transitive,  $A \sim B \& B \sim C \implies A \sim C$ : If  $B = PAP^{-1}, C = QBQ^{-1}$ , then  $C = Q(PAP^{-1})Q^{-1} = (QP)A(QP)^{-1}$ , so take L = QP to yield  $C = LAL^{-1}$ .

**Definition:** We say  $A \sim B$  in  $M(n \times n, R) \iff B = PAQ$  with  $P \in GL(n, R), Q \in GL(m, R)$ .

- Reflexive,  $A \sim A$ :

  Take  $P = I_{m,n}$  the matrix with 1s on the diagonal and zeros elsewhere, and  $Q = P^t$ .
- Symmetric,  $A \sim B \implies B \sim A$ :  $B = PAQ \implies BQ^{-1} = PA \implies P^{-1}BQ^{-1} = A, \text{ so we can take } S = P^{-1}, T = Q^{-1} \text{ to yield } A = QBT.$
- Transitive,  $A \sim B \& B \sim C \implies A \sim C$ : If B = PAQ, C = RBS, then C = R(PAQ)S = (RP)A(QS), so take L = RP, M = QS to yield C = LAM.

### 4 Problem 4

**Lemma**: The rank-nullity theorem holds over division rings.

Proof: A linear map  $\phi: D^m \to D^n$  induces a short exact sequence:

$$0 \to \ker \phi \to D^m \xrightarrow{\phi} \operatorname{im} \phi \to 0$$

But every module over a division ring is free; in particular, im  $\phi \leq D^n$  is a module over D and is thus free. So by a lemma in class, since the right-most term is a free module, this sequence splits and we have

$$D^m \cong \ker \phi \oplus \operatorname{im} \phi$$

and taking dimensions yields

$$m = \dim \ker(\phi) + \operatorname{rank}(\phi).$$

1.  $A \in M(n \times m, D)$  has a left inverse  $B \iff \operatorname{rank}(A) = m$ :

 $\implies$ : Suppose toward the contrapositive that  $\operatorname{rank}(A) < m$ , so A has at least one pair of linearly dependent columns. So wlog write

$$A = [\mathbf{a}_1^t, \mathbf{a}_2^t, \cdots, \mathbf{a}_m^t]$$

in block form with each  $\mathbf{a}_i$  a column vector, and we can assume that  $\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2$  are linearly dependent. Now suppose such a left inverse B were to exist. Write it in block form as

$$B = [\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_n]^t,$$

so each  $\mathbf{b}_i$  is a row of B.

Now if  $BA = I_m$  is to hold, noting that  $(BA)_{ij} = \langle \mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{a}_j \rangle$ , we must have

$$I_{1,1} = \langle \mathbf{b}_1, \ \mathbf{a}_1 \rangle = 1$$

$$I_{1,2} = \langle \mathbf{b}_1, \ \mathbf{a}_2 \rangle = 0$$

$$I_{1,3} = \langle \mathbf{b}_1, \ \mathbf{a}_3 \rangle = 0$$

$$\vdots$$

$$I_{2,1} = \langle \mathbf{b}_2, \ \mathbf{a}_1 \rangle = 0$$

$$I_{2,2} = \langle \mathbf{b}_2, \ \mathbf{a}_2 \rangle = 1$$

$$I_{2,3} = \langle \mathbf{b}_2, \ \mathbf{a}_3 \rangle = 0$$

$$\vdots$$

But the claim is that this can *not* happen if  $\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2$  are linearly dependent. To see why, note that the linear dependence supplies elements  $d_1, d_2 \neq 0 \in D$  such that  $d_1\mathbf{a}_1 + d_2\mathbf{a}_2 = \mathbf{0}$ . But then taking inner products against, e.g.  $\mathbf{b}_1$  (that is, applying  $\langle \mathbf{b}_1, \cdot \rangle$  to everything in sight), we obtain

$$d_{1}\mathbf{a}_{1} + d_{2}\mathbf{a}_{2} = \mathbf{0}$$

$$\implies \langle \mathbf{b}_{1}, d_{1}\mathbf{a}_{1} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{b}_{1}, d_{2}\mathbf{a}_{2} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{b}_{1}, \mathbf{0} \rangle = 0$$

$$\implies d_{1}\langle \mathbf{b}_{1}, \mathbf{a}_{1} \rangle + d_{2}\langle \mathbf{b}_{1}, \mathbf{a}_{2} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{b}_{1}, \mathbf{0} \rangle = 0$$

$$\implies d_{1}\langle \mathbf{b}_{1}, \mathbf{a}_{1} \rangle + d_{2}\langle \mathbf{b}_{1}, \mathbf{a}_{2} \rangle = 0$$

$$\implies d_{1} + d_{2}\langle \mathbf{b}_{1}, \mathbf{a}_{2} \rangle = 0$$

$$\implies \langle \mathbf{b}_{1}, \mathbf{a}_{2} \rangle = -\frac{d_{1}}{d_{2}} \neq 0,$$

which contradicts  $\langle \mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{a}_2 \rangle = 0$  as required by the previous equations.

 $\Leftarrow$ : Suppose rank(A) = m, so A has m linearly independent columns – note that this is all of its columns.

Note: since row rank equals column rank, this also says that A has m linearly independent rows, so  $n \ge m$ .

Viewing A as a representative of a map  $\phi: D^m \to D^n$ , we find that dim im  $\phi = m \le n$ . In particular, from the rank nullity theorem, we have

$$m = \dim \ker \phi + \operatorname{rank}(\phi) = \dim \ker \phi + m \implies \dim \ker \phi = 0.$$

So ker  $A = \{0\}$ , and A represents an injective map  $f_A : D^m \to D^n$ .

But any injective set map  $f: S_1 \to S_2$  has a left-inverse g such that  $g \circ f = \mathrm{id}_{S_1}$ . So  $f_A: D^m \to D^n$  as a set map has a left inverse  $g_B: D^n \to D^m$  satisfying  $g_B \circ f_A = \mathrm{id}_{D^m}$ . But then taking the matrix associated to  $g_B$  yields a matrix  $B \in M(m \times n, D)$  such that  $BA = I_m$  as desired.  $\square$ 

- 2. A has a right inverse  $B \iff \operatorname{rank}(A) = n$ :
- $\implies$ : By a similar argument, supposing that rank A < n but  $AB = I_n$  for some B, we find that A has at least two linearly dependent *rows* this time, say  $\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2$ , whereas we obtain a system of equations of the form  $\langle a_i, \mathbf{b}_k \rangle = \delta_{ik}$  where  $\mathbf{b}_i$  are now the columns of B.

In a similar manner, the linear dependence forces, say,  $\langle \mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{b}_1 \rangle \neq 0$ , which is a contradiction.

 $\Leftarrow$ : By another similar argument, we find that A represents a map  $f_A: D^m \to D^n$ , and since rank  $A = \dim \operatorname{im} A = n$ , we find that A represents a surjective map  $f_A$ . Surjective set maps have right inverses, so there is some  $g_B: D^n \to D^m$  such that  $f_A \circ g_B = \operatorname{id}_{D^n}$ , and when translated to matrices this yields  $AB = I_n$ .  $\square$ 

### 5 Problem 5

#### 5.1 Part 1

 $\Leftarrow$ : Suppose that  $A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$  has a solution  $\mathbf{x}$ .

Write  $A = [\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \cdots \mathbf{a}_m]^t$  in block form with each  $\mathbf{a}_i$  a row of A. By definition, a solution to this equation is a  $\mathbf{x} = (x_i)$  such that for each i, we have  $\langle \mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{x} \rangle = b_i$  (by carrying out the matrix multiplication).

But

$$\langle \mathbf{a}_i, \ \mathbf{x} \rangle = b_i$$

$$\implies \sum_{j=1}^m a_{ij} x_j = b_i,$$

which says that the collection  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  solves the equation

$$a_{i1}x_1 + a_{i2}x_2 + \cdots + a_{im} = b_i$$

for every i, which is exactly the statement that the  $x_i$  simultaneously solve the given system.

 $\implies$ : Suppose that the given system has a simultaneous solutions  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$ , and consider the matrix equation  $A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$ .

Letting  $\mathbf{x} = [x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_n]$ , we can rewrite

$$b_i = a_{i1}x_1 + a_{i2}x_2 + \dots + a_{im}x_m = \langle \mathbf{a}_i, \ \mathbf{x} \rangle,$$

where  $\mathbf{a}_i = [a_{i1}, a_{i2}, \cdots, a_{im}].$ 

But then  $\mathbf{a}_i$  is the *i*th row of A, and  $A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$  has a solution iff there is a  $\mathbf{x}$  such that  $\langle \mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{x} \rangle = b_i$  for all i, which is exactly what we've constructed.

#### 5.2 Part 2

Noting that applying a row operation to A is the same as taking the product EA for some elementary matrix E, we can write  $A_1 = \left(\prod_{i=1}^{\ell} E_i\right) A$  and  $B_1 = \left(\prod_{i=1}^{\ell} E_i\right) B$ ,

thus

$$A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$$

$$\implies E_{\ell}A\mathbf{x} = E_{\ell}\mathbf{b}$$

$$\implies E_{\ell-1}E_{\ell}A\mathbf{x} = E_{\ell-1}E_{\ell}\mathbf{b}$$

$$\vdots$$

$$\implies E_1E_2\cdots E_{\ell}A\mathbf{x} = E_1E_2\cdots E_{\ell}A\mathbf{b}$$

$$\implies A_1\mathbf{x} = B_1$$

#### 5.3 Part 3

1. AX = B has a solution  $\iff$  rank(A) = rank(C):

Note that we can only have rank  $C \ge \operatorname{rank} A$ .

 $\Longrightarrow$ :

Suppose that AX = B has a solution; then **b** is in the column space of A. But this says that

$$\operatorname{span}(\{\mathbf{a}_i\}) = \operatorname{span}(\{\mathbf{a}_i\} \bigcup \{\mathbf{b}\}),$$

where  $\mathbf{a}_i$  are the columns of A. But then taking dimensions on both sides yields rank  $A = \operatorname{rank} C$ , since the rank of the dimension of the column space.

⇐ :

Suppose rank  $A = \operatorname{rank} C$ ; then the

$$\dim \operatorname{span}(\{\mathbf{a}_i\}) = \dim \operatorname{span}(\{\mathbf{a}_i\} \bigcup \{\mathbf{b}\}),$$

which says that  $\mathbf{b}_i$  is in the column space of A, and thus AX = B has a solution.

2. The solution is unique  $\iff$  rank(A) = m.

 $\implies$ : To the contrapositive, Suppose rank(A) < m. Then by rank-nullity, dim ker A > 0, so there is a vector  $\mathbf{v} \neq 0$  such that  $A\mathbf{v} = 0$ . But noting that  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$  is always a solution to  $A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ , this yields two distinct solutions.

⇐=:

Suppose that rank(A) = m. Then by rank-nullity, dim ker A = 0, so ker  $A = \{0\}$ . Now suppose  $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2$  are potentially distinct solutions to  $A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$ .

Then,

$$A\mathbf{v}_1 = A\mathbf{v}_2 = \mathbf{b}$$

$$\Rightarrow A\mathbf{v}_1 - A\mathbf{v}_2 = \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0}$$

$$\Rightarrow A(\mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{v}_2) = \mathbf{0}$$

$$\Rightarrow \mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{v}_2 \in \ker A$$

$$\Rightarrow \mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{v}_2 = \mathbf{0}$$

$$\Rightarrow \mathbf{v}_1 = \mathbf{v}_2,$$

which shows that any solution is unique.

#### 5.4 Part 4

We want to show that  $A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$  has a nontrivial solution  $\iff$  rank(A) < m.

 $\implies$ : Suppose  $A\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}$  for some  $\mathbf{v} \neq 0$ . Then dim ker  $A \geq 1$ , and by rank nullity we must have  $m = \dim \ker A + \operatorname{rank}(A)$ . But this immediately forces  $\operatorname{rank}(A) \leq m - 1$ .

 $\Leftarrow$ : Suppose rank(A) < m. Then again by rank nullity, this forces dim ker  $A \ge 1$ , so A has a nontrivial kernel and thus there is a nontrivial solution to  $A\mathbf{x} = 0$ .

### 6 Problem 6