

- (1) Suppose V and W are finite-dimensional vector spaces, $T \in L(V, W)$, and define $\text{rank}(T) := \dim \text{range}(T)$. Prove that if $\text{rank}(T) = \dim W$ then T is surjective.

Proof. Suppose $\text{rank}(T) = \dim W$. We know that $\text{range}(T)$ is a subspace of W , so consider a basis of $\text{range}(T)$, which we can then extend to a basis of W . But since $\text{rank}(T) = \dim W$ these bases must have the same length, and so the basis of $\text{range}(T)$ is already a basis of W , whence $\text{range}(T) = W$. \square

- (2) Suppose U , V , and W are finite-dimensional vector spaces, $S \in L(U, V)$, and $T \in L(V, W)$.
- Show that $\text{rank}(TS) \leq \min(\text{rank}(S), \text{rank}(T))$. Give examples to show that both equality and strict inequality are possible. Can two nonzero maps have composition equal to zero?
 - If S has a right inverse, show that $\text{rank}(TS) = \text{rank}(T)$.
 - If T has a left inverse, show that $\text{rank}(TS) = \text{rank}(S)$.
 - Prove that the rank of a matrix (i.e., the rank of the underlying linear map) is not more than the number of rows or the number of columns of the matrix.
 - A matrix is said to have *maximal rank* if the rank is equal to the minimum of the number of rows and the number of columns. Show that a matrix has maximal rank if and only if it is either injective or surjective.

Proof. (a) It suffices to show that $\text{rank}(TS) \leq \text{rank}(S)$ and $\text{rank}(TS) \leq \text{rank}(T)$. The latter follows directly from $\text{range}(TS) \subseteq \text{range}(T)$ (which we know by adapting the previous homework #4). To prove the former, note that

$$\dim U = \dim \text{null}(TS) + \text{rank}(TS) \quad \text{and} \quad \dim U = \dim \text{null}(S) + \text{rank}(S).$$

Again by adaptation of the previous homework #4, we know that $\text{null}(TS) \subseteq \text{null}(S)$ and thus $\text{rank}(S) \geq \text{rank}(TS)$. An example that shows that $\text{rank}(TS) = \min(\text{rank}(S), \text{rank}(T))$ is possible is given by $S = T = \text{identity map on an arbitrary vector space } U = V = W$. An example that shows that $\text{rank}(TS) < \min(\text{rank}(S), \text{rank}(T))$ is possible is given by $U = V = W = \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbf{R})$ and $S = T = \frac{d}{dx}$.

- (b) Suppose SR is the identity map. By using part (a) twice,

$$\text{rank}(T) \geq \text{rank}(TS) \geq \text{rank}(TSR) = \text{rank}(T),$$

and so we must have equality all around. (One can also argue via surjectivity of S .)

- (c) Suppose LT is the identity map. By using part (a) twice,

$$\text{rank}(S) \geq \text{rank}(TS) \geq \text{rank}(LTS) = \text{rank}(S).$$

(One can also argue via injectivity of T .)

- (d) The rank of a linear map M is the dimension of $\text{range}(M)$, which can be at most the dimension of the codomain of M , and that is the number of rows of the matrix corresponding to M . By our dimension–null space–rank theorem, the rank of M is also at most the dimension of the domain of M , which equals the number of columns of the matrix corresponding to M .
- (e) Suppose the linear map underlying M is from V to W . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rank}(M) = \# \text{ rows of } M &\iff \dim \text{range}(M) = \dim W \\ &\iff \text{range}(M) = W, \end{aligned}$$

i.e., M is surjective, and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rank}(M) = \# \text{ columns of } M &\iff \dim \text{range}(M) = \dim V \\ &\iff \dim \text{null}(M) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

i.e., M is injective. \square

- (3) Consider the linear operator $\frac{d}{dx} \in L(\mathcal{P}_n(\mathbf{F}))$ given by differentiation. Compute the matrix of $\frac{d}{dx}$ using the basis

- $1, x, x^2, \dots, x^n$;
- $\begin{pmatrix} x \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} x \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \dots, \begin{pmatrix} x \\ n \end{pmatrix}$.

Solution. (a) Since $\frac{d}{dx}x^k = kx^{k-1}$, the matrix of $\frac{d}{dx}$ with respect to the monomial basis has entries $a_{k-1,k} = k$ for $2 \leq k \leq n$ and $a_{jk} = 0$ otherwise.

(b) We claim that

$$\frac{d}{dx} \binom{x}{k} = \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{(-1)^{j-1}}{j} \binom{x}{k-j}$$

(which is really a finite sum, as $\binom{x}{j} = 0$ when $j < 0$ by definition) and prove this by induction on k . The base case $k = 0$ just says $0 = 0$. The induction step follows with

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dx} \binom{x}{k} &= \frac{d}{dx} \left(\binom{x}{k-1} + \binom{x-1}{k-1} \right) \\ &= \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{(-1)^{j-1}}{j} \binom{x}{k-1-j} + \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{(-1)^{j-1}}{j} \binom{x-1}{k-1-j} \\ &= \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{(-1)^{j-1}}{j} \left(\binom{x}{k-1-j} + \binom{x-1}{k-1-j} \right) \\ &= \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{(-1)^{j-1}}{j} \binom{x}{k-j}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the matrix of $\frac{d}{dx}$ with respect to the binomial-coefficient basis has entries

$$a_{jk} = \begin{cases} \frac{(-1)^{k-j-1}}{k-j} & \text{if } j < k, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad \square$$

- (4) Suppose V is a finite-dimensional vector space and $S, T \in L(V)$. Prove that ST is invertible if and only if both S and T are invertible. Give an example that shows that this statement is not true for infinite-dimensional vector spaces.

Proof. Suppose ST is invertible and so, in particular, $\text{null}(ST) = \{\mathbf{0}\}$ and $\text{range}(ST) = V$. We have shown in a previous homework that $\text{null}(T) \subseteq \text{null}(ST) = \{\mathbf{0}\}$, and so T is injective and (by a theorem from class) invertible. We have also shown that $\text{range}(S) \supseteq \text{range}(ST) = V$, and so S is surjective and (by the same theorem) invertible.

An example of how this statement can fail if V is infinite dimensional is given by $V = \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{R})$, $S(p(x)) = p'(x)$, and $T(p(x)) = \int_0^x p(t) dt$: by the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus, ST is the identity map; however, S is not injective. \square

- (5) Suppose V and W are finite-dimensional vector spaces, and U is a subspace of V . Let $R : L(V, W) \rightarrow L(U, W)$ be the *restriction map* defined by $(R(T))(u) = T(u)$.
- (a) Show that R is linear.
 - (b) Show that R is surjective.
 - (c) If U is a proper subspace of V , show that the restriction map is not injective.

Proof. (a) Given $S, T \in L(V, W)$ and $a \in \mathbf{F}$, we have for any $u \in U$

$$R(aS + T)(u) = aS(u) + T(u) = aR(S)(u) + R(T)(u).$$

- (b) Let $(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_m)$ be a basis of U , and extend it to a basis $(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_m, \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n)$ of V . Given $T \in L(U, W)$, define $S \in L(V, W)$ through

$$\mathbf{v} = \sum_{j=1}^m a_j \mathbf{u}_j + \sum_{j=1}^n b_j \mathbf{v}_j \quad \mapsto \quad S(\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{j=1}^m a_j T(\mathbf{u}_j).$$

This map S is by definition linear, and $R(S) = T$. Hence R is surjective.

- (c) Let $m := \dim U$, $n := \dim V$, and $k := \dim W$. Then we know from a theorem in class that $\dim L(V, W) = nk$ and $\dim L(U, W) = mk$. If $U \subsetneq V$ then $m < n$, and so $\text{rank}(R)$ (which is at most $\dim L(U, W)$) cannot be equal $\dim L(V, W)$, i.e., R cannot be surjective. \square