ON THE EIGENVECTOR BELONGING TO THE MAXIMAL ROOT OF A NON-NEGATIVE MATRIX

by A. M. OSTROWSKI (Received 16th March 1960)

1. By a theorem of Perron, a non-negative irreducible $(n \times n)$ matrix $A = (a_{\mu\nu})$ has a *positive* fundamental root σ , the "maximal root of A", such that the moduli of all other eigenvalues of A do not exceed σ . If we put

 σ lies between R and r. Since σ is not changed if A is transformed by a positive diagonal matrix $D(p_1, ..., p_n)$, σ lies also between the expressions

By a theorem of Frobenius, to σ as an eigenvalue of A belongs a *positive* eigenvector $\xi = (x_1, ..., x_n)$, satisfying

$$\sigma x_{\mu} = \sum_{\nu=1}^{n} a_{\mu\nu} x_{\nu} (\mu = 1, ..., n). \qquad (3)$$

For certain purposes a good estimate of the quotient

is required. In what follows we shall improve the estimates which we gave for γ in 1952 for *positive* matrices (3) † and also an upper estimate of H. Schneider (4) for non-negative matrices.[‡] Our results are contained in (10), (11), (13), (14), (22), (23) and (29)-(33).

2. After making a permissible cogredient permutation of indices and a convenient norming of ξ , we can assume that

Choosing another norming we obtain an eigenvector $\eta = (y_1, ..., y_n)$ for which

$$y_1 + \ldots + y_n = 1; y_1 \ge y_2 \ge \ldots \ge y_n > 0.$$
 (6)

† Refining a method used previously by Ledermann (2) in order to obtain an estimate of σ . This estimate was improved by A. Brauer (1), who did not, however, discuss γ .

 \ddagger This estimate, however, was the first solution to the problem of estimating γ for non-negative matrices.

We have obviously

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{x_n} = \frac{y_1}{y_n}.$$
 (7)

We denote by κ_1 , κ_2 , *m*, *M* respectively the smallest $a_{\mu\mu}$, the smallest $a_{\mu\nu}(\mu \neq \nu)$, the smallest $a_{\mu\nu}(\mu, \nu = 1, ..., n)$ and the greatest $a_{\mu\nu}(\mu, \nu = 1, ..., n)$, i.e.

$$\kappa_{1} = \min_{\mu} a_{\mu\mu}, \kappa_{2} = \min a_{\mu\nu} (\mu \neq \nu), \ m = \min_{\mu, \nu} a_{\mu\nu} = \min(\kappa_{1}, \kappa_{2}), \ M = \max_{\mu, \nu} a_{\mu\nu}.$$
(8)

In the case of a non-negative matrix we denote by κ the smallest *positive* $a_{\mu\nu}(\mu \neq \nu)$ and by $\kappa^{(\mu)}$ the smallest *positive* $a_{\mu\nu}(\nu \neq \mu)$ in the μ th row. $\kappa^{(\mu)}$ exists as A is irreducible.

3. Assuming that A is positive we have from

and from (6), that $M \ge \sigma y_{\mu} \ge m$, whence, since $\gamma = \frac{\sigma y_1}{\sigma y_n}$,

$$\gamma \leq \frac{M}{m}, \dots, \dots$$
 (10)

a particularly simple estimate for *positive* matrices.

This result can be improved to a certain extent and generalised to the case of non-negative matrices with $a_{\mu\nu} > 0$ ($\mu \neq \nu$) if we use the values of κ_1 and κ_2 . We prove in this case, if $\kappa_1 \leq \kappa_2$, that

which is a better estimate than (10) and also holds for $\kappa_1 = 0$.

A still more precise result is obtained if we introduce

$$M_1 = \max_{\mu} a_{\mu\mu}, \quad M_2 = \max_{\mu \neq \nu} a_{\mu\nu}.$$
 (12)

Then we prove that

$$\gamma \leq \frac{\max\left(M_1 + \kappa_2 - \kappa_1, M_2\right)}{\kappa_2}.$$
 (13)

(11) is obviously contained in (13) and it suffices to prove (13).

If we add to each $a_{\mu\mu}$ the quantity $\kappa_2 - \kappa_1$, then a new matrix *B* is obtained, for which σ is replaced by $\sigma + \kappa_2 - \kappa_1$, but for which all y_v in (9) remain unchanged; therefore γ is unchanged too. On the other hand, for the matrix *B*, κ_1 and M_1 become κ_2 and $M_1 + \kappa_2 - \kappa_1$ respectively, while κ_2 and M_2 remain unchanged. Further, *m* becomes κ_2 , and *M* becomes $\max(M_1 + \kappa_2 - \kappa_1, M_2)$. (13) then follows immediately from (10) applied to *B*.

108

4. We sometimes obtain a more precise result if we use (12) directly in (9). Then we have

$$\sigma y_{\mu} \leq M_1 y_{\mu} + M_2 (1 - y_{\mu}), \quad (\sigma + M_2 - M_1) y_{\mu} \leq M_2$$

and

$$\sigma y_{\mu} \ge \kappa_1 y_{\mu} + \kappa_2 (1 - y_{\mu}), \quad (\sigma + \kappa_2 - \kappa_1) y_{\mu} \ge \kappa_2$$

and therefore

Here, the second fraction is increasing or decreasing with σ according as $(M_2 - M_1) - (\kappa_2 - \kappa_1)$ is positive or negative. In the first case σ can be replaced by any *upper bound* as, for instance, R_p . In the second case we have to replace σ by a lower bound such as r_p .

5. We consider now an irreducible *non-negative* matrix A for which κ_2 could also be zero. We have from (3) that, for an $a_{\mu\nu} \neq 0$, $\mu \neq \nu$,

$$(\sigma - a_{\mu\mu})x_{\mu} \ge a_{\mu\nu}x_{\nu} \ge \kappa^{(\mu)}x_{\nu} \quad (a_{\mu\nu} \ne 0, \ \mu \ne \nu). \qquad (15)$$

We now assert that there exists a sequence of indices, $n = \mu_0, \mu_1, \mu_2, ..., \mu_{k-1}$, such that $n \neq \mu_1 \neq \mu_2 \neq ... \neq \mu_{k-1} \neq 1$ and

$$a_{n\mu_1}a_{\mu_1\mu_2}...a_{\mu_{k-1}1} \neq 0.$$
(16)

Indeed, call an index τ connected with *n* if either $\tau = n$ or there exists a "chain" $a_{n\mu_1}, a_{\mu_1\mu_2}, ..., a_{\mu_s\tau}$ of positive elements of *A*, and consider the set of all different indices $\tau_1 = n, \tau_2, ..., \tau_s$ connected with *n*. If 1 is not connected with *n*, then denote the non-empty set of indices among 1, 2, ..., n-1 not connected with *n*, by $\lambda_1 = 1, \lambda_2, ..., \lambda_{n-s}$. Then we must have

$$a_{\mu\nu} = 0 \begin{pmatrix} \mu = \tau_1, \dots, \tau_s \\ \nu = \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{n-s} \end{pmatrix}$$

and A is not irreducible.

We can therefore assume (16) and have from (15), for $\mu = \mu_0 = n$, μ_1 , ..., $\mu_{k-1} \neq 1$, that

If we put now

we have from (17) that

$$x_{\mu_{t+1}}/x_{\mu_t} \leq \phi_{\mu_t}(t=0, 1, ..., k-1).$$
 (19)

6. Multiplying all inequalities in (19) and using (5), we obtain

$$\frac{1}{x_n} \leq \prod_{t=0}^{k-1} \phi_{\mu_t}.$$
 (20)

Here we have $k \leq n-1$ and all μ_t are distinct. We therefore obtain from (7) the result:

If the expressions $\frac{\sigma - a_{\mu\mu}}{\kappa^{(\mu)}}$ in decreasing order are denoted by

then

$$\gamma \leq \psi_1 \prod_{\nu=2}^{n-1} \max(1, \psi_{\nu}).$$
(22)

Introducing here κ_1 and κ we obtain the bound found by H. Schneider (4), namely,

since, as is easy to see from (15) for $\mu = 1$, $\frac{\sigma - \kappa_1}{\kappa} \ge 1$.

7. We show now by a fairly general example that in (22) and (23) the equality sign can certainly occur. Consider, for a sequence of positive numbers

and a $\kappa_1 > 0$, the non-negative irreducible matrix

κ_1	0	0	•	•	•	• •	$\kappa^{(1)}$)
	κ_1							
0	$\kappa^{(3)}$	κ_1	•	•	•		0	,(25)
• •	• •	• •	•	•	•	• •	•	
0	0	0				к ⁽ⁿ⁾	κ_1	J

then equations (3) become

$$x_n(\sigma-\kappa_1)=\kappa^{(n)}x_{n-1}.$$

Since all x_v are positive, (24) gives $(\sigma - \kappa_1)^n = \kappa^{(1)} \kappa^{(2)} \dots \kappa^{(n)} = 1$,

$$\sigma - \kappa_1 = 1, \ \sigma = \kappa_1 + 1, \ \phi_{\mu} = \frac{1}{\kappa^{(\mu)}}$$
(27)

and therefore by (24) and (4)

110

THE MAXIMAL ROOT OF A NON-NEGATIVE MATRIX 111

If we here take $\kappa^{(2)} = \kappa^{(3)} = \dots = \kappa^{(n)} = \kappa$, then $\gamma = \kappa^{-(n-1)}$ and by (27) the equality sign holds in (23).

8. We now choose μ in (3) such that $R = R^{(\mu)}$. Then by (5)

$$x_{\mu}(\sigma - a_{\mu\mu}) \ge a_{\mu 1} + (R - a_{\mu\mu} - a_{\mu 1})x_n = (R - a_{\mu\mu})x_n + (1 - x_n)a_{\mu 1},$$

where for $\mu = 1$ we write 0 for $a_{\mu 1}$. In any case it follows that

$$x_{\mu}(\sigma - a_{\mu\mu}) \ge (R - a_{\mu\mu})x_{n}, \ \sigma - a_{\mu\mu} \ge (R - a_{\mu\mu})x_{n}, \ x_{n} \le \frac{\sigma - a_{\mu\mu}}{R - a_{\mu\mu}}.$$

As $\sigma/R \leq 1$, we do not decrease the right-hand bound by replacing $a_{\mu\mu}$ by κ_1 and so

$$x_n \leq \frac{\sigma - \kappa_1}{R - \kappa_1}, \quad \gamma \geq \frac{R - \kappa_1}{\sigma - \kappa_1}.$$
 (29)

Here σ can be replaced by any upper bound, for instance an R_p . On the other hand, taking μ in (3) such that $r = R^{(\mu)}$, we have

$$x_{\mu}(\sigma-a_{\mu\mu}) \leq r-a_{\mu\mu}-a_{\mu n}(1-x_n),$$

where for $\mu = n$ we write 0 for $a_{\mu n}$. In any case it follows that

$$x_{\mu}(\sigma - a_{\mu\mu}) \leq r - a_{\mu\mu}, \ x_n(\sigma - a_{\mu\mu}) \leq r - a_{\mu\mu}, \ x_n \leq \frac{r - a_{\mu\mu}}{\sigma - a_{\mu\mu}}$$

As $r/\sigma \leq 1$, we do not decrease the right-hand bound replacing $a_{\mu\mu}$ by κ_1 and hence

$$x_n \leq \frac{r-\kappa_1}{\sigma-\kappa_1}, \quad \gamma \geq \frac{\sigma-\kappa_1}{r-\kappa_1}.$$
 (30)

Here σ can be replaced by any lower bound, for instance r_p .

Multiplying (29) and (30) we obtain

$$x_n \leq \sqrt{\frac{r-\kappa_1}{R-\kappa_1}}, \quad \gamma \geq \sqrt{\frac{R-\kappa_1}{r-\kappa_1}}.$$
 (31)

The inequalities (29), (30), (31) hold, by continuity, in the case of non-negative irreducible matrices.

In particular we obtain the estimate depending only on R and r, namely,

$$x_n \leq \sqrt{\frac{r}{R}}, \quad \gamma \geq \sqrt{\frac{R}{r}}.$$
 (32)

9. We now use (3) for $\mu = n$. Then it follows by (5), if $\kappa_2 > 0$, that

$$x_n(\sigma - a_{nn}) \ge a_{n1} + (R^{(n)} - a_{nn} - a_{n1})x_n = (R^{(n)} - a_{nn})x_n + a_{n1}(1 - x_n).$$

The expression on the right is $\geq (r-a_{nn})x_n + \kappa_2(1-x_n)$, and hence

$$x_n(\sigma-a_{nn}) \ge x_n(r-a_{nn}-\kappa_2)+\kappa_2,$$

from which we obtain

here σ can be replaced by any upper bound, for instance, R_p .

Acknowledgment

This work has been sponsored by the U.S. Army under contract No. DA-11-022-ORD-2059, and I am indebted to Dr H. Schneider for some discussions on it.

REFERENCES

(1) A. T. BRAUER, The theorems of Ledermann and Ostrowski on positive matrices, *Duke Math. J.*, 24 (1957), 265-274.

(2) W. LEDERMANN, Bounds for the greatest latent root of a positive matrix, Journal London Math. Soc., 25 (1950), 265-268.

(3) A. M. OSTROWSKI, Bounds for the greatest latent root of a positive matrix, *Journal London Math. Soc.*, 27 (1952), 253-256.

(4) H. SCHNEIDER, Note on the fundamental theorem on irreducible non-negative matrices, *Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc.*, 11 (2), 127-130.

Certenago/Montagnola, Ti. Switzerland

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0013091500025293 Published online by Cambridge University Press

112