## A MAXIMIZATION PROBLEM AND ITS APPLICATION TO CANONICAL CORRELATION

by

Morris L. Eaton

Technical Report No. 233

۱ ۱

نے،

September, 1974

Department of Statistics University of Minnesota

## Abstract

Let  $\Sigma$  be an  $n \ge n$  positive definite matrix with eigenvalues  $\lambda_1 \ge \lambda_2 \ge \ldots \ge \lambda_n > 0$  and let  $M = \{x, y \mid x \in \mathbb{R}^n, y \in \mathbb{R}^n, x \neq 0, y \neq 0, x \le y = 0\}$ . Then  $\sup_{x,y \in M} \frac{x \ge y}{\sqrt{x \ge x \cdot y \ge y}} = \frac{\lambda_1 - \lambda_n}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_n}$ .

If  $\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{11} & \Sigma_{12} \\ \Sigma_{21} & \Sigma_{22} \end{pmatrix}$  is a partitioning of  $\Sigma$ , let  $\theta_1$  be the largest

canonical correlation associated with the above partitioning. The above result yields  $\theta_1 \leq \frac{\lambda_1 - \lambda_n}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_n}$ .

Let  $\Sigma$  be an n x n positive definite matrix with eigenvalues  $\lambda_1 \ge \lambda_2 \ge \ldots \ge \lambda_n > 0$  and associated eigenvectors  $x_1, \ldots, x_n, ||x_i|| = 1$ ,  $i = 1, \ldots, n, x_i, x_j = 0$  if  $i \ne j$ . The main result of this note is <u>Theorem 1</u>: Let

 $M = \{x, y | x \in \mathbb{R}^n, y \in \mathbb{R}^n, x \neq 0, y \neq 0, x'y = 0\}.$  Then

(1) 
$$\sup_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{M}} \frac{\mathbf{x} \Sigma \mathbf{y}}{\sqrt{\mathbf{x} \Sigma \mathbf{x} \mathbf{y} \Sigma \mathbf{y}}} = \frac{\lambda_1 - \lambda_n}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_n}.$$

Equality in (1) is achieved for  $x = x_1 + x_n$  and  $y = x_1 - x_n$ . The proof of Theorem 1 is based on the following two lemmas. Lemma 1: Suppose  $w_0 \in R^n$  and  $v_0 \in R^n$  are both non-zero. Then

(2) 
$$\sup_{\|\mathbf{u}\|=1}^{\sup} (\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{0})^{2} = \|\mathbf{v}_{0}\|^{2} - \frac{(\mathbf{w}_{0} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{0})^{2}}{\|\mathbf{w}_{0}\|^{2}}$$

<u>Proof</u>: Let  $P = I_n - w_0 w_0'$  so P is the orthogonal projection onto the  $\frac{\|w_0\|^2}{\|w_0\|^2}$ 

orthogonal complement of w. Then

(3) 
$$\sup_{\|u\|=1}^{(u'v_o)^2} = \sup_{\|u\|=1}^{(uv_o)^2} ((Pu)'v_o)^2$$
$$= \sup_{\|u\|=1}^{(u'w_o=0)} (u'Pv_o)^2 \le \|Pv_o\|^2$$
$$= \sup_{\|u\|=1}^{(u'w_o=0)} (u'Pv_o)^2 \le \|Pv_o\|^2$$

by the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality. But equality in the above inequality is

- 1 -

attained by setting  $u = \frac{Pv_o}{\|Pv_o\|}$  when  $Pv_o \neq 0$  (the case of  $Pv_o = 0$  is obvious). Noting that  $\|Pv_o\|^2 = \|v_o\|^2 - \frac{(w_o v_o)^2}{\|w_o\|^2}$ , the proof is complete.

Lemma 2: Suppose X is a random variable with  $Pr\{m \le X \le M\} = 1$  where  $m \ge 0$ . Then

(4) 
$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon x \varepsilon x^{-1}} \geq \frac{\mu_{mM}}{(m+M)^2}$$

<u>Proof</u>: This follows immediately from Lemma 2.2 in Marshall and Olkin (1964) by setting (in the Olkin-Marshall notation)  $Z \equiv 1$ , s = 1 and r = -1. Of course, (4) is just the Kantorovich Inequality.

<u>Proof of Theorem 1</u>: Fix  $x \neq 0$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Then

(5) 
$$\sup_{\substack{\mathbf{y}\neq\mathbf{0}\\\mathbf{x}^{'}\mathbf{y}=\mathbf{0}}} \left(\frac{\mathbf{x}^{'}\sum\mathbf{y}}{\sqrt{\mathbf{y}^{'}\sum\mathbf{y}}}\right)^{2} = \sup_{\substack{\mathbf{y}\neq\mathbf{0}\\\mathbf{x}^{'}\sum^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{y}=\mathbf{0}}} \left(\frac{\mathbf{x}^{'}\sum^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{y}}{\sqrt{\mathbf{y}^{'}\mathbf{y}}}\right)^{2} =$$

$$\sup_{\substack{\|y\|=1\\ (\sum^{\frac{1}{2}} x) y=0}} [(\sum^{\frac{1}{2}} x) y]^2 = \|\sum^{\frac{1}{2}} x\|^2 - \frac{((\sum^{\frac{1}{2}} x) \sum^{\frac{1}{2}} x)^2}{\|\sum^{\frac{1}{2}} x\|^2} =$$

$$x^{2} \sum x - \frac{(x^{2}x)^{2}}{x^{2} \sum^{1} x}$$

where the next to the last equality follows from Lemma 1 with  $v_0 = \sum^{\frac{1}{2}} x$ and  $w_0 = \sum^{-\frac{1}{2}} x$ . Here,  $\sum^{\frac{1}{2}}$  is the unique positive definite square root of  $\sum$  and  $\sum^{-\frac{1}{2}} \equiv (\sum^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-1}$ . Thus,

کی

(6) 
$$\sup_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{M}} \frac{(\mathbf{x}^* \Sigma \mathbf{y})^2}{\mathbf{x}^* \Sigma \mathbf{x} \mathbf{y}^* \Sigma \mathbf{y}} = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \neq 0} \frac{1}{\mathbf{x}^* \Sigma \mathbf{x}} \left( \mathbf{x}^* \Sigma \mathbf{x} - \frac{(\mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{x})^2}{\mathbf{x}^* \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{x}} \right) =$$

Now, write  $\sum = \Gamma D \Gamma'$  where  $\Gamma$  is an  $n \ge n$  orthogonal matrix and D is a diagonal matrix with diagonal elements  $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n$  - the eigenvalues of  $\sum$ . Then, with  $w = \Gamma x$ ,

(7) 
$$\inf_{\|\mathbf{x}\|=1} \frac{1}{\mathbf{x}' \sum \mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}' \sum^{-1} \mathbf{x}} = \inf_{\|\mathbf{w}\|=1} \frac{1}{\mathbf{w}' D \mathbf{w} \mathbf{w}' D^{-1} \mathbf{w}} =$$

$$\| \mathbf{w} \| = 1 \quad \frac{1}{(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\mathbf{w}_i|^2 \lambda_i) (\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\mathbf{w}_i|^2 \lambda_i^{-1})}$$

Since ||w|| = 1,  $\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i^2 = 1$ . Denoting by X the random variable which takes on the value  $\lambda_i$  with probability  $w_i^2$ , we see that for all w, ||w|| = 1,

(8) 
$$\frac{1}{(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\lambda_{i}w_{i}^{2})(\sum_{i=1}^{n}w_{i}^{2}\lambda_{i}^{-1})} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon x \varepsilon x^{-1}} \geq \frac{4\lambda_{i}\lambda_{n}}{(\lambda_{i}+\lambda_{n})^{2}}$$

by Lemma 2 with  $m = \lambda_n$  and  $M = \lambda_1$ .

- 3 -

Thus, combining (6), (7) and (8),

(9) 
$$\sup_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{M}} \frac{(\mathbf{x} \cdot \Sigma \mathbf{y})^2}{\mathbf{x} \cdot \Sigma \mathbf{x} \mathbf{y} \cdot \Sigma \mathbf{y}} = 1 - \inf_{\|\mathbf{x}\|=1} \frac{1}{\mathbf{x} \cdot \Sigma \mathbf{x} \mathbf{x} \cdot \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{x}} \leq 1 - \frac{4 \lambda_1 \lambda_n}{(\lambda_1 + \lambda_n)^2} = \frac{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_n)^2}{(\lambda_1 + \lambda_n)^2} .$$

Taking square roots, we now have the inequality

(10) 
$$\sup_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{M}} \frac{\mathbf{x} \sum \mathbf{y}}{\sqrt{\mathbf{x} \sum \mathbf{x} \mathbf{y} \sum \mathbf{y}}} \leq \frac{\lambda_1 - \lambda_n}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_n}$$

However, setting  $x = x_1 + x_n$  and  $y = x_1 - x_n$ , we see that in (10), we actually achieve equality. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

<u>Corollary 1</u>: Let  $\sum$  and A be two n x n positive definite matrices and let  $M_A = \{x, y | x \in \mathbb{R}^n, y \in \mathbb{R}^n, x \neq 0, y \neq 0, x' Ay = 0\}$ . Then

(11) 
$$\sup_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y} \in M_{A}} \frac{\mathbf{x} \sum \mathbf{y}}{\sqrt{\mathbf{x} \sum \mathbf{x} \mathbf{y} \sum \mathbf{y}}} = \frac{\mu_{1} - \mu_{n}}{\mu_{1} + \mu_{n}}$$

where  $\mu_1$  is the largest eigenvalue of  $A^{-1}\sum$  and  $\mu_n$  is the smallest eigenvalue of  $A^{-1}\sum$  .

Proof: This follows immediately from Theorem 1.

- 4 -

Consider 
$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{11} & \Sigma_{12} \\ \Sigma_{21} & \Sigma_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$
 where  $\Sigma_{11}$  is  $p \ge p$  and  $\Sigma_{22}$  is  $q \ge q$ 

with p + q = n. As is well known, (Anderson (1958), p 289 - or Eaton (1972) Chapter 10) the largest canonical correlation coefficient, say  $\theta_1$ , is given by

(12) 
$$\theta_{1} = \sup_{\substack{0 \neq a \in \mathbb{R}^{p} \\ 0 \neq b \in \mathbb{R}^{q}}} \frac{a \sum_{12} b}{\sqrt{a \sum_{11} a b \sum_{22} b}}$$

<u>Theorem 2</u>: For any partitioning of  $\Sigma$  ,

(13) 
$$\theta_1 \leq \frac{\lambda_1 - \lambda_n}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_n}$$

where  $\lambda_1 \ge \ldots \ge \lambda_n > 0$  are the eigenvalues of  $\sum_{a}$ <u>Proof</u>: For  $a \in \mathbb{R}^p$  and  $b \in \mathbb{R}^q$ , set  $a^* = \binom{a}{o} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $b^* = \binom{o}{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Then we have

(14) 
$$\theta_{1} = \sup_{\substack{0 \neq a^{*} \in \mathbb{R}^{n} \\ 0 \neq b^{*} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}}} \frac{a^{*} \sum b^{*}}{\sqrt{a^{*} \sum a^{*} b^{*} \sum b^{*}}}$$

$$\leq \sup_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{M}} \frac{\mathbf{x} \cdot \sum \mathbf{y}}{\sqrt{\mathbf{x} \cdot \sum \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y} \cdot \sum \mathbf{y}}} = \frac{\lambda_1 - \lambda_n}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_n}$$

by Theorem 1. The inequality holds because  $a^*, b^* = 0$  so the second

sup is over a larger set of vectors than is the first sup. The proof is complete.

The inequality in (13) was also established by Haberman (1974) using a different method.

To show that the inequality (13) is sharp, consider  $p \le q$  and (15)  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} = \begin{pmatrix} I_{p} & (D_{\theta} & 0) \\ I_{p} & (D_{\theta} & 0) \\ \begin{pmatrix} D_{\theta} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} & I_{q} \end{pmatrix}$ 

where  $D_{\theta}$ :  $p \ge p$  is diagonal with diagonal entries  $1 \ge \theta_1 \ge \theta_2 \ge \dots \ge \theta_p \ge 0$ . For  $\Sigma$  partitioned as in (15),  $\theta_1$  is the largest canonical correlation and it is not hard to show that  $\lambda_1 = 1 + \theta_1$  and  $\lambda_n = 1 - \theta_1$ . Hence  $\theta_1 = (\lambda_1 - \lambda_n)/(\lambda_1 + \lambda_n)$  so (13) is sharp. One can also show that when  $p \ge 2$  and for  $\Sigma$  given in (15), we have  $\theta_2 = (\lambda_2 - \lambda_{n-1})/(\lambda_2 + \lambda_{n-1})$ . This might lead one to conjecture that for general  $\Sigma$  and  $p \ge 2$ ,  $q \ge 2$ , the inequality  $\theta_2 \le (\lambda_2 - \lambda_{n-1})/(\lambda_2 + \lambda_{n-1})$  holds. However, it is possible to construct a  $4 \ge 4 \Sigma$  where the inequality does not hold.

## References

- Anderson, T. W. (1958). An Introduction to Multivariate Statistical Analysis. Wiley, New York.
- [2] Eaton, M. L. (1972). Multivariate Statistical Analysis. University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- [3] Haberman, S. [1974]. How much do Gauss-Markov and Least Squares Estimates Differ? A Coordinate-free Approach. University of Chicago preprint.
- [4] Marshall, A. W. and Olkin, I. (1964). Reversal of the Lyaponov,
  Hölder, and Minkowski Inequalities and other Extensions of the
  Kantorovich Inequality. J. of Math. Anal. and Appl. 8, p. 503-14.