

1998

# The Adjoint Alternative for Matrix Operators

C. H. Cooke  
*Old Dominion University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/mathstat\\_fac\\_pubs](https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/mathstat_fac_pubs)

 Part of the [Applied Mathematics Commons](#), and the [Computer Sciences Commons](#)

---

## Repository Citation

Cooke, C. H., "The Adjoint Alternative for Matrix Operators" (1998). *Mathematics & Statistics Faculty Publications*. 134.  
[https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/mathstat\\_fac\\_pubs/134](https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/mathstat_fac_pubs/134)

## Original Publication Citation

Cooke, C. H. (1998). The adjoint alternative for matrix operators. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, 35(5), 79-81.  
doi:10.1016/s0898-1221(98)00006-6



# The Adjoint Alternative for Matrix Operators

C. H. COOKE

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Old Dominion University  
Norfolk, VA 23529-0077, U.S.A.

(Received March 1997; accepted April 1997)

**Abstract**—The following inverse problem is considered: given a matrix  $B$  of rank  $r$ , does there exist a matrix  $A$  such that

$$B = T(A) = \text{adjoint}(A)$$

where the classical adjoint operation is intended? Conditions are determined on the rank of  $B$  which decides whether or not  $B$  lies in the range of the matrix adjoint operator.

**Keywords**—Adjoint alternative, Matrix range, Matrix operator, Adjoint range, Range characterization.

## INTRODUCTION

Consider the following problem, posed by Wardlaw [1] in *Mathematics Magazine*. Show that

$$E = \begin{bmatrix} 5 & 5 & 2 \\ 5 & 5 & 2 \\ 1 & 1 & 6 \end{bmatrix} \quad (1)$$

is not the classical adjoint of any matrix with real entries.

As shall be established, for a given matrix  $B$  whose rank is  $R_B$ , the inverse problem

$$B = T(A) = \text{adj}(A), \quad (2)$$

where  $A, B$  are  $n \times n$  matrices, may have no solution, for  $A$  real or complex. Indeed, the counterexample (1) indicates that the range of  $T$  does not cover the whole space  $S^n$  of  $n \times n$  matrices. The purpose of this note is to characterize the range of  $T$ , through a careful study of (2) by means of the adjoint property

$$AB = BA = \alpha I, \quad \alpha = \det(A). \quad (3)$$

The general conclusion is that there are “more”  $B$  excluded from range ( $T$ ) than are included.

**THEOREM I. THE ADJOINT ALTERNATIVE.** *As regards solutions of the inverse problem (2), the following trichotomy holds.*

- (i) If  $R_B = n$ , equation (2) has  $n - 1$  solutions, some of which are complex.
- (ii) If the incompatibility condition

$$1 < R_B < n \quad (4)$$

holds, then equation (2) has no solution.

- (iii) If  $R_B \leq 1$ , equation (2) has infinitely many solutions, except when  $B = 0$  and  $n < 3$ . In this case  $A = 0$  is the only solution.

## PROOF OF THE ADJOINT ALTERNATIVE.

I. Nonsingular  $B$ . In this case, equation (3) implies that

$$\det(A) = \det(B)^m, \quad m = \frac{1}{n-1}. \quad (5)$$

For each root  $\alpha_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$  of  $\det(B)$ , equation (2) determines a unique matrix

$$A = \alpha_i B^{-1} \quad (6)$$

which satisfies equation (2). For complex  $\alpha$  and real  $B$ ,  $A$  is complex.

II. Incompatible  $B$ . For  $B$  satisfying the incompatibility condition (4), a search for solutions  $A$  of (3) which additionally satisfy (2) is necessary. However, if  $BA = 0$ , then  $A$  can have at most  $n-2$  linearly independent columns. Therefore,  $T(A) = 0$ . Thus, equation (2) has no solutions.

IIIa.  $B = 0$ . If  $n > 2$ , any square matrix  $A$  of rank  $R_A < n-1$  satisfies equation (2). However, if  $n \geq 2$ ,  $A = 0$  is the only solution of (2). Thus, an infinite number of solutions exist when  $n > 2$ .

IIIb.  $\text{Rank}(B) = 1$ . This is the interesting case, as the proof is more difficult. Looking for solutions of  $BA = 0$ , the columns of  $A$  will be linear combinations of the  $n-1$  linearly independent null vectors of  $B$ , which are denoted by  $x_1, \dots, \bar{x}_{n-1}$ . Each linear combination can involve  $n-1$  free parameters. Thus the further requirement that  $AB = 0$  appears to lead to a system of  $n^2$  equations in  $n^2 - n$  unknowns, about which little can be said. However, a closer look leads to more modest requirements.

LEMMA 1. Let  $A, B$  denote  $n \times n$  matrices, with  $R_B = 1$ . Then  $AB = 0$  if and only if  $A\bar{x} = 0$  for every invariant vector  $B$  which corresponds to a nonzero eigenvalue.

PROOF. If  $A = 0$ , the result is trivial; therefore, assume  $n > 1$ . As  $R_B = 1$ ,  $\lambda = 0$  is an eigenvalue of geometric and algebraic multiplicity  $n-1$ , with the null vectors  $\bar{x}$ ; serving as a corresponding set of linearly independent eigenvectors. Complete this set with an eigenvector  $\bar{x}_n$  which corresponds to the one nonzero eigenvalue of  $B$ . Writing a general vector  $\bar{x}$  as a linear combination of the complete set  $\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n$ , with constants  $c_j$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , it follows that

$$AB\bar{x} = c_n \lambda_n A\bar{x}_n \quad (7)$$

Then  $AB\bar{x} = 0$  for general  $\bar{x}$  if and only if  $A\bar{x}_n = 0$ . ■

The structure of the column vectors of  $A$  must now be taken into consideration. Let  $\bar{b}$  with components  $(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n)$  be any nonzero row vector of  $B$ . It is just as general to assume that  $b_n$  is nonzero; otherwise, the structure of a matrix for which we aim in the sequel is merely row-shifted. Then, the typical column vector of the most general matrix  $A$ , satisfying  $BA = 0$  is of the form

$$\bar{x}_j^\top = (\alpha_1^j, \alpha_2^j, \dots, \alpha_{n-1}^j, Q^j), \quad (8a)$$

where  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$  and

$$Q^j = \frac{-1}{b_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \alpha_i^j b_i. \quad (8b)$$

Now, for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , define vectors

$$\bar{\alpha}_j^\top = (\alpha_1^j, \alpha_2^j, \dots, \alpha_{n-1}^j), \quad (9)$$

and let

$$\bar{x}^\top = (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n)$$

be any invariant vector of  $B$  corresponding to the nonzero eigenvalue (any nonzero column vector of  $B$  will serve). Invoking Lemma 1, the requirement  $AB = 0$  leads to the system of equations

$$\sum_{j=1}^n c_j \bar{\alpha}_j = 0. \quad (10)$$

Here, one additional equation, which is a linear combination of the equation (10), has been discarded. (If  $b_n = 0$  but  $b_k \neq 0$ , the equation to be discarded would come from row  $k$  versus row  $n$  of the coefficient matrix for the set of unknowns  $\alpha_i^j$  resulting from  $A\bar{x} = 0$ .)

Since some  $c_k$  does not vanish, equation (10) expresses  $\bar{\alpha}_k$  as a linear combination of the remaining  $\bar{\alpha}_j$ . The one unaddressed concern is that the resulting matrix  $A$  be of rank  $n - 1$ . However, this clearly can be accomplished, nonuniquely, as many ways as one can determine a linearly independent set of  $n - 1$  vectors  $\bar{\alpha}_j$ .

Therefore,  $AB = BA = 0$  has infinitely many solutions,  $A$ , of rank  $n - 1$ . For each such  $A$ ,  $\text{adj}(A) = 0$  or else  $\text{adj}(A)$  is a nonzero multiple of  $B$ . In this case, the relation

$$B = \frac{\text{adj}(A)}{c} = \text{adj}(qA), \quad c = q^{1-n} \quad (11)$$

produces the desired result. The adjoint alternative is thus established.

AN EXAMPLE. Consider the matrices

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (12)$$

and

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & \delta \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \gamma \end{bmatrix}. \quad (13)$$

For any finite values of  $\gamma, \delta$ ,  $AB = BA = 0$  and  $\text{adj}(A) = \gamma B$ . Therefore,  $B = \text{adj}(A/\sqrt{\gamma})$ .

## REFERENCE

1. W.P. Wardlow, Problem 1334, *Mathematics Magazine* **62** (5), 343, (December 1989).