



ELSEVIER

Contents lists available at SciVerse ScienceDirect

# Linear Algebra and its Applications

journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/laa](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/laa)

## The $\Lambda_S$ -Householder matrices

Dennis I. Merino<sup>a,\*</sup>, Agnes T. Paras<sup>b</sup>, Terrence Erard D. Teh<sup>b</sup><sup>a</sup> Department of Mathematics, Southeastern Louisiana University, Hammond, LA 70402-0687, USA<sup>b</sup> Institute of Mathematics, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City 1101, Philippines

## ARTICLE INFO

## Article history:

Received 5 July 2011

Accepted 6 October 2011

Available online 10 November 2011

Submitted by V. Sergeichuk

## AMS classification:

15A21

15A23

## Keywords:

 $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices

Householder matrices

## ABSTRACT

Let  $A, S \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be given. Suppose that  $S$  is nonsingular and Hermitian. Then  $A$  is  $\Lambda_S$ -orthogonal if  $A^*SA = S$ . Let  $u \in \mathbb{C}^n$  be such that  $u^*Su \neq 0$ . The  $\Lambda_S$ -Householder matrix of  $u$  is  $S_u \equiv I - tuu^*S$ , where  $t = \frac{2}{u^*Su}$ . We show that  $\det(S_u) = -1$ , so that products of  $\Lambda_S$ -Householder matrices have determinant  $\pm 1$ . Let  $n \geq 2$  and let  $k$  be positive integers with  $k \leq n$ . Set  $L_k \equiv I_k \oplus -I_{n-k}$ . We show that every  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -orthogonal matrix having determinant  $\pm 1$  can be written as a product of at most  $2n + 2$   $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -Householder matrices. We also determine the possible Jordan Canonical Forms of products of two  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -Householder matrices.

© 2011 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

### 1. Introduction

We denote by  $M_{m,n}(\mathbb{F})$  the set of  $m$ -by- $n$  matrices with entries in  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$  or  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$ . When  $m = n$ , we set  $M_n(\mathbb{F}) \equiv M_{n,n}(\mathbb{F})$ . We denote by  $\mathbb{F}^n$  the set of column vectors with entries in  $\mathbb{F}$ . For  $x \in \mathbb{F}^n$ , we set  $\langle x \rangle = \{\alpha x : \alpha \in \mathbb{F}\}$ .

Let an integer  $n \geq 2$  and a unit vector  $v \in \mathbb{C}^n$  be given. The Householder matrix of  $v$  is  $H_v \equiv I - 2vv^*$ . One checks that  $H_v$  is Hermitian, unitary, and an involution. Let  $v_1 = v$  and extend this to an orthonormal basis of  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , say  $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ . Set  $V = [v_1 \cdots v_n]$ , and notice that  $V^*H_vV = [-1] \oplus I_{n-1}$ . Hence,  $\det(H_v) = -1$ .

Consider  $B \equiv \text{diag}(e^{i\theta}, -e^{-i\theta})$ , where  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\theta \neq k\pi$  with  $k$  an integer. Then  $B - I$  is nonsingular, so that  $B$  is not a Householder matrix. Suppose that  $B$  is a product of Householder matrices. Because  $\det(B) = -1$ , we must have that  $B$  is a product of an odd number of Householder matrices. That is, if  $B$  can be written as a product of Householder matrices, then  $B$  can be written as a product of

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: [dmerino@selu.edu](mailto:dmerino@selu.edu) (D.I. Merino), [agnes@math.upd.edu.ph](mailto:agnes@math.upd.edu.ph) (A.T. Paras), [tdteh1@upd.edu.ph](mailto:tdteh1@upd.edu.ph) (T.E.D. Teh).

at least three Householder matrices. This contradicts Theorem 1 in [4], which says that every unitary  $U \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  can be written as a product of at most  $n$  Householder matrices.

Let  $e_i^{(n)} \in \mathbb{C}^n$  be the vector whose  $i$ th entry is 1 and 0 elsewhere. When the context is clear, we drop the superscript.

Let  $e_1, e_2 \in \mathbb{C}^2$ . Set  $a = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(e_1 + e_2)$  and set  $b = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(e_1 + e^{i\theta}e_2)$ . Notice that  $C = \text{diag}(e^{i\theta}, e^{-i\theta}) = H_a H_b$ . Moreover,  $B = H_{e_2} C$  is a product of three Householder matrices. Suppose that  $n \geq 3$ . Let  $V = \text{diag}(e^{i\theta_1}, \dots, e^{i\theta_n})$ , where  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\theta_1 + \dots + \theta_n = k\pi$  for some integer  $k$ . Let  $C = \text{diag}(e^{i\theta}, e^{-i\theta}) \oplus I_{n-2}$  and let  $D = \text{diag}(1, e^{i(\theta_1+\theta_2)}, e^{i\theta_3}, \dots, e^{i\theta_n})$ . Then  $C$  can be written as a product of two Householder matrices. An easy induction argument now shows that  $V$  can be written as a product of at most  $2n - 1$  Householder matrices. This confirms Theorem 3 in [4]. In fact, if  $\text{rank}(V - I) = k$ , then  $V$  can be written as a product of at most  $2k - 1$  Householder matrices.

Let  $Q \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be unitary and let  $v \in \mathbb{C}^n$  be a unit vector. Then  $QH_v Q^* = H_{Qv}$ . If  $U \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  is unitary with  $\det(U) = \pm 1$ , then there exists a unitary  $Q$  such that  $QUQ^* = \text{diag}(e^{i\theta_1}, \dots, e^{i\theta_n})$ . Hence,  $U$  can be written as a product of at most  $2k - 1$  Householder matrices, where  $k = \text{rank}(U - I)$ . In particular,  $U$  can be written as a product of at most  $2n - 1$  Householder matrices.

For more discussion on Householder matrices and related topics, see [3–6].

## 2. $\Lambda_S$ -Householder matrices

**Definition 1.** Let  $S \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be nonsingular. Let  $\Lambda_S : M_n(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be given by  $\Lambda_S(A) = S^{-1}A^*S$  for every  $A \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$ . A given  $A \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  is called  $\Lambda_S$ -symmetric if  $\Lambda_S(A) = A$ ; and  $A$  is called  $\Lambda_S$ -orthogonal if  $\Lambda_S(A) = A^{-1}$ .

Notice that  $\Lambda_S(AB) = \Lambda_S(B)\Lambda_S(A)$  and that  $\Lambda_S(I) = I$ . Hence, if  $A$  is nonsingular, then  $\Lambda_S(A)$  is nonsingular and  $(\Lambda_S(A))^{-1} = \Lambda_S(A^{-1})$ . When  $S$  is Hermitian, then  $\Lambda_S(\Lambda_S(A)) = A$  for every  $A \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$ .

Let  $A \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be  $\Lambda_S$ -symmetric. Then, [1, Theorem 4.1.7] guarantees that  $A$  is similar to a real matrix. Hence, the trace and the determinant of  $A$  are both real. If  $k$  is a positive integer and if  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  is given, then  $\alpha A^k$  is  $\Lambda_S$ -symmetric. It follows that if  $p(x)$  is a polynomial with real coefficients, then  $p(A)$  is also  $\Lambda_S$ -symmetric. If  $S$  is Hermitian, then for any  $A \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$ , the matrices  $\Lambda_S(A), A, A\Lambda_S(A)$  and  $A + \Lambda_S(A)$  are all  $\Lambda_S$ -symmetric.

Let  $A \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be  $\Lambda_S$ -orthogonal. Then  $A^*SA = S$ , so that  $|\det(A)| = 1$ . If  $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$  and if  $\langle x, x \rangle_S = x^*Sx$ , then  $\langle Ax, Ax \rangle_S = \langle x, x \rangle_S$ . Moreover, if  $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$  is such that  $|\alpha| = 1$ , then  $\alpha A$  is also  $\Lambda_S$ -orthogonal. Notice that  $S = A^{-*}SA^{-1}$ , so that  $A^{-1}$  is also  $\Lambda_S$ -orthogonal. In addition, the product of two  $\Lambda_S$ -orthogonal matrices is  $\Lambda_S$ -orthogonal. We denote by  $\mathcal{O}_S$  the set all  $\Lambda_S$ -orthogonal matrices, and by  $\mathcal{SO}_S$  the set of all  $\Lambda_S$ -orthogonal matrices having determinant  $\pm 1$ .

**Definition 2.** Let  $S \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be nonsingular and Hermitian. Let  $0 \neq v \in \mathbb{C}^n$  be given. Then  $v$  is isotropic with respect to  $S$  (or  $S$ -isotropic) if  $v^*Sv = 0$ . If  $v^*Sv \neq 0$ , then  $v$  is nonisotropic with respect to  $S$  (or  $S$ -nonisotropic).

Take  $S = \text{diag}(1, -1) \in M_2(\mathbb{C})$  and take  $u = [ae^{i\alpha} \ ae^{i\beta}]^T$ . For any  $a \in \mathbb{C}$ , and for any  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ , notice that  $u$  is  $S$ -isotropic.

**Definition 3.** Let  $S \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be nonsingular and Hermitian. Let  $x, y \in \mathbb{C}^n$  be given. Then  $x$  and  $y$  are  $S$ -perpendicular if  $x^*Sy = 0$ . Two subspaces  $V$  and  $W$  (of  $\mathbb{C}^n$ ) are  $S$ -perpendicular if  $v^*Sw = 0$  for all  $v \in V$  and all  $w \in W$ .

If  $x, y \in \mathbb{C}^n$  are  $S$ -perpendicular, then  $\langle x \rangle$  and  $\langle y \rangle$  are  $S$ -perpendicular. Take  $S = \text{diag}(1, -1) \in M_2(\mathbb{C})$ , take  $v = [a \ b]^T$ , and take  $w = [b \ a]^T$  with  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then  $v$  and  $w$  are  $S$ -perpendicular.

**Definition 4.** Let  $S \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be nonsingular and Hermitian. Let  $v \in \mathbb{C}^n$  be  $S$ -nonisotropic. The  $\Lambda_S$ -Householder matrix of  $v$  is  $S_v \equiv I - tvv^*S$ , where  $t = \frac{2}{v^*Sv}$ .

Let  $S \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be nonsingular and Hermitian. If  $n = 1$ , then for any  $0 \neq v \in \mathbb{C}$ , we have  $S_v = [-1]$ . Conversely, if  $S_v = -I$ , then  $I = \frac{1}{v^*Sv}vv^*S$ . Hence,  $n = \text{rank}(I) = \text{rank}\left(\frac{1}{v^*Sv}vv^*S\right) = 1$ . Thus,  $S_v = -I$  if and only if  $n = 1$ .

Let  $n \geq 2$  be a given integer. Let  $v \in \mathbb{C}^n$  be  $S$ -nonisotropic. Then  $\langle v \rangle_S^\perp \equiv \{x \in \mathbb{C}^n : x^*Sv = 0\}$  has dimension  $n - 1$ . Now, if  $x \in \langle v \rangle$ , then  $S_v x = -x$ . If  $x \in \langle v \rangle_S^\perp$ , then  $S_v x = x$ .

**Proposition 5.** Let  $S \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be nonsingular and Hermitian. Let  $u, v \in \mathbb{C}^n$  be  $S$ -nonisotropic.

1.  $S_u$  is  $\Lambda_S$ -symmetric, is  $\Lambda_S$ -orthogonal, and is an involution.
2.  $S_u$  is diagonalizable and  $S_u$  is similar to  $I_{n-1} \oplus [-1]$ . Hence,  $\text{tr}(S_u) = n - 2$  and  $\det(S_u) = -1$ . If  $n = 1$ , then the minimal polynomial of  $S_u$  is  $x + 1$ . If  $n \geq 2$ , then the minimal polynomial of  $S_u$  is  $x^2 - 1$ .
3.  $S_u = S_v$  if and only if  $\langle u \rangle = \langle v \rangle$ .
4. If  $u$  and  $v$  are  $S$ -perpendicular, then  $S_u S_v = S_v S_u$ .
5. If  $P \in \mathcal{O}_S$ , then  $PS_u P^{-1} = S_{Pu}$ .
6. If  $n \geq 2$ , then the singular values of  $S_u$  are 1 (with multiplicity  $n - 2$ ) and  $\sqrt{\frac{\mu \pm \sqrt{\mu^2 - 4}}{2}}$ , where  $\mu = \frac{4(u^*S^2u)u^*u}{(u^*Su)^2} - 2$ .

**Proof.** The first claim can be verified by direct computation. For the second claim, if  $n = 1$ , then  $S_u = -1$ . If  $n \geq 2$ , then notice that 1 is an eigenvalue of  $S_u$ , with an eigenspace of dimension  $n - 1$ , and  $-1$  is an eigenvalue of  $S_u$  with an eigenspace of dimension 1.

To show the third claim, suppose  $S_u = S_v$ . Then  $-u = S_u u = S_v u = (I - tvv^*S)u = u - t(v^*Su)v$ . Notice that  $v^*Su \neq 0$ , otherwise,  $u = 0$ . Now,  $u = \frac{tv^*Su}{2}v$  and  $\langle u \rangle = \langle v \rangle$ . If  $\langle u \rangle = \langle v \rangle$ , then  $v = \alpha u$  for some  $0 \neq \alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ . Now,  $S_v = S_{\alpha u} = I - \frac{2}{(\alpha u)^*S(\alpha u)}(\alpha u)(\alpha u)^*S = S_u$ .

The next two claims can be shown by direct computation.

For the last claim, we have

$$\text{rank}(S_u S_u^* - I) = \text{rank}(S_u(S_u^* - S_u)) = \text{rank}(S_u^* - S_u).$$

Now,  $S_u^* - S_u = tuu^*S - tSuu^*$  has rank at most 2. Hence, 1 is an eigenvalue of  $S_u S_u^*$  with geometric multiplicity at least  $n - 2$ . Let  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  be the (possibly) other two eigenvalues of  $S_u S_u^*$ . Then  $1 = \det(S_u S_u^*) = \alpha\beta$ . A direct computation now shows that  $S_u S_u^* = I - tuu^*S - tSuu^* + \frac{4(u^*S^2u)}{(u^*Su)^2}uu^*$ . Taking the trace of both sides, we get  $n - 2 + \alpha + \frac{1}{\alpha} = n - 4 + \frac{4(u^*S^2u)u^*u}{(u^*Su)^2}$ . Setting  $\mu \equiv \frac{4(u^*S^2u)u^*u}{(u^*Su)^2} - 2$ , we get  $\alpha^2 - \mu\alpha + 1 = 0$ , and  $\alpha = \frac{\mu \pm \sqrt{\mu^2 - 4}}{2}$ . The remaining singular values of  $S_u$  are  $\sqrt{\frac{\mu \pm \sqrt{\mu^2 - 4}}{2}}$ .  $\square$

### 2.1. \*-Congruence

Let  $S, T \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be Hermitian matrices. Then  $S$  and  $T$  are \*-congruent ( $S = P^*TP$  for some nonsingular  $P$ ) if and only if they have the same inertia, that is, they have the same number of positive, negative, and zero eigenvalues. If  $S$  is nonsingular, then its spectrum contains only positive and negative eigenvalues, that is,  $S$  is \*-congruent to  $L_k \equiv I_k \oplus -I_{n-k}$  for some  $k = 0, 1, \dots, n$ , and where we make the convention that  $I_0$  is not present.

Let  $S, T \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be nonsingular Hermitian matrices and suppose that  $S = P^*TP$  for some nonsingular  $P$ . Suppose that  $C \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  is  $\Lambda_S$ -symmetric, that is,  $S^{-1}C^*S = C$ . Then,  $P^{-1}T^{-1}P^{-*}C^*P^*TP =$

$C$  and  $T^{-1} (PCP^{-1})^* T = (PCP^{-1})$ , so that  $PCP^{-1}$  is  $\Lambda_T$ -symmetric. Conversely, if  $PCP^{-1}$  is  $\Lambda_T$ -symmetric, then  $C$  is  $\Lambda_S$ -symmetric.

A similar calculation also shows that  $C \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  is  $\Lambda_S$ -orthogonal if and only if  $PCP^{-1}$  is  $\Lambda_T$ -orthogonal.

**Theorem 6.** Let  $S, T \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be nonsingular Hermitian matrices. Suppose that  $S = P^*TP$  for some nonsingular  $P \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$ .

1.  $C \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  is  $\Lambda_S$ -symmetric if and only if  $PCP^{-1}$  is  $\Lambda_T$ -symmetric.
2.  $C \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  is  $\Lambda_S$ -orthogonal if and only if  $PCP^{-1}$  is  $\Lambda_T$ -orthogonal.
3. Let  $v \in \mathbb{C}^n$  be  $S$ -nonisotropic. Then  $Pv$  is  $T$ -nonisotropic and  $PS_vP^{-1} = T_{Pv}$ .

**Proof.** Suppose that  $v$  is  $S$ -nonisotropic. Then  $v^*P^*TPv = v^*Sv \neq 0$ . Now,  $PS_vP^{-1} = P \left( I - \frac{2}{v^*Sv} vv^*S \right) P^{-1} = P \left( I - \frac{2}{v^*P^*TPv} vv^*P^*TP \right) P^{-1} = I - \frac{2}{(Pv)^*T(Pv)} (Pv)(Pv)^* T = T_{Pv}$ .  $\square$

Let  $S \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be nonsingular and Hermitian. Then there exists an integer  $k$ , with  $0 \leq k \leq n$  such that  $S$  is  $*$ -congruent to  $L_k$ . Now,  $-L_k$  and  $L_{n-k}$  have the same inertia. In fact, if we set  $P = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_{n-k} \\ I_k & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ , then  $P^{-1} = P^*$  and  $-L_k = P^*L_{n-k}P$ . Let  $A \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be given. Then  $\Lambda_{L_k}(A) = L_k^{-1}A^*L_k = (-L_k)^{-1}A^*(-L_k) = \Lambda_{-L_k}(A)$ .

**Lemma 7.** Let  $n \geq 2$  be a given integer. Suppose that  $0 \leq k \leq n$  is an integer.

1. If  $C \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  is  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -symmetric, then  $C$  is permutation similar to a  $\Lambda_{L_{n-k}}$ -symmetric matrix.
2. If  $C \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  is  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -orthogonal, then  $C$  is permutation similar to a  $\Lambda_{L_{n-k}}$ -orthogonal matrix.

**Proof.** Suppose that  $C \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  is  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -symmetric. Then  $C$  is  $\Lambda_{-L_k}$ -symmetric. Theorem 6 (1) now guarantees that  $PCP^{-1}$  is  $\Lambda_{L_{n-k}}$ -symmetric.

The second claim can be proven similarly.  $\square$

### 3. Product of $\Lambda_S$ -Householder matrices

Let  $S \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be nonsingular and Hermitian. Then there exist an integer  $k$ , with  $0 \leq k \leq n$ , and a nonsingular  $P \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  such that  $S = P^*L_kP$ . Suppose that  $Q = Q_1Q_2$  is a product of  $\Lambda_S$ -orthogonal matrices  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$ . Theorem 6 guarantees that  $PQP^{-1} = (PQ_1P^{-1})(PQ_2P^{-1})$  is a product of  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -orthogonal matrices.

For now, we let  $n \geq 2$ , we fix  $k$ , and we drop the subscript, that is, we say that  $L = L_k$ .

Let  $Q \in \mathcal{O}_S$  be given. Then  $|\det Q| = 1$ . Hence, there exists  $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$  such that  $\alpha Q \in \mathcal{S}\mathcal{O}_S$ , that is,  $\det(\alpha Q) = \pm 1$ . Our goal is to determine which elements of  $\mathcal{S}\mathcal{O}_S$  can be written as a product of  $\Lambda_S$ -Householder matrices. We are also interested in finding the least number of  $\Lambda_S$ -Householder matrices necessary to form such a product. Our approach is to study  $\Lambda_L$ -orthogonal matrices.

#### 3.1. $\Lambda_L$ -orthogonal matrices

We begin with the following observation.

**Lemma 8.** Let  $S \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be nonsingular and Hermitian. Suppose that  $S = P^*LP$ , where  $P \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  is nonsingular and  $L = I_k \oplus -I_{n-k}$  for some integer  $k$  with  $0 \leq k \leq n$ . Then  $A \in \mathcal{O}_S$  can be written as a product of  $\Lambda_S$ -Householder matrices if and only if  $PAP^{-1}$  can be written as a product of  $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices. Moreover, the minimum number used in both cases are the same.

Let  $A \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be  $\Lambda_L$ -orthogonal. If  $A$  can be written as a product of  $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices, then necessarily,  $\det(A) = \pm 1$ . We show that the converse holds, as well.

Suppose that  $A = L_{u_1}L_{u_2} \cdots L_{u_m}$  and suppose that such a factorization is minimal. If  $\langle u_k \rangle = \langle u_{k+1} \rangle$ , then  $L_{u_k} = L_{u_{k+1}}$ , and since Proposition 5 guarantees that  $L_u$  is an involution, we can take away  $L_{u_k}L_{u_{k+1}}$  (which is  $I$ ). If  $\langle u_k \rangle = \langle u_{k+t} \rangle$  for  $t \geq 2$ , then  $L_{u_k}L_{u_{k+1}} \cdots L_{u_{k+t}} = L_{u_k}L_{u_{k+1}} \cdots L_{u_k} = (L_{u_k}L_{u_{k+1}}L_{u_k}) \cdots (L_{u_k}L_{u_{k+t-1}}L_{u_k})$ . Now, for each  $l = 1, \dots, t - 1$ , Proposition 5 (5) guarantees that  $L_{u_k}L_{u_{k+l}}L_{u_k} = L_{w_l}$ , where each  $w_l = L_{u_k}u_{k+l}$ . This apparent contradiction shows the following.

**Lemma 9.** *Let  $u_i \in \mathbb{C}^n$  for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . Let  $A \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be  $\Lambda_L$ -orthogonal. Suppose that  $A = L_{u_1}L_{u_2} \cdots L_{u_m}$ . If  $m$  is minimal, then  $\langle u_i \rangle \neq \langle u_j \rangle$  for  $i \neq j$ .*

Let  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be given, and let  $D$  be a nonsingular diagonal matrix in  $M_n(\mathbb{R})$ . If  $x^T D x = y^T D y \neq 0$ , then either  $(x + y)^T D (x + y) \neq 0$  or  $(x - y)^T D (x - y) \neq 0$  [4, Lemma 3]. The following is an analog in the complex case and using  $D = L$ .

**Lemma 10.** *Let  $x, y \in \mathbb{C}^n$  be such that  $x^* L x = y^* L y \neq 0$ . Then  $x + y$  is  $L$ -nonisotropic or  $x - y$  is  $L$ -nonisotropic.*

**Proof.** The assumption assures that  $x^* L x + y^* L y \neq 0$ . Suppose now that both  $x + y$  and  $x - y$  are  $L$ -isotropic. Then  $(x + y)^* L (x + y) = 0$ , so that  $\text{Re}(x^* L y) = -\frac{1}{2}(x^* L x + y^* L y)$ . Now, we also have  $(x - y)^* L (x - y) = 0$ , so that  $\text{Re}(x^* L y) = \frac{1}{2}(x^* L x + y^* L y)$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

Let  $x, y \in \mathbb{C}^n$  be such that  $x^* L x = y^* L y \neq 0$ . Say,  $w = x + y$  is  $L$ -nonisotropic. Suppose that  $x^* L y \in \mathbb{R}$ . Now, compute:  $L_w x = x - \frac{2}{w^* L w} w w^* L x$ . Notice that  $w^* L w = 2(x^* L x + y^* L y)$ . Also,  $w^* L x = x^* L x + y^* L x = x^* L x + x^* L y$ . Hence,  $L_w x = -y$ .

Conversely, if  $L_w x = -y$ , then  $w \left(1 - \frac{2w^* L x}{w^* L w}\right) = 0$ , so that  $w^* L w - 2w^* L x = 0$ . Now,  $w^* L w = 2x^* L x + 2\text{Re}(y^* L x)$  and  $w^* L x = x^* L x + y^* L x$ . Hence,  $\text{Re}(y^* L x) = y^* L x$ . Consequently,  $x^* L y \in \mathbb{R}$ .

If  $v = x - y$  is  $L$ -nonisotropic, then a similar calculation shows that  $L_v x = y$  if and only if  $x^* L y \in \mathbb{R}$ .

**Lemma 11.** *Let  $x, y \in \mathbb{C}^n$  be such that  $x^* L x = y^* L y \neq 0$ . If  $w = x + y$  is  $L$ -nonisotropic, then  $L_w x = -y$  if and only if  $x^* L y \in \mathbb{R}$ . If  $v = x - y$  is  $L$ -nonisotropic, then  $L_v x = y$  if and only if  $x^* L y \in \mathbb{R}$ .*

It is known that if  $x, y \in \mathbb{C}^n$  have the same Euclidean norm, then there exists a unitary  $U$  such that  $Ux = y$  [1, Problem 4 on page 77]. The following is an analog.

**Lemma 12.** *Let  $x, y \in \mathbb{C}^n$  be such that  $x^* L x = y^* L y \neq 0$ . Then there exists a  $\Lambda_L$ -orthogonal  $P$  such that  $Px = y$ .*

**Proof.** Suppose that  $x^* L y = re^{i\theta}$ , where  $r, \theta \in \mathbb{R}$ . Set  $u = e^{i\theta} x$ . Then  $u^* L u = y^* L y \neq 0$ . Moreover,  $u^* L y \in \mathbb{R}$ . Let  $w = u + y$  and let  $v = u - y$ . Lemma 10 guarantees that  $w$  or  $v$  is  $L$ -nonisotropic. If  $w$  is  $L$ -nonisotropic, then Lemma 11 guarantees that  $L_w u = -y$ . We take  $P = -e^{i\theta} L_w$ . If  $v$  is  $L$ -nonisotropic, then Lemma 11 guarantees that  $L_v u = y$ . We take  $P = e^{i\theta} L_v$ .  $\square$

Let  $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$  be  $L$ -nonisotropic. Write  $x = [x_i]$ . Then  $x^* L x = \sum_{i=1}^k |x_i|^2 - \sum_{i=k+1}^n |x_i|^2 \in \mathbb{R}$ . Suppose that  $x^* L x = \alpha^2$ , with  $\alpha > 0$ . Set  $e \equiv \alpha e_1$ . Then  $e^* L e = \alpha^2$ . Lemma 12 guarantees that there exists a  $\Lambda_L$ -orthogonal  $P$  such that  $x = Pe$ . Now,  $L_x = L_{Pe} = PL_e P^{-1}$ . Notice that  $L_e = L_{\alpha e_1} = L_{e_1}$  is diagonal.

Suppose that  $x^* L x = -\alpha^2$ , with  $\alpha > 0$ . Set  $e \equiv \alpha e_{k+1}$ . Then  $e^* L e = -\alpha^2$ . Lemma 12 guarantees that there exists a  $\Lambda_L$ -orthogonal  $P$  such that  $x = Pe$ . Now,  $L_x = L_{Pe} = PL_e P^{-1}$ . Notice that  $L_e = L_{\alpha e_{k+1}} = L_{e_{k+1}}$  is diagonal.

**Theorem 13.** *Let  $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$  be  $L$ -nonisotropic. There exists a  $\Lambda_L$ -orthogonal  $P$  such that  $PL_x P^{-1}$  is diagonal.*

Let  $0 \neq x \in \mathbb{C}^n$  be  $L$ -isotropic. Write  $x = [x_1^T \ x_2^T]^T$ , with  $x_1 \in \mathbb{C}^k$ . Notice that  $0 = x^*Lx = x_1^*x_1 - x_2^*x_2$ , so that  $\|x_1\|_2 = \|x_2\|_2$ . Because  $x \neq 0$ , we have  $x_1 \neq 0$  (and also  $x_2 \neq 0$ ). Let  $U_1 \in M_k(\mathbb{C})$  be a unitary such that  $U_1x_1 = \|x_1\|_2 e_1^{(k)}$  and let  $U_2 \in M_{n-k}(\mathbb{C})$  be a unitary such that  $U_2x_2 = \|x_1\|_2 e_1^{(n-k)}$ . Set  $U = U_1 \oplus U_2$ . Then  $U$  is  $\Lambda_L$ -orthogonal and  $Ux = \|x_1\|_2 e_1^{(n)} + \|x_1\|_2 e_{k+1}^{(n)}$ . Set  $H_\beta \equiv \begin{bmatrix} [\cosh \beta] \oplus I_{k-1} & [\sinh \beta] \oplus 0 \\ [\sinh \beta] \oplus 0 & [\cosh \beta] \oplus I_{n-k-1} \end{bmatrix}$ , and notice that  $H_\beta$  is  $\Lambda_L$ -orthogonal. Moreover,  $H_\beta Ux = e^\beta \|x_1\|_2 e_1^{(n)} + e^{-\beta} \|x_1\|_2 e_{k+1}^{(n)}$ . Choosing  $\beta = -\ln(\|x_1\|_2)$ , we have  $H_\beta Ux = e_1^{(n)} + e_{k+1}^{(n)}$ .

**Lemma 14.** Let  $0 \neq x \in \mathbb{C}^n$  be  $L$ -isotropic. Then there exists a  $\Lambda_L$ -orthogonal  $P$  such that  $Px = e_1^{(n)} + e_{k+1}^{(n)}$ .

Let  $U \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be unitary. If  $U$  is block upper triangular, then in fact,  $U$  is block diagonal.

**Lemma 15.** Let  $A \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be  $\Lambda_L$ -orthogonal. If  $A$  is block upper triangular, then  $A$  is block diagonal.

**Proof.** Suppose that  $A = \begin{bmatrix} W & X \\ 0 & Y \end{bmatrix}$ . Because  $A$  is  $\Lambda_L$ -orthogonal,  $W$  and  $Y$  are both nonsingular.

Write  $L = D_1 \oplus D_2$  conformal to  $A$ . Looking at the  $(1, 2)$  entries of the equation  $A^*LA = L$ , we have  $W^*D_1X = 0$ . Since both  $W$  and  $D_1$  are nonsingular, we have  $X = 0$ .  $\square$

### 3.2. Product of $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices

Let  $L = \text{diag}(1, -1)$  and let  $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})$  be  $\Lambda_L$ -orthogonal and suppose that  $\det(A) = \pm 1$ . Let  $u = [u_1 \ u_2]^T$  be the first column of  $A$  with  $u_1 = re^{i\theta}$  and  $r, \theta \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then  $u^*Lu = 1$ . Set  $e = e^{i\theta}e_1$ , so that  $u^*Le = r$  and  $e^*Le = 1$ . Lemma 10 guarantees that  $w = u + e$  is  $L$ -nonisotropic or that  $v = u - e$  is  $L$ -nonisotropic. If  $w$  is  $L$ -nonisotropic, then Lemma 11 guarantees that  $L_wu = -e$  and if  $v$  is  $L$ -nonisotropic, then Lemma 11 guarantees that  $L_vu = e$ .

Suppose that  $w$  is  $L$ -nonisotropic. Then  $L_wA = \begin{bmatrix} -e^{i\theta} & b \\ 0 & c \end{bmatrix}$ . Lemma 15 ensures that  $b = 0$ , and since  $\det(A) = \pm 1$ , we must have  $c = \pm e^{-i\theta}$ .

If  $v$  is  $L$ -nonisotropic, then  $L_vA = \begin{bmatrix} e^{i\theta} & b \\ 0 & c \end{bmatrix}$ . Lemma 15 ensures that  $b = 0$ , and since  $\det(A) = \pm 1$ , we must have  $c = \pm e^{-i\theta}$ .

We look at the number of  $\Lambda_L$ -Householder factors of  $X_1 \equiv \text{diag}(e^{i\theta}, e^{-i\theta})$  and  $X_2 \equiv \text{diag}(e^{i\theta}, -e^{-i\theta})$ . First, notice that for many values of  $\theta$ , we have  $X_1 - I$  and  $X_2 - I$  are both nonsingular. Hence, for these values of  $\theta$ , neither  $X_1$  nor  $X_2$  is  $\Lambda_L$ -Householder. Moreover, since  $\det(X_1) = 1$ , if  $X_1$  can be written as a product of  $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices, then the number of such factors must be even. Now, if  $X_2$  can be written as a product of  $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices, then the number of factors must be odd and that number must be bigger than or equal to 3.

When  $\theta = 0$ , we have  $X_1 = I = L_t^2$  for any  $L$ -nonisotropic vector  $t$  and we have  $X_2 = L_{e_2}$ .

When  $\theta = \pi$ , we have  $X_1 = -I = L_{e_1}L_{e_2}$  and we have  $X_2 = L_{e_1}$ .

Suppose now that  $-\frac{\pi}{2} < \theta < \frac{\pi}{2}$ . We show that  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  can be written as a product of  $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices. Let  $u \in \mathbb{C}^2$  be  $L$ -nonisotropic. Suppose that  $u^*Lu > 0$ . Set  $v = \frac{1}{\sqrt{u^*Lu}}u$  and

notice that  $v^*Lv = 1$ . Suppose that  $u^*Lu < 0$ . Set  $w = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}u$  and notice that  $w^*Lw = -u^*Lu > 0$ .

Hence, we may assume that  $u^*Lu = 1$ .

Let  $u = [re^{i\alpha} se^{i\beta}]^T$ , where  $r, s, \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then  $w = e^{-i\alpha}u \in \langle u \rangle$  and  $L_u = L_w$ . Hence, we may further assume that  $u = [r se^{i\theta}]^T$ , where  $r^2 - s^2 = 1$ . Now, notice that  $L_u = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - 2r^2 & 2rse^{-i\theta} \\ -2rse^{i\theta} & 1 + 2s^2 \end{bmatrix}$ . Set  $a \equiv 1 - 2r^2$  and  $b \equiv -2rs$ . Then we have  $a^2 - b^2 = 1$ , we have  $1 + 2s^2 = 2r^2 - 1 = -a$ , and we have

$$L_u = \begin{bmatrix} a & -be^{-i\theta} \\ be^{i\theta} & -a \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let  $u_1 = [r se^{i\alpha}]^T$  and let  $u_2 = [r se^{i\beta}]^T$ . We look at the product  $L_{u_1}L_{u_2}$ . A direct computation shows that

$$L_{u_1}L_{u_2}e_1 = \begin{bmatrix} a^2 - b^2e^{i(\beta-\alpha)} \\ ab(e^{i\alpha} - e^{i\beta}) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let  $x = \beta - \alpha$  and note that  $d \equiv a^2 - b^2e^{ix} = a^2 - b^2 \cos x - ib^2 \sin x$ . Write  $d = c \cos y + ic \sin y$ , with  $c, y \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $c \geq 0$ . Then  $\tan y = \frac{-b^2 \sin x}{a^2 - b^2 \cos x} = \frac{-b^2 \sin x}{1 + b^2 - b^2 \cos x}$ , so that  $\cot y = -\frac{1 - \cos x}{\sin x} - \frac{1}{b^2 \sin x} = -\tan\left(\frac{x}{2}\right) - \frac{1}{b^2 \sin x}$ . For each  $b$ , the range of  $f(x, b) = -\tan\left(\frac{x}{2}\right) - \frac{1}{b^2 \sin x}$  is  $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ . Now choose  $y = \cot^{-1}\left(-\tan\left(\frac{x}{2}\right) - \frac{1}{b^2 \sin x}\right)$  so that  $y \in \left(-\frac{\pi}{2}, 0\right) \cup \left(0, \frac{\pi}{2}\right)$ , and notice that for each  $b$ , the function  $g(y) = \cot y$  is a bijection from  $\left(-\frac{\pi}{2}, 0\right) \cup \left(0, \frac{\pi}{2}\right)$  to  $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ .

Now,  $(L_{u_1}L_{u_2}e_1)^*L(L_{u_1}L_{u_2}e_1) = e_1^*Le_1 = 1$ . Set  $e = e^{iy}e_1$ , so that  $e^*L(L_{u_1}L_{u_2}e_1) = c \in \mathbb{R}$ . Moreover,  $e^*Le = 1$ . Hence,  $w = L_{u_1}L_{u_2}e_1 + e$  is  $L$ -nonisotropic or  $v = L_{u_1}L_{u_2}e_1 - e$  is  $L$ -nonisotropic.

If  $w$  is  $L$ -nonisotropic, then  $L_wL_{u_1}L_{u_2}e_1 = -e$ , so that  $L_wL_{u_1}L_{u_2} = \begin{bmatrix} -e^{iy} & h \\ 0 & j \end{bmatrix}$ . Since  $L_wL_{u_1}L_{u_2}$  is  $\Lambda_L$ -orthogonal, we have  $h = 0$  and  $j = \pm e^{-iy}$ . That is,  $Y \equiv \begin{bmatrix} -e^{iy} & 0 \\ 0 & \pm e^{-iy} \end{bmatrix}$  can be written as a product of three  $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices. However, since the determinant of an odd number of  $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices is  $-1$ , we have  $Y = \begin{bmatrix} -e^{iy} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-iy} \end{bmatrix}$ . Now,  $X_1 = L_{e_1}Y$  is a product of four  $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices. Also,  $X_2$  is a product of five  $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices.

Notice that  $Y^2 = \text{diag}(e^{2iy}, e^{-2iy}) = (L_wL_{u_1}L_{u_2})^2$ . Proposition 5 (5) guarantees that

$$(L_wL_{u_1}L_{u_2})^2 = L_{L_wu_1}L_{L_wu_2}L_{u_1}L_{u_2}$$

is a product of four  $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices. Moreover,  $\text{diag}(e^{2iy}, -e^{-2iy}) = L_{e_2}Y^2$  is a product of five  $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices.

If  $v$  is  $L$ -nonisotropic, then  $L_vL_{u_1}L_{u_2}e_1 = e$ , so that  $L_vL_{u_1}L_{u_2} = \begin{bmatrix} e^{iy} & h \\ 0 & j \end{bmatrix}$ . Since  $L_vL_{u_1}L_{u_2}$  is  $\Lambda_L$ -orthogonal with determinant  $-1$ , we have  $h = 0$  and  $j = -e^{-iy}$ . That is,  $Y = \begin{bmatrix} e^{iy} & 0 \\ 0 & -e^{-iy} \end{bmatrix}$ . Thus,  $X_2 = L_vL_{u_1}L_{u_2}$  can be written as a product of three  $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices, and  $X_1 = L_{e_2}X_2$  is a product of four  $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices.



Notice that  $X_2^2 = \text{diag}(e^{2iy}, e^{-2iy}) = (L_v L_{u_1} L_{u_2})^2$  is a product of four  $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices. Moreover,  $\text{diag}(e^{2iy}, -e^{-2iy}) = L_{e_2} X_2^2$  is a product of five  $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices.

Suppose that  $-\pi < \theta < \pi$ . Set  $\theta = 2y$ . Then  $\text{diag}(e^{2iy}, e^{-2iy})$  can be written as a product of four  $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices, while  $\text{diag}(e^{2iy}, -e^{-2iy})$  can be written as a product of five  $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices.

**Lemma 16.** *Let  $L = \text{diag}(1, -1)$ . Let  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$  be given. Then  $\text{diag}(e^{i\theta}, \pm e^{-i\theta})$  can be written as a product of at most five  $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices in  $M_2(\mathbb{C})$ .*

We summarize our results.

**Lemma 17.** *Let  $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})$  be  $\Lambda_L$ -orthogonal. If  $\det(A) = \pm 1$ , then  $A$  can be written as a product of at most 6  $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices.*

Let  $A \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be  $\Lambda_L$ -orthogonal with  $\det(A) = \pm 1$ . Suppose that  $k = 1$ . We look at the first column of  $A$ , say  $u$ , and suppose that the first entry of  $u$  is  $ce^{i\theta}$ , with  $c, \theta \in \mathbb{R}$ . Let  $w = u + e^{i\theta}e_1$  and let  $v = u - e^{i\theta}e_1$ . As before, either  $w$  is  $L$ -nonisotropic or  $v$  is  $L$ -nonisotropic. Moreover,  $L_w u = -e^{i\theta}e_1$  or  $L_v u = e^{i\theta}e_1$ . For  $j = 1, 2$ , we let  $B_j = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & A_j \end{bmatrix}$  and let  $C(a, b, n) \equiv \left( \begin{bmatrix} e^{i(a+b)} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i(a+b)} \end{bmatrix} \oplus I_{n-2} \right)$ . If  $w$  is  $L$ -nonisotropic, then we have  $L_w A = B_1 C(\theta, \pi, n)$ . If  $v$  is  $L$ -nonisotropic, then we have  $L_v A = B_2 C(\theta, 0, n)$ . Notice that  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  have the same forms, and that  $C(\theta, \pi, n)$  and  $C(\theta, 0, n)$  have the same forms. Hence, it is without loss of generality to assume that  $v$  is  $L$ -nonisotropic. Now,  $A_1 \in M_{n-1}(\mathbb{C})$  is a unitary matrix having determinant  $\pm 1$ , and hence a product of at most  $2(n-1) - 1 = 2n - 3$  Householder matrices [4, Theorem 1]. Let  $H_x = I - 2xx^* \in M_{n-1}(\mathbb{C})$  be a Householder matrix.

Set  $y = [0 \ x^T]^T \in \mathbb{C}^n$ . Set  $L_y = I - \frac{2}{y^* L_y} y y^* L$ . Then  $L_y = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & H_x \end{bmatrix}$ . Hence,  $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & A_1 \end{bmatrix}$  is a product of at most  $2n - 3$   $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices. Let  $C = C(\theta, \pi, n)$  or  $C = C(\theta, 0, n)$  so that  $\det(C) = 1$ . Notice that we can write  $C$  as a product of at most 4  $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices. Hence,  $A$  is a product of at most  $2n + 2$   $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices.

Suppose  $k \geq 2$ . We look at the first column of  $A$ , say  $u$  and suppose that the second entry of  $u$  is  $ce^{i\theta}$ , with  $c, \theta \in \mathbb{R}$ . Let  $w = u + e^{i\theta}e_2$  and let  $v = u - e^{i\theta}e_2$ . Then, either  $w$  is  $L$ -nonisotropic or  $v$  is  $L$ -nonisotropic. Moreover,  $L_w u = -e^{i\theta}e_2$  or  $L_v u = e^{i\theta}e_2$ .

Suppose that  $w$  is  $L$ -nonisotropic. Then  $L_w A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & b^T \\ -e^{i\theta} & c^T \\ 0 & B \end{bmatrix}$ , where  $b, c \in \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$  and  $B \in$

$M_{(n-2), (n-1)}(\mathbb{C})$ . Let  $p = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(e_1 + e^{i\theta}e_2)$ . Then  $L_p = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -e^{-i\theta} \\ -e^{i\theta} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \oplus I_{n-2}$ . Hence, we have

$L_p L_w A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & d^T \\ 0 & D \end{bmatrix}$ , where  $d \in \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$  and  $D \in M_{n-1}(\mathbb{C})$ . Lemma 15 guarantees that  $d = 0$ , so that  $D$

is  $\Lambda_{L_{k-1}}$ -orthogonal. If  $k = 2$ , then  $D$  can be written as a product of  $2(n-1) + 2$   $\Lambda_{L_{k-1}}$ -Householder matrices. Thus,  $A$  can be written as a product of  $2n + 2$   $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices. If  $k > 2$ , repeat the reduction  $k - 2$  more times. At this time, we have used  $2(k-1)$   $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices, and we need  $2(n-k+1) + 2$  more. Hence,  $A$  can be written as a product of  $2n + 2$   $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices.

If  $v$  is  $L$ -nonisotropic, then a similar calculation shows that  $A$  can be written as a product of  $2n + 2$   $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices.



**Theorem 18.** Let  $n \geq 2$  and  $1 \leq k \leq n$  be integers. Let  $L = I_k \oplus -I_{n-k}$ . Let  $A \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be  $\Lambda_L$ -orthogonal with  $\det(A) = \pm 1$ . Then  $A$  can be written as a product of at most  $2n + 2$   $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices.

The following is part of Theorem 3 in [4]. We provide a different proof.

**Corollary 19.** Let  $n \geq 2$  and  $k \geq 1$  be integers such that  $n \geq k$ . Let  $L = I_k \oplus -I_{n-k}$ . Let  $A \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$  be  $\Lambda_L$ -orthogonal. Then  $A$  can be written as a product of at most  $2n - 1$   $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices.

**Proof.** Let  $A \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$  be  $\Lambda_L$ -orthogonal. Because  $A$  is real, we have  $\det(A) = \pm 1$ . Suppose  $L_p A = B_1 C_1(\theta, 0, n)$ , where  $p = w$  or  $p = v$  as in the proof of Theorem 18. Notice that we may take  $\theta = 0$  so that  $C_1 = I$  and  $B_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \pm 1 & 0 \\ 0 & A_1 \end{bmatrix}$ . So, far, we have only used 1  $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrix. We apply induction to show that we can use  $n - 2$  more  $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices to reduce  $A_1$  to a diagonal matrix with diagonal entries  $\pm 1$ . We only need  $n - 2$   $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices because only 1  $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrix is needed to reduce a 2-by-2 matrix to a diagonal. Now, for each diagonal entry that is  $-1$ , multiply by  $L_{e_i}$ . Hence, every  $\Lambda_L$ -orthogonal  $A$  can be written as a product of at most  $2n - 1$   $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices.  $\square$

### 3.3. Product of two $\Lambda_L$ -Householder matrices

Let  $n \geq 2$  and  $k \geq 1$  be given integers with  $k \leq n$ . Let  $L_k = I_k \oplus -I_{n-k}$ . Let  $Q = [q_i] \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -orthogonal. Then  $q_i^* L_k q_i = 1$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ ,  $q_i^* L_k q_i = -1$  for  $i = k + 1, \dots, n$ , and  $q_i^* L_k q_j = 0$  for  $i \neq j$ .

**Definition 20.** Let  $p \leq n$  be a given positive integer. Then  $\{x_1, \dots, x_p\} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  is a  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -orthogonal set if  $x_i^* L_k x_j = 0$  for  $i \neq j$  and  $x_i^* L_k x_i = \pm 1$  for  $i = 1, \dots, p$ .

Let  $A = \{x_1, \dots, x_p\} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  be a  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -orthogonal set. Let  $y = \alpha_1 x_1 + \dots + \alpha_p x_p = 0$ . Then, for each  $i = 1, \dots, p$ , we have  $0 = x_i^* L_k y = \pm \alpha_i$ , so that  $\alpha_i = 0$ . Hence,  $A$  is linearly independent. Let  $Q \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -orthogonal. One checks that  $QA = \{Qx_1, \dots, Qx_p\}$  is also a  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -orthogonal set. Suppose that  $x_i^* L_k x_i = 1$  for  $i = 1, \dots, q$  and that  $x_i^* L_k x_i = -1$  for  $i = q + 1, \dots, p$ . Set  $B = [x_1 \dots x_p]$ . Lemma 12 guarantees that there exists a  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -orthogonal  $P$  such that  $Px_1 = e_1^{(n)}$ . Because

$PA$  is a  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -orthogonal set, we must have  $PB = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & B_1 \end{bmatrix}$ , where  $B_1 = [b_i^{(1)}] \in M_{(n-1), (p-1)}(\mathbb{C})$  and

$\{b_1^{(1)}, \dots, b_{p-1}^{(1)}\}$  is a  $\Lambda_{L_{k-1}}$ -orthogonal set.

If  $k = 1$ , then  $B_1$  has orthonormal columns. Extend  $\{b_1^{(1)}, \dots, b_{p-1}^{(1)}\}$  to an orthonormal basis of  $\mathbb{C}^{n-1}$ , say  $\{c_1, \dots, c_{n-p}\} \cup \{b_1^{(1)}, \dots, b_{p-1}^{(1)}\}$ . Set  $C_1 = [c_i]$  and set  $C = [B_1 \ C_1]$ . Then  $C \in M_{n-1}(\mathbb{C})$  is unitary. Moreover,  $D \equiv [1] \oplus C$  is  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -orthogonal. Let  $P^{-1}D = [y_i]$ . Notice that  $y_i = x_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, p$ . Moreover, we have extended  $A$  to a  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -orthogonal basis of  $\mathbb{C}^n$ .

If  $k > 1$ , then there exists a  $\Lambda_{L_{k-1}}$ -orthogonal  $Q_1 \in M_{n-1}(\mathbb{C})$  such that  $Q_1 B_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & B_2 \end{bmatrix}$ , where  $B_2 = [b_i^{(2)}] \in M_{(n-2), (p-2)}(\mathbb{C})$  and  $\{b_1^{(2)}, \dots, b_{p-2}^{(2)}\}$  is a  $\Lambda_{L_{k-2}}$ -orthogonal set. Set  $P_2 = [1] \oplus Q_1$

and notice that  $P_2$  is  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -orthogonal and that  $P_2 P B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & B_2 \end{bmatrix}$ . Continue the reduction un-

til  $i = q$ , and let  $T = P_q \cdots P_2 P$ . Then  $TB = \begin{bmatrix} I_q & 0 \\ 0 & C \end{bmatrix}$ , where  $C = [c_i] \in M_{(n-q), (p-q)}(\mathbb{C})$  and  $\{c_1, \dots, c_{p-q}\}$  is a  $\Lambda_{L_{k-q}}$ -orthogonal set. Notice that necessarily,  $q \leq k$ . Otherwise, we have  $e_q^* L_k e_q = -1$ , but  $(TB)^* L_k (TB) = B^* L_k B = I_q \oplus -I_{p-q}$  implies  $e_q^* L_k e_q = 1$ . Now,  $c_i^* L_{k-q} c_j = 0$  for  $i \neq j$  and  $c_i^* L_{k-q} c_i = -1$  for  $i = 1, \dots, p - q$ . There exists a  $\Lambda_{L_{k-q}}$ -orthogonal  $S \in M_{n-q}(\mathbb{C})$  such that  $Sc_1 = e_{n-q}^{(n-q)}$ . Then  $SC = \begin{bmatrix} C_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ . Let  $N_1 = I_q \oplus S$ . Then  $N_1$  is  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -orthogonal. Moreover,  $C_1 = [f_i] \in M_{(n-q-1), (p-q-1)}(\mathbb{C})$  and  $\{f_1, \dots, f_{p-q-1}\}$  is a  $\Lambda_{L_{k-q}}$ -orthogonal set. Here,  $L_{k-q} = I_{k-q} \oplus -I_{n-k-1}$ . Now, there exists  $\Lambda_{L_{k-q}}$ -orthogonal  $R_1$  such that  $R_1 C_1 = \begin{bmatrix} C_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ . Set  $S_2 = R_1 \oplus [1]$  and set  $N_2 = I_q \oplus S_2$ . Continue the reduction until  $i = p - q$ , and let  $W = N_{p-q} \cdots N_1$ . Necessarily,  $p - q \leq n - k$  and

$$WTB = \begin{bmatrix} I_q & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_{p-q} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let  $M = WT$ , and let  $M^{-1} = [n_i]$ . Set  $F = [n_{q+1} \cdots n_{n-p+q}]$ , set  $E_1 = [x_1 \cdots x_q]$ , set  $E_2 = [x_{q+1} \cdots x_p]$ , and set  $D = [E_1 F E_2]$ . Then  $MD = I$ , so that  $D = M^{-1}$ . Now, notice that  $M$  is  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -orthogonal, so that  $M^{-1}$  is also  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -orthogonal. Hence, we have extended  $A$  to a  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -orthogonal basis of  $\mathbb{C}^n$ .

**Theorem 21.** *Let  $A = \{x_1, \dots, x_p\} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  be a  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -orthogonal set. Then  $A$  is linearly independent. Suppose that  $x_i^* L_k x_i = 1$  for  $i = 1, \dots, q$  and  $x_i^* L_k x_i = -1$  for  $i = q + 1, \dots, p$ . Then  $q \leq k$  and  $p - q \leq n - k$ . Moreover,  $A$  can be extended to a  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -orthogonal basis of  $\mathbb{C}^n$ .*

Let  $A \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be a product of two  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -Householder matrices, say  $A = L_u L_v$ , where  $u, v \in \mathbb{C}^n$ . Then  $\text{rank}(A - I) = \text{rank}(L_u (L_v - L_u)) = \text{rank}(L_v - L_u) \leq 2$ . If  $\text{rank}(L_u - L_v) = 0$ , then  $L_v = L_u$  and  $A = I$ . Suppose that  $\text{rank}(A - I) \neq 0$ . Theorem 45 of [2] guarantees that the Jordan Canonical Form of  $A$  contains only blocks of the form (1)  $J_k(\lambda) \oplus J_k(\frac{1}{\lambda})$ , where  $|\lambda| > 1$  and any  $k$ , and (2)  $J_k(e^{i\theta})$ , where  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$  and any  $k$ . If the Jordan Canonical Form of  $A$  contains blocks of the form (1), then  $\lambda$  must be real. Since  $\text{rank}(A - I) \leq 2$ , we must have  $k = 1$ , that is,  $A$  is similar to  $\text{diag}(\lambda, \frac{1}{\lambda}) \oplus I_{n-2}$ . If the Jordan Canonical Form of  $A$  contains blocks of the form (2) and if  $\theta \neq k\pi$ , where  $k$  is an integer, then the Jordan Canonical Form of  $A$  must also contain  $J_k(e^{-i\theta})$ . In this case, we must have  $k = 1$ . If  $-1$  is an eigenvalue of  $A$ , then  $A$  is similar to  $-J_2 \oplus I_{n-2}$  or  $A$  is similar to  $J_2(-1) \oplus I_{n-2}$ . If  $1$  is the only eigenvalue of  $A$ , then  $A$  is similar to  $J_2(1) \oplus I_{n-2}$  or  $A$  is similar to  $J_3(1) \oplus I_{n-3}$ .

It is without loss of generality to assume that  $u^* L_k u = \pm 1$  and that  $v^* L_k v = \pm 1$ . We look at these cases.

**Case 1.**  $u^* L_k u = v^* L_k v = 1$ . There exists a  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -orthogonal  $P$  such that  $Pu = e_1$ . Then  $PAP^{-1} = L_{e_1} L_{Pv}$ . Let  $Pv = [a_i]_{i=1}^n$ , let  $z = [a_i]_{i=2}^n$ .

Suppose that  $k = 1$ . If  $z = 0$ , then  $Pv = a_1 e_1$  and  $|a_1| = 1$ , so that  $L_{Pv} = L_{e_1}$  and  $A = I$ , a contradiction. Hence,  $z \neq 0$ . Let  $\|z\|_2 = b$ . Then, there exists a unitary  $Q \in M_{n-1}(\mathbb{C})$  such that  $Qz = be_1^{(n-1)}$ . Set  $P_1 = [1] \oplus Q$ , so that  $P_1$  is  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -orthogonal. Moreover,  $P_1 e_1 = e_1$  and  $P_1 P v = a_1 e_1 + be_2$ . A direct computation shows that

$$P_1 P A P^{-1} P_1^{-1} = L_{e_1} L_{a_1 e_1 + be_2} = \begin{bmatrix} 2|a_1|^2 - 1 & -2a_1 b \\ -2\bar{a}_1 b & 1 + 2b^2 \end{bmatrix} \oplus I_{n-2}.$$

Here, we have  $|a_1|^2 - b^2 = 1$  since  $v^*L_kv = 1$  and  $P_1P$  is  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -orthogonal. Let  $\alpha = 1 + 2b^2$ . Then the eigenvalues of  $A$  are the two positive numbers  $\alpha \pm \sqrt{\alpha^2 - 1}$  and 1.

Suppose that  $k \geq 2$ . Notice that if  $\{u, v\}$  is a  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -orthogonal set, then  $a_1 = 0$ . Moreover,  $z^*L_{k-1}z = 1$ , so that there exists a  $\Lambda_{L_{k-1}}$ -orthogonal  $Q$  such that  $Qz = e_1^{(n-1)}$ . Set  $P_1 = [1] \oplus Q$ , so that  $P_1$  is  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -orthogonal. Moreover,  $P_1e_1 = e_1$  and  $P_1Pv = e_2$ . In this case,  $P_1PAPP_1^{-1} = L_{e_1}L_{e_2} = -I_2 \oplus I_{n-2}$ .

Suppose that  $\{u, v\}$  is not a  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -orthogonal set. We have two subcases:  $z$  is  $L_{k-1}$ -isotropic or  $z$  is  $L_{k-1}$ -nonisotropic.

Suppose that  $z$  is  $L_{k-1}$ -isotropic. Notice that  $n \geq 3$ , otherwise,  $z = 0$  and  $A = I$ . Now,  $|a_1| = 1$ , say,  $a_1 = e^{i\theta}$ , where  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ . Lemma 14 guarantees that there exists a  $\Lambda_{L_{k-1}}$ -orthogonal  $Q$  such that  $Qz = e_1^{(n-1)} + e_k^{(n-1)}$ . Set  $P_1 = [1] \oplus Q$ , so that  $P_1$  is  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -orthogonal. Moreover,  $P_1e_1 = e_1$  and  $P_1Pv = e^{i\theta}e_1 + e_2 + e_{k+1}$ . A direct calculation shows that

$$P_1PAP^{-1}P_1^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2e^{i\theta} & 0 & -2e^{i\theta} & 0 \\ -2e^{-i\theta} & -1 & 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I_{k-2} & 0 & 0 \\ -2e^{-i\theta} & -2 & 0 & 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & I_{n-k-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let  $A_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2e^{i\theta} & -2e^{i\theta} \\ -2e^{-i\theta} & -1 & 2 \\ -2e^{-i\theta} & -2 & 3 \end{bmatrix}$ . Then, notice that  $(A_1 - I)^2$  has rank 1 and that  $(A_1 - I)^3 = 0$ .

Hence, in this case,  $A$  is similar to  $J_3(1) \oplus I_{n-3}$ .

Suppose that  $z$  is  $L_{k-1}$ -nonisotropic. We have two subcases:  $z^*L_{k-1}z > 0$  and  $z^*L_{k-1}z < 0$ .

Suppose that  $b^2 = z^*L_{k-1}z > 0$ , with  $b > 0$ . There exists a  $\Lambda_{L_{k-1}}$ -orthogonal  $Q$  such that  $Qz = be_1^{(n-1)}$ . Set  $P_1 = [1] \oplus Q$ , and notice that  $P_1e_1 = e_1$  and that  $P_1Pv = a_1e_1 + be_2$ . Here, we have  $|a_1|^2 + b^2 = 1$ . In this case, we have

$$P_1PAP^{-1}P_1^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 2|a_1|^2 - 1 & -2a_1b \\ -2\bar{a}_1b & 1 - 2b^2 \end{bmatrix} \oplus I_{n-2}.$$

Let  $\alpha = 1 - 2b^2$ . Because  $|\alpha| < 1$ , the eigenvalues of  $A$  are  $\alpha \pm i\sqrt{1 - \alpha^2}$  and 1.

Suppose that  $-b^2 = z^*L_{k-1}z < 0$ , with  $b > 0$ . There exists a  $\Lambda_{L_{k-1}}$ -orthogonal  $Q$  such that  $Qz = be_k^{(n-1)}$ . Set  $P_1 = [1] \oplus Q$ , and notice that  $P_1e_1 = e_1$  and that  $P_1Pv = a_1e_1 + be_{k+1}$ . Here, we have  $|a_1|^2 - b^2 = 1$ . In this case, we have

$$P_1PAP^{-1}P_1^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 2|a_1|^2 - 1 & 0 & -2a_1b & 0 \\ 0 & I_{k-1} & 0 & 0 \\ -2\bar{a}_1b & 0 & 1 + 2b^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & I_{n-k-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let  $\alpha = 1 + 2b^2$ . Then the eigenvalues of  $A$  are  $\alpha \pm \sqrt{\alpha^2 - 1}$  and 1.

**Case 2.**  $u^*L_ku = v^*L_kv = -1$ . Then  $u^*(-L_k)u = 1$ . Set  $P = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_{n-k} \\ I_k & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ . Then  $P(-L_k)P^T = L_{n-k}$ .

Set  $x = Pu$  and set  $y = Pv$ . Then  $x^*L_{n-k}x = y^*L_{n-k}y = 1$ .

**Case 3.**  $u^*L_k u = 1$  and  $v^*L_k v = -1$ . There exists a  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -orthogonal  $P$  such that  $Pu = e_1$ . Then  $PAP^{-1} = L_{e_1}L_{Pv}$ . Let  $Pv = [a_i]_{i=1}^n$ , let  $z = [a_i]_{i=2}^n$ .

Suppose that  $k = 1$ . Suppose further that  $\{u, v\}$  is a  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -orthogonal set. Then  $a_1 = 0$  and  $\|z\|_2 = 1$ , so that there exists a unitary  $Q \in M_{n-1}(\mathbb{C})$  such that  $Qz = e_1^{(n-1)}$ . Set  $P_1 = [1] \oplus Q$  and notice that  $P_1PAP^{-1}P_1^{-1} = -I_2 \oplus I_{n-2}$ .

Suppose that  $\{u, v\}$  is not a  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -orthogonal set. Let  $b = \|z\|_2$ . Then  $|a_1|^2 - b^2 = 1$ . Notice that  $b \neq 0$ , otherwise,  $v^*L_k v = 1$ . Now, there exists a unitary  $Q \in M_{n-1}(\mathbb{C})$  such that  $Qz = be_1^{(n-1)}$ . Set  $P_1 = [1] \oplus Q$ , and notice that  $P_1e_1 = e_1$  and  $P_1Pv = a_1e_1 + be_2$ . One checks that

$$P_1PAP^{-1}P_1^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} -1 - 2|a_1|^2 & 2a_1b \\ 2\bar{a}_1b & 1 - 2b^2 \end{bmatrix} \oplus I_{n-2}.$$

Set  $\alpha = 1 + 2b^2$ . Then, the eigenvalues of  $A$  are  $-\alpha \pm \sqrt{\alpha^2 - 1}$  and 1.

Suppose that  $k \geq 2$ . Suppose further that  $\{u, v\}$  is a  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -orthogonal set. Then  $a_1 = 0$  and  $z^*L_{k-1}z = -1$ , so that there exists a  $\Lambda_{L_{k-1}}$ -orthogonal  $Q \in M_{n-1}(\mathbb{C})$  such that  $Qz = e_k^{(n-1)}$ . Set  $P_1 = [1] \oplus Q$  and notice that  $P_1e_1 = e_1$ , and that  $P_1Pv = e_{k+1}$ . In this case,  $P_1PAP^{-1}P_1^{-1} = [-1] \oplus I_{k-1} \oplus [-1] \oplus I_{n-k-1}$ , so that  $A$  is similar to  $-I_2 \oplus I_{n-2}$ .

Suppose that  $\{u, v\}$  is not a  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -orthogonal set. Notice that  $z$  is not  $L_{k-1}$ -isotropic, otherwise, we have  $-1 = |a_1|^2 + z^*L_{k-1}z = |a_1|^2$ . Moreover,  $z^*L_{k-1}z = -1 - |a_1|^2 < 0$ . Let  $b = \sqrt{1 + |a_1|^2}$ . There exists a  $\Lambda_{L_{k-1}}$ -orthogonal  $Q \in M_{n-1}(\mathbb{C})$  such that  $Qz = be_k^{(n-1)}$ . Set  $P_1 = [1] \oplus Q$ , and notice that  $P_1e_1 = e_1$  and that  $P_1Pv = a_1e_1 + be_{k+1}$ . Then,

$$P_1PAP^{-1}P_1^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} -1 - 2|a_1|^2 & 0 & 2a_1b & 0 \\ 0 & I_{k-1} & 0 & 0 \\ 2\bar{a}_1b & 0 & 1 - 2b^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & I_{n-k-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Set  $\alpha = 2b^2 - 1 = 1 + 2|a_1|^2$ . The eigenvalues of  $A$  are the two real numbers  $-\alpha \pm \sqrt{\alpha^2 - 1}$  and 1.

**Case 4.**  $u^*L_k u = -1$  and  $v^*L_k v = 1$ . Consider instead  $-L_k$ .

We summarize our results. Notice that neither  $J_2(1)$  nor  $J_2(-1)$  is a possible Jordan block of a product of two  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -Householder matrices.

**Theorem 22.** *Let  $n \geq 2$  and  $k \geq 1$  be given integers. Let  $A \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be given. Suppose that  $A$  is a product of two  $\Lambda_{L_k}$ -Householder matrices. Then  $A$  is similar to only one of the following:*

1.  $\text{diag}\left(\lambda, \frac{1}{\lambda}\right) \oplus I_{n-2}$ , where  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $|\lambda| \geq 1$ ,
2.  $\text{diag}\left(e^{i\theta}, e^{-i\theta}\right) \oplus I_{n-2}$ , where  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ , or
3.  $J_3(1) \oplus I_{n-3}$ .

**References**

[1] R.A. Horn, C.R. Johnson, Matrix Analysis, Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, 1985.  
 [2] R.A. Horn, D.I. Merino, D. Serre, The orthogonal groups (preprint, private communication with the authors).  
 [3] P. Scherk, On the decomposition of orthogonalities into symmetries, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 4 (1950) 481–491.  
 [4] F. Uhlig, Constructive ways for generating (generalized) real orthogonal matrices as products of (generalized) symmetries, Linear Algebra Appl. 332/334 (2001) 459–467.  
 [5] D.S. Mackey, N. Mackey, F. Tisseur, G-reflectors: analogues of Householder transformations in scalar product spaces, Linear Algebra Appl. 385 (2004) 187–213.  
 [6] A. Mostafazadeh, Pseudo-unitary operators and pseudo-unitary dynamics, J. Math. Phys. 45 (2003) 932–946.