JOURNAL OF COMBINATORIAL THEORY 11, 303-306 (1971)

Note

Matrices Permutable to $*$ Matrices

R. C. ENTRINGER AND DOUGLAS E. JACKSON

University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106, and Center for Naval Analysis, Arlington, Virginia 22209

Communicated by J. Riordan

Received February 19, 1970

A (0, 1) matrix (a_{ij}) is said to be a $*$ matrix iff $a_{ij} = 1$ implies $a_{i'j'} = 1$ for all (i',j') satisfying $1 \leq i' \leq i, 1 \leq j' \leq j$. (0, 1) matrices permutable to $*$ matrices are characterized and counted. Commutivity of matrices which permute to $*$ matrices is also discussed.

In [1] we defined $*$ matrices to be matrices (a_{ij}) with $a_{ij} = 0$ or 1 and $a_{i'j'} = 1$ if $a_{ij} = 1$ and $1 \leq i' \leq i, 1 \leq j' \leq j$. For example the matrix

is a $*$ matrix. We note that $*$ matrices are maximal in the sense of Ryser $[3, p. 621$. In this note we wish to consider the number $p(m, n)$ of $m \times 10^{13}$ $\mathcal{P}(m, n)$ or $m \times n$ (0,1)
matrices from and be obtained by permutation of $\mathcal{P}(m, n)$ or $m \times n$ (0,1) matrices from which a $*$ matrix can be obtained by permuting rows and columns. We say such a matrix permutes to a $*$ matrix. For example the matrix 110

$$
B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}
$$

permutes to the * matrix A. We observe that B contains no submatrix equal permules to the $*$ matrix A. we observe that B contains no submatrix equal to $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ or $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$. The following theorem shows that this is a characteristic property of matrices permutable to $*$ matrices.
303

THEOREM 1. A $(0, 1)$ matrix permutes to a $*$ matrix if and only if every 2×2 submatrix is unequal to $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ and $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$.

Proof. Clearly if a matrix has $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ or $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ as a submatrix then so does every permutation and hence no permutation can be $a *$ matrix. Conversely suppose a matrix has neither as a submatrix. Permute the columns so that each column has at least as many l's as the column to the right of it. Now permute the rows so that the first column has no 0 above a 1. If none of the first $k - 1$ columns has a 0 above a 1 then rows may be permuted so that none of the first k columns has a 0 above a 1. This procedure leads to the desired $*$ matrix.

We note that if in a matrix permutable to $a *$ matrix the 0's are replaced by l's and the l's by O's then by the above characterization the resulting matrix also permutes to a $*$ matrix. Hence $p(m, n)$ is even. A generalization of this result is a consequence of the following theorem.

 $S(n, k)$ is a Stirling number of the second kind for $1 \leq k \leq n$ and is defined to be 0 for $k > n$.

THEOREM 2.

$$
p(m, n) = \sum_{k \geq 0} (k!)^2 S(m + 1, k + 1) S(n + 1, k + 1)
$$

=
$$
\sum_{k \geq 1} (-1)^{n+k} k! (k + 1)^m S(n, k).
$$

Proof. For convenience in classifying the matrices counted by $p(m, n)$ according to the number of distinct row sums and column sums we consider $(m + 1) \times (n + 1)$ matrices obtained by bordering the given matrices with a row and column of zeroes; clearly this has no effect on the count.

Let p_k be the number of such (0, 1) matrices which permute to a $*$ matrix $\text{For } p_k$ or the number of such (v, t) indifferent permitted $v \cdot \text{matrix}$ $\lim_{i \to \infty}$ contens, h.e., exactly k entries $a_{ij} = 1$ with $a_{i+1,j} = 0 = a_{i,j+1}$. Frow since each matrix counted by p_k has exactly $\kappa + 1$ distinct fow sums $\frac{1}{4}$ $\frac{1}{4}$ into k $\frac{1}{4}$ into k $\frac{1}{4}$ into k $\frac{1}{4}$ in the $\frac{1}{4$ $M = \{1, ..., m + 1\}$ into $k + 1$ parts with $m + 1$ in the $(k + 1)$ -th part is defined by letting the *i*-th part of the partition consist of the indices of the intervention rows with the intervention α is the intervention, α is the intervention, α $\frac{1}{2}$ are known which the *t*-th targest row sum, similarly an ordered partition, of which there are $k! S(n + 1, k + 1)$, of the set $N = \{1, ..., n + 1\}$ into $k + 1$ parts with $n + 1$ in the $(k + 1)$ -th part is determined by the columns since there are $k + 1$ distinct column sums also. As an example the row of the previous defined matrix \mathbb{R} defined matrix \mathbb{R} defined matrix \mathbb{R} determined matrix \mathbb{R} defined matrix \mathbb{R} defined matrix \mathbb{R} defined matrix \mathbb{R} defined matr

As an example the rows of the previously defined matrix \vec{D} determine the ordered partition $R = (\{1, 4\}, \{2\}, \{3\}, \{5\})$ of $\{1, ..., 5\}$ while the columns of *B* determine the ordered partition $C = (\{4\}, \{2\}, \{1, 5\}, \{3, 6\})$ of $\{1,..., 6\}$. Conversely suppose the ordered partitions

$$
R = (\{r_1, ..., r_{i_1}\}, ..., \{r_{i_k+1}, ..., r_{i_{k+1}} = m+1\})
$$

and

$$
C = (\{c_1, ..., c_{i_1}\}, ..., \{c_{i_k+1}, ..., c_{i_{k+1}} = n+1\})
$$

of M and N, respectively, into $k + 1$ parts are given. Let R' and C' be the ordered partitions

$$
(\{1,\ldots,i_1\},\ldots,\{i_k+1,\ldots,i_{k+1}=m+1\})
$$

and

$$
(\{1,...,j_1\},\ldots,\{j_k+1,...,j_{k+1}=n+1\})
$$

of M and N, respectively. It suffices now to show there is a unique $*$ matrix A determining R' and C' for then the matrix B obtained from A by applying the row and column permutations $s \rightarrow r_s$ and $t \rightarrow c_t$ is the unique matrix determining R and C . But the corners of any $*$ matrix determining R' and C' must lie in rows $i_1, ..., i_k$ and columns $j_1, ..., j_k$. Hence A must be that $(m + 1) \times (n + 1)$ * matrix with corners at $(i_1, j_k),..., (i_k, j_1).$

In the example we have $R' = (\{1, 2\}, \{3\}, \{4\}, \{5\})$ and

$$
C' = (\{1\}, \{2\}, \{3, 4\}, \{5, 6\}).
$$

The matrix determining R' and C' has corners at $(2, 4)$, $(3, 2)$, and $(4, 1)$ and therefore is the $*$ matrix A previously defined.

The second equality of the theorem can be derived from the identity

$$
k! S(n + 1, k + 1) = \sum_{j \geq k} (-1)^{n+j} {j \choose k} j! S(n, j),
$$

which is equivalent to one found in [2, p. 209]. The derivation involves multiplying both sides by $k!S(m + 1, k + 1)$, summing on k, and using the identity

$$
\sum_{k\geqslant 0} {j \choose k} k! S(m+1, k+1) = (j+1)^m,
$$

which is easily derived by using the recurrence relation and usual equation of definition of the Stirling numbers.

The folIowing result is an immediate consequence of the theorem.

COROLLARY 3.

$$
p(m + p - 1, n) \equiv p(m, n) \pmod{p}
$$
 for all primes p.

If A and B are permutable to $*$ matrices we may have $AB = BA$ without having $A = B$ or either of them equal to the zero matrix. For example, if C is any $n \times n$ * matrix and D is the $n \times n$ zero matrix then trivially the matrices $\begin{bmatrix} C & D \\ D & D \end{bmatrix}$ and $\begin{bmatrix} D & C \\ D & D \end{bmatrix}$ commute since their product is the $2n \times 2n$ zero matrix. If, however, $A = PA'PT$, $B = PB'PT$ for $n \times n$ $*$ matrices A' and B' and some permutation matrix P (P^T is its transpose) then we must have $A = B$ or $A = 0$ or $B = 0$. This follows from the fact that $PAP^T PBP^T = PBP^T PAP^T$ if and only if $AB = BA$ and from the following theorem:

THEOREM 4. Two $*$ matrices A and B commute if and only if $A = B$ or one of them is the zero matrix.

Proof. Let k be the least integer for which the k-th row of A is not equal to the k-th row of B. Let r_k be the k-th row sum of A. We may assume B has k-th row sum $r_k + r$ with $r > 0$. Then the $(r_k + 1)$ -th column sum of A is at most $k - 1$ while that of B is at least k. Commutativity then requires $min(r_k, k) = min(r_k + r, k - 1)$ which implies $r_k \le k - 1$ and this in turn gives $r_k = k - 1$. If $k = 1$ then A is the zero matrix. For $k > 1$ both A and B have their first column sums c and c' equal to or greater than k . Hence

$$
k-1=\min(r_k,c')=\min(r_k+r,c)\geqslant k,
$$

which is impossible.

REFERENCES

- 1. D. E. JACKSON AND R. C. ENTRINGER, Enumeration of certain binary matrices, J. Combinatorial Theory 8 (1970), 291-298. $\frac{2.6}{100}$ J. Riombinatorial Identities, $\frac{2.6}{100}$ Minimum Section Identities, $\frac{2.6}{100}$
- 3. H. J. RYSER, "Combinatorial Mathematics," Wiley, New York, 1963.
-