On the simultaneous diagonalisability of matrices

This article has been downloaded from IOPscience. Please scroll down to see the full text article.
1986 J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 193917
(http://iopscience.iop.org/0305-4470/19/18/036)
View the table of contents for this issue, or go to the journal homepage for more

Download details:
IP Address: 129.252.86.83
The article was downloaded on 31/05/2010 at 12:58

Please note that terms and conditions apply.

## COMMENT

# On the simultaneous diagonalisability of matrices $\dagger$ 
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#### Abstract

We prove two theorems on the simultaneous diagonalisability of a set of complex square matrices by a biunitary transformation.


The problem of simultaneous diagonalisation of a set of square matrices (e.g. Mehta 1977) arises in the discussion of natural flavour conservation in Higgs induced neutral currents (e.g. Sartori 1979, Gatto et al 1980, Frère and Yao 1985). In this context the following theorem was formulated.

Theorem 1. Let $\left\{A_{1}, \ldots, A_{N}\right\}$ be a set of complex $m \times m$ matrices. Then there exist unitary matrices $U, V$ such that $U^{\dagger} A_{i} V$ is diagonal for all $i=1, \ldots, N$ iff the sets $S_{1}=\left\{A_{i}^{\dagger} A_{j}\right\}_{l, j=1, \ldots, N}$ and $S_{2}=\left\{A_{i} A_{j}^{\dagger}\right\}_{i, j=1 \ldots, N}$ are Abelian.

This is the original version of Sartori (1979) who, however, only sketched the idea of a proof in his paper. Theorem 1 was discussed again by Gatto et al (1980) who presented a proof under the additional assumption of, e.g., $A_{1} A_{1}^{+}$being non-degenerate. More recently, Frère and Yao (1985) referred to a similar theorem by Federbush where both the non-degeneracy of $\boldsymbol{A}_{1}^{\dagger} \boldsymbol{A}_{1}$ and the non-singularity of the matrices $A_{i}$ seem to play an essential role. The purpose of the present comment is twofold: firstly we show that theorem 1 holds in its original form, i.e. no assumptions concerning non-degeneracy or non-singularity of matrices need to be made. Secondly, if at least one of the matrices $A_{i}$ is non-singular it can be shown that the commutativity of either $S_{1}$ or $S_{2}$ is actually sufficient for the simultaneous diagonalisation of $A_{1}, \ldots, A_{N}$ (theorem 2).

Let us first prove theorem 1. The commutativity of $S_{1}$ and $S_{2}$ is clearly necessary for the existence of unitary matrices $U, V$ such that $U^{\dagger} A_{i} V$ are diagonal for all $i=1, \ldots, N$. The more interesting part of the theorem concerns the opposite implication. If $S_{1}$ is Abelian all elements of $S_{1}$ are normal matrices. Consequently, there exists a common orthonormal basis of eigenvectors $\left\{x_{\alpha}\right\}_{\alpha=1, \ldots, m}$ for all matrices of $S_{1}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{i}^{\dagger} A_{j} x_{\alpha}=\lambda_{i j}^{\alpha} x_{\alpha} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $\lambda_{i j}^{\alpha}(\alpha=1, \ldots, m ; i, j=1, \ldots, N)$ the corresponding eigenvalues. Let $\left\{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{k}\right\}$ be those vectors for which $A_{i} x_{\alpha}=0$ for all $i=1, \ldots, N$. Then for all $\alpha>k$ (for $k=m$ the theorem holds trivially because $A_{i} \equiv 0$ ) there exists an index $i_{\alpha}$ such that $A_{i_{0}} x_{\alpha} \neq 0$. This allows one to define the normalised vectors

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{\alpha}=A_{i_{\alpha}} x_{\alpha} /\left\|A_{t_{\mathrm{o}}} x_{\alpha}\right\| \quad \alpha=k+1, \ldots, m . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

[^0]Using

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda_{i i}^{\alpha}=\left\|A_{i} x_{\alpha}\right\|^{2} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

one finds that the $y_{\alpha}$ form an orthonormal system since

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(y_{\alpha} \mid y_{\beta}\right)=\lambda_{i_{\alpha} i_{\beta}}^{\beta} \delta_{\alpha \beta} /\left(\left\|A_{i_{\alpha}} x_{\alpha}\right\|\left\|A_{i_{\beta}} x_{\beta}\right\|\right)=\delta_{\alpha \beta} \quad \alpha, \beta>k . \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Furthermore, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(y_{\alpha} \mid A_{i} x_{\beta}\right)=\lambda_{i_{a} i}^{\beta} \delta_{\alpha \beta}\left(\lambda_{i_{a} i_{\alpha}}^{\alpha}\right)^{-1 / 2} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

which implies that each vector $A_{i} x_{\beta}$ has only a $y_{\beta}$ component and a possible component in the space orthogonal to all $y_{\alpha}(\alpha=k+1, \ldots, m)$. To show that $A_{i} x_{\beta}$ is in fact proportional to $y_{\beta}$ it is sufficient to prove

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\left(y_{\beta} \mid A_{i} x_{\beta}\right)\right|=\left\|A_{i} x_{\beta}\right\| . \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

At this point the commutativity of $S_{2}$ enters. From

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{i} A_{i}^{\dagger} A_{i} A_{j}^{\dagger} A_{j} x_{\beta}=A_{i} A_{j}^{\dagger} A_{i} A_{i}^{\dagger} A_{j} x_{\beta} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

we obtain the relation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda_{i i}^{\beta} \lambda_{j j}^{\beta}=\lambda_{j i}^{\beta} \lambda_{i j}^{\beta}=\left|\lambda_{i j}^{\beta}\right|^{2} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

using (1). With the help of (8) we can derive (6):

$$
\left|\left(y_{\beta} \mid A_{i} x_{\beta}\right)\right|=\left|\lambda_{i_{i} i}^{\beta}\right|\left(\lambda_{i_{\beta} i_{\beta}}^{\beta}\right)^{-1 / 2}=\left(\lambda_{i i}^{\beta}\right)^{1 / 2}=\left\|A_{i} x_{\beta}\right\| .
$$

Completing $\left\{y_{k+1}, \ldots, y_{m}\right\}$ to an orthonormal basis $\left\{y_{1}, \ldots, y_{k}, y_{k+1}, \ldots, y_{m}\right\}$ we can write ${ }^{\dagger}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{i} x_{\alpha}=\rho_{i}^{\alpha} y_{\alpha} \quad i=1, \ldots, N ; \alpha=1, \ldots, m \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
A_{i}=\sum_{\alpha=1}^{m} \rho_{i}^{\alpha} y_{\alpha} x_{\alpha}^{\dagger}=\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m}\right)\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
\rho_{i}^{1} & & 0  \tag{10}\\
& \ddots & \\
0 & & \rho_{i}^{m}
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}
x_{1}^{\dagger} \\
\vdots \\
x_{m}^{\dagger}
\end{array}\right) .
$$

Thus we have obtained unitary matrices

$$
\begin{align*}
& U=\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m}\right) \\
& V=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}\right) \tag{11}
\end{align*}
$$

which diagonalise all $A_{i}$, completing the proof of theorem 1 .
The commutativity of both $S_{1}$ and $S_{2}$ was crucial for the proof. If, however, one of the matrices $A_{i}(i=1, \ldots, N)$ is non-singular it is already sufficient for the simultaneous diagonalisability of the $A_{i}$ that either $S_{1}$ or $S_{2}$ is Abelian. This is the content of the following theorem.

Theorem 2. Let $A_{1}$ be non-singular and $S_{1}=\left\{A_{i}^{\dagger} A_{j}\right\}_{i, j=1, \ldots, N}$ be an Abelian set. Then there exist unitary matrices $U, V$ such that $U^{\dagger} A_{i} V$ is diagonal for all $i=1, \ldots, N$ and thus the set $S_{2}=\left\{A_{i} A_{j}^{\dagger}\right\}_{i, j=1, \ldots, N}$ is also Abelian.
† Of course, $\rho_{1}^{\alpha}=0$ for $\alpha=1, \ldots, k$ and all $i$.

In order to prove theorem 2 we choose vectors $\left\{x_{\alpha}\right\}_{\alpha=1, \ldots, m}$ as before and we define

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{\alpha}=A_{1} x_{\alpha} /\left\|A_{1} x_{\alpha}\right\| \quad \alpha=1, \ldots, m . \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

The $y_{\alpha}$ exist for all $\alpha$ because $A_{1}$ is non-singular. As in (5) we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(y_{\alpha} \mid A_{i} x_{\beta}\right)=\lambda_{1 i}^{\beta} \delta_{\alpha \beta}\left(\lambda_{11}^{\alpha}\right)^{-1 / 2} . \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since now $\left\{y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m}\right\}$ is a complete orthonormal basis of $C^{m}$ it follows immediately from (13) that $A_{i} x_{\beta}$ is proportional to $y_{\beta}$. As for theorem $1 U$ and $V$ are given by (11).

In conclusion we want to note that the non-singularity of $A_{1}$ in theorem 2 is essential. For instance, it is not sufficient to demand only non-degeneracy of $A_{1}^{\dagger} A_{1}$. Finally, we emphasise once again that no assumptions concerning non-degeneracy were needed to prove both theorems, making their actual application much simpler in most cases.

The content of this comment grew out of discussions during an earlier collaboration with our late friend Walter Konetschny.

Note added in proof. After submission of this comment, Professors R Gatto and G Sartori supplied us with an alternative proof of theorem 1 .
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