

604155



A NOTE ON PRIMITIVE MATRICES\*

I. N. Herstein

P-544 ✓ (B)

12 November 1952

Approved for OTS release

*6p*

COPY	OF	
HARD COPY		\$ . 1.00
MICROFICHE		\$ . 0.50

*p*

**DDC**  
**REGISTERED**  
**AUG 19 1964**  
**DDC-IRA C**

The **RAND** Corporation

1500 FOURTH ST. • SANTA MONICA • CALIFORNIA

\*Research undertaken under contract between the Cowles Commission for Research in Economics and The RAND Corporation

A Note on Primitive Matrices

I. N. Herstein

November 12, 1952

Suppose that  $A$  is a square matrix consisting of nonnegative elements. In certain considerations it is important to know when all the elements of some power of  $A$  are strictly positive. Frobenius [2] gave a very simple necessary and sufficient condition for this to happen. In this note we give a simple proof of this result. Our proof is algebraic in nature and avoids the use of the convergence of powers of a matrix.

All matrices considered here will have real elements. For two such matrices (not necessarily square)  $B = (b_{ij})$ ,  $C = (c_{ij})$  we define

$$B \geq C \quad \text{if} \quad b_{ij} \geq c_{ij} \quad \text{for each } i, j.$$

$$B \geq C \quad \text{if} \quad B \geq C \text{ but } B \neq C$$

$$B > C \quad \text{if} \quad b_{ij} > c_{ij} \quad \text{for each } i, j.$$

A square matrix  $A \geq 0$  ( $A$  is then called nonnegative) is said to be indecomposable if for no permutation matrix  $P$  does

$$PAP^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ 0 & A_{22} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{where the } A_{ii} \text{ are square submatrices.}$$

The fundamental result about nonnegative, indecomposable matrices is due to Frobenius [2]; this, and other, results have recently been rederived and extended in a greatly simplified manner by Wielandt [3] and Debreu and Herstein [1]. It is

THEOREM. Let  $A \geq 0$  be an indecomposable matrix. Then  $A$  has a positive characteristic root  $r$  such that

1.  $r$  is a simple root.

2. to r can be associated a characteristic vector x > 0.

3. if α is any other characteristic root of A, |α| ≤ r.

If A > 0 then 3. can be sharpened to |α| < r for all characteristic roots α ≠ r of A.

If A ≥ 0 is indecomposable and if A has no characteristic root other than r of maximal absolute value then A is said to be primitive.

In this paper we prove the

**THEOREM\*** (Perron-Frobenius). Let A ≥ 0. Then A<sup>m</sup> > 0 for some integer m > 0 if and only if A is primitive.

Suppose that A<sup>m</sup> > 0. Then A must be indecomposable; for if

$$PAP^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} B & C \\ 0 & D \end{pmatrix} \text{ then } PA^mP^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} B^m & C^m \\ 0 & D^m \end{pmatrix} \text{ contradicting } A^m > 0.$$

Now suppose that r and  $re^{i\psi} \neq r$  are characteristic roots of A of maximal absolute value. Then A<sup>m</sup>, A<sup>m+1</sup> are both positive and have  $r^m, r^m e^{im\psi}$ , and  $r^{m+1}, r^{m+1} e^{i(m+1)\psi}$  respectively as roots of maximal absolute value.

Since the largest root of a positive matrix is simple and is actually greater than any other root in absolute value. We must have

$$r^m e^{im\psi} = r^m, r^{m+1} e^{i(m+1)\psi} = r^{m+1}, \text{ whence } e^{i\psi} = 1, \text{ a contradiction.}$$

There remains but to show that if A is primitive then A<sup>m</sup> > 0 for a suitable integer m > 0. This will be proved as a consequence of the following few lemmas, which by themselves are of some interest.

**Lemma 1.** If A is primitive then A<sup>m</sup> is primitive for every positive integer m.

Proof. Since r is a simple root of A and is the only root of A of absolute value r, r<sup>m</sup> is a simple root of A<sup>m</sup> and is the only root of A<sup>m</sup> of absolute value r<sup>m</sup>. So we need but show that A<sup>m</sup> is indecomposable for every integer

$m > 0$ . Suppose that for some  $s$   $A^s$  is not indecomposable; we can then assume that  $A^s = \begin{pmatrix} B & C \\ 0 & D \end{pmatrix}$ . Now  $Ax = rx$  for  $x > 0$ , so  $A^s x = r^s x$ ; partition

$x$  according to the partitioning of  $A^s$  and we have  $\begin{pmatrix} B & C \\ 0 & D \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} = r^s \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix}$ .

That is  $Dx_2 = r^s x_2$ , and since  $x_2$  is positive,  $r^s$  is a characteristic root of  $D$ . Since the transpose,  $A^t$ , of  $A$  is also indecomposable, we have  $A^t Y = rY$  for  $Y > 0$ . Partitioning as above we obtain that  $r^s$  is a characteristic root of  $B^t$ , and so of  $B$ . Being a characteristic root of both  $B$  and  $D$   $r^s$  must be a multiple root of  $A^s$ , which is a contradiction. The lemma is thereby proved.

Lemma 2. (Wielandt). Let  $\epsilon$  be any positive number. Suppose  $A \geq 0$  is an  $n \times n$  indecomposable matrix. Then  $(\epsilon I + A)^{n-1} > 0$  where  $I$  is the identity matrix.

Proof. It clearly suffices to show that for any vector  $x$ ,  $x \geq 0$ ,  $(\epsilon I + A)^{n-1} x > 0$ . Let

$$x_j = (\epsilon I + A)^{j-1} x. \text{ Then } x_{j+1} = \epsilon x_j + Ax_j.$$

Hence a zero component can occur in  $x_{j+1}$  only where a zero component already occurred in  $x_j$ . However, not every such zero component can be preserved in  $x_{j+1}$ . For if so, by a suitable reordering of the coordinates,

$$x_j = \begin{pmatrix} p \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, p > 0, \text{ whence } x_{j+1} = \epsilon \begin{pmatrix} p \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} p \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} q \\ 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

from which it follows that  $A_{21}p = 0$ . This together with  $p > 0$  forces  $A_{21} = 0$ , violating the indecomposability of  $A$ . So each application of

$\epsilon I + A$  to  $x$  decreases the number of zero coordinates by at least one.

Hence  $(\epsilon I + A)^{n-1} x > 0$ .

As an easy consequence of Lemma 2 we obtain

Lemma 3. If  $A = (a_{ij})$  is indecomposable and  $a_{ii} > 0$  for each  $i$  then  $A^{n-1} > 0$ .

For let  $\epsilon$  be chosen satisfying  $0 < \epsilon < \min_i a_{ii}$ . Then  $A = \epsilon I + B$  where  $B \geq 0$  is indecomposable. Lemma 2 then yields  $A^{n-1} > 0$ .

Let  $A^{(m)} = (a_{ij}^{(m)})$ . Then we have

Lemma 4. Let  $A \geq 0$  be indecomposable. Then for any  $i, j$  we can find an  $m = m(i, j) > 0$  so that  $a_{ij}^{(m)} > 0$ .

Proof. Consider first the case  $i \neq j$ . Since

$(I+A)^{n-1} = A^{n-1} + \binom{n-1}{1} A^{n-2} + \dots + I > 0$  by Lemma 2,  $a_{ij}^{(m)} > 0$  for some  $m \leq n-1$ . Now suppose  $i = j$ . Since  $A$  is indecomposable, no column of zeros can occur in  $A$ . So there is a  $k$  with  $a_{ki} > 0$ . If  $k = i$  then  $a_{ii}^{(m)} > 0$  for all  $m$  trivially. If, on the other hand,  $k \neq i$ , then  $a_{ik}^{(m)} > 0$  for some  $m$ , and since  $a_{ii}^{(m+1)} = \sum_r a_{ir}^{(m)} a_{ri} > a_{ik}^{(m)} a_{ki} > 0$  the lemma is proved.

We are now in position to complete the proof of Theorem\*. Let  $A$  be primitive. Pick  $m_1$  so that in  $A^{m_1}$ ,  $a_{11}^{(m_1)} > 0$ . Let  $A_1 = A^{m_1} = (a_{ij}^{(1)})$ . By Lemma 1  $A_1$  is primitive, so there is an  $m_2$  such that in  $A_1^{m_2}$ ,  $a_{22}^{(m_2)}(1) > 0$ . Since  $a_{11}^{(1)} = a_{11}^{(m_1)} > 0$ ,  $a_{11}^{(m_2)}(1) > 0$ . Let  $A_2 = A_1^{m_2}$ . Continuing in this way we arrive at an  $A_n = A^{m_1 m_2 \dots m_n}$  which is primitive and whose diagonal elements are all positive. By Lemma 3  $A_n^t > 0$  for some  $t$ , hence  $A^m > 0$  for some suitably chosen integer  $m$ .

Cowles Commission for Research in Economics

and The University of Chicago

## FOOTNOTES

1. This paper is a result of the work being done at the Cowles Commission for Research in Economics on the "Theory of Resource Allocation" under sub-contract to the RAND Corporation.
2. Numbers in square brackets refer to the bibliography at the end of this paper.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Debreu, Gerard and Herstein, I. N., "Nonnegative Square Matrices." (forthcoming).
2. Frobenius, G., "Über Matrizen aus nicht negativen Elementen," Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie, 1912, p. 456-477.
3. Wielandt, H., "Unzerlegbare, nicht negative Matrizen," Mathematische Zeitschrift, Vol. 52, 1950, p. 642-648.