

A New Criterion for H -Stability of Complex Matrices*

DAVID CARLSON
Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon

Communicated by Hans Schneider

Generalizing some work of Arrow and McManus [1], Ostrowski and Schneider in [5] defined two strong notions of matrix stability which they called H -stability and H -semistability. They gave necessary and sufficient criteria for a matrix to be H -stable or H -semistable; another criterion for H -stability was given by this author and Schneider [3]. In this note we modify their definitions and give yet another criterion for H -stability. We derive some consequences of our criterion, and conclude by listing some criteria for the stability or semistability of a matrix.

1. DEFINITIONS

We define the inertia of a complex n by n matrix A to be $\text{In } A = (\pi(A), \nu(A), \delta(A))$, where $\pi(A)$, $\nu(A)$, and $\delta(A)$ are respectively the numbers of eigenvalues (counting multiplicities) of A with positive, negative, and zero real parts. While matrix stability is usually defined in terms of eigenvalues with negative real parts, we shall deal exclusively with "positive" stabilities. We define A to be stable if $\pi(A) = n$ and semistable if $\nu(A) = 0$. We shall always use H to denote a hermitian matrix. We define A to be H -stable if AH is stable whenever $H > 0$ (positive definite) and H -semistable if AH is semistable whenever $H > 0$. For real A , we define A to be real H -stable or real H -semistable if the appropriate

* This research was done while the author was on a Fulbright-Hayes grant to the Universidad de la República in Montevideo, Uruguay; he wishes to express his appreciation to the Fulbright Commission in Uruguay and the Instituto de Matemática y Estadística for affording him this opportunity.

condition holds for all real symmetric H . A real matrix is real H -stable (real H -semistable) if and only if it is H -stable (H -semistable) [5].

2. EQUIVALENCE OF DEFINITIONS

Using continuity, it is easy to see that if AH is semistable for all $H > 0$, then AH is also semistable for all $H \geq 0$ (positive semidefinite); thus our definition of H -semistability and that in [5] are equivalent. That our definition of H -stability is equivalent to that in [5] follows from

REMARK 1. *If AH is stable whenever $H > 0$, then $H > 0$ whenever AH is stable.*

Proof. Clearly A is H -semistable, and thus by Theorem 3 of [5], $R(A) = (A + A^*)/2 \geq 0$. By Corollary 4 of [5], $\text{In } AH \leq \text{In } H$ (i.e., $\pi(AH) \leq \pi(H)$, $\nu(AH) \leq \nu(H)$) for every H . If AH is stable, then $n = \pi(AH) \leq \pi(H) \leq n$ and $H > 0$.

The proofs of equivalence for the definitions of real H -stability and real H -semistability follow *mutus mutandi*.

3. A NEW CRITERION FOR H -STABILITY

Our criterion is derived from that given in [3]. We define $I(A) = (A - A^*)/2i$.

LEMMA. *Given a matrix A . Suppose*

$$(i) \quad R(A) \geq 0,$$

*and let S be any nonsingular matrix for which $S^*R(A)S = P_{11} \oplus 0$, where $P_{11} > 0$. If $S^*I(A)S = Q$ is partitioned conformably, then $Q_{22} = 0$ if and only if*

$$(ii) \quad x^*R(A)x = 0 \Rightarrow x^*I(A)x = 0.$$

Proof. Let $y = S^{-1}x$ be partitioned conformably. Then $x^*R(A)x = y_1^*P_{11}y_1 = 0$ if and only if $y_1 = 0$; and $x^*I(A)x = y_2^*Q_{22}y_2 = 0$ for all such x if and only if $Q_{22} = 0$.

COROLLARY 1. *Suppose (i) and (ii) hold; then no principal submatrix of A has any nonzero imaginary eigenvalues.*

Proof. Suppose A had a nonzero imaginary eigenvalue βi . Then, as $R(A) \geq 0$, by Theorem 2 of [5], for some unitary U , $U^*AU = B_{11} \oplus \beta i$. This, we see by the lemma, would violate (ii). As each principal submatrix of A inherits (i) and (ii) from A , the corollary follows.

THEOREM. *The matrix A is H -stable if and only if*

(i) $R(A) \geq 0$,

(ii) $x^*R(A)x = 0 \Rightarrow x^*I(A)x = 0$,

and

(iii) A is nonsingular.

Proof. By Theorem VII of [3], A is H -stable if and only if (i), (iii), and, for any S of the form described in the lemma, $Q_{22} = 0$. The theorem now follows from the lemma.

The notion of H -stability can be generalized to operators on any Hilbert space. We pose a question: is the characterization given in our theorem still valid?

Suppose now that A is real. We can give a criterion for real H -stability in terms of A and real vectors ξ and η . For any complex vector x , we have $x = \xi + i\eta$, where ξ and η are real. Now if $R(A) \geq 0$,

$$x^*R(A)x = 0 \Leftrightarrow R(A)x = 0 \Leftrightarrow R(A)\xi = R(A)\eta = 0.$$

Now assume that $x^*R(A)x = 0$. We have

$$x^*I(A)x = 0 \Leftrightarrow x^*Ax = 0 \Leftrightarrow \xi'A\xi + \eta'A\eta + i(\xi'A\eta - \eta'A\xi) = 0.$$

As $x^*R(A)x = 0$ and $iI(A) = A - R(A)$ is real and skewsymmetric,

$$\eta'A\xi = i\eta'I(A)\xi = -i\xi'I(A)\eta = -\xi'A\eta.$$

Thus

$$x^*I(A)x = 0 \Leftrightarrow \xi'A\xi + \eta'A\eta + 2i\xi'A\eta = 0.$$

Now it is clear that we have

COROLLARY 2. *Suppose A is real. Then A is real H -stable if and only if (i) and (iii) hold, and*

(ii') *for each pair of real vectors ξ, η for which $R(A)\xi = R(A)\eta = 0$, we have $\xi'A\eta = 0$.*

COROLLARY 3. *Suppose A is real. Then A is real H -stable if it is nonsingular and $R(A) \geq 0$, of rank $n - 1$.*

Proof. If ξ and η are eigenvectors for zero of $R(A)$, we must have $\eta = \lambda\xi$ for some real scalar λ . Now

$$\xi'A\eta = \lambda\xi'A\xi = \lambda\xi'R(A)\xi = 0.$$

4. SOME CONSEQUENCES

Let $F(A) = \{\alpha: \alpha = x^*Ax, x^*x = 1\}$ denote the field of values of A , and let P denote the open right half-plane.

COROLLARY 4. *The matrix is H -stable if and only if A is nonsingular and $F(A) \subseteq P \cup \{0\}$.*

Proof. The proof is immediate as $x^*Ax = x^*R(A)x + ix^*I(A)x$.

COROLLARY 5. *If A is normal, then A is H -stable if and only if A is stable.*

Proof. Clearly A is stable if A is H -stable. If A is normal, the field of values of A is the convex hull of the eigenvalues of A (cf. [4, p. 168]); if A is also stable, then A is nonsingular and $F(A) \subset P$.

We cannot in general replace $F(A)$ by the convex hull of the eigenvalues of A in Corollary 4; the matrix

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 + 4i & 1 + 2i \\ 1 + 2i & 1 + i \end{bmatrix}$$

is stable, has $R(A) \geq 0$, yet is not H -stable.

Ostrowski and Schneider proved in [5] that if $R(A) > 0$, then $\text{In } AH = \text{In } H$ for each H . Now if $\text{In } AH = \text{In } H$ for each $H > 0$, A is H -stable. We can also give a more precise converse to their result:

REMARK 2. *If $\text{In } AH = \text{In } H$ for each $H \geq 0$, then $R(A) > 0$.*

Proof. The matrix A is H -stable. If $R(A) \geq 0$ and singular, then there exists a unitary U such that, as in the lemma,

$$U^*AU = \begin{bmatrix} P_{11} + iQ_{11} & iQ_{12} \\ iQ_{21} & \cdot \end{bmatrix}, \quad P_{11} > 0; \quad \text{for } U^*HU = \begin{bmatrix} \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & I \end{bmatrix} \geq 0,$$

we have $\text{In } AH = \text{In } U^*AHU = (0, 0, n) \neq \text{In } H$.

5. STABILITY AND SEMISTABILITY CRITERIA

We have

REMARK 3. *The following are equivalent:*

- (iv) A is stable;
- (v) there exists an $H > 0$ for which AH is H -stable;
- (vi) there exist a B , $R(B) > 0$, and an $H > 0$ for which $A = BH$.

The proof is trivial using Theorem 1 of [5].

REMARK 4. *The following are equivalent:*

- (vii) A is semistable, and all elementary divisors associated with imaginary eigenvalues of A are linear;
- (viii) there exists an $H > 0$ for which AH is H -semistable;
- (ix) there exist a B , $R(B) \geq 0$, and an $H > 0$ for which $A = BH$.

That (vii) \Leftrightarrow (viii) is Corollary III.1 of [3]; the rest of the proof is trivial.

Our final remark is tedious but not difficult to prove:

REMARK 5. *The following are equivalent:*

- (x) A is semistable;
- (xi) there exists an $H \geq 0$ for which $R(AH) \geq 0$, and $\text{rank } R(AH) = \text{rank } H = \pi(A) + \nu(A)$.

REFERENCES

- 1 K. J. Arrow and M. McManus, A note on dynamic stability, *Econometrica* **26**(1958), 448-454.
- 2 D. Carlson, On real eigenvalues of complex matrices, *Pacific J. Math.* **15**(1965), 1119-1129.
- 3 D. Carlson and H. Schneider, Inertia theorems for matrices: the semidefinite case, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **6**(1963), 430-446.
- 4 M. Marcus and H. Minc, *A Survey of Matrix Theory and Matrix Inequalities*, Allyn and Bacon, Boston, 1964.
- 5 A. Ostrowski and H. Schneider, Some theorems on the inertia of general matrices, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **4**(1962), 72-84.

Received August 1, 1967