

2016

A counterexample to a question of Bapat and Sunder

Stephen W. Drury

Department of Mathematics & Statistics, McGill University, Montreal, drury@math.mcgill.ca

Follow this and additional works at: <http://repository.uwyo.edu/ela>

 Part of the [Algebra Commons](#), and the [Analysis Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Drury, Stephen W.. (2016), "A counterexample to a question of Bapat and Sunder", *Electronic Journal of Linear Algebra*, Volume 31, pp. 69-70.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.13001/1081-3810.3178>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Wyoming Scholars Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Journal of Linear Algebra by an authorized editor of Wyoming Scholars Repository. For more information, please contact scholcom@uwyo.edu.

A COUNTEREXAMPLE TO A QUESTION OF BAPAT AND SUNDER*

STEPHEN W. DRURY[†]

Abstract. A counterexample to a question of Bapat and Sunder is presented.

Key words. Permanent, Hadamard product, Oppenheim's inequality.

AMS subject classifications. 15A15.

1. Introduction. In [1], Bapat and Sunder raise the question of whether the inequality

$$\text{per}(A \circ B) \leq \text{per}(A) \prod_{j=1}^n b_{jj} \tag{1.1}$$

holds for positive semidefinite $n \times n$ matrices A and B . The quantity $\text{per}(A)$ denotes the permanent of A and the notation $A \circ B$ is for the Hadamard (entrywise) product of A and B . This is the permanental version of Oppenheim's inequality. It is the objective of this article to provide a counterexample. The question is related to two other questions:

- The permanent on top conjecture, recently disproved by Shchesnovich [4] which would have implied (1.1) had it been true.
- The inequality $\text{per}(A \circ B) \leq \text{per}(A)\text{per}(B)$ introduced by Chollet [2] and established in the case $n = 3$ by Gregorac and Hentzel [3]. This inequality would be a consequence of (1.1) had it been true. Chollet's conjecture remains open. For a relatively recent discussion of Chollet's conjecture, the reader may consult Zhang [5].

2. The counterexample. With $n = 7$, we take

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & 1 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}e^{\frac{4}{5}i\pi} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}e^{\frac{2}{5}i\pi} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}e^{-\frac{2}{5}i\pi} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}e^{-\frac{4}{5}i\pi} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}e^{-\frac{4}{5}i\pi} & 1 & \cos\left(\frac{1}{5}\pi\right)e^{-\frac{1}{5}i\pi} & \cos\left(\frac{2}{5}\pi\right)e^{-\frac{2}{5}i\pi} & \cos\left(\frac{2}{5}\pi\right)e^{\frac{2}{5}i\pi} & \cos\left(\frac{1}{5}\pi\right)e^{\frac{1}{5}i\pi} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}e^{-\frac{2}{5}i\pi} & \cos\left(\frac{1}{5}\pi\right)e^{\frac{1}{5}i\pi} & 1 & \cos\left(\frac{1}{5}\pi\right)e^{-\frac{1}{5}i\pi} & \cos\left(\frac{2}{5}\pi\right)e^{-\frac{2}{5}i\pi} & \cos\left(\frac{2}{5}\pi\right)e^{\frac{2}{5}i\pi} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}e^{\frac{2}{5}i\pi} & \cos\left(\frac{2}{5}\pi\right)e^{\frac{2}{5}i\pi} & \cos\left(\frac{1}{5}\pi\right)e^{\frac{1}{5}i\pi} & 1 & \cos\left(\frac{1}{5}\pi\right)e^{-\frac{1}{5}i\pi} & \cos\left(\frac{2}{5}\pi\right)e^{-\frac{2}{5}i\pi} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}e^{\frac{4}{5}i\pi} & \cos\left(\frac{2}{5}\pi\right)e^{-\frac{2}{5}i\pi} & \cos\left(\frac{2}{5}\pi\right)e^{\frac{2}{5}i\pi} & \cos\left(\frac{1}{5}\pi\right)e^{\frac{1}{5}i\pi} & 1 & \cos\left(\frac{1}{5}\pi\right)e^{-\frac{1}{5}i\pi} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}e^{\frac{4}{5}i\pi} & \cos\left(\frac{1}{5}\pi\right)e^{-\frac{1}{5}i\pi} & \cos\left(\frac{2}{5}\pi\right)e^{-\frac{2}{5}i\pi} & \cos\left(\frac{2}{5}\pi\right)e^{\frac{2}{5}i\pi} & \cos\left(\frac{1}{5}\pi\right)e^{\frac{1}{5}i\pi} & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

*Received by the editors on November 30, 2015. Accepted for publication on January 26, 2016. Handling Editor: Ravi Bapat.

[†]Department of Mathematics and Statistics, McGill University, Montreal, Canada H3A 0B9 (drury@math.mcgill.ca).

and $B = A^T$. Then it is easy to check that A and B are hermitian positive semidefinite matrices of rank two (with eigenvalue $\frac{7}{2}$ of multiplicity two) and that

$$\text{per}(A \circ B) = \frac{6185}{128},$$

that $\prod_{j=1}^7 b_{jj} = 1$ and that $\text{per}(A) = 45$. We find that

$$\frac{\text{per}(A \circ B)}{\text{per}(A) \prod_{j=1}^7 b_{jj}} = \frac{1237}{1152} > 1.$$

REFERENCES

- [1] R.B. Bapat and V.S. Sunder. On majorization and Schur products. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 72:107–117, 1985.
- [2] J. Chollet. Is there a permanent analogue to Oppenheim's inequality? *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 84(1):57–59, 1982.
- [3] R.J. Gregorac and I.R. Hentzel. A note on the analogue of Oppenheim's inequality for permanents. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 94:109–112, 1987.
- [4] V.S. Shchesnovich. The permanent-on-top conjecture is false. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 490:196–201, 2016.
- [5] F. Zhang. An analytic approach to a permanent conjecture. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 438:1570–1579, 2013.