

2004

Two characterizations of inverse-positive matrices: the Hawkins-Simon condition and the Le Chatelier-Braun principle

Takao Fujimoto
takao@ec.kagawa-u.ac.jp

Ravindra R. Ranade

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

Recommended Citation

Fujimoto, Takao and Ranade, Ravindra R.. (2004), "Two characterizations of inverse-positive matrices: the Hawkins-Simon condition and the Le Chatelier-Braun principle", *Electronic Journal of Linear Algebra*, Volume 11.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.13001/1081-3810.1122>

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.

TWO CHARACTERIZATIONS OF INVERSE-POSITIVE MATRICES: THE HAWKINS-SIMON CONDITION AND THE LE CHATELIER-BRAUN PRINCIPLE*

TAKAO FUJIMOTO[†] AND RAVINDRA R. RANADE[†]

Dedicated to the late Professors David Hawkins and Hukukane Nikaido

Abstract. It is shown that (a weak version of) the Hawkins-Simon condition is satisfied by any real square matrix which is inverse-positive after a suitable permutation of columns or rows. One more characterization of inverse-positive matrices is given concerning the Le Chatelier-Braun principle. The proofs are all simple and elementary.

Key words. Hawkins-Simon condition, Inverse-positivity, Le Chatelier-Braun principle.

AMS subject classifications. 15A15, 15A48.

1. Introduction. In economics as well as other sciences, the inverse-positivity of real square matrices has been an important topic. The Hawkins-Simon condition [9], so called in economics, requires that every principal minor be positive, and they showed the condition to be necessary and sufficient for a Z -matrix (a matrix with nonpositive off-diagonal elements) to be inverse-positive. One decade earlier, this was used by Ostrowski [12] to define an M -matrix (an inverse-positive Z -matrix), and was shown to be equivalent to some of other conditions; see Berman and Plemmons [1, Ch.6] for many equivalent conditions. Georgescu-Roegen [8] argued that for a Z -matrix it is sufficient to have only *leading* (upper left corner) principal minors positive, which was also proved in Fiedler and Ptak [5]. Nikaido's two books, [10] and [11], contain a proof based on mathematical induction. Dasgupta [3] gave another proof using an economic interpretation of indirect input.

In this paper, the Hawkins-Simon condition is defined to be the one which requires that all the *leading* principal minors should be positive, and we shall refer to it as the *weak* Hawkins-Simon condition (WHS for short). We prove that the WHS condition is necessary for a real square matrix to be inverse-positive after a suitable permutation of columns (or rows). The proof is easy and simple and uses the Gaussian elimination method. One more characterization of inverse-positive matrices is given: Each element of the inverse of the leading $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ principal submatrix is less than or equal to the corresponding element in the inverse of the original matrix. This property is related to the Le Chatelier-Braun principle in thermodynamics.

Section 2 explains our notation, then in section 3 we present our theorems and their proofs, finally giving some numerical examples and remarks in section 4.

2. Notation. The symbol \mathbb{R}^n means the real Euclidean space of dimension n ($n \geq 2$), and \mathbb{R}_+^n the non-negative orthant of \mathbb{R}^n . A given real $n \times n$ matrix A is a

*Received by the editors on 26 August 2003. Accepted for publication on 31 March 2004. Handling Editor: Michael Neumann.

[†]Department of Economics, University of Kagawa, Takamatsu, Kagawa 760-8523, Japan (takao@ec.kagawa-u.ac.jp, ranade@ec.kagawa-u.ac.jp).

map from \mathbb{R}^n into itself. The (i, j) entry of A is denoted by a_{ij} , $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ stands for a column vector, and x_i denotes the i -th element of x . The symbol $(A)_{*,j}$ means the j -th column of A , and $(A)_{i,*}$ means the i -th row. We also use the symbol $x_{(i)}$, which represents the column vector in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} formed by deleting the i -th element from x . Similarly, the symbol $A_{(i,j)}$ means the $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ matrix obtained by deleting the i -th row and the j -th column from A . Likewise, $A_{(\cdot,j)}$ shows the $n \times (n-1)$ matrix obtained by deleting the j -th column from A . The symbol $(A)_{i,*(n)}$ shall denote the row vector formed by deleting the n -th element from $(A)_{i,*}$, and $(A)_{*(n),j}$ is the column vector in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} formed by deleting the n -th element from $(A)_{*,j}$. The symbol $e_i \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ denotes a column vector whose i -th element is unity with all the remaining entries being zero. $|A|$ denotes the determinant of A .

The inequality signs for vector comparison are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} x \geq y & \text{ iff } x - y \in \mathbb{R}_+^n; \\ x > y & \text{ iff } x - y \in \mathbb{R}_+^n - \{0\}; \\ x \gg y & \text{ iff } x - y \in \text{int}(\mathbb{R}_+^n), \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{int}(\mathbb{R}_+^n)$ means the interior of \mathbb{R}_+^n . These inequality signs are applied to matrices in a similar way.

3. Propositions. Let us first note that the condition “ A is inverse-positive” is equivalent to the following property:

Property 1. For any $b \in \text{int}(\mathbb{R}_+^n)$, the equation $Ax = b$ has a solution $x \in \text{int}(\mathbb{R}_+^n)$.

This property was used in Dasgupta and Sinha [4] to establish the nonsubstitution theorem, and in Bidard [2].

Now we can prove the following theorem.

THEOREM 3.1. *Let A be inverse-positive. Then the WHS condition is satisfied when a suitable permutation of columns (or rows) is made.*

Proof. The outline of our proof is as follows. We eliminate, step by step, a variable whose coefficient is positive. The existence of such a variable is guaranteed at each step by Property 1 above. By performing a suitable permutation of columns if necessary, this coefficient can be shown to be positively proportional to a leading principal minor of A .

Because of Property 1 above, there should be at least one positive entry in the first row of A . So, such a column and the first column can be exchanged. We assume the two columns have been permuted so that

$$a_{11} > 0.$$

Next at the second step, we divide the first equation of the system $Ax = b$ by a_{11} and subtract this equation side by side from the i -th ($i \geq 2$) equation after multiplying this by a_{i1} , to obtain

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & a_{12}/a_{11} & \cdots & a_{1n}/a_{11} \\ 0 & a_{22} - a_{12}a_{21}/a_{11} & \cdots & a_{2n} - a_{1n}a_{21}/a_{11} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & a_{n2} - a_{12}a_{n1}/a_{11} & \cdots & a_{nn} - a_{1n}a_{n1}/a_{11} \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ \vdots \\ x_n \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} b_1/a_{11} \\ b_2 - b_1a_{21}/a_{11} \\ \vdots \\ b_n - b_1a_{n1}/a_{11} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Notice that the $(2, 2)$ -entry of the coefficient matrix above is

$$\frac{\begin{vmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} \end{vmatrix}}{a_{11}},$$

and the corresponding entry on the RHS is

$$\frac{\begin{vmatrix} a_{11} & b_1 \\ a_{21} & b_2 \end{vmatrix}}{a_{11}}.$$

We continue this type of elimination up to the k -th step, having at the (k, k) -position

$$\frac{\begin{vmatrix} a_{11} & \cdots & \cdots & a_{1,k} \\ \vdots & \ddots & & \vdots \\ a_{k,1} & \cdots & \cdots & a_{k,k} \end{vmatrix}}{\begin{vmatrix} a_{11} & \cdots & a_{1,k-1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{k-1,1} & \cdots & a_{k-1,k-1} \end{vmatrix}},$$

and the RHS of the k -th equation is given as

$$\frac{\begin{vmatrix} a_{11} & \cdots & a_{1,k-1} & b_1 \\ \vdots & \ddots & & \vdots \\ a_{k,1} & \cdots & a_{k,k-1} & b_k \end{vmatrix}}{\begin{vmatrix} a_{11} & \cdots & a_{1,k-1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{k-1,1} & \cdots & a_{k-1,k-1} \end{vmatrix}}.$$

The denominator of these equations is known to be positive at the $(k-1)$ -th step, and when b_k is large enough, the RHS of the k -th equation becomes positive. Thus, by Property 1, there is at least one positive coefficient in the k -th equation. Again, we assume a suitable permutation has been made so that the (k, k) -position is positive, giving

$$\begin{vmatrix} a_{11} & \cdots & \cdots & a_{1,k} \\ \vdots & \ddots & & \vdots \\ a_{k,1} & \cdots & \cdots & a_{k,k} \end{vmatrix} > 0 \quad \text{for } k = 2, 3, \dots, n.$$

Therefore, our theorem is proved for a permutation of columns. A similar result can be obtained by a suitable permutation of rows - just transpose the given matrix and apply the same proof. \square

COROLLARY 3.2. *When A is a Z -matrix, the WHS condition is necessary and sufficient for A to be inverse-positive.*

Proof. First we show the necessity. Let us consider the elimination method used in the proof of Theorem 3.1. When A is a Z -matrix it is easy to notice that as elimination proceeds, a positive entry is always given at the upper left corner with the other entries (or coefficients) on the top equation being all non-positive, while the RHS of each equation always remains positive. This implies that the WHS condition holds (without any permutation).

Next we show the sufficiency. We assume that $b \gg 0$. When A is a Z -matrix, as elimination proceeds, a positive coefficient can appear only at the upper left corner with the remaining coefficients being all non-positive, while the RHS of each equation is always positive. So, finally we reach the equation of a single variable x_n with the two coefficients on both sides being positive. Thus, $x_n > 0$. Now moving backward, we find $x \gg 0$. Since $b \gg 0$ is arbitrary, this proves that A is inverse-positive. \square

This corollary is well known and the reader is referred to Nikaido [10, p.90, Theorem 6.1], Nikaido [11, p.14, Theorem 3.1], or Berman and Plemmons [1, p.134]. (In the diagram of Berman and Plemmons [1, p.134], the N conditions (inverse-positivity) are not connected with the E conditions (WHS) for general matrices.)

Next, we present a theorem which is related to the Le Chatelier-Braun principle; see Fujimoto [6]. This theorem is valid for a class of matrices which is more general than that of inverse-positive matrices.

THEOREM 3.3. *Suppose that the inverse of A has its last column and the bottom row non-negative, and that $|A_{(n,n)}| > 0$. Then each element of the inverse of $A_{(n,n)}$ is less than or equal to the corresponding element of the inverse of A .*

Proof. It is clear that $|A| > 0$. The first column of the inverse of A can be obtained as a solution vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ to the system of equations $Ax = e_1$, while the first column of the inverse of $A_{(n,n)}$ is a solution vector $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ to the system $A_{(n,n)}y = e_{1(n)}$. Adding these two systems with some manipulations, we get the following system:

$$(3.1) \quad A \begin{bmatrix} x_1 + y_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_{n-1} + y_{n-1} \\ x_n \end{bmatrix} = d \equiv \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ (A)_{n,*(n)} \cdot y \end{bmatrix}.$$

By Cramer's rule, it follows that

$$x_n = \frac{|A_{(n)} d|}{|A|} = 2x_n + \frac{|A_{(n,n)}|}{|A|} \cdot (A)_{n,*(n)} \cdot y.$$

Thus, if $x_n = (A^{-1})_{n1} > 0$, then $(A)_{n,*(n)} \cdot y < 0$, and if $x_n = 0$, then $(A)_{n,*(n)} \cdot y = 0$, because $\frac{|A_{(n,n)}|}{|A|} > 0$.

For the i -th ($i < n$) equation of (3.1), Cramer's rule gives us

$$x_i + y_i = 2x_i + \frac{|A_{(n,i)}|}{|A|} \cdot (A)_{n,*(n)} \cdot y.$$

From this, we have

$$y_i = x_i + (A^{-1})_{in} \cdot (A)_{n,*(n)} \cdot y.$$

Therefore we can assert

$$\begin{cases} y_i < x_i & \text{when } (A^{-1})_{n1} > 0 \text{ and } (A^{-1})_{in} > 0, \\ y_i = x_i & \text{when } (A^{-1})_{n1} = 0 \text{ or } (A^{-1})_{in} = 0. \end{cases}$$

For the other columns, we can proceed in a similar way by replacing e_1 with the appropriate e_i . \square

As a special case, we have

COROLLARY 3.4. *Suppose that A is inverse-positive, and the WHS condition is satisfied. Then each element of the inverse of $A_{(n,n)}$ is less than or equal to the corresponding element of the inverse of A .*

4. Numerical Examples and Remarks. The first example is given by

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} -2 & 1 \\ 7 & -3 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } A^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 1 \\ 7 & 2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

By exchanging two columns, we have the M -matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & -2 \\ -3 & 7 \end{bmatrix}, \text{ whose inverse is } \begin{bmatrix} 7 & 2 \\ 3 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

This satisfies the normal Hawkins-Simon condition. The inverse of (1) is (1), and the entry 1 is smaller than 7, thus verifying Corollary 3.4.

The second example is not an M -matrix:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -9 & 8 \\ 0 & 12 & -12 \\ -1 & 6 & -4 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } A^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & \frac{1}{3} & 1 \\ 1 & \frac{1}{4} & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

It should be noted that there does not exist a permutation matrix P such that PA or AP satisfies the normal Hawkins-Simon condition. However, the WHS condition is satisfied by A . The inverse of $A_{(3,3)}$ is calculated as

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & -9 \\ 0 & 12 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \frac{3}{4} \\ 0 & \frac{1}{12} \end{bmatrix}.$$

This verifies Corollary 3.4.

The next example is again not an M -matrix:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } A^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The inverse of $A_{(3,3)}$ is calculated as

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \\ -\frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The elements $(A^{-1})_{11}$, $(A^{-1})_{12}$, and $(A^{-1})_{22}$ are all equal to $(A_{(3,3)}^{-1})_{11}$, $(A_{(3,3)}^{-1})_{12}$, and $(A_{(3,3)}^{-1})_{22}$ because $(A^{-1})_{32} = 0$ and $(A^{-1})_{13} = 0$. The entry $(A_{(3,3)}^{-1})_{21}$ is, however, $-\frac{1}{2}$ and is smaller than the corresponding entry $(A^{-1})_{21} = 0$, confirming the statements in the proof of Theorem 3.3.

The final example illustrates Theorem 3.3:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{17}{24} & \frac{2}{3} & -\frac{5}{24} \\ \frac{1}{6} & -\frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{6} \\ \frac{23}{24} & -\frac{2}{3} & \frac{11}{24} \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } A^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -4 & 1 \\ 2 & -3 & 2 \\ 5 & 4 & 3 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since

$$\begin{bmatrix} -\frac{17}{24} & \frac{2}{3} \\ \frac{1}{6} & -\frac{1}{3} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{8}{3} & -\frac{16}{3} \\ -\frac{4}{3} & -\frac{17}{3} \end{bmatrix},$$

these results conform to Theorem 3.3.

REMARK 4.1. The Le Chatelier-Braun principle in thermodynamics states that when an equilibrium in a closed system is perturbed, directly or indirectly, the equilibrium shifts in the direction which can attenuate the perturbation. As is explained in Fujimoto [6], the system of equations $Ax = b$ can be solved as an optimization problem when A is an M -matrix. Thus, a solution x to the system can be viewed as a sort of equilibrium. A similar argument can be made when A is inverse-positive. That is, the solution vector x of the equations $Ax = b$ can be obtained by solving the minimization problem: $\min e \cdot x$ subject to $Ax \geq b$, $x \geq 0$, where e is the row n -vector whose elements are all positive, or more simply unity. Thus, the solution vector x can be regarded as a sort of physical equilibrium. In terms of economics, the above minimization problem is to minimize the use of labor input while producing the final output vector b . (Each column of A represents a production process with a positive entry being output and a negative one input, while the vector e is the labor input coefficient vector.) Then, in our case, a perturbation is a new constraint that the n -th variable x_n should be kept constant even after the vector b shifts, destroying the n -th equation. The changes in other variables may become smaller when the increase of those variables requires x_n to be greater. This is obvious in the case of an M -matrix. What we have shown is that it is also the case with an inverse-positive matrix or even with a matrix with *positively bordered inverse* as can be seen from Theorem 3.3.

REMARK 4.2. Much more can be said about the sensitivity analysis in the case of M -matrices. We can also deal with the effects of changes in the elements of A on the solution vector x ; see Fujimoto, Herrero, and Villar [7].

Acknowledgment. Thanks are due to the anonymous referee, who provided the authors with very useful comments and many stylistic suggestions to improve this paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abraham Berman and Robert J. Plemmons. *Nonnegative Matrices in the Mathematical Sciences*. Academic Press, New York, 1979.
- [2] Christian Bidard. Fixed capital and vertical integration. Mimeo, MODEM, University of Paris X - Nanterre, 1996.
- [3] Dipankar Dasgupta. Using the correct economic interpretation to prove the Hawkins-Simon-Nikaido theorem: one more note. *Journal of Macroeconomics*, 14:755–761, 1992.
- [4] Dipankar Dasgupta and Tapen N. Sinha. Nonsubstitution theorem with joint production. *International Journal of Economics and Business*, 39:701–708, 1992.
- [5] Miroslav Fiedler and Vlastimil Ptak. On Matrices with nonpositive off-diagonal elements and positive principal minors. *Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal*, 12:382–400, 1962.
- [6] Takao Fujimoto. Global strong Le Chatelier-Samuelson principle. *Econometrica*, 48:1667–1674, 1980.
- [7] Takao Fujimoto, Carmen Herrero and Antonio Villar. A sensitivity analysis for linear systems involving M-matrices and its application to the Leontief model. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 64:85–91, 1985.
- [8] Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen. Some properties of a generalized Leontief model. In Tjalling Koopmans (ed.), *Activity Analysis of Allocation and Production*. John Wiley & Sons, New York, 165–173, 1951.
- [9] David Hawkins and Herbert A. Simon. Note: Some Conditions of Macroeconomic Stability. *Econometrica*, 17:245–248, 1949.
- [10] Hukukane Nikaido. *Convex Structures and Economic Theory*. Academic Press, New York, 1963.
- [11] Hukukane Nikaido. *Introduction to Sets and Mappings in Modern Economics*. Academic Press, New York, 1970. (The original Japanese edition is in 1960.)
- [12] Alexander Ostrowski. Über die Determinanten mit überwiegender Hauptdiagonale. *Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici*, 10:69–96, 1937.