Linear and Multilinear Algebra
Vol. 00, No. 00, month 200X, 1–4

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Sums of Σ-strictly diagonally dominant matrices

Rafael Bru† . , Ljiljana Cvetković‡, Vladimir Kostić‡ and Francisco Pedroche†
(*This version dated 1-07-2008*)

In this paper a generalization of a known result about the subdirect sum of two S-SDD matrices is obtained for Σ-SDD matrices. The class of Σ-SDD matrices is a generalization of S-SDD matrices, and it is also a subclass of H-matrices. More precisely, the question of when the subdirect sum, and consequently, the usual sum, of two Σ-SDD matrices is an Σ-SDD matrix is studied.

Keywords: Subdirect sum, H-matrices, overlapping blocks

1. Introduction

As in [7], if A and B are two square matrices of order n_1 and n_2, respectively, and A_{22} and B_{11} are square matrices of order k, $1 \le k \le \min(n_1, n_2)$, then the k-subdirect sum of A and B, denoted by $C = A \oplus_k B$ is defined to be

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} & O \\ A_{21} & A_{22} + B_{11} & B_{12} \\ O & B_{21} & B_{22} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{where } A = \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} B_{11} & B_{12} \\ B_{21} & B_{22} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{1}$$

Let $n = n_1 + n_2 - k$ and let us define the following set of indices

$$S_1 = \{1, \ldots, n_1 - k\},\ S_2 = \{n_1 - k + 1, \ldots, n_1\},\ S_3 = \{n_1 + 1, \ldots, n\}. \tag{2}$$

Given a matrix $A = [a_{ij}] \in \mathbb{C}^{n,n}$, we define the following deleted row sums:

$$r_i(A) = \sum_{j \ne i,\, j=1}^{n} |a_{ij}|, \quad r_i^S(A) = \sum_{j \ne i,\, j \in S} |a_{ij}|, \quad i \in N,$$

where $N = \{1, 2, ..., n\}$ is the set of indices and $S \subseteq N$. If S is the empty set, then $r_i^S(A)$ is considered to be zero. Finally, $\overline{S} := N \backslash S$.

Given a matrix $A = [a_{ij}] \in \mathbb{C}^{n,n}, n \ge 2$, and a nonempty proper subset S of N, we say that A is an S-strictly diagonally dominant (S-SDD) matrix if

- $|a_{ii}| > r_i^S(A)$, for all $i \in S$ and
- $|a_{jj}| > r_j^{\overline{S}}(A)$, for all $j \in \overline{S}$ and

† Institut de Matemàtica Multidisciplinària, Universitat Politècnica de València, Valencia, Spain. Supported by Spanish DGI grant MTM2007-64477 and by an agreement of research cooperation between the University of Novi Sad (Serbia) and the Universitat Politècnica de València
‡ Department of Mathematics and Informatics, Faculty of Science, University of Novi Sad, Serbia. Supported by the Provincial Secretariat of Science and Technological Development of Vojvodina, Serbia, grant 621 and by the Ministry of Science of Serbia, grant 144025.

ISSN: 0308-1087 print/ISSN 1563-5139 online

DOI: 10.1080/03081080xxxxxxxxxxxxx
http://www.informaworld.com

- $\big(|a_{ii}| - r_i^S(A)\big)\big(|a_{jj}| - r_j^{\overline{S}}(A)\big) > r_i^{\overline{S}}(A) r_j^S(A)$, for all $i \in S$, $j \in \overline{S}$.

By convention, if S is either the empty set or the whole set of indices, then we identify the classes $\emptyset$-SDD matrices and N-SDD matrices with the class of SDD matrices.

The class of S-SDD can be characterized in the following way. For an arbitrary nonempty proper set of indices S, let us define the interval

$$J_A(S) := \Big(\max_{i \in S} \frac{r_i^{\overline{S}}(A)}{|a_{ii}| - r_i^S(A)}, \min_{j \in \overline{S}, r_j^S(A) \neq 0} \frac{|a_{jj}| - r_j^{\overline{S}}(A)}{r_j^S(A)} \Big),$$

where the last fraction is defined to be $+\infty$ if $r_j^S(A) = 0$ for all $j \in \overline{S}$. For $S = \emptyset$ or $S = N$, we define $J_A(S) = (0, +\infty)$. With the usual notation $A[S]$ for the principal submatrix of A with indices from the set S, it is easy to show that for a given $S \subseteq N$, the matrix A is S-SDD matrix if and only if $A[S]$ and $A[\overline{S}]$ are strictly diagonally dominant matrices and the interval $J_A(S)$ is nonempty; the proof easily follows from the results obtained in [6] and [3].

The following characterization of S-SDD matrices is also known (see, for example, a related statement in the eigenvalue localization field given in [5]): A matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n,n}$ is an S-SDD matrix if and only if there exists a diagonal matrix

$$X_n(S, x) = diag(x_1, \dots, x_n), \text{ where } x_i = x > 0 \text{ for } i \in S \text{ and } x_i = 1 \text{ otherwise},$$

such that $AX_n(S, x)$ is an SDD matrix. Moreover, $x \in J_A(S)$.

As in [3], a matrix A belongs to the class of Σ-SDD matrices if there is a subset S of N, such that A is an S-SDD matrix.

2. Subdirect sum of Σ-SDD matrices

The above characterization of an S-SDD matrix in terms of a scaling matrix allows us to simplify the proof of an existing result. Indeed, this characterization provides a more general result for the subdirect sum of Σ-SDD matrices, which is the main goal of this paper.

We recall now the following result of [2].

Theorem 2.1 : *Let A and B be matrices of order n_1 and n_2, respectively. Let $n_1 \geq 2$, and let k be an integer such that $1 \leq k \leq \min(n_1, n_2)$, which defines the sets S_1, S_2, S_3 as in (2). Let A and B be partitioned as in (1). Let S be a set of indices of the form $S = \{1, 2, \dots\}$. Let A be S-strictly diagonally dominant, with $card(S) \leq card(S_1)$, and let B be strictly diagonally dominant. If the diagonal entries of A_{22} and B_{11} are all positive (or all negative), then the k-subdirect sum $C = A \oplus_k B$ is S-strictly diagonally dominant, and therefore, nonsingular.*

We give a straightforward proof of this theorem in the following way. Since A is an S-SDD matrix and $S \subseteq S_1 := \{1, 2, \dots, n_1 - k\}$ we know that there exists a scaling matrix $X_{n_1}(S, x)$, such that $AX_{n_1}(S, x)$ is an SDD matrix. Now we construct the matrix $X_n(S, x)$ with $n = n_1 + n_2 - k$. From (1) we have that $CX_n(S, x) = AX_{n_1}(S, x) \oplus_k B$. Since $AX_{n_1}(S, x)$ and B are SDD matrices with the same sign pattern of diagonal entries of the overlapping blocks A_{22} and B_{11}, it is easy to show that their subdirect sum $CX_n(S, x)$ is also an SDD matrix, which means that C is also an S-SDD matrix.

Using the same technique, we obtain a more general result.

Theorem 2.2: *Let $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n_1,n_1}$, $B \in \mathbb{C}^{n_2,n_2}$, $n_1 \geq 2$, $1 \leq k \leq \min(n_1, n_2)$, and let the sets of indices S_1, S_2, S_3 be defined as in* (2)*. For A and B partitioned as in* (1)*, let the corresponding diagonal entries of A_{22} and B_{11} have the same sign pattern. For an arbitrary set of indices $S \subseteq \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, where $n = n_1 + n_2 - k$, let us define $S_A := S \cap (S_1 \cup S_2)$ and $S_B := \{i - t : i \in S \cap (S_2 \cup S_3)\}$. If*

- *A is an S_A-SDD matrix,*
- *B is S_B-SDD matrix, and*
- *$J_A(S_A) \cap J_B(S_B) \neq \emptyset$,*

then the k-subdirect sum $C = A \oplus_k B$ is an S-SDD matrix.

Proof: Let $x \in J_A(S_A) \cap J_B(S_B)$ (which is nonempty). We construct the following scaling matrices: $X_{n_1}(S_A, x)$ and $X_{n_2}(S_B, x)$. Since A is an S_A-SDD matrix and B is an S_B-SDD matrix, it follows that $AX_{n_1}(S_A, x)$ and $BX_{n_2}(S_B, x)$ are SDD matrices. Now, building the matrix $X_n(S, x)$, it is easy to see that $CX_n(S, x) = AX_{n_1}(S_A, x) \oplus_k BX_{n_2}(S_B, x)$. Since the k-subdirect sum of SDD matrices with the same sign pattern of diagonal entries of the overlapped blocks is again an SDD matrix, we conclude that $CX_n(S, x)$ is an SDD matrix, which means that C is an S-SDD matrix. $\square$

Example 2.3 Let

$$A_1 = B_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1.0 & 0.3 & 0.4 & 0.5 \\ 0.9 & 1.6 & 0.4 & 0.7 \\ 0.1 & 0.4 & 1.3 & 0.4 \\ 0.1 & 0.9 & 0.1 & 2.0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad C_1 = A_1 \oplus_2 B_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1.0 & 0.3 & 0.4 & 0.5 & 0 & 0 \\ 0.9 & 1.6 & 0.4 & 0.7 & 0 & 0 \\ 0.1 & 0.4 & 2.3 & 0.7 & 0.4 & 0.5 \\ 0.1 & 0.9 & 1.0 & 3.6 & 0.4 & 0.7 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.1 & 0.4 & 1.3 & 0.4 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.1 & 0.9 & 0.1 & 2.0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

A_1 and B_1 are both $\{1, 2\}$-SDD matrices and $\{3, 4\}$-SDD matrices. But C_1 is not an S-SDD matrix for any $S \subseteq \{1, 2, \ldots, 6\}$. Thus, the answer to the question of whether the subdirect sum of two Σ-SDD matrices is or is not an Σ-SDD matrix is, in general, negative. Observing the conditions of Theorem 2.2 and taking $S = \{3, 4\}$, we have that $S_{A_1} = \{3, 4\}$ and $S_{B_1} = \{1, 2\}$; thus, the intervals $J_{A_1}(S_{A_1})$ and $J_{B_1}(S_{B_1})$ are well defined. But, obviously, $J_{A_1}(S_{A_1}) \cap J_{B_1}(S_{B_1}) = (0.56, 0.64) \cap (1.57, 1.80) = \emptyset$.

The sufficient condition of Theorem 2.2 is not necessary as the following example shows.

Example 2.4 Let

$$A_2 = B_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 2.0 & 0.9 & 0.3 & 0.1 \\ 0.8 & 2.9 & 0.2 & 0.5 \\ 0.5 & 0.1 & 1.4 & 0.9 \\ 0.6 & 0.8 & 0.8 & 2.3 \end{bmatrix}, \quad C_2 = A_2 \oplus_2 B_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 2.0 & 0.9 & 0.3 & 0.1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0.8 & 2.9 & 0.2 & 0.5 & 0 & 0 \\ 0.5 & 0.1 & 3.4 & 1.8 & 0.3 & 0.1 \\ 0.6 & 0.8 & 1.6 & 5.2 & 0.2 & 0.5 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.5 & 0.1 & 1.4 & 0.9 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.6 & 0.8 & 0.8 & 2.3 \end{bmatrix}.$$

For $S = \{3, 4\}$, we have $S_{A_2} = \{3, 4\}$ and $S_{B_2} = \{1, 2\}$. Computing the corresponding intervals $J_{A_2}(S_{A_2}) = (1.20, 2.75)$ and $J_{B_2}(S_{B_2}) = (0.36, 0.83)$, we find that $J_{A_2}(S_{A_2}) \cap J_{B_2}(S_{B_2}) = \emptyset$, but C is still an S-SDD matrix, since $J_{C_2}(S) = (0.63, 0.83)$ is nonempty and $C_2[S]$ and $C_2[\overline{S}]$ are both SDD matrices.

Note that the usual sum of two matrices A and B of the same order, $n = n_1 = n_2$, is, in fact, a k-subdirect sum with $k = n$. In this case, the sets of indices given by (2) reduce to $S_2 = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. These remarks lead to the following corollary of Theorem 2.2.

Corollary 2.5 Let $A, B \in \mathbb{C}^{n,n}$ have all diagonal entries with the same sign pattern and let $S \subseteq \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. If A and B are S-SDD matrices and $J_A(S) \cap J_B(S) \neq \emptyset$, then the sum $A + B$ is an S-SDD matrix.

References

[1] Bru, R., Pedroche, F. and Szyld, D. B., 2005, Subdirect sums of nonsingular M-matrices and of their inverses, *Electron. J. Linear Algebra,* **13**, 162–174.

[2] Bru, R., Pedroche, F. and Szyld, D. B., 2006, Subdirect sums of S-Strictly Diagonally Dominant matrices, *Electron. J. Linear Algebra,* **15**, 201–209.

[3] Cvetković, L., 2006, H-matrix theory vs. eigenvalue localization, *Numerical Alg.,* **42**, 229–245.

[4] Cvetković, L. and Kostić, V., 2005, New criteria for identifying H-matrices, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.,* **180**, 265–278.

[5] Cvetković, L. and Kostić, V., 2006, Between Geršgorin and minimal Geršgorin set, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.,* **196**, 452–458.

[6] Cvetković, L., Kostić, V. and Varga, R. S., 2004, A new Geršgorin-type eigenvalue inclusion set, *Electron. Trans. Numer. Anal.,* **18**, 73–80.

[7] Fallat, S. M. and Johnson, C. R., 1999, Sub-direct sums and positivity classes of matrices. *Linear Algebra Appl.,* **288**, 149–173.

[8] Varga, R. S., 2004, Geršgorin and his circles. *Springer Series in Computational Mathematics,* **36** (Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg).