

## CONVERSION OF THE PERMANENT INTO THE DETERMINANT<sup>1</sup>

P. M. GIBSON

**ABSTRACT.** Let  $A$  be an  $n$ -square  $(0, 1)$ -matrix with positive permanent. It is shown that if the permanent of  $A$  can be converted into a determinant by affixing  $\pm$  signs to the elements of  $A$  then  $A$  has at most  $(n^2 + 3n - 2)/2$  positive entries. Corollaries of this result are given.

The permanent appears naturally in many combinatorial problems. Since computations with the permanent are difficult, it is of interest to find a simple method for conversion of the permanent into the determinant. Pólya [4] noted that there is no method of uniformly affixing  $\pm$  signs to the elements of the matrices of the vector space  $M_n$ ,  $n > 2$ , of all  $n$ -square matrices over the field  $F$  of characteristic zero so that the permanent is converted into the determinant. Marcus and Minc [2] generalized this by showing that if  $n > 2$  then there is no linear transformation  $\sigma: M_n \rightarrow M_n$  such that  $\text{per } A = \det \sigma(A)$  for every  $A$  in  $M_n$ . In this paper, a different improvement of Pólya's result is given. It is shown that if  $A$  is an  $n$ -square  $(0, 1)$ -matrix with positive permanent and there is a way of converting the permanent of  $A$  into a determinant by affixing  $\pm$  signs to the elements of  $A$  then  $A$  has at most  $(n^2 + 3n - 2)/2$  positive entries.

Let  $A = [a_{ij}]$  be an  $n$ -square matrix. Let  $A_{ij}$  be the  $(n-1)$ -square submatrix of  $A$  that remains after row  $i$  and column  $j$  are removed, and let  $s_{ij}$  denote the sum of the entries in the complement of  $A_{ij}$ , i.e.,

$$s_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^n a_{ik} + \sum_{m=1}^n a_{mj} - a_{ij}.$$

If there exists an  $n$ -square matrix  $B = [b_{ij}]$  such that  $\text{per } A = \det B$  and  $b_{ij} = \pm a_{ij}$  for  $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ , then  $A$  is *convertible*. If  $A$  contains a  $k \times (n-k)$  zero submatrix, for some  $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ , then  $A$  is *partly decomposable*; otherwise,  $A$  is *fully indecomposable*.

If  $A$  and  $B$  are  $n$ -square matrices, let  $A \sim B$  denote that there exist

Received by the editors January 30, 1970.

AMS 1969 subject classifications. Primary 1520; Secondary 0540, 0525.

*Key words and phrases.* Permanents, determinants,  $(0, 1)$ -matrices, matrices over a field.

<sup>1</sup> This paper was presented at the Auburn University Matrix Theory Conference, June 11, 1970.

permutation matrices  $P$  and  $Q$  such that  $A = PBQ$ . Clearly, if  $A$  is invertible and  $A \sim B$ , then  $B$  is invertible.

Let  $T_n = [t_{ij}]$  be the  $n$ -square  $(0, 1)$ -matrix with  $t_{ij} = 0$  if and only if  $1 \leq i < j < n$ , let  $\nu(A)$  denote the number of 1's in the  $(0, 1)$ -matrix  $A$ , and let  $\Omega_n = (n^2 + 3n - 2)/2$ . If  $A \sim T_n$ , then  $\text{per } A > 0$ ,  $\nu(A) = \Omega_n$ , and it follows from [1] that  $A$  is invertible. In this paper we prove the converse.

We shall use the following three lemmas in our proof of the primary result.

**LEMMA 1.** *If  $A = [a_{ij}]$  is an  $n$ -square invertible  $(0, 1)$ -matrix,  $n \geq 2$ , and  $a_{km} = 1$ , then  $A_{km}$  is invertible.*

**PROOF.** Let  $B = [b_{ij}]$  be an  $n$ -square matrix with  $\text{per } A = \det B$  and  $b_{ij} = \pm a_{ij}$ . Expanding  $\text{per } A$  and  $\det B$  by row  $k$ ,

$$(1) \quad \sum_{j=1}^n a_{kj} \text{per } A_{kj} = \sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^{k+j} b_{kj} \det B_{kj}.$$

Since  $b_{ij} = \pm a_{ij}$  and  $a_{ij} \geq 0$ ,

$$(2) \quad a_{kj} \text{per } A_{kj} \geq (-1)^{k+j} b_{kj} \det B_{kj}, \quad j = 1, \dots, n.$$

Since  $a_{km} = 1 = \pm b_{km}$ , (1) and (2) imply that  $\text{per } A_{km} = \pm \det B_{km}$ . Hence,  $A_{km}$  is invertible.

**LEMMA 2.** *If  $A = [a_{ij}]$  is an  $n$ -square  $(0, 1)$ -matrix,  $n \geq 3$ , with  $a_{jj} = 1$  and  $\nu(A_{jj}) \leq \Omega_{n-1}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, n$ , then*

$$(3) \quad \min\{s_{jj} \mid 1 \leq j \leq n\} \leq n + 2,$$

with equality only if

$$(4) \quad \nu(A) = 1 + \Omega_n.$$

**PROOF.** Suppose that

$$(5) \quad s_{kk} = \min\{s_{jj} \mid 1 \leq j \leq n\}.$$

Since  $a_{jj} = 1$ ,

$$(6) \quad ns_{kk} \leq \sum_{j=1}^n s_{jj} = 2\nu(A) - n.$$

Since  $\nu(A_{kk}) \leq \Omega_{n-1}$ ,

$$(7) \quad \nu(A) \leq s_{kk} + \Omega_{n-1}.$$

Combining (5), (6), and (7), we have (3). Suppose that equality holds in (3). Then equality holds in (7). These two equalities imply (4).

LEMMA 3. If  $A = [a_{ij}]$  is an  $n$ -square  $(0, 1)$ -matrix,  $n \geq 5$ , such that

- (8)  $a_{ij} = 1 \Rightarrow s_{ij} \geq n + 1,$
- (9)  $(a_{ij} = 1, s_{ij} = n + 1) \Rightarrow A_{ij} \sim T_{n-1},$
- (10)  $a_{11} = 1, \quad s_{11} = n + 1,$
- (11)  $A_{11} = T_{n-1},$

then

(12)  $A \sim T_n.$

PROOF. Suppose that  $a_{1n} + a_{n1} = 0$ . Since  $a_{1n} = 0$ , (11), (8), and (9) imply that  $A_{2n} \sim T_{n-1}$ . Since  $a_{n1} = 0$ , this implies that

(13)  $a_{1j} = 1, \quad j = 1, \dots, n - 1.$

Similarly,  $A_{n,n-1} \sim T_{n-1}$ ,

(14)  $a_{j1} = 1, \quad j = 1, \dots, n - 1.$

From (13) and (14),  $s_{11} = 2n - 3$ . Since  $n \geq 5$ , this is a contradiction to (10). Hence,  $a_{1n} + a_{n1} \geq 1$ . Combining this with (11) and (8),

(15)  $a_{1j} + a_{j1} \geq 1, \quad j = 2, \dots, n.$

We consider two cases.

Case (i). Let  $a_{1n} + a_{n1} = 1$ . Suppose that  $a_{1n} = 1, a_{n1} = 0$ . From (10) and (15),

(16)  $a_{12} = a_{21} = 1 \quad \text{or} \quad a_{13} + a_{31} = 1.$

Since  $a_{n1} = 0$  and  $n \geq 5$ , (11), (16), and (9) imply that

(17)  $a_{1,n-1} + a_{n-1,1} = 2.$

From (10), (15), and (17),  $a_{12} + a_{21} = 1 = a_{13} + a_{31}$ . Combining this with (11) and (9),  $a_{1j} = 1, j = 1, \dots, n$ . Combining this with (11) and (17), we have (12). If  $a_{1n} = 0$  and  $a_{n1} = 1$  a similar argument shows (12).

Case (ii). Let

(18)  $a_{1n} + a_{n1} = 2.$

Then (10) and (15) imply that

(19)  $a_{1j} + a_{j1} = 1, \quad j = 2, \dots, n - 1.$

If  $a_{1,n-1} = 1$ , we can reduce this case to Case (i) by interchanging row  $n - 1$  and row  $n$  of  $A$ . Suppose that  $a_{1,n-1} = 0$ . Then there exists  $1 \leq k \leq n - 2$  such that  $a_{1k} = 1$  and

(20)  $a_{1j} = 0, \quad j = k + 1, \dots, n - 1.$

We shall prove that

$$(21) \quad a_{1j} = 1, \quad j = 1, \dots, k.$$

Let  $r_j$  be the  $j$ th row sum of  $A_{k+1, k+1}$ . Suppose that  $2 \leq m \leq k-1$  with  $a_{1j} = 1, j = 1, \dots, m-1$ . It is easy to show that

$$\begin{aligned} r_1 &> m, \\ r_j &< m, \quad j = 2, \dots, m-1, \\ r_j &> m, \quad j = m+1, \dots, n-1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, since  $A_{k+1, k+1} \sim T_{n-1}$ , we have  $r_m = m$ . Combining this with (11) and (19), we have  $a_{1m} = 1$ . This implies (21). Combining (11) with (18) through (21), we have (12).

**THEOREM.** *If  $A$  is an  $n$ -square convertible  $(0, 1)$ -matrix with  $\text{per } A > 0$  then*

$$(22) \quad \nu(A) \leq \Omega_n$$

*with equality if and only if  $A \sim T_n$ .*

**PROOF.** Clearly this statement is true for  $n = 1, 2$ , and it is easy to prove for  $n = 3, 4$ . Assume that it is true for all  $m < n$ , where  $n \geq 5$ , and let  $A = [a_{ij}]$  be an  $n$ -square convertible  $(0, 1)$ -matrix with  $\text{per } A > 0$ . Suppose that  $A$  is partly decomposable. We may assume that

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & 0 \\ A_3 & A_2 \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $A_1$  is  $k$ -square,  $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ . Since  $A$  is a convertible  $(0, 1)$ -matrix and  $(\text{per } A_1) (\text{per } A_2) = \text{per } A > 0$ ,  $A_j$  is a convertible  $(0, 1)$ -matrix with  $\text{per } A_j > 0, j = 1, 2$ . Hence, using the inductive assumption,

$$\nu(A) \leq \Omega_k + k(n-k) + \Omega_{n-k} = \Omega_n - 1.$$

This proves (22), for  $A$  partly decomposable.

Now suppose that  $A$  is fully indecomposable. We may assume that  $a_{11} = 1$ ,

$$(23) \quad s_{11} = \min\{s_{ij} \mid a_{ij} = 1\}.$$

From Minc's characterization of fully indecomposable matrices [3],

$$(24) \quad \text{per } A_{ij} > 0, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n.$$

Since  $\text{per } A_{11} > 0$ , we may assume that

$$(25) \quad a_{jj} = 1, \quad j = 1, \dots, n.$$

According to Lemma 1,  $A_{jj}$  is convertible. Hence, from (24) and the inductive assumption,

$$(26) \quad \nu(A_{jj}) \leq \Omega_{n-1}, \quad j = 1, \dots, n.$$

From (23), (25), (26), and Lemma 2,

$$(27) \quad s_{11} \leq n + 2.$$

Suppose that equality holds in (27). By Lemma 2, we have (4). Hence  $\nu(A_{11}) = \Omega_{n-1}$ . Hence, from Lemma 1, (24), and the inductive assumption, we have  $A_{11} \sim T_{n-1}$ . We may assume that

$$(28) \quad A_{11} = T_{n-1}.$$

Since equality holds in (27), (23) and (28) imply that  $s_{2n} = s_{n,n-1} = s_{jj} = n + 2, j = 2, \dots, n - 1$ , and therefore that  $a_{1j} = a_{j1} = 1, j = 2, \dots, n$ . Since  $n \geq 5$ , this contradicts (27). Hence

$$(29) \quad s_{11} \leq n + 1.$$

From (26) and (29), we have (22).

Suppose that equality holds in (22). Then  $A$  is fully indecomposable. From (26) and (29), equality must hold in (29) and  $\nu(A_{11}) = \Omega_{n-1}$ . Hence, by the inductive assumption,  $A_{11} \sim T_{n-1}$ , and we may assume (11). Since equality holds in (29), we have (8) and (10). It is easy to show (9). Hence by Lemma 3,  $A \sim T_n$ . The converse follows from [1].

We state three corollaries.

**COROLLARY 1.** *If  $A$  is an  $n$ -square convertible  $(0, 1)$ -matrix,  $n \geq 5$ , then  $\nu(A) \leq n(n-1)$  with equality only if  $A$  has a zero row or a zero column.*

Let  $M_n$  be the ring of all  $n$ -square matrices over a field  $F$  of characteristic zero. If

$$K_n \subset \{1, \dots, n\} \times \{1, \dots, n\},$$

let

$$\Gamma(K_n) = \{[a_{ij}] \in M_n \mid a_{ij} = 0 \ \forall (i, j) \in K_n\},$$

and let  $|K_n|$  be the cardinal number of  $K_n$ .

**COROLLARY 2.** *If every matrix in  $\Gamma(K_n)$  is convertible and per  $A \neq 0$  for some  $A$  in  $\Gamma(K_n)$ , then  $|K_n| \geq (n^2 - 3n + 2)/2$ , with equality if and only if there exist permutation matrices  $P$  and  $Q$  such that*

$$\{PAQ \mid A \in \Gamma(K_n)\} = \{[b_{ij}] \in M_n \mid b_{ij} = 0 \forall j > i + 1\}.$$

COROLLARY 3. *If  $n \geq 5$  and every matrix in  $\Gamma(K_n)$  is convertible, then*

$$|K_n| \geq n,$$

*with equality only if every matrix in  $\Gamma(K_n)$  has a zero row or a zero column.*

#### REFERENCES

1. P. M. Gibson, *An identity between permanents and determinants*, Amer. Math. Monthly **76** (1969), 270–271. MR **39** #2779.
2. M. Marcus and H. Minc, *On the relation between the determinant and the permanent*, Illinois J. Math. **5** (1961), 376–381. MR **26** #5004.
3. H. Minc, *On lower bounds for permanents of (0, 1) matrices*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **22** (1969), 117–123. MR **39** #6891.
4. G. Pólya, *Aufgabe 424*, Arch. Math. Phys. (3) **20** (1913), 271.

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA, HUNTSVILLE, ALABAMA 35807