

## A0 Linear Algebra Solutions

[B] Bookwork, [S] Seen similar, [N] New

**Question 1** (a) (i) The minimal polynomial  $m_T(x)$  is defined to be the monic polynomial  $f(x)$  of least degree such that  $f(T) = 0$ . It exists since the Cayley-Hamilton theorem states that  $\chi(T) = 0$  where  $\chi(x) = \det(xI - T)$  is the characteristic polynomial of  $T$ . [1 mark B]

Now if  $\lambda$  is an eigenvalue of  $T$  with eigenvector  $v$ , then  $0 = m_T(T)(v) = m_T(\lambda)v$  and hence  $m_T(\lambda) = 0$ . Conversely if  $\lambda$  is a root of  $m_T$  then  $m_T = (x - \lambda)g(x)$  with  $\deg g(x) < \deg m_T$ . Therefore  $g(T) \neq 0$  and we can find a nonzero vector  $v$  such that  $w := g(T)v \neq 0$ . But then  $(T - \lambda)w = (T - \lambda)g(T)v = m_T(T)v = 0$  and so  $\lambda$  is an eigenvalue of  $T$  with eigenvector  $w$ . [3 marks, B]

(ii) If  $T$  is diagonalizable with respect to some basis  $B$  so that  $X = {}_B[T]_B$  is a diagonal matrix, we consider a polynomial  $f(x)$  to be product of linear factors  $(x - \mu)$  where  $\mu$  ranges over the distinct diagonal entries of  $X$ . We see  $f(T) = 0$  and together with (a)(i) we deduce that  $f = m_T$  and has distinct roots. Conversely suppose  $m_T = \prod_{i=1}^k (x - \mu_k)$  has distinct roots. We argue by induction on  $k$ , the case  $k = 1$  being clear. Let  $m_T(x) = (x - \mu_1)g(x)$ . Then  $g(\mu_1) \neq 0$ . Let  $U_1 = \ker(T - \mu_1)$ ,  $U_2 = \ker g(x)$ . If  $v \in U_1 \cap U_2$  then  $0 = g(T)v = g(\mu_1)v$  and so  $v = 0$  since  $\mu_1$  is not a root of  $g(x)$ . We now show  $V = U_1 + U_2$ . Let  $v \in V$  and define  $v_1 = g(\mu_1)^{-1}g(T)v$ ,  $v_2 = v - v_1$ . Since  $m_T(v) = 0 = (T - \mu_1)g(T)v$  it follows that  $Tv_1 = \mu_1v_1$ , i.e.  $v_1 \in U_1$ . Also  $g(T)v_2 = g(T)v - g(T)v_1 = g(T)v - g(\mu_1)v_1 = 0$  by the definition of  $v_1$ . So  $v_2 \in U_2$ . Therefore  $V = U_1 \oplus U_2$ . Now  $T$  acts as the scalar  $\mu_1$  on  $U_1$  and  $g(T) = 0$  on  $U_2$  hence the minimal polynomial of  $T$  on  $U_2$  has degree less than  $k$ . By induction we can choose a basis diagonalizing  $T$  on  $U_2$  and adding any basis of  $U_1$  we are finished. [8 marks, B]

(iii) Let  $v$  be an eigenvector of  $T$ , and note that  $v$  is still an eigenvector for any  $p(T)$ . We can extend  $v$  to a basis  $v, w_1, w_2, \dots$  of  $V$  and define  $B(v) = w_1$  and  $B(w_i) = 0$ . Then  $v$  is not an eigenvector of  $B$  and so  $B \neq p(T)$  for any polynomial  $p(x)$ . The students can also argue using that the dimension of the space spanned by  $\{1, T, T^2, \dots\}$  in  $\text{End}(V)$  is exactly  $\deg m_T \leq n$ . [3 marks, N]

(b)(i) If  $A$  is diagonalizable, then for some change of basis matrix  $P$  the matrix  $P^{-1}AP$  is a diagonal matrix with eigenvalues  $\lambda, \lambda^{-1}$  for some nonzero  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ . Take  $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$  such that  $\mu^2 = \lambda$  and let  $X$  be the diagonal matrix with entries  $\mu, \mu^{-1}$ . Take  $B = P^{-1}XP$ . [3 marks, S]

(ii) Take  $A = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$ . Suppose  $A = B^2$ . The eigenvalues of  $B$  must be  $\pm i$  and since  $\det(B) = 1$  they must be distinct:  $i$  and  $-i$ . By part (a)  $B$  is similar to a diagonal matrix with diagonal entries  $\{i, -i\}$  and so  $B^2 = -Id \neq A$ . Contradiction. [3 marks, N]

(iii)  $SL(2, \mathbb{F})$  is a finite set so if the map  $A \mapsto A^2$  is surjective it must be injective. But this is not true, as for odd  $p$  we have  $Id^2 = (-Id)^2$  while if  $p = 2$

then

$$Id^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^2.$$

[4 marks, N]

**Question 2**

(a) (i) Suppose  $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$  is a basis of  $V$  and  $C = \{c_1, \dots, c_m\}$  is a basis of  $W$ . We define  $B' = \{b'_1, \dots, b'_n\}$  where  $b'_i \in V'$  is such that  $b'_i(b_j) = \delta_{ij}$ . [1 mark, B]

Similarly we take  $C' = \{c'_1, \dots, c'_m\}$ . Suppose  ${}_C[T]_B = (a_{ij})$  so that  $T(b_j) = \sum_{i=1}^m a_{ij}c_i$ . We compute  $T'(c'_j)(b_s) = c'_j(T(b_s)) = c'_j(\sum_{i=1}^m a_{is}c_i) = a_{js}$ . This gives  $T'(c'_j) = \sum_{i=1}^n a_{ji}b'_i$  and so  ${}_{B'}[T']_{C'}$  is the transpose of  ${}_C[T]_B$ . [4 marks, B]

(ii) For a polynomial  $f(x)$  and a square matrix  $X$  we have  $f(X^t) = (f(X))^t$  and so  $f(T) = 0$  if and only if  $f(X^t) = 0$ . It follows that  $m_T = m_{T'}$ . Let  $A = {}_B[T]_B$ . Then  $\chi_T(x) = \det(xId - A) = \det(xId - A)^t = \det(xId - A^t) = \chi_{T'}(x)$ . [2 marks, S]

(iii) We define  $U^0 := \{f \in V' \mid f(u) = 0, \forall u \in U\}$ .

Let  $b_1, \dots, b_k$  be a basis of  $U$  and extend this to a basis  $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$  of  $V$ . We claim that  $U^0$  has basis  $b'_{k+1}, \dots, b'_n$ . Indeed these functionals are linearly independent (since they are a subset of  $B'$ ), and for  $f = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i b'_i$  the condition  $f \in U^0$  is equivalent to  $f(b_i) = 0$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , which is equivalent to  $\alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_k = 0$ . This proves the claim. Hence  $\dim U^0 = n - k = \dim V - \dim U$  and we are done. [4 marks, B]

(b) (i) There are many ways to argue this, here is an argument which also applies to (ii).

We note that  $(\text{Im}(T))^0 = \ker T'$ . Indeed  $f \in (\text{Im}(T))^0$  iff  $f(Tv) = 0$  for all  $v \in V$  iff  $f \circ T = 0$  iff  $f \in \ker T'$ . Now by part (a) (iii) and the Rank-Nullity theorem applied to  $T'$  we have

$$\dim \text{Im}(T) = \dim W - \dim(\text{Im}(T))^0 = \dim W' - \dim \ker T' = \dim \text{Im}(T').$$

[4 marks, S]

(ii) The above argument only uses that  $\dim W$  is finite, so the result remains true even if  $\dim V$  is infinite. [3 marks, N]

(c) Let  $U = \bigcap_{i=1}^k \ker f_i$  and let  $L$  be the subspace of  $V'$  spanned by all  $f_i$ . Observe that  $U = \bigcap_{h \in L} \ker h$ . Now if  $L = V'$  then choosing a basis  $B$  of  $V$  we consider the dual basis  $B'$  and then  $U = \bigcap_{b \in B'} \ker b = \{0\}$ . [2 marks, S]

For the converse the students may argue using the natural isomorphism between  $V$  and  $V''$ . Here is an alternative short argument: Suppose  $\dim V = n$  and  $L \neq V'$ . Choose a basis  $g_1, \dots, g_k$  of  $L$  and note  $k < n$ . Thus

$$U = \bigcap_{i=1}^k \ker g_i = \ker \phi,$$

where  $\phi : V \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^k$  is the linear map  $\phi(v) = (g_1(v), g_2(v), \dots, g_k(v))$ . Since  $k < \dim V$  the Rank-Nullity Theorem applied to  $\phi$  gives that  $U = \ker \phi \neq \{0\}$ . Contradiction, therefore  $L = V'$ . [5 marks, N]

**Question 3**

(a) If  $v \in U \cap U^\perp$  then  $\langle v, v \rangle = 0$  and hence  $v = 0$  since the inner product is positive definite. Hence  $U \cap U^\perp = \{0\}$ . We now show that  $V = U + U^\perp$ . Let  $v \in V$ . Let  $e_1, \dots, e_k$  be an orthonormal basis of  $U$  and define  $v_1 = \sum_{i=1}^k \langle v, e_i \rangle e_i$ . Then  $v_1 \in U$  and  $\langle v, e_i \rangle = \langle v_1, e_i \rangle$  for all  $i$  which implies that  $v - v_1$  is orthogonal to each  $e_i$ , i.e.  $v - v_1 \in U^\perp$ . Hence  $V = U + U^\perp$  and therefore  $V = U \oplus U^\perp$ . [5 marks, B]

(b) (i) The adjoint  $N^*$  is the unique linear transformation  $N^* : V \rightarrow V$  such that  $\langle N^*(v), w \rangle = \langle v, N(w) \rangle$  for all  $v, w \in V$ . [1 Mark, B]

(ii) Fix  $w \in U^\perp$  and let  $v \in U$ . We have  $\langle N^*(w), v \rangle = \langle w, N(v) \rangle = 0$  since  $N(v) \in U$ . This holds for all  $v \in U$  and hence  $N^*(w) \in U^\perp$ . The vector  $w \in U^\perp$  was arbitrary and so  $N^*(U^\perp) \subseteq U^\perp$ . [4 marks, S]

(iii) If  $N = S + A$  as required then  $N^* = S - A$  and so we can solve  $S = (N + N^*)/2$ ,  $A = (N - N^*)/2$ . This  $A$  and  $S$  are uniquely determined by  $N$ . Conversely we check  $(\frac{N+N^*}{2})^* = \frac{N+N^*}{2}$  and  $(\frac{N-N^*}{2})^* = -\frac{N-N^*}{2}$  so  $A$  and  $S$  exist for any  $N$ .

Now if  $NN^* = N^*N$  then we check

$$\frac{N + N^*}{2} \frac{N - N^*}{2} = \frac{N^2 - (N^*)^2}{2} = \frac{N - N^*}{2} \frac{N + N^*}{2}$$

Conversely if  $A$  and  $S$  commute then  $NN^* = (A + S)(S - A) = S^2 - A^2 = (S - A)(A + S) = N^*N$  [5 marks, S]

(c) (i) Suppose  $v \in \ker N$ . Then  $\|N^*(v)\|^2 = \langle N^*v, N^*v \rangle = \langle v, NN^*v \rangle = \langle v, N^*Nv \rangle = 0$  and so  $N^*(v) = 0$  giving that  $v \in \ker N^*$ . Hence  $\ker N \subseteq \ker N^*$ . The same argument applied with  $N^*$  instead of  $N$  gives the opposite containment and hence  $\ker N^* = \ker N$ . [3 marks, N]

Let  $U = \ker N = \ker N^*$ . Since both  $N$  and  $N^*$  send  $U$  into  $U$ , from part (b)(ii) we have  $N(U^\perp) \subseteq U^\perp$  and  $N^*(U^\perp) \subseteq U^\perp$ . Also both  $N$  and  $N^*$  are injective when restricted to  $U^\perp$  and hence both maps are bijections when restricted to  $U^\perp$ . Finally  $N(V) = N(U + U^\perp) = N(U^\perp) = U^\perp$  and arguing with  $N^*$  in place of  $N$  we get  $Im(N) = Im(N^*) = U^\perp$ . [3 marks, N]

(ii) We have  $\|N^*(v)\| = \langle v, NN^*(v) \rangle$  and  $\|N(v)\| = \langle v, N^*N(v) \rangle$ . Therefore if we set  $A = NN^* - N^*N$  we get  $\langle v, Av \rangle = 0$  for all  $v \in V$ . From this point the students can argue with the spectral theorem to deduce  $A = 0$  but there is a direct way: Let  $u, v \in V$  and apply the above equality to  $u + v$ . So  $0 = \langle u + v, A(u + v) \rangle$ . Using  $\langle v, Av \rangle = \langle u, A(u) \rangle = 0$  we obtain

$$\langle u, A(v) \rangle + \langle v, A(u) \rangle = 0$$

Now replace  $v$  with  $iv$  to obtain

$$i\langle u, A(v) \rangle - i\langle v, A(u) \rangle = 0$$

Solving the two equations we get  $\langle u, A(v) \rangle = 0$  for all  $u, v \in V$  and so  $A = 0$  and  $NN^* = N^*N$ . [4 marks, N]