POW 2013-01 Solution 20080286 Joonhyun La (Mathematical Science)

1. Problem

Let A, B be $N \times N$ symmetric matrices with eigenvalues $\lambda_1^A \leq \lambda_2^A \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_N^A$ and $\lambda_1^B \leq \lambda_2^B \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_N^B$. Prove that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} |\lambda_i^A - \lambda_i^B|^2 \le tr(A - B)^2$$

2. Solution

First, we may assume that both λ_1^A and λ_1^B are nonnegative; for any t if we let C = A + tIand D = B + tI, where I is the $N \times N$ identity matrix, then C and D are $N \times N$ symmetric matrices with eigenvalues $\lambda_i^C = \lambda_i^A + t$ and $\lambda_i^D = \lambda_i^B + t$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$. Thus, $\lambda_i^C - \lambda_i^D = \lambda_i^A - \lambda_i^B$ and C - D = A - B, so the values of left-handed side and right-handed side of the desired inequality remain unchanged if we substitute C and D instead of A and B, respectively. Taking sufficiently large t, we may assume that all eigenvalues of Cand D are nonnegative.

Next, we may assume that A may be considered as a diagonal one, with $A_{ii} = \lambda_i^A$. This is because of the fact that the left-handed side and right-handed side of the desired inequality are invariant under similarity transformation, and since A is symmetric $A = P^T D P$ for some orthogonal matrix P, and a diagonal matrix D with $D_{ii} = \lambda_i^A$.

Therefore we may assume that $A_{ij} = \lambda_i^A$ if i = j and 0 if $i \neq j$. Then since \boldsymbol{B} is also a symmetric matrix, $B = P^T D_B P$ for some orthogonal matrix $P = (e_{ij})$ and a diagonal matrix D_B with $D_{Bii} = \lambda_i^B$. Computing the entries of \boldsymbol{B} , we get

Since A - B is also symmetric, we have

Substituting (1) to (2), we get

$$tr(A-B)^{2} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\lambda_{i}^{A} - \sum_{k=1}^{N} \lambda_{k}^{B} e_{ki}^{2})^{2} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^{N} (\sum_{k=1}^{N} \lambda_{k}^{B} e_{ki} e_{kj})^{2}$$
$$= \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\lambda_{i}^{A})^{2} - 2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_{i}^{A} (\sum_{k=1}^{N} \lambda_{k}^{B} e_{ki}^{2}) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} (\sum_{k=1}^{N} \lambda_{k}^{B} e_{ki} e_{kj})^{2}$$

But

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} (\sum_{k=1}^{N} \lambda_{k}^{B} e_{ki} e_{kj})^{2} = \sum_{k=1}^{N} \sum_{l=1}^{N} \lambda_{k}^{B} \lambda_{l}^{B} (\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} e_{ki} e_{kj} e_{li} e_{lj})$$
$$= \sum_{k=1}^{N} \sum_{l=1}^{N} \lambda_{k}^{B} \lambda_{l}^{B} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (e_{ki} e_{li}) \sum_{j=1}^{N} (e_{kj} e_{lj}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\lambda_{i}^{B})^{2}$$

Since

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} (e_{ki}e_{li}) = \langle (e_{k1}, e_{k2}, \cdots, e_{kN}), (e_{l1}, e_{l2}, \cdots, e_{lN}) \rangle = \delta_{kl}$$

Where δ_{kl} equals 1 if $k = l$ and equals 0 if $k \neq l$, due to orthogonality of $P = (e_{ij})$.

Consequently,

$$tr(A-B)^{2} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} ((\lambda_{i}^{A})^{2} + (\lambda_{i}^{B})^{2}) - 2\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda_{i}^{A} \lambda_{j}^{B} (e_{ji})^{2}$$
$$= \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\lambda_{i}^{A} - \lambda_{i}^{B})^{2} + 2(\sum_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_{i}^{A} \lambda_{i}^{B} - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda_{i}^{A} \lambda_{j}^{B} (e_{ji})^{2})$$

And it suffices to show that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_{i}^{A} \lambda_{i}^{B} - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda_{i}^{A} \lambda_{j}^{B} (e_{ji})^{2} \ge 0$$
.....(3)

Inequality (3) immediately follows from the following lemma;

Lemma Let $0 \le x_1 \le \dots \le x_N$, $0 \le y_1 \le \dots \le y_N$ and $A = (a_{ij})$ be an $N \times N$ matrix with $a_{ij} \ge 0$ for all i and j, and $\sum_{i=1}^N a_{ij} = 1$ for all j and $\sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij} = 1$ for all i. Then $\sum_{i=1}^N x_i y_i \ge \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N x_i a_{ij} y_j$

Proof of the Lemma) I have referred [M].

Let $z_1 = x_1$, $z_i = x_i - x_{i-1}$ for $i \ge 2$ and $w_1 = y_1$, $w_j = y_j - y_{j-1}$ for $j \ge 2$. Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} x_i y_i - \sum_{\substack{i=1\\N}}^{N} \sum_{\substack{j=1\\N}}^{N} x_i a_{ij} y_j = \sum_{\substack{i=1\\i}}^{N} \sum_{\substack{j=1\\i}}^{N} (\delta_{ij} - a_{ij}) (\sum_{\substack{i=1\\N}}^{r=1} z_r) (\sum_{s=1}^{j} w_s)$$
$$= \sum_{\substack{r=1\\N}}^{N} \sum_{\substack{s=1\\N}}^{N} z_r w_s (\sum_{\substack{i=r\\j=s}}^{N} \sum_{\substack{j=s\\N}}^{N} (\delta_{ij} - a_{ij}))$$
$$\sum_{\substack{r=1\\N}}^{N} \sum_{\substack{i=1\\N}}^{N} (\delta_{ij} - a_{ij}) \ge 0$$

And it suffices to show that i=r j=s for every r and s. If $r \ge s$, then

$$\sum_{i=r}^{N} \sum_{j=s}^{N} (\delta_{ij} - a_{ij}) = (N - r + 1) - \sum_{i=r}^{N} \sum_{j=s}^{N} a_{ij} \ge (N - r + 1) - \sum_{i=r}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} a_{ij} = 0$$

And similar argument works for $r \leq s$ case.

3. Reference

[M] Mirsky L., A trace inequality of John von Neuman, Monatshefte f["]ur Math. **79** (1975), 303–306.