

# ON THE MAXIMAL RANK IN A SUBSPACE OF MATRICES

by ROY MESHULAM

[Received 4th July 1984]

## On the maximal rank in a subspace of matrices

LET  $M_n(F)$  be the space of  $n \times n$  matrices over a field  $F$ , and let  $W$  be a linear subspace of  $M_n(F)$ .

Flanders [2] proved that if  $\dim W > rn$  and  $|F| \geq r+1$ , then  $W$  contains a matrix of rank  $> r$ . He also characterized the subspaces  $W$  such that  $\dim W = rn$  and  $W$  contains no matrix of rank  $> r$ .

In this note we prove a lower bound on the maximal rank attained in a subspace of matrices (Theorem 1). We then use this bound to derive Flanders' results (Theorems 2 and 3) without restrictions on  $F$ .

Let  $[n]$  denote  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ , and let  $<$  be the lexicographic order on  $[n] \times [n]$ . ( $(i, j) < (i_1, j_1)$  iff  $i < i_1$  or  $i = i_1$  and  $j < j_1$ .)

For  $A \in M_n(F)$  denote by  $p(A) \in [n] \times [n]$ , the location of  $A$ 's lexicographically first non-zero entry:

$$p(A) = \min \{(i, j) : A(i, j) \neq 0\}$$

For a collection  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$  of  $n \times n$  matrices, construct an  $n \times n$  matrix  $B$  as follows:  $B(k, l) = 1$  if  $(k, l) = p(A_i)$  for some  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , and  $B(k, l) = 0$  otherwise.

Denote by  $\rho(\mathcal{A})$  the minimal number of lines in  $B$  (a line is either a row or a column) which cover all 1's in  $B$ .

**THEOREM 1.** *Let  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_m\} \subset M_n(F)$ . Then span  $\mathcal{A}$  contains a matrix of rank  $\geq \rho(\mathcal{A})$ .*

*Proof.* Call a set of entries in a matrix independent, if it contains no two entries on the same line. By König's Theorem ([4], Theorem 5.1.4 in [3]), the maximal size of an independent set of 1's in a 0-1 matrix, is equal to the minimal number of lines, which cover all 1's in that matrix. Hence if  $\rho(\mathcal{A}) = r$ , then there exist  $1 \leq i_1, \dots, i_r \leq m$  such that  $\{p(A_{i_j}) : 1 \leq j \leq r\}$  is independent.

Let  $p(A_{i_j}) = (k_j, l_j)$  for  $1 \leq j \leq r$ , then  $S = \{k_1, \dots, k_r\}$  and  $T = \{l_1, \dots, l_r\}$  are both of cardinality  $r$ . For  $1 \leq j \leq r$  define  $B_j = A_{i_j}[S | T] \in M_r(F)$  (the minor determined by restricting the entries to  $S \times T$ ).

We shall prove the theorem by showing that span  $\{B_1, \dots, B_r\}$  contains a non-singular matrix.

We may assume that  $k_1 < \dots < k_r$ . Let  $h$  be the permutation on  $[r]$  for which:  $l_{h(1)} < \dots < l_{h(r)}$ . Denote the  $j$ th row of  $B_j$  by  $b_j$ .

Clearly  $B_j$ 's first  $(j-1)$  rows are zero,  $b_j(k)=0$  for  $1 \leq k < h^{-1}(j)$ , and  $b_j(h^{-1}(j)) \neq 0$ . Let  $C$  be the  $r \times r$  matrix, whose rows are  $b_1, \dots, b_r$ .  $C$  is non-singular, because by the preceding remarks, permuting  $C$ 's rows according to  $h$ , we obtain an upper triangular matrix, with non-zeros on the diagonal. Let  $D_j = B_j C^{-1}$  for  $1 \leq j \leq r$ . It is easy to check that the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{For all } 1 \leq j \leq r: D_j \text{'s first } j-1 \text{ rows are zero} \\ \text{and } D_j \text{'s } j\text{th row is the } j\text{th unit vector.} \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

*Claim 1.* If  $D_1, \dots, D_r$  satisfy (1), then there exists a 0-1 combination of  $D_1, \dots, D_r$  which is non-singular.

*Proof.* We use induction on  $r$ . The case  $r=1$  is trivial. Assume  $r > 1$ . For  $1 \leq j \leq r-1$  let  $D'_j = D_j([r-1] | [r-1]) \in M_{r-1}(F)$ .  $D'_1, \dots, D'_{r-1}$  satisfy (1) for  $r-1$ , and so, by induction there exist  $x_1, \dots, x_{r-1} \in \{0, 1\}$  such that  $\sum_{j=1}^{r-1} x_j D'_j$  is non-singular.

Now, since  $D_r(i, j) = 0$  for all  $(i, j) \neq (r, r)$ , and  $D_r(r, r) = 1$ , we obtain by expanding the bottom row:

$$\det \left( \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} x_j D_j + D_r \right) = \det \left( \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} x_j D'_j \right) + \det \left( \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} x_j D'_j \right) \quad (2)$$

But  $\det(\sum_{j=1}^{r-1} x_j D'_j) \neq 0$ , so (2) implies that  $\sum_{j=1}^{r-1} x_j D_j$  and  $\sum_{j=1}^{r-1} x_j D_j + D_r$  cannot both be singular. ■

We return to the proof of the theorem. By the claim  $\sum_{j=1}^r x_j D_j$  is non-singular for some  $x_j$ 's, and therefore  $\sum_{j=1}^r x_j B_j = (\sum_{j=1}^r x_j D_j)C$  is also non-singular. This implies that  $\text{rank}(\sum_{j=1}^r x_j A_{ij}) \geq r$ . ■

The next result had been proved by Flanders [2], for  $|F| \geq r+1$ :

**THEOREM 2.** If  $W$  is a subspace of  $M_n(F)$ , and  $\dim W > m$ , then  $W$  contains a matrix of rank  $> r$ . ■

*Proof.* Choose a basis  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_t\}$  of  $W$ . By performing a gaussian elimination on  $\{A_1, \dots, A_t\}$  (regarding them as  $n^2$  dimensional vectors), we may assume that  $p(A_1), \dots, p(A_t)$  are all distinct. Since a line in a matrix covers  $n$  entries, we cannot cover  $p(A_1), \dots, p(A_t)$  by less than  $t/n$  lines. Therefore  $\rho(\mathcal{A}) \geq t/n > r$ , which by Theorem 1 implies that  $W = \text{span } \mathcal{A}$  contains a matrix of rank  $> r$ . ■

Next we discuss a certain extremal case of Theorem 2.

Let  $F^n$  be the space of  $n$ -tuples over  $F$ . Denote by  $x \otimes y \in M_n(F)$ , the Kronecker product of  $x, y \in F^n$ . For  $A, B \subset F^n$ , let  $A \otimes B = \text{span } \{x \otimes y : x \in A, y \in B\}$ .

The following result had been proved by Flanders [2], under the assumptions  $|F| \geq r+1$  and  $\text{char}(F) \neq 2$ . Atkinson and Lloyd [1] had obtained it assuming only  $|F| \geq r+1$ .

**THEOREM 3.** *Suppose  $W \subset M_n(F)$  is a subspace of dimension  $m$ , such that for all  $A \in W$ ,  $\text{rank}(A) \leq r$ . Then either  $W = E \otimes F^n$  or  $W = F^n \otimes E$ , for some  $r$  dimensional subspace  $E \subset F^n$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$  be a basis of  $W$ . As in Theorem 2, we may assume that  $p(A_1), \dots, p(A_m)$  are all distinct.  $W$  does not contain a matrix of rank  $> r$ , therefore by Theorem 1,  $\rho(\mathcal{A}) \leq r$ . Choose  $r$  lines which cover  $p(A_1), \dots, p(A_m)$ . Since each line covers at most  $n$  of the  $p(A_i)$ 's, it follows that the lines are pairwise disjoint, and that each of them consists entirely of  $p(A_i)$ 's.

Hence, either all  $r$  lines are rows, or all  $r$  lines are columns.

We shall assume the first case—that is:  $p(A_1), \dots, p(A_m)$  form  $r$  rows. (The case of columns is treated similarly).

Next we note that if  $Q_1, Q_2 \in M_n(F)$  are non-singular, then the maximal rank in  $Q_1 W Q_2$  is equal to the maximal rank in  $W$ , and  $W = E_1 \otimes E_2$  for some  $E_1, E_2 \subset F^n$  iff  $Q_1 W Q_2 = (Q_1 E_1) \otimes (E_2 Q_2)$ .

In particular, by performing the same row permutation on all matrices in  $W$ , we may assume that  $p(A_1), \dots, p(A_m)$  consist of the first  $r$  rows.

Clearly, by gaussian elimination on  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  (regarded as vectors in  $F^n$ ), we may obtain a new basis  $\{B_{ij} : 1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq n\}$  of  $W$ , such that  $B_{ij}(i, j) = 1$  and  $B_{ij}(k, l) = 0$  for all  $1 \leq k \leq r, 1 \leq l \leq n$  such that  $(k, l) \neq (i, j)$ .

*Claim 2.*  $B_{ij}$  is zero, except for the  $j$ th column.

*Proof.* We have to show that  $B_{ij}(k, l) = 0$  for  $l \neq j$  and  $r + 1 \leq k \leq n$  (for  $1 \leq k \leq r$  this is known). Since our claim is invariant under row and column permutations, it suffices to prove it for specific  $i, j, k, l$  (which satisfy  $l \neq j$  and  $r + 1 \leq k \leq n$ ), say  $i = j = r, k = l = r + 1$ . That is, we show that  $B_r(r + 1, r + 1) = 0$ . let  $C_{ij} = B_{ij}([r + 1] | [r + 1]) \in M_{r+1}(F)$ , and define  $E_{ij} \in M_r(F)$  for  $1 \leq i, j \leq r$  by  $E_{ij}(k, l) = \delta_{ik} \delta_{jl}$ .

Let  $P \subset [r] \times [r]$ . As  $C_p(i, r + 1) = 0$  for all  $p \in P, 1 \leq i \leq r$ , we have:

$$\det \left( \sum_{p \in P} C_p \right) = \det \left( \sum_{p \in P} E_p \right) \left( \sum_{p \in P} C_p(r + 1, r + 1) \right). \tag{3}$$

Since  $W$  does not contain a matrix of rank  $> r$ , it follows that  $\det(\sum_{p \in P} C_p) = 0$ , and so if  $P \subset [r] \times [r]$  satisfies:

$$\det \left( \sum_{p \in P} E_p \right) \neq 0 \tag{4}$$

Then  $\sum_{p \in P} C_p(r + 1, r + 1) = 0$ .

It is clear that the sets  $P = \{(1, 1), (2, 2), \dots, (r - 2, r - 2), (r - 1, r), (r, r - 1)\}$  ( $P = \{(1, 1)\}$  for  $r = 1$ ), and  $P_1 = P \cup \{(r, r)\}$ , both satisfy (4),

and so:

$$\sum_{p \in P} C_p(r+1, r+1) = \sum_{p \in P_1} C_p(r+1, r+1) = 0.$$

This implies  $B_r(r+1, r+1) = C_r(r+1, r+1) = 0$ . ■

We complete the proof of Theorem 3, by showing that for every  $1 \leq i \leq r$  there exists  $x_i \in F^n$ , such that for every  $1 \leq j \leq n$   $B_{ij} = x_i \otimes e_j$  ( $e_j$  is the  $j$ th unit vector in  $F^n$ ).

In view of Claim 2, we only have to show that for  $1 \leq j_1, j_2 \leq n$ , the  $j_1$ th column of  $B_{i_1}$  is equal to the  $j_2$ th column of  $B_{i_2}$ . Again by permuting rows and columns it suffices to prove (for example) that  $B_{11}(r+1, 1) = B_{12}(r+1, 2)$ . Using the notations of Claim 2, let

$$C = C_{11} + C_{12} + (C_{23} + C_{34} + \dots + C_{r+1})$$

By Claim 2:  $C(r+1, 1) = B_{11}(r+1, 1)$ ,  $C(r+1, 2) = B_{12}(r+1, 2)$ .  $C$ , being an  $(r+1) \times (r+1)$  minor of a matrix in  $W$  is singular, because  $W$  has no member of rank  $> r$ . On the other hand it is clear that:

$$\det(C) = (-1)^r (C(r+1, 1) - C(r+1, 2))$$

Therefore  $C(r+1, 1) = C(r+1, 2)$  and so:  $B_{11}(r+1, 1) = B_{12}(r+1, 2)$ . ■

*Remark.* Atkinson and Lloyd [1] have extended Flanders' classification, by proving that if  $W \subset M_n(F)$  does not contain a matrix of rank  $> r$ ,  $\dim W \geq rn - r + 1$  and  $|F| \geq r + 1$ , then  $W$  is  $r$ -decomposable (that is:  $W \subset E_1 \otimes F^n + F^n \otimes E_2$  for some subspaces  $E_1, E_2 \subset F^n$  such that  $\dim E_1 + \dim E_2 = r$ ).

Contrary to Theorems 2 and 3, this result does depend on the field, as the following example, which has been suggested by the referee, indicates: Let  $W$  be the 5-dimensional space of all

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & 0 \\ c & b & 0 \\ d & e & a+b \end{pmatrix} \tag{5}$$

over  $GF(2)$ . Clearly  $W$  does not contain a non-singular matrix, yet  $W$  is not 2-decomposable. For otherwise  $W'$ —the space of all matrices of the form (5) over say,  $GF(4)$ —would also be 2-decomposable, which is impossible since  $W'$  contains non-singular matrices.

*Acknowledgment*

I would like to thank Nathan Linial and Michael Rabin for their help.

REFERENCES

1. M. D. Atkinson and S. Lloyd, 'Large subspaces of matrices of bounded rank', *Quarterly J. Math.* 31 (1980). 253-262.

2. H. Flanders, 'On spaces of linear transformations with bounded rank', *J. London Math. Soc.* 37 (1962), 10–16.
3. M. Hall, Jr., *Combinatorial Theory*, Blaisdell, Waltham, Mass. 1967.
4. D. König, 'Graphok és matrixok', *Mat. Fiz. Lapok* 38 (1931), 115–119.

*Institute of Mathematics,  
Hebrew University  
Jerusalem 91904  
Israel*