

MA 110

Linear Algebra and Differential Equations

Lecture 04

Prof. Sudhir R. Ghorpade
Department of Mathematics
IIT Bombay

<http://www.math.iitb.ac.in/~srg/>

Spring 2025

Recall: A square matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is said to be **invertible** if there is $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ such that

$$\mathbf{AB} = \mathbf{I} = \mathbf{BA},$$

and in this case, \mathbf{B} is called an **inverse** of \mathbf{A} .

We have seen examples of square matrices that are invertible and also those that are not invertible. Further we noted that:

- If a square matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is invertible, then it has a unique inverse, and it is denoted by \mathbf{A}^{-1}
- If a square matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is invertible, then so is its transpose \mathbf{A}^T and in this case,

$$(\mathbf{A}^T)^{-1} = (\mathbf{A}^{-1})^T.$$

We have also related the invertibility of a square matrix \mathbf{A} to the solutions of the homogeneous system $\mathbf{Ax} = \mathbf{0}$ by proving:

Proposition

Let $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. Then \mathbf{A} is invertible if and only if the linear system $\mathbf{Ax} = \mathbf{0}$ has **only** the zero solution.

This gave a 50% reduction in the condition for invertibility:

Corollary

Let $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. If there is $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ such that **either** $\mathbf{BA} = \mathbf{I}$ **or** $\mathbf{AB} = \mathbf{I}$, then \mathbf{A} is invertible, and $\mathbf{A}^{-1} = \mathbf{B}$.

And we also established the following useful property:

Proposition

Let $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. Then \mathbf{AB} is invertible if and only if both \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} are invertible. In this case, $(\mathbf{AB})^{-1} = \mathbf{B}^{-1}\mathbf{A}^{-1}$.

Row Canonical Form (RCF)

As we have seen, a matrix \mathbf{A} may not have a unique REF. However, a special REF of \mathbf{A} turns out to be unique.

An $m \times n$ matrix \mathbf{A} is said to be in a **row canonical form** (RCF) or a **reduced row echelon form** (RREF) if

- (i) it is in a row echelon form (REF),
- (ii) all pivots are equal to 1 and
- (iii) in each pivotal column, all entries above the pivot are (also) equal to 0.

For example, the matrix

$$\mathbf{A} := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & * & 0 & 0 & * \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & * \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & * \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

is in a RCF, where $*$ denotes any real number.

Note: If \mathbf{A} is in REF, then in each pivotal column, all entries below the pivot are 0. If \mathbf{A} is in fact in RCF and has r nonzero rows, then the $r \times r$ submatrix formed by the first r rows and the r pivotal columns is the $r \times r$ identity matrix \mathbf{I} .

Suppose an $m \times n$ matrix \mathbf{A} is in RCF and has r nonzero rows. If $r = n$, then it has n pivotal columns, that is, all its columns

are pivotal, and so $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{I}$ if $m = n$, and $\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} \\ \mathbf{O} \end{bmatrix}$ if $m > n$,

where \mathbf{I} is the $n \times n$ identity matrix and \mathbf{O} is the $(m - n) \times n$ zero matrix.

To transform an $m \times n$ matrix to a RCF, we first transform it to a REF by elementary row operations of type I and II. Then we multiply a row containing a pivot p by $1/p$ (which is an elementary row operation of type III), and then we add a suitable nonzero multiple of this row to each preceding row.

Every matrix has a unique RCF. (Proof by induction on n)

Example

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 3 & -2 & 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 2 & 6 & -5 & -2 & 4 & -3 \\ 0 & 0 & 5 & 10 & 0 & 15 \\ 2 & 6 & 0 & 8 & 4 & 16 \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\text{EROs}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 3 & -2 & 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & -2 & 0 & -3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 6 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

which is in REF,

$$\xrightarrow{\text{EROs}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 3 & 0 & 4 & 2 & 6 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 6 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\text{EROs}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 3 & 0 & 4 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

which is in RCF.

Recall: A square matrix \mathbf{A} is invertible if and only if the homogeneous linear system $\mathbf{Ax} = \mathbf{0}$ has only the zero solution.

Proposition

An $n \times n$ matrix is invertible if and only if it can be transformed to the $n \times n$ identity matrix by EROs.

Proof. Suppose $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is invertible. Using EROs, transform \mathbf{A} to a matrix $\mathbf{A}' \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ such that \mathbf{A}' is in a RCF. Since \mathbf{A} is invertible, the linear system $\mathbf{Ax} = \mathbf{0}$ has only the zero solution. Hence \mathbf{A}' has n nonzero rows, and so each of the n columns of \mathbf{A}' is pivotal. Also, the number of rows of \mathbf{A} is equal to the number of its columns, that is, $m = n$. Therefore $\mathbf{A}' = \mathbf{I}$.

Conversely, suppose $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ can be transformed to the $n \times n$ identity matrix \mathbf{I} by EROs. Since $\mathbf{Ix} = \mathbf{0} \implies \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$, we see that the linear system $\mathbf{Ax} = \mathbf{0}$ has only the zero solution. Hence \mathbf{A} is invertible. □

Remark.

Suppose an $n \times n$ square matrix \mathbf{A} is invertible. In order to solve the linear system $\mathbf{Ax} = \mathbf{b}$ for a given $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$, we may transform the augmented matrix $[\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{b}]$ to $[\mathbf{I}|\mathbf{c}]$ by EROs. Now $\mathbf{Ax} = \mathbf{b} \iff \mathbf{Ix} = \mathbf{c}$ for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$. Hence $\mathbf{Ac} = \mathbf{b}$. Thus \mathbf{c} is the unique solution of $\mathbf{Ax} = \mathbf{b}$. This observation is the basis of an important method to find the inverse of a square matrix.

Gauss-Jordan Method for Finding the Inverse of a Matrix

Let $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be an invertible matrix. Consider the basic column vectors $\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$. Then $[\mathbf{e}_1 \ \cdots \ \mathbf{e}_n] = \mathbf{I}$. Let $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$ be the unique elements of $\mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$ be such that $\mathbf{Ax}_1 = \mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Ax}_n = \mathbf{e}_n$, and define $\mathbf{X} := [\mathbf{x}_1 \ \cdots \ \mathbf{x}_n]$. Then

$$\mathbf{AX} = \mathbf{A} [\mathbf{x}_1 \ \cdots \ \mathbf{x}_n] = [\mathbf{Ax}_1 \ \cdots \ \mathbf{Ax}_n] = [\mathbf{e}_1 \ \cdots \ \mathbf{e}_n] = \mathbf{I}.$$

By an earlier result, it follows that $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{A}^{-1}$.

Hence to find \mathbf{A}^{-1} , we may solve the n linear systems $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_n = \mathbf{e}_n$ simultaneously by considering the $n \times 2n$ augmented matrix

$$[\mathbf{A} | \mathbf{e}_1 \cdots \mathbf{e}_n] = [\mathbf{A} | \mathbf{I}]$$

and transform \mathbf{A} to its RCF, namely to \mathbf{I} , by EROs. Thus if $[\mathbf{A} | \mathbf{I}]$ is transformed to $[\mathbf{I} | \mathbf{X}]$, then \mathbf{X} is the inverse of \mathbf{A} .

Remark To carry out the above process, we need not know beforehand that the matrix \mathbf{A} is invertible. This follows by noting that \mathbf{A} can be transformed to the identity matrix by EROs if and only if \mathbf{A} is invertible. Hence the process itself reveals whether \mathbf{A} is invertible or not.

Example

Let

$$\mathbf{A} := \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 1 & 2 \\ 3 & -1 & 1 \\ -1 & 3 & 4 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We use EROs to transform $[\mathbf{A} \mid \mathbf{I}]$ to $[\mathbf{I} \mid \mathbf{X}]$, where $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$.

$$\left[\begin{array}{ccc|ccc} -1 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 3 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 3 & 4 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{array} \right] \rightarrow \left[\begin{array}{ccc|ccc} -1 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 7 & 3 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 2 & -1 & 0 & 1 \end{array} \right] \rightarrow$$

$$\left[\begin{array}{ccc|ccc} -1 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 7 & 3 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -5 & -4 & -1 & 1 \end{array} \right] \rightarrow \left[\begin{array}{ccc|ccc} 1 & -1 & -2 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 3.5 & 1.5 & 0.5 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0.8 & 0.2 & -0.2 \end{array} \right]$$

$$\rightarrow \left[\begin{array}{ccc|ccc} 1 & -1 & 0 & 0.6 & 0.4 & -0.4 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -1.3 & -0.2 & 0.7 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0.8 & 0.2 & -0.2 \end{array} \right]$$

$$\rightarrow \left[\begin{array}{ccc|ccc} 1 & 0 & 0 & -0.7 & 0.2 & 0.3 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -1.3 & -0.2 & 0.7 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0.8 & 0.2 & -0.2 \end{array} \right] = [\mathbf{I} \mid \mathbf{X}].$$

Thus **A** is invertible and

$$\mathbf{A}^{-1} = \mathbf{X} = \frac{1}{10} \begin{bmatrix} -7 & 2 & 3 \\ -13 & -2 & 7 \\ 8 & 2 & -2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Linear Dependence

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We shall work entirely with **row vectors** in $\mathbb{R}^{1 \times n}$ (of length n), or entirely with **column vectors** in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$ (of length n), both of which will be referred to as '**vectors**'.

We have already considered a **linear combination**

$$\alpha_1 \mathbf{a}_1 + \cdots + \alpha_m \mathbf{a}_m$$

of vectors $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m$, where $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m$ are scalars.

A set S of vectors is called **linearly dependent** if there is $m \in \mathbb{N}$, there are (distinct) vectors $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m$ in S and there are scalars $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m$, **not all zero**, such that

$$\alpha_1 \mathbf{a}_1 + \cdots + \alpha_m \mathbf{a}_m = \mathbf{0}.$$

It can be seen that S is linearly dependent \iff either $\mathbf{0} \in S$ or a vector in S is a linear combination of other vectors in S .

Examples

(i) Let $S := \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}^T, \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 \end{bmatrix}^T, \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}^T \right\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 1}$. Then the set S is linearly dependent since

$$\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix}. \text{ Clearly, } \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

(ii) Let

$$S := \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 3 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -3 & 3 \end{bmatrix} \right\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{1 \times 3}.$$

Then the set S is linearly dependent since

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & -3 & 3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 \end{bmatrix} - 2 \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 3 & 1 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}. \text{ Clearly,}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 \end{bmatrix} - 2 \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 3 & 1 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -3 & 3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

In (i) above, S is a set of 3 vectors in $\mathbb{R}^{2 \times 1}$, and in (ii) above, S is a set of 4 vectors in $\mathbb{R}^{1 \times 3}$. These examples illustrate an important phenomenon to which we now turn. First we prove the following **crucial result**.

Proposition

Let S be a set of s vectors, each of which is a linear combination of elements of a (fixed) set of r vectors. If $s > r$, then the set S is linearly dependent.

Proof. Let $S := \{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_s\}$, and suppose each vector in S is a linear combination of elements of the set $\{\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_r\}$ of r vectors and $s > r$. Then

$$\mathbf{x}_j = \sum_{k=1}^r a_{jk} \mathbf{y}_k \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, s, \text{ where } a_{jk} \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Let $\mathbf{A} := [a_{jk}] \in \mathbb{R}^{s \times r}$. Then $\mathbf{A}^T \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times s}$. Since $r < s$, the linear system $\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ has a nonzero solution, that is, there are $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s$, not all zero, such that

$$\mathbf{A}^T \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_1 \\ \vdots \\ \alpha_s \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & \cdots & a_{s1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ a_{1r} & \cdots & a_{sr} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_1 \\ \vdots \\ \alpha_s \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times 1},$$

that is, $\sum_{j=1}^s a_{jk} \alpha_j = 0$ for $k = 1, \dots, r$. It follows that

$$\sum_{j=1}^s \alpha_j \mathbf{x}_j = \sum_{j=1}^s \alpha_j \left(\sum_{k=1}^r a_{jk} \mathbf{y}_k \right) = \sum_{k=1}^r \left(\sum_{j=1}^s a_{jk} \alpha_j \right) \mathbf{y}_k = \mathbf{0}.$$

Since not all $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ are zero, S is linearly dependent. \square

Corollary

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and S be a set of vectors of length n . If S has more than n elements, then S is linearly dependent.

Proof. If S is a set of column vectors of length n , then each element of S is a linear combination of the n column vectors $\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n$. Similarly, if S is a set of row vectors of length n , then each element of S is a linear combination of the n row vectors $\mathbf{e}_1^T, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n^T$. Hence the desired result follows from the crucial result we just proved. \square