

# Pacific Journal of Mathematics

**A THEOREM ON MATRICES OF 0'S AND 1'S**

MICHAEL P. DRAZIN AND EMILIE VIRGINIA HAYNSWORTH

# A THEOREM ON MATRICES OF 0'S AND 1'S

M. P. DRAZIN AND E. V. HAYNSWORTH

In this note we define two types of matrices, called "special" and "quasi-special", which we first discuss in their own rights; it turns out that the quasi-special matrices have a canonical representation (under permutational similarity) in terms of special matrices. We show how this fact can, essentially, be expressed in the language of graph theory, and we also use it to give a new proof of a theorem of Goldberg [1] on matrices with real roots. We shall be concerned, specifically, with the following properties of an  $n \times n$  matrix  $A = (a_{ij})$ :

DEFINITION 1. We call  $A$  *special* if  $a_{ij} \neq 0$  implies  $a_{ji} \neq 0$ .

DEFINITION 2. Given any integer  $s$  with<sup>1</sup>  $3 \leq s \leq n$ , we call  $A$  *s-special* if, for every ordered set  $(i) = (i_1, \dots, i_s)$  of integers  $i_r$  in the range  $1 \leq i_r \leq n$  ( $r = 1, \dots, s$ ), the statement

$$N_A(i): a_{i_1 i_2} \neq 0, \dots, a_{i_{s-1} i_s} \neq 0, \quad a_{i_s i_1} \neq 0$$

implies

$$N_{A'}(i): a_{i_2 i_1} \neq 0, \dots, a_{i_s i_{s-1}} \neq 0, \quad a_{i_1 i_s} \neq 0.$$

For example, every symmetric matrix is special (and the same is true of hermitian matrices over any ring with involution). Also, obviously, every special  $n \times n$  matrix is  $s$ -special for each  $s = 3, \dots, n$ , and it will be convenient to call any matrix with this latter property *quasi-special*. Thus every special matrix is quasi-special. The converse of this is easily seen to be false: e.g.

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

is 3-special (since  $N_A(i_1, i_2, i_3)$  is always false), hence quasi-special, but this  $A$  is evidently not special. Nevertheless, every quasi-special matrix does have certain special matrices associated with it. More precisely, our main result is

---

Received March 14, 1962. The first author's research was supported in part by the United States Air Force through the Air Force Office of Scientific Research of the Air Research and Development Command, under contract No. AF 49 (638)-382. Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.

<sup>1</sup> Clearly  $s = 1, 2$  would lead to properties enjoyed by every matrix  $A$ , and so we need not consider these values of  $s$ .

**THEOREM.** (1) *Given any  $n \times n$  matrix of the lower-triangular block form*

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} B_{11} & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ B_{21} & B_{22} & 0 & & 0 \\ \vdots & & & \cdot & \vdots \\ B_{m1} & B_{m2} & B_{m3} & \cdots & B_{mm} \end{pmatrix}$$

*where each block  $B_{kk}$  occurring on the diagonal of  $B$  is special (in particular, square), and given any  $n \times n$  permutation matrix  $P$ , then the matrix  $A = PBP^{-1}$  is always quasi-special.*

(2) *Conversely, every quasi-special  $n \times n$  matrix  $A$  can be expressed in the form  $A = PBP^{-1}$ , with  $B, P$  as in (1).*

For matrices over any integral domain, of course  $N_A(i)$  becomes simply  $a_{i_1 i_2} \cdots a_{i_s i_1} \neq 0$ . However, our Theorem is essentially combinatorial, in that its proof involves no genuinely algebraic operations on the elements of the matrices  $A, B$ , which may consequently be of quite arbitrary nature. All that we need is that there be given some classification of these elements into two disjoint subsets, say  $Z$  and  $N$  (standing for "zero" and "nonzero"), in which case we must replace each inequality  $a_{i_r i_{r+1}} \neq 0$  occurring in  $N_A(i)$  by a corresponding statement  $a_{i_r i_{r+1}} \in N$  (or, equivalently, by a relational statement  $i_r Ri_{r+1}$ ). Since our arguments will not require any further properties of  $Z$  or  $N$  we might, with no real loss of generality, equally well have stated the theorem for matrices whose elements are all 0 or 1 (hence our title). Nevertheless, for the sake of its application in a Corollary below, where the elements will be complex numbers, we have preferred to state the result in the apparently (but rather illusorily) more general form above.

*Proof of (1).* This is relatively trivial. Since the property of being quasi-special (or not) is clearly preserved under similarity transformation by any permutation matrix  $P$ , we need only prove that a matrix of the type  $B$  must itself be quasi-special. To this end, let  $(i) = (i_1, \cdots, i_s)$  (where  $3 \leq s \leq n$ ) be any sequence for which  $N_B(i)$  holds. We shall show first that this can happen only if each of the  $b_{i_r i_{r+1}}$  (where we define  $i_{s+1} = i_1$  conventionally) lies in some diagonal block  $B_{kk}$  (and indeed all in the same block, though this is not vital to our argument).

For, since  $N_B(i)$  requires all the  $b_{i_r i_{r+1}}$  to be nonzero, each  $b_{i_r i_{r+1}}$

must lie in some block  $B_{uv}$  with  $v \leq u$  (where  $u, v$  depend on  $r$ ). Among all those  $B_{uv}$  which contain a  $b_{i_r i_{r+1}}$ , choose one with minimum  $u$ ; without loss of generality, we may suppose that the corresponding  $r = 1$ , i.e. that  $b_{i_1 i_2} \in B_{uv}$  with  $u$  minimum and  $v \leq u$ . Then, since all the  $B_{kk}$  are square,  $b_{i_2 i_3} \in B_{vw}$  for some  $w$ , and, by the minimality of  $u$ , we must have  $v = u$ , i.e.  $b_{i_1 i_2} \in B_{uu}$ . Repeating the argument, we see that  $b_{i_2 i_3} \in B_{uu}, \dots, b_{i_{r-1} i_r} \in B_{uu}, b_{i_r i_1} \in B_{uu}$ .

Thus all the  $b_{i_r i_{r+1}}$  corresponding to any sequence  $(i)$  for which  $N_B(i)$  holds must belong to the same diagonal block  $B_{uu}$ . Since each such  $B_{uu}$  is given to be special (even quasi-special would be enough for our present purpose) and since all the  $b_{i_r i_{r+1}}$  are nonzero (by  $N_B(i)$ ), it follows that all the  $b_{i_{r+1} i_r}$  are nonzero too, i.e.  $N_{B'}(i)$  holds. To summarize,  $N_B(i)$  implies  $N_{B'}(i)$ , so that  $B$ , and hence  $A$ , is indeed quasi-special, as required.

*Proof of (2).* If  $A$  is not itself special, i.e. if for some  $u, v$  we have  $a_{uv} = 0, a_{vu} \neq 0$ , then, since of course  $u \neq v$ , by applying a suitable permutational similarity (specifically, the one that interchanges the first row with the  $u$ th and the  $v$ th with the  $n$ th, and the columns similarly), we may take  $u = 1, v = n$ , i.e. we may suppose throughout that

$$(*) \quad a_{1n} = 0, \quad a_{n1} \neq 0.$$

We now apply a double induction, first on the order  $n$  of  $A$  and secondly on the row index  $i$  within  $A$ . Thus, supposing the theorem already proved for all square matrices of order  $< n$ , we let  $A$  be as stated, assume by way of contradiction that  $A$  can not be transformed to the form  $B$  by permutation, and take as our "inner" inductive hypothesis the proposition

$H_i$ : there exist an  $n \times n$  permutation matrix  $Q_i$ , and integers  $k_1, \dots, k_i$  satisfying  $1 \leq k_1 \leq k_2 \leq \dots \leq k_i < n$  such that, for each  $h = 1, \dots, i$ , we have

$$c_{hj} \neq 0 \ (k_{h-1} < j \leq k_h), \quad c_{hj} = 0 \ (k_h < j \leq n),$$

and also  $c_{n1} \neq 0$ , where  $C = (c_{hj})$  denotes the matrix  $Q_i^{-1} A Q_i$  and we interpret  $k_0 = 1$ .

We wish to prove first that  $H_i$  is true for each  $i = 1, \dots, n - 1$ , and our chief task in so doing will be to deduce  $H_i$  from  $H_{i-1}$ . Suppose then, for some  $i$  with  $1 < i < n$ , that  $H_{i-1}$  holds. Since the property of being quasi-special is unaffected under similarity transformation by a permutation matrix, and since any product of permutation matrices is itself a permutation matrix, we may assume

with no loss of generality that  $Q_{i-1}$  is just the unit matrix (so that we may speak of  $A$  rather than  $C$ ).

Given  $H_{i-1}$ , if  $k_{i-1} \leq i - 1$ , then  $A$  would have an  $(i - 1) \times (n - i + 1)$  block of zeroes in its upper right hand corner. Also the leading  $(i - 1) \times (i - 1)$  block of  $A$  and its complementary  $(n - i + 1) \times (n - i + 1)$  submatrix are both quasi-special, of order at most  $n - 1$ , and so, by our inductive hypothesis on  $n$ , we could find an  $n \times n$  permutation matrix  $P$  (of the form  $P = \text{diag.}(P_1, P_2)$ , where  $P_1, P_2$  are permutation matrices of orders  $i - 1, n - i + 1$  respectively) transforming  $A$  to the form  $B$ , which is contrary to assumption.

Thus the only possibility is that each  $k_{i-1} \geq i$ . Let us now permute the columns of  $A$  to the right of the  $k_{i-1}$ th, but omitting the  $n$ th (i.e.  $n - k_{i-1} - 1$  columns in all), among themselves so that, in the set of elements where these columns intersect the  $i$ th row, the nonzero elements (if any) are brought to the left, and the zeroes (if any) to the right (while, by the definition of  $k_1, \dots, k_{i-1}$ , such a permutation of columns leaves the first  $i - 1$  rows unaffected); and define an integer  $k_i$  (clearly in the desired range  $k_{i-1} \leq k_i < n$ ) by writing the number of these nonzero elements as  $k_i - k_{i-1}$ . Then, since  $k_{i-1} \geq i$ , we may perform a corresponding permutation on the  $(k_{i-1} + 1)$ th through  $(n - 1)$ st rows without interfering with any of the first  $i$  rows (or the  $n$ th, so that  $a_{n1}$  is left nonzero), i.e., with this  $k_i$ , we have constructed a permutational similarity taking  $A$  into just the form prescribed in  $H_i$ , *provided only that*  $a_{in} = 0$ .

To prove that we do always in fact have  $a_{in} = 0$ , we proceed indirectly, and shall first consider the elements of the  $i$ th column which lie above the  $i$ th row. For  $i > 1$ , if  $a_{pi} = 0$  for each  $p = 1, \dots, i - 1$ , then this would imply  $i > k_{i-1}$ , a contradiction. Hence there must be some integer  $i_1$  in the range  $i > i_1 \geq 1$  such that  $a_{i_1 i} \neq 0$ . By repeating this argument, we can find a sequence of integers  $i > i_1 > i_2 > \dots > i_t > i_{t+1} = 1$  such that  $a_{i_1 i} \neq 0, a_{i_2 i_1} \neq 0, \dots, a_{i_t i_{t-1}} \neq 0, a_{i_1 i_t} \neq 0$  (where we interpret  $t = 0$  if  $i_1 = 1$ , in which case we need only the fact that  $a_{i_1 i} \neq 0$ ). But then, if  $a_{in} \neq 0$ , we should have (since  $a_{n1} \neq 0$  by  $H_{i-1}$ ) a  $(t + 3)$ -cycle of nonzero elements

$$a_{1i_t} \neq 0, \quad a_{i_t i_{t-1}} \neq 0, \quad \dots, \quad a_{i_2 i_1} \neq 0, \quad a_{i_1 i} \neq 0, \quad a_{in} \neq 0, \quad a_{n1} \neq 0,$$

whence, since  $A$  is quasi-special and  $t + 3 \leq i + 1 \leq n$ , it would follow that (in particular)  $a_{in} \neq 0$ , contrary to  $H_{i-1}$  (at least for  $n \geq 3$ ); hence  $a_{in} \neq 0$  cannot occur, i.e.  $H_i$  holds in its entirety.

Thus, to sum up, given the truth of (2) for all matrices  $A$  of order  $< n$ , where  $n \geq 3$ , we have proved, for each  $i$  with  $1 < i < n$ , that  $H_{i-1}$  implies  $H_i$ . Since  $H_1$  always holds (as is easily verified, given (\*)), it follows that  $H_{n-1}$  holds. But, since  $k_{n-1} < n$ , this would

imply that (after a suitable permutational transformation) the  $n$ th column of  $A$  (excepting perhaps the  $(n, n)$  element) consisted entirely of zeroes, so that, by our ("outer") inductive hypothesis on  $n$ , it would follow that  $A$  could, after all, be permuted into the form  $B$ , which contradiction completes our inner induction argument.

Thus for  $n \geq 3$ , the required assertion (2) about any  $n \times n$  quasi-special matrix  $A$  is implied by the corresponding assertion about all quasi-special matrices of order  $< n$ ; the cases  $n = 1, 2$  being trivial, (2) now follows at once by induction on  $n$ .

Though the proof we have given is in a sense quite direct, it is also possible to regard our Theorem as being just an algebraic formulation of a geometrically almost self-evident result in the theory of graphs; and, in the process, our apparently somewhat exotic Definitions 1, 2 above will now appear in a more natural light.

We suppose given a directed graph  $G$ , i.e. a set of *vertices* (denoted  $p, q, p_1, p_2, \dots$ ) and a binary relation  $R$  on this set (so that, for given vertices  $p, q$ , then  $pRq$  may or may not hold); we may think of the vertices of  $G$  as points in a plane, with a directed segment from  $p$  to  $q$  for each pair  $p, q$  satisfying  $pRq$ . By convention,  $pRp$  is always false<sup>2</sup>. By a *cycle* of  $G$  we shall mean any ordered subset  $p_1, \dots, p_s$  of its vertices such that  $p_1Rp_2, \dots, p_{s-1}Rp_s, p_sRp_1$ ; we call such a cycle *reversible* if  $p_s, p_{s-1}, \dots, p_1$  is also a cycle. If  $G$  has no cycles, we call  $G$  *acyclic*. If, for arbitrary  $p, q \in G$ ,  $pRq$  implies  $qRp$ , then we call  $G$  *symmetric*. If, for arbitrary  $p, q \in G$  with  $p \neq q$ , there is always a sequence  $q_1, \dots, q_s$  of vertices of  $G$  such that  $q_1 = p, q_s = q$  and also, for each  $i = 2, \dots, s$ , either  $q_{i-1}Rq_i$  or  $q_iRq_{i-1}$ , then we call  $G$  *connected*.

The concept of a subgraph is clear, and we can also define quotient graphs by factoring  $G$  with respect to any prescribed identifications of its vertices. More precisely, given any equivalence relation  $S$  on the vertices of  $G$ , inducing equivalence classes denoted by  $G_{h(h=1, 2, \dots)}$ , then we may regard the  $G_h$  as vertices of a new graph  $\mathfrak{G}$  by defining  $\mathfrak{R}$  on  $\mathfrak{G}$  by the rule that  $G_h \mathfrak{R} G_k$  (for  $h \neq k$ ) if and only if there exist  $p \in G_h, q \in G_k$  such that  $pRq$ . We call  $\mathfrak{G}$  the *quotient graph of  $G$  by  $S$* , and write  $\mathfrak{G} = G/S$ . We can now state

**LEMMA.** (1) *Given any directed graph  $G$  and a quotient graph  $G/S$  of it which is acyclic and of which every vertex is a symmetrical subgraph of  $G$ , then every cycle of  $G$  is reversible.*

<sup>2</sup> For definiteness, it is desirable to adopt either this convention or its opposite, and in the present connection this alternative seems the more convenient. However, there is no general agreement on the point: e.g. Harary uses the opposite convention in [2], but in effect also uses ours in [3].

(2) *Conversely, if every cycle of a directed graph  $G$  is reversible, then there is a factoring  $G/S$  such that  $G/S$  is acyclic and each vertex  $G_h$  of  $G/S$  is a symmetrical connected subgraph of  $G$ .*

*Proof of (1).* By the acyclic nature of  $G/S$ , any cycle in  $G$  can involve only vertices from a single equivalence class  $G_h$  under  $S$ ; and, since each such  $G_h$  is given to be symmetric, any cycle in  $G_h$  is certainly reversible.

*Proof of (2).* We define a binary relation  $S$  on  $G$  by the rule that, for  $p, q \in G$ , we have  $pSq$  whenever either  $p = q$  or there is a cycle of  $G$  containing both  $p$  and  $q$ . We see at once that  $S$  is an equivalence. It is also a trivial matter to check that the induced equivalence classes are connected and (by our hypothesis on  $G$ ) symmetric with respect to the given relation  $R$  on  $G$ , and, finally, that  $G/S$  is acyclic.

So transparent a lemma as this deserves stating only for the sake of its applications, and presumably various forms of the same result have appeared in the literature; for example, a somewhat more general version is implicit in [3]. However, it seems desirable here to have an explicit account in a terminology adapted to our present concerns.

In both parts of the Lemma, clearly  $G$  is connected if and only if  $G/S$  and all its vertices  $G_h$  are. The two parts of the Lemma are in close analogy with those of our Theorem, and in fact we can set up a one-one correspondence between directed graphs of  $n$  vertices (numbered in some specified order) on the one hand, and  $n \times n$  matrices of 0's and 1's with zero diagonal on the other (we shall suppose  $n$  finite, for conformity with our statement of the Theorem, but this is not really necessary). Specifically, given  $G$ , with vertices  $p_1 \dots, p_n$ , we define  $a_{ij} = 1$  if  $p_i R p_j$ , and  $a_{ij} = 0$  otherwise; conversely, given any  $n \times n$  matrix  $A$  of 0's and 1's with zero diagonal, we can reverse this to obtain a unique numbered graph  $G$  of order  $n$ . Thus we may write  $A = M(G)$ ,  $G = M^{-1}(A)$ . We verify at once that  $A$  is special if and only if  $G$  is symmetric, that  $A$  is quasi-special if and only if the cycles of  $G$  are reversible, and that  $A$  is lower-triangular (i.e.  $a_{ij} = 0$  whenever  $i < j$ ) if and only if  $p_i R p_j$  implies  $i > j$  (in particular, this makes  $G$  acyclic). The restriction that  $A$  have zero diagonal is purely a technicality, since the diagonal elements have no effect on the properties of being special or quasi-special.

Also, given any equivalence  $S$  on  $G$ , there is a simple relationship between the matrix  $A$  corresponding to  $G$  and those corresponding to  $G/S$  and its vertices  $G_h$ . For the matrix  $M(G_h)$ , relative to

the ordering induced on  $G_h$  by the prescribed numbering of  $G$ , is just the submatrix of  $A$  formed by the intersections of the rows and columns of  $A$  corresponding to those vertices of  $G$  which lie in  $G_h$ . Also, if the numbering of  $G$  is chosen so that all the vertices of  $G_1$  come first (in some arbitrary order), then those of  $G_2$ , and so on, and if we partition  $A$  accordingly, then each  $G_h$  will have as its matrix the  $h$ th diagonal block of  $A$ ; and  $G/S$  will have as its matrix  $(e_{hk})$ , where  $e_{hk} = 1$  if  $h \neq k$  and there exist  $p \in G_h, q \in G_k$  with  $pRq$ , and where  $e_{hk} = 0$  otherwise.

Finally, similarity transformation of  $A$  by a permutation matrix  $P$  corresponds to re-numbering the vertices of  $G$  according to the permutation defined by  $P$ , while  $G$  is connected if and only if there is no such  $P$  transforming  $A$  into a diagonal sum of smaller matrices.

Thus our correspondence  $A = M(G) \leftrightarrow G = M^{-1}(A)$  embraces all the concepts involved in the Theorem and the Lemma, and it is a routine matter (the only point constituting a minor exception is that we need to show that any finite acyclic graph can be numbered in such a way that its matrix is triangular) to check that the various hypotheses and conclusions of the two parts of the Theorem translate, under this correspondence, into those of the Lemma. Thus (at the cost of introducing several additional concepts and definitions) our lemma and its proof provide an alternative and more intuitive proof for the Theorem. This second approach shows also that the set of diagonal blocks  $B_{hk}$  appearing in the Theorem is uniquely determined by  $A$  (up to permutational similarities applied to the  $B_{kk}$  themselves).

We conclude with our promised application: this could be established as a direct consequence of the Lemma, but seems more naturally obtained from the theorem. We first need some terminology analogous to that in Definition 2 above.

DEFINITION 3. Given any complex  $n \times n$  matrix  $A$  and an integer  $s$  with  $3 \leq s \leq n$ , we call  $A$  *s-hermitian* if, for every ordered index set  $(i)$  (as in Definition 2), we have

$$a_{i_1 i_2} \cdots a_{i_{s-1} i_s} a_{i_s i_1} = \overline{a_{i_2 i_1} \cdots a_{i_s i_{s-1}} a_{i_1 i_s}} .$$

If  $A$  is *s-hermitian* for each  $s = 3, \dots, n$ , then we call  $A$  *quasi-hermitian*. Thus every quasi-hermitian matrix is quasi-special.

COROLLARY. *If, for a given  $n \times n$  quasi-hermitian matrix  $A$ , we have*

(P): *all  $a_{ij} a_{ji}$  are real and non-negative ( $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ ), then  $A$  has all its eigenvalues real.*



This result is due to Goldberg [1], whose own proof was by explicitly exhibiting a certain hermitian matrix having the same principal minors (and hence the same characteristic function) as  $A$ .

*Proof.* By part (2) of our Theorem,  $A$  is permutationally similar to a matrix of the form  $B$ . Since (P) and the property of being quasi-hermitian are preserved under any permutational similarity, consequently  $B$ , and hence each of its diagonal blocks  $B_{kk}$ , again satisfies the hypotheses of the Corollary; thus, since the eigenvalues of the  $B_{kk}$  are collectively just those of  $A$ , it will be enough to prove that all of the eigenvalues of these  $B_{kk}$  are real. In other words, we need only prove the Corollary for the case of a *special* matrix; accordingly, we may suppose from the outset that  $A$  is itself special.

We now introduce an  $n \times n$  matrix  $D$  coinciding with  $A$  except where  $A$  has zeroes, in which places we let  $D$  have 1's; i.e., more formally, let

$$d_{ij} = \begin{cases} a_{ij} & \text{when } a_{ij} \neq 0, \\ 1 & \text{when } a_{ij} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Since  $A$  is special and satisfies (P), we have  $d_{ij}d_{ji}$  real and strictly positive ( $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ ). Define also, for all  $u, v$  with  $1 \leq u < v \leq n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} f_{uv} &= d_{u,u+1}d_{u+1,u+2} \cdots d_{v-1,v}, \\ g_{uv} &= d_{u+1,u}d_{u+2,u+1} \cdots d_{v,v-1}, \\ f_{uu} &= g_{uu} = 1, \end{aligned}$$

and write

$$t_i = |g_{1i}|^2 \overline{f_{in}g_{in}} \quad (i = 1, \dots, n)$$

Now, since the  $d_{ij}$  are all nonzero by definition, certainly each  $g_{1i} \neq 0$ , while also, for any  $u, v$  with  $u < v$ , we have

$$f_{uv}g_{uv} = (d_{u,u+1}d_{u+1,u}) \cdots (d_{v-1,v}d_{v,v-1}),$$

so that each  $f_{uv}g_{uv}$  is real and strictly positive. In particular  $f_{in}g_{in} > 0$  for all  $i < n$ , while this is trivially true for  $i = n$ . Thus all the  $t_i$  are strictly positive real numbers.

We wish to show next that  $t_j a_{ij} = t_i \overline{a_{ji}}$  ( $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ ), to which end it will be convenient to write the  $t_i$  in the equivalent form  $t_i = \overline{g_{1n}g_{1i}f_{in}}$ . There being no loss of generality (since the  $t_i$  are real) in supposing that  $i < j$ , it will suffice to prove that

$$g_{1j} \overline{f_{jn}a_{ij}} = g_{1i} \overline{f_{in}a_{ji}} \quad (1 \leq i < j \leq n).$$

But, under our assumption  $i < j$ , clearly  $g_{1j} = g_{1i}g_{ij}$ ,  $f_{in} = f_{ij}f_{jn}$ , and so we need only verify that  $g_{ij}a_{ij} = \overline{f_{ij}a_{ji}}$ , which, on being translated back in terms of the  $a_{ij}$ , is an immediate consequence of our assumption that  $A$  is special, quasi-hermitian and satisfies (P).

Thus we have produced positive real  $t_1, \dots, t_n$  such that  $t_j a_{ij} = \overline{t_i a_{ji}}$  ( $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ ), i.e.  $AT^2 = T^2A^*$ , where  $T = \text{diag. } (t_1^{1/2}, \dots, t_n^{1/2})$  is hermitian and non-singular, and we use an asterick to denote the conjugate transposed. Thus  $T^{-1}AT = (T^{-1}AT)^*$ , so that  $A$  is similar to the hermitian matrix  $T^{-1}AT$ ; in particular, the eigenvalues of  $A$  must be real, as required.

In conclusion, we note that, by considering matrices of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & a_{12} & a_{13} \\ a_{21} & 0 & 0 \\ a_{31} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

with characteristic function  $x(x^2 - a_{12}a_{21} - a_{13}a_{31})$ , it is clear that a special quasi-hermitian matrix  $A$  can have its eigenvalues all real even if (P) fails (in particular,  $A$  need not be hermitian).

It is a pleasure to acknowledge helpful discussion with Dr. John C. Stuelpnagel on the subject matter of this paper.

#### REFERENCES

1. K. Goldberg, *Random notes on matrices*, J. Res. Nat. Bur. Standards. **60** (1958), 321-325.
2. F. Harary, *A graph theoretic method for the complete reduction of a matrix with a view toward finding its eigenvalues*. J. Math. and Phys. **38** (1959), 104-111.
3. F. Harary, *On the consistency of precedence matrices*, J. Assoc. Comput. Mach., **7** (1960), 255-259.

RIAS, BALTIMORE

(PRESENT ADDRESS: PURDUE UNIVERSITY, LAFAYETTE, INDIANA)

AND

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS, WASHINGTON, D.C.

(PRESENT ADDRESS: AUBURN UNIVERSITY, ALABAMA)



# PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

## EDITORS

RALPH S. PHILLIPS

Stanford University  
Stanford, California

M. G. ARSOVE

University of Washington  
Seattle 5, Washington

J. DUGUNDJI

University of Southern California  
Los Angeles 7, California

LOWELL J. PAIGE

University of California  
Los Angeles 24, California

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

E. F. BECKENBACH

T. M. CHERRY

D. DERRY

M. OHTSUKA

H. L. ROYDEN

E. SPANIER

E. G. STRAUS

F. WOLF

## SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA  
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA  
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY  
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON  
OSAKA UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

STANFORD UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO  
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH  
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

\* \* \*

AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY  
CALIFORNIA RESEARCH CORPORATION  
SPACE TECHNOLOGY LABORATORIES  
NAVAL ORDNANCE TEST STATION

---

Mathematical papers intended for publication in the *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* should be typewritten (double spaced), and the author should keep a complete copy. Manuscripts may be sent to any one of the four editors. All other communications to the editors should be addressed to the managing editor, L. J. Paige at the University of California, Los Angeles 24, California.

50 reprints per author of each article are furnished free of charge; additional copies may be obtained at cost in multiples of 50.

---

The *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* is published quarterly, in March, June, September, and December. Effective with Volume 13 the price per volume (4 numbers) is \$18.00; single issues, \$5.00. Special price for current issues to individual faculty members of supporting institutions and to individual members of the American Mathematical Society: \$8.00 per volume; single issues \$2.50. Back numbers are available.

Subscriptions, orders for back numbers, and changes of address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, 103 Highland Boulevard, Berkeley 8, California.

Printed at Kokusai Bunken Insatsusha (International Academic Printing Co., Ltd.), No. 6, 2-chome, Fujimi-cho, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

PUBLISHED BY PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS, A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION

The Supporting Institutions listed above contribute to the cost of publication of this Journal, but they are not owners or publishers and have no responsibility for its content or policies.

# Pacific Journal of Mathematics

Vol. 13, No. 2

April, 1963

Rafael Artzy, <i>Solution of loop equations by adjunction</i> . . . . .	361
Earl Robert Berkson, <i>A characterization of scalar type operators on reflexive Banach spaces</i> . . . . .	365
Mario Borelli, <i>Divisorial varieties</i> . . . . .	375
Raj Chandra Bose, <i>Strongly regular graphs, partial geometries and partially balanced designs</i> . . . . .	389
R. H. Bruck, <i>Finite nets. II. Uniqueness and imbedding</i> . . . . .	421
L. Carlitz, <i>The inverse of the error function</i> . . . . .	459
Robert Wayne Carroll, <i>Some degenerate Cauchy problems with operator coefficients</i> . . . . .	471
Michael P. Drazin and Emilie Virginia Haynsworth, <i>A theorem on matrices of 0's and 1's</i> . . . . .	487
Lawrence Carl Eggan and Eugene A. Maier, <i>On complex approximation</i> . . . . .	497
James Michael Gardner Fell, <i>Weak containment and Kronecker products of group representations</i> . . . . .	503
Paul Chase Fife, <i>Schauder estimates under incomplete Hölder continuity assumptions</i> . . . . .	511
Shaul Foguel, <i>Powers of a contraction in Hilbert space</i> . . . . .	551
Neal Eugene Foland, <i>The structure of the orbits and their limit sets in continuous flows</i> . . . . .	563
Frank John Forelli, Jr., <i>Analytic measures</i> . . . . .	571
Robert William Gilmer, Jr., <i>On a classical theorem of Noether in ideal theory</i> . . . . .	579
P. R. Halmos and Jack E. McLaughlin, <i>Partial isometries</i> . . . . .	585
Albert Emerson Hurd, <i>Maximum modulus algebras and local approximation in <math>C^n</math></i> . . . . .	597
James Patrick Jans, <i>Module classes of finite type</i> . . . . .	603
Betty Kvarda, <i>On densities of sets of lattice points</i> . . . . .	611
H. Larcher, <i>A geometric characterization for a class of discontinuous groups of linear fractional transformations</i> . . . . .	617
John W. Moon and Leo Moser, <i>Simple paths on polyhedra</i> . . . . .	629
T. S. Motzkin and Ernst Gabor Straus, <i>Representation of a point of a set as sum of transforms of boundary points</i> . . . . .	633
Rajakularaman Ponnuswami Pakshirajan, <i>An analogue of Kolmogorov's three-series theorem for abstract random variables</i> . . . . .	639
Robert Ralph Phelps, <i>Čebyšev subspaces of finite codimension in <math>C(X)</math></i> . . . . .	647
James Dolan Reid, <i>On subgroups of an Abelian group maximal disjoint from a given subgroup</i> . . . . .	657
William T. Reid, <i>Riccati matrix differential equations and non-oscillation criteria for associated linear differential systems</i> . . . . .	665
Georg Johann Rieger, <i>Some theorems on prime ideals in algebraic number fields</i> . . . . .	687
Gene Fuerst Rose and Joseph Silbert Ullian, <i>Approximations of functions on the integers</i> . . . . .	693
F. J. Sansone, <i>Combinatorial functions and regressive isols</i> . . . . .	703
Leo Sario, <i>On locally meromorphic functions with single-valued moduli</i> . . . . .	709
Takayuki Tamura, <i>Semigroups and their subsemigroup lattices</i> . . . . .	725
Pui-kei Wong, <i>Existence and asymptotic behavior of proper solutions of a class of second-order nonlinear differential equations</i> . . . . .	737
Fawzi Mohamad Yaqub, <i>Free extensions of Boolean algebras</i> . . . . .	761