SOME MATRIX FACTORIZATION THEOREMS. II

Robert Charles Thompson

SOME MATRIX FACTORIZATION THEOREMS, II

Robert C. Thompson

In the first part of this paper a thorough analysis was made of the matrix equation $C = ABA^{-1}B^{-1}$ when C, A, B are normal matrices. Not included, however, was the discussion of this equation when A and B are real skew-symmetric matrices. In the present paper we complete the investigation by giving this discussion.

Throughout this paper we adopt the notation and terminology of part I. We also continue the convention that all matrices appearing in this paper, except the zero matrix, are to be nonsingular. We always let K_1, K_2 denote real skew symmetric matrices.

LEMMA 1. *Let M be a matrix with linear elementary divisors, and let $M = K_1 K_2$ be a product of two real skew-symmetric matrices K_1, K_2. Then each eigenvalue of M has even multiplicity.*

Proof. This is a special case of a result of H. Freudenthal [1]. Using the idea of [1], we give a short proof of the lemma. From $M = K_1 K_2$ we get $\lambda I - M = (\lambda K_2^{-1} - K_1) K_2$. For any (real or complex) eigenvalue λ of M, the matrix $\lambda K_2^{-1} - K_1$ is (real or complex) skew symmetric and therefore has even rank. Because K_2 is nonsingular, it follows that $\lambda I - M$ has even rank for each λ. Since degree M is even and M has linear elementary divisors, it follows that the multiplicity of λ as an eigenvalue of M is even.

We are now ready to state our main result.

THEOREM 1. *Let N be real and normal. Then N is a commutator*

$$(1) \qquad\qquad N = K_1 K_2 K_1^{-1} K_2^{-1}$$

of two real skew-symmetric matrices K_1, K_2 if and only if N is orthogonally similar to a direct sum of the following five types of real normal matrices:

$$(2) \qquad\qquad \mathrm{diag}\,(r_1,\ r_1^{-1},\ r_2,\ r_2^{-1})\,, \qquad\qquad r_1 > 0,\ r_2 > 0;$$

$$(3) \qquad\qquad \mathrm{diag}\,(-r_1,\ -r_1^{-1},\ -r_2,\ -r_2^{-1})\,, \qquad r_1 > 0,\ r_2 > 0;$$

$$(4) \qquad\qquad F(\varphi) + F(\varphi)\,;$$

$$(5) \qquad R_1 F(\varphi) + R_1^{-1} F(\varphi) + R_2 F(\varphi) + R_2^{-1} F(\varphi)\,, \quad R_1 > 0,\ R_2 > 0;$$

$$(6) \qquad\qquad \mathrm{diag}\,(1, 1)\,.$$

We remind the reader that

$$F(\varphi) = \begin{bmatrix} \cos\varphi & \sin\varphi \\ -\sin\varphi & \cos\varphi \end{bmatrix}.$$

THEOREM 2. *If real normal N is a commutator* (1) *with*

$$(7) \qquad\qquad\qquad NK_1 = K_1 N$$

then N is symmetric and orthogonally similar to a direct sum of the types (6), (8), (9):

$$(8) \qquad\qquad \mathrm{diag}\,(r,\, r,\, r^{-1},\, r^{-1})\,, \qquad\qquad r > 0\,;$$

$$(9) \qquad\qquad \mathrm{diag}\,(-r,\, -r,\, -r^{-1},\, -r^{-1})\,, \qquad\qquad r > 0\,.$$

Conversely, if symmetric N is orthogonally similar to a direct sum of types (6), (8), (9) *then N is a commutator* (1) *of two skew matrices such that* (7) *holds, and such that K_2 is also orthogonal. We may, in addition, choose K_1 orthogonal if N is also orthogonal.*

THEOREM 3. *If real normal N is a commutator* (1) *of two skew matrices K_1, K_2 such that*

$$(10) \qquad\qquad NK_1 = K_1 N,\; NK_2 = K_2 N$$

then N Symmetric is orthogonal and satisfies the condition

$$(\textit{multiplicity of eigenvalue } -1) \equiv 0 \;(\mathrm{mod}\;4)\,.$$

(That is, N is orthogonally similar to a direct sum of the types (6) *and* (11):

$$(11) \qquad\qquad \mathrm{diag}\,(-1,\, -1,\, -1,\, -1)\,.$$

Conversely, if N satisfies these conditions then N can be represented as a commutator (1) *satisfying* (10) *such that K_1 and K_2 are both skew orthogonal.*

Proof of Theorem 1. We use the notation in the proof of Theorem 5.7 of [2]. As in that proof, we agree that subscripts attached to a matrix indicate the degree of the matrix. The only exceptions to this rule are K_1 and K_2. From (1) we get $N^{-1T} = (K_2 K_1)^{-1} N (K_2 K_1)$. Hence the eigenvalues of N occur in reciprocal pairs. Thus after an orthogonal similarity of (1) we may assume N is given by (61) of [2] and that the agreement about the eigenvalues of the direct summands of N explained below (61) of (2) is in force. Then we derive [2, (62)], and hence from $(K_2 K_1) N^{-1T} = N(K_2 K_1)$ we get

$$(12) \quad K_2 K_1 = A_\alpha \dotplus B_\beta \dotplus \sum_{i=1}^{u} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 0 & C_{m_i} \\ \Gamma_{m_i} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \dotplus \sum_{i=1}^{v} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 0 & D_{k_i} \\ \Delta_{k_i} & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\dotplus \sum_{i=1}^{w} \cdot E_{2p_i} \dotplus \sum_{i=1}^{t} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 0 & F_{2q_i} \\ \mathscr{F}_{2q_i} & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where we also have

$$(13) \quad \Phi_{2p_i}(\varphi_i) E_{2p_i} = E_{2p_i} \Phi_{2p_i}(\varphi_i), \qquad 1 \leqq i \leqq w,$$

$$(14) \quad F_{2q_i} \Phi_{2q_i}(\theta_i) = \Phi_{2q_i}(\theta_i) F_{2q_i}, \qquad 1 \leqq i \leqq t,$$

$$(15) \quad \mathscr{F}_{2q_i} \Phi_{2q_i}(\theta_i) = \Phi_{2q_i}(\theta_i) \mathscr{F}_{2q_i}, \qquad 1 \leqq i \leqq t.$$

Taking the transpose of each side of (12) yields an expression for $K_1 K_2$, which when substituted into $N(K_2 K_1) = K_1 K_2$ produces the following formulas:

$$(16) \quad \begin{aligned} A_\alpha = A_\alpha^T, \; -B_\beta = B_\beta^T, \; \Gamma_{m_i} = r_i C_{m_i}^T, \; \Delta_{k_i} = -s_i D_{k_i}^T, \\ \Phi_{2p_i}(\varphi_i) E_{2p_i} = E_{2p_i}^T, \; R_i \Phi_{2q_i}(\theta_i) F_{2q_i} = \mathscr{F}_{2q_i}^T. \end{aligned}$$

From these formulas (16) we get by Lemmas 3.4 and 3.5 of [2] that the following direct summand of $K_1 K_2$ is similar to a diagonal matrix and has real eigenvalues:

$$(17) \quad A_\alpha^T \dotplus \sum_{i=1}^{u} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 0 & r_i C_{m_i} \\ C_{m_i}^T & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Similarly the following direct summand of $K_1 K_2$ is also similar to a diagonal matrix and its eigenvalues are all pure imaginaries:

$$(18) \quad B_\beta^T \dotplus \sum_{i=1}^{v} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -s_i D_{k_i} \\ D_{k_i}^T & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Now by (13) and the fifth of equations (16), we find as in the descussion between equations (70) and (75) of [2] that E_{2p_j} is similar to a diagonal matrix and that the eigenvalues of E_{2p_j} are of the form

$$\varepsilon'_{j1} \rho'_{j1} e^{-i\varphi_j/2}, \; \cdots, \; \varepsilon'_{jp_j} \rho'_{jp_j} e^{-i\varphi_j/2},$$

$$\varepsilon''_{j1} \rho''_{j1} e^{i\varphi_j/2}, \; \cdots, \; \varepsilon''_{jp_j} \rho''_{jp_j} e^{i\varphi_j/2},$$

where each ε is ± 1 and each $\rho > 0$. Since the eigenvalues of E_{2p_j} appear in conjugate pairs and $e^{i\varphi_j/2}$ is not real, we may arrange the notation so that the eigenvalues of E_{2p_j} are

$$(19) \quad \begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{j1} \rho_{j1} e^{-i\varphi_j/2}, \; \cdots, \; \varepsilon_{jp_j} \rho_{jp_j} e^{-\varphi_j/2}, \\ \varepsilon_{j1} \rho_{j1} e^{i\varphi_j/2}, \; \cdots, \; \varepsilon_{jp_j} \rho_{jp_j} e^{i\varphi_j/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where each ε is ± 1 and each $\rho > 0$. Thus the direct summand $E_{2p_j}^T$

of K_1K_2 contributes the eigenvalues (19) to K_1K_2. The eigenvalues (19) are not real and not pure imaginary.

Now we examine the eigenvalues and elementary divisors of the direct summand

$$(20) \qquad \begin{bmatrix} 0 & R_j\Phi_{2q_j}(\theta_j)F_{2q_j} \\ F_{2q_j}^T & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

in K_1K_2. The matrix (20) is similar to

$$(21) \qquad \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ R_jF_{2q}^T F_{2q_j}\Phi_{2q_j}(\theta_j) & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Because of (14), when we make the unitary similarity that converts $\Phi_{2q_j}(\theta_j)$ to $e^{i\theta_j}I_{q_j} + e^{-i\theta_j}I_{q_j}$, we convert F_{2q_j} to $F'_{q_j} + F''_{q_j}$. Thus (21) is similar to

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ R_j \begin{bmatrix} e^{i\theta_j}F'^*_{q_j}F'_{q_j} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i\theta_j}F''^*_{q_j}F''_{q_j} \end{bmatrix} & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

which in turn is similar to

$$(22) \qquad \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ R_je^{i\theta_j}F'^*_{q_j}F'_{q_j} & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ R_je^{-i\theta_j}F''^*_{q_j}F''_{q_j} & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

As in Lemmas 3.4 and 3.5 of [2], we find that the direct summands in (22) are each similar to diagonal matrices and that the eigenvalues of (20) have the form

$$(23) \qquad \begin{aligned} &\pm g'_{j_1}e^{i\theta_j/2}, \cdots, \pm g'_{jq_j}e^{i\theta_j/2}, \\ &\pm g''_{j_1}e^{-i\theta_j/2}, \cdots, \pm g''_{jq_j}e^{-i\theta_j/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where each $g > 0$. Since $e^{i\theta_j/2}$ is not real or pure imaginary, and since the eigenvalues of (20) appear in conjugate pairs, we can arrange the notation in (23) so that the eigenvalues of (20) are

$$(24) \qquad \begin{aligned} &\pm g_{j_1}e^{i\theta_j/2}, \cdots, \pm g_{jq_j}e^{i\theta_j/2}, \\ &\pm g_{j_1}e^{-i\theta_j/2}, \cdots, \pm g_{jq_j}e^{-i\theta_j/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where each $g > 0$.

We can now classify the eigenvalues of K_1K_2 into three types: (i) the real eigenvalues, arising from the direct summand (17); (ii) the pure imaginary eigenvalues, arising from the direct summand (18); (iii) the not real, not pure imaginary eigenvalues (19) and (24), which arise, respectively from the direct summands $E_{2p_j}^T$ and

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & \mathscr{F}_{2q_j}^T \\ F_{2q_j}^T & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since each direct summand of $K_1 K_2$ is similar to a diagonal matrix, so is $K_1 K_2$. By Lemma 1, we see that each distinct eigenvalue of $K_1 K_2$ must have even multiplicity.

Let us first consider the real eigenvalues of $K_1 K_2$. We study (17). Let $\sharp^+$ be the number of positive eigenvalues of the symmetric matrix A_α and $\sharp^-$ be the number of negative eigenvalues of A_α. Then by Lemma 3.5 of [2], the number of positive eigenvalues of (17) is

$$(25) \qquad\qquad \sharp^+ + \sum_{i=1}^{u} m_i \ ,$$

and the number of negative eigenvalues is

$$(26) \qquad\qquad \sharp^- + \sum_{i=1}^{u} m_i \ .$$

Each of (25), (26) has to be an even integer. If $\sum_{i=1}^{u} m_i$ is even, then both $\sharp^+$ and $\sharp^-$ are even and hence $\alpha = \sharp^+ + \sharp^-$ is even. In this event the direct summands of all the $\Omega_{2m_i}(r_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq u$, of N can be brought together in pairs and so classified into $(\sum_{i=1}^{u} m_i)/2$ replicas of type (2), and as α is even, the direct summand I_α classifies into $\alpha/2$ copies of type (6). If $\sum_{i=1}^{u} m_i$ is odd, then both $\sharp^+$ and $\sharp^-$ are odd, hence α is even again. By classifying the direct summand I_α into $(\alpha - 2)/2$ copies of type (6), and reclassifying one copy of I_2 as $\Omega_2(1)$, we can now group together the direct summands of the $\Omega_{2m_i}(r_i)$ in pairs and so obtain $(1 + \sum_{i=1}^{u} m_i)/2$ sets of type (2). Thus the real eigenvalues of $K_1 K_2$ give rise to types (2), (6).

Now let us consider the pure imaginary eigenvalues of $K_1 K_2$. We study (18). The eigenvalues of (18) are pure imaginaries of total number

$$\beta + \sum_{i=1}^{v} 2k_i \ .$$

Since the eigenvalues must appear in conjugate pairs, we may count only the eigenvalue of each pair in the upper half plane, and hence conclude that (18) has

$$(27) \qquad\qquad \beta/2 + \sum_{i=1}^{v} k_i$$

eigenvalues in the upper half plane, each of which must therefore have even multiplicity. (Note that β is even since B_β is a nonsingular skew matrix.) Let us reclassify the direct summand $-I_\beta$ of N as the direct sum of $\beta/2$ copies of $\Omega_2(-1)$. Then N has an even number

of blocks of the type $\Omega_2(-r)$, $r > 0$; hence we may group these blocks into pairs of type (3). Thus the type (3) blocks in N arise from the pure imaginary eigenvalues of K_1K_2.

We now study the eigenvalues of K_1K_2 not on the real or imaginary axes. These are given by (19), where $1 \leq j \leq w$, and (24), where $1 \leq j \leq t$. Each eigenvalue in the union of these sets must appear with even multiplicity. To simplify the discussion, we now change notation somewhat. We now assume the not real, not pure imaginary, eigenvalues of N on the unit circle arise from blocks $\Phi_2(\varphi_i) = F(\varphi_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq w$, and that the eigenvalues of N not on the real or imaginary axes nor the unit circle arise from blocks $\Psi_4(R_i, \theta_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq t$. Now, of course $\Phi_2(\varphi_i)$ and $\Phi_2(\varphi_j)$ may have a common eigenvalue if $i \neq j$, but if this happens we arrange matters such that $\varphi_i = \varphi_j$. Also $\Psi_4(R_i, \theta_i)$ and $\Psi_4(R_j, \theta_j)$ may have a common eigenvalue if $i \neq j$, but if this happens then the four eigenvalues of $\Psi_4(R_i, \theta_i)$ coincide in some order with the four eigenvalues of $\Psi_4(R_j, \theta_j)$. Then in place of (19) we get the pair of eigenvalues

$$(28) \qquad\qquad \varepsilon_j \rho_j e^{-i\varphi_j/2}, \ \varepsilon_j \rho_j e^{i\varphi_j/2}, \qquad\qquad \varepsilon_j = \pm 1, \rho_j > 0 ,$$

as the eigenvalues of K_1K_2 associated with the direct summand $\Phi_2(\varphi_j)$ of N, $1 \leq j \leq w$, and we get the set of four eigenvalues,

$$(29) \qquad\qquad \pm g_j e^{i\theta_j/2}, \ \pm g_j e^{-i\theta_j/2} , \qquad\qquad g_j > 0 ,$$

as the set of eigenvalues of K_1K_2 associated with the direct summand $\Psi_4(R_j, \theta_j)$ of N, $1 \leq j \leq t$. Then in the union of the sets (28), (29), each eigenvalue appears with even multiplicity.

Note that if the two sets

$$\pm g_1 e^{i\theta_1/2}, \ \pm g_1 e^{-i\theta_1/2} \ ;$$

$$\pm g_2 e^{i\theta_2/2}, \ \pm g_2 e^{-i\theta_2/2} \ ;$$

have a common eigenvalue, then all four of the eigenvalues in one of these sets appear in the other set. This situation gives rise in N to the pairing of the blocks $\Psi_4(R_1, \theta_1)$, $\Psi_4(R_2, \theta_2)$ and so leads to the block

$$R_1 F(\theta_1) \dotplus R_1^{-1} F(\theta_1) \dotplus R_2 F(\theta_2) \dotplus R_2^{-1} F(\theta_2) ,$$

of type (5) as a direct summand of N. (A change of notation brings θ_2 to equal θ_1.) Deleting such pairings from the sets (29), we obtain a new smaller collection of sets (26), (29) of eigenvalues such that each eigenvalue appears with even multiplicity in the union of these sets and such that no common eigenvalue appears in two of the sets (29).

Now the eigenvalue equal to

$$\varepsilon_1 \rho_1 e^{i\varphi_1/2}$$

may appear in some other set (28). (We don't have $\varepsilon_1 \rho_1 e^{i\varphi_1/2} = \varepsilon_1 \rho_1 e^{-\varphi_1/2}$.) So assume that $\varepsilon_1 \rho_1 e^{i\varphi_1/2}$ is one of

$$\varepsilon_2 \rho_2 e^{-i\varphi_2/2}, \ \varepsilon_2 \rho_2 e^{i\varphi_2/2} \ .$$

Then $\rho_1 = \rho_2$. We can't have $\varepsilon_1 e^{i\varphi_1/2} = \varepsilon_2 e^{-i\varphi_2/2}$ since then $F(\varphi_1), F(\varphi_2)$ have a common eigenvalue and $\varphi_1 \neq \varphi_2$. So $\varepsilon_1 \rho_1 e^{i\varphi_1/2} = \varepsilon_2 \rho_2 e^{i\varphi_2/2}$, hence $e^{i\varphi_1} = e^{i\varphi_2}$, so that $\varphi_1 = \varphi_2$. Thus we get a direct summand $F(\varphi_1) \dotplus F(\varphi_1)$ in N, and moreover after deleting

$$\varepsilon_1 \rho_1 e^{-i\varphi_1/2}, \ \varepsilon_1 \rho_1 e^{i\varphi_1/2} \ ,$$

$$\varepsilon_2 \rho_2 e^{-i\varphi_2/2}, \ \varepsilon_2 \rho_2 e^{i\varphi_2/2} \ ,$$

from the union of sets (28), the eigenvalues remaining in the sets (28), (29) each appear with even multiplicity.

Thus we may reduce ourselves to the situation where different sets (28) do not have a common eigenvalue, and different sets (29) do not have a common eigenvalue. In this circumstance we must have for a certain choice of the $\pm$ sign and perhaps after a notational change (including possibly the change of θ_1 to $-\theta_1$),

(30) $$\varepsilon_1 \rho_1 e^{i\varphi_1/2} = \pm g_1 e^{i\theta_1/2} \ .$$

Then

(31) $$\varepsilon_1 \rho_1 e^{-i\varphi_1/2} = \pm g_1 e^{-i\theta_1/2}$$

and so $\mp g_1 e^{i\theta_1/2}$ must also appear in one of the sets (28), say

(32) $$\mp g_1 e^{i\theta_1/2} = \varepsilon_2 \rho_2 e^{i\varphi_2/2} \ .$$

(It may be necessary to replace φ_2 with $-\varphi_2$ to achieve (32).) Then

(33) $$\mp g_1 e^{-i\theta_1/2} = \varepsilon_2 \rho_2 e^{-i\varphi_2/2} \ .$$

In this case the four eigenvalues of the set (29) with $j = 1$ find their partners in the sets $j = 1, j = 2$ of (28). After deleting from (28) the pairs with $j = 1, 2$ and deleting from (29) the set with $j = 1$, the eigenvalues in the remaining sets (28), (29) must still have even multiplicity.

The equations (30), (32) imply $g_1 = \rho_1 = \rho_2$, and $e^{i\theta_1} = e_i^{\varphi_1} = e^{i\varphi_2}$ and so $\theta_1 = \varphi_1 = \varphi_2$. Thus, before we changed the signs of θ_1, θ_2, we had $\theta_1 = \pm\varphi_1 = \pm\varphi_2$. Without loss of generality we may make a diagonal similarity of N to achieve $\theta_1 = \varphi_1 = \varphi_2$. We now group together the following direct summands of N:

(34) $R_1 F(\theta_1) + R_1^{-1} F(\theta_1) + F(\varphi_1) + F(\varphi_2)$.

This block (34) can be classified under the type (5) with $R_2 = 1$.

Thus we have demonstrated that N is orthogonally similar to a direct sum of types (2)–(6).

For the converse we express each of the types (2)–(6) in turn as a commutator of two skew symmetric matrices.

Let $N = \mathrm{diag}\,(r_1,\, r_1^{-1},\, r_2,\, r_2^{-1})$.   Put

(35) $$K_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -r_2^{1/2} r_1^{1/2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ r_2^{1/2} r_1^{1/2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

(36) $$K_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & r_1^{1/2} r_2^{-1/2} & 0 \\ 0 & -r_1^{1/2} r_2^{-1/2} & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then

$$K_1 K_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & r_1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \dotplus \begin{bmatrix} 0 & r_1^{1/2} r_2^{1/2} \\ r_2^{-1/2} r_1^{1/2} & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Taking the transpose we obtain $K_2 K_1$ and then we easily see that $N K_2 K_1 = K_1 K_2$.

Now let $N = \mathrm{diag}\,(-r_1,\, -r_1^{-1},\, -r_2,\, -r_2^{-1})$.   Let

(37) $$K_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & r_1^{1/2} r_2^{1/2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ -r_1^{1/2} r_2^{1/2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

and let K_2 be given by (36).   Then $N = K_1 K_2 K_1^{-1} K_2^{-1}$.

Now let $N = \mathrm{diag}\,(1, 1)$.   Put

$$K_1 = K_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then $N = K_1 K_2 K_1^{-1} K_2^{-1}$.

Next let $N = F(\varphi) \dotplus F(\varphi)$.   Let θ_1, θ_2 be any two angles with $\theta_1 - \theta_2 = \varphi/2$.   Put

$$K_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & G(\theta_1) \\ -G(\theta_1) & 0 \end{bmatrix},\ K_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & G(\theta_2) \\ -G(\theta_2) & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

(The matrix $G(\theta)$ is described in [2].) Using Lemma 3.3 of [2], we see that $N = K_1 K_2 K_1^{-1} K_2^{-1}$. Clearly K_1, K_2 are skew orthogonal.

Finally let $N = R_1 F(\varphi) \dotplus R_1^{-1} F(\varphi) \dotplus R_2 F(\varphi) \dotplus R_2^{-1} F(\varphi)$. Let $\theta_1, \theta_2, \alpha_1, \alpha_2$ be any four angles such that $\varphi = \theta_1 + \theta_2 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2$. Put

$$(38) \qquad K_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & (R_1 R_2)^{1/2} G(\theta_1) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & G(\theta_2) \\ -(R_1 R_2)^{1/2} G(\theta_1) & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -G(\theta_2) & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

$$(39) \qquad K_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & (R_2/R_1)^{1/2} G(\alpha_1) \\ 0 & 0 & G(\alpha_2) & 0 \\ 0 & -G(\alpha_2) & 0 & 0 \\ -G(\alpha_1)(R_2/R_1)^{1/2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Using Lemma 3.3 of [2],

$$K_1 K_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -(R_1 R_2)^{1/2} F(\theta_1 - \alpha_2) \\ -(R_2/R_1)^{1/2} F(\theta_2 - \alpha_1) & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$
$$\dotplus \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -R_2 F(\theta_1 - \alpha_1) \\ -F(\theta_2 - \alpha_2) & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

By taking transposes one finds $K_2 K_1$. It is then a simple matter to verify that $N K_2 K_1 = K_1 K_2$.

The proof of Theorem 1 is now complete.

Proof of Theorem 2. From (1) and (7) we see that N is a commutator of the Hermitian matrices iK_1, iK_2, commuting with iK_1. By [2, Th. 4.2] it follows that N is symmetric. The formula (61) of [2] therefore simplifies to

$$(40) \qquad N = I_\alpha \dotplus -I_\beta \dotplus \sum_{i=1}^{u} {}^{\cdot} \Omega_{2m_i}(r_i) \dotplus \sum_{i=1}^{v} {}^{\cdot} \Omega_{2k_i}(-s_i) \, ,$$

where $r_i > 1$, $s_i > 1$, and distinct direct summands in (40) do not have a common eigenvalue. Then, as in the proof of Theorem 1, we obtain

$$(41) \qquad K_2 K_1 = A_\alpha \dotplus B_\beta \dotplus \sum_{i=1}^{u} {}^{\cdot} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & C_{m_i} \\ \Gamma_{m_i} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \dotplus \sum_{i=1}^{v} {}^{\cdot} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & D_{k_i} \\ \Delta k_i & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

From $NK_1 = K_1 N$ we see that K_1 has the the form

$$(42) \qquad K_1 = U_\alpha \dotplus V_\beta \dotplus \sum_{i=1}^{u} {}^{\cdot} \begin{bmatrix} W_{m_i} & 0 \\ 0 & \widetilde{W}_{m_i} \end{bmatrix} \dotplus \sum_{i=1}^{v} {}^{\cdot} \begin{bmatrix} X_{k_i} & 0 \\ 0 & \widetilde{X}_{k_i} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The direct summands in (42) must each be skew. Thus α, β, m_i, k_i

all must be even. Then each $\Omega_{2m_i}(r_i)$ is the direct sum of $m_i/2$ copies of type (8) and each $\Omega_{2k_i}(-s_i)$ is the direct sum of $k_i/2$ copies of type (9). Furthermore I_α is the direct sum of $\alpha/2$ copies of (6). If we can prove that $\beta \equiv 0 \pmod 4$ then we can classify $-I_\beta$ as the direct sum of $\beta/4$ copies of type (9).

From the forms (41) of $K_2 K_1$ and (42) of K_1, it follows that a direct summand Y_β of K_2 exists such that $B_\beta = Y_\beta V_\beta$. We also have (see (16)) $B_\beta = -B_\beta^T$; hence B_β is a real skew matrix which is the product of two other real skew matrices. By Lemma 1 we know that each eigenvalue of B_β has even multiplicity. Thus the eigenvalues of B_β come in sets of four of the form $ri, ri, -ri, -ri$, with $r > 0$. This implies $\beta \equiv 0 \pmod 4$.

The conditions of Theorem 2 are therefore necessary. To prove sufficiency, we examine types (8), (9), (6) in turn.

Let $N = rI_2 + r^{-1}I_2$. Set

$$(43) \qquad K_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & r^{-1} \\ -r^{-1} & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$(44) \qquad K_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_2 \\ -I_2 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Plainly K_2 is skew orthogonal. It is easy to see that $N = K_1 K_2 K_1^{-1} K_2^{-1}$ and $NK_1 = K_1 N$. This works whether r is positive or negative. Now let $N = I_2$. Here we may take

$$K_1 = K_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

and again K_2 is skew orthogonal. The proof of Theorem 2 is complete.

Proof of Theorem 3. By [2, Th. 9.1], N is unitary; hence in types (8) and (9) we have $r = 1$; and so we obtain types (6) and (11). Conversely, if N is given by (11), then let K_1 be given by (43), with $r = -1$ in (43), and let K_2 be given by (44). Then (1) and (10) are satisfied.

THEOREM 4. *Let N be positive definite symmetric and n-square. Then N is a commutator* (1) *of two skew symmetric matrices K_1, K_2 if and only if:*

(i) *for $n \equiv 0 \pmod 4$, N is orthogonally similar to a direct sum of blocks of the type* diag (r, r^{-1}), $r > 0$;

(ii) *for $n \equiv 2 \pmod 4$, N is orthogonally similar to*

$$\text{diag}\,(1, 1) + N_1,$$

where N_1 satisfies the condition (i).

THEOREM 5.   *Proper orthogonal $\mathscr{O}$ is a commutator*

$$\mathscr{O} = K_1 K_2 K_1^{-1} K_2^{-1}$$

of two skew symmetric matrices if and only if:
    (i)   *each eigenvalue γ of $\mathscr{O}$ for which $\gamma \neq -1$ has even multi-plicity;*
    (ii)   *the eigenvalue $\gamma = -1$ of $\mathscr{O}$ has multiplicity $\equiv 0 \pmod 4$. If these conditions are satisfied, we may choose both K_1 and K_2 to be skew orthogonal.*

Proofs.   These results follow by observing what happens to types (2)–(6) when N is positive definite or orthogonal.   The proof of Theorem 1 showed how to choose K_1, K_2 to be skew orthogonal if N is orthogonal.

THEOREM 6.   *Let $n \equiv 0 \pmod 4$.   Let S be positive definite symmetric and n-square and let $\det S = 1$.   Then*

$$S = (K_1 K_2 K_1^{-1} K_2^{-1})(K_3 K_4 K_3^{-1} K_4^{-1})$$

is a product of two commutators of skew symmetric matrices.

Proof.   By Fan's factorization applied to S, we write $S = S_1 S_2$ where S_1 and S_2 satisfy the conditions of Theorem 4.

THEOREM 6.   *Let $n \equiv 0 \pmod 4$.   Let $\mathscr{O}$ be proper orthogonal and n-square.   Then*

$$\mathscr{O} = (K_1 K_2 K_1^{-1} K_2^{-1})(K_3 K_4 K_3^{-1} K_4^{-1})$$

is a product of two commutators of skew orthogonal matrices K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4.

Proof.   Any proper orthogonal $\mathscr{O}$ is orthogonally similar to a direct sum of blocks of type $F(\varphi_1) \dotplus F(\varphi_2)$.   But

$$F(\varphi_1) \dotplus F(\varphi_2) = (F(\alpha_1) \dotplus F(\alpha_1))(F(\alpha_2) \dotplus F(-\alpha_2))$$

where $\alpha_1 = (\varphi_1 + \varphi_2)/2$, $\alpha_2 = (\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)/2$.   Each of

$$F(\alpha_1) \dotplus F(\alpha_1), \ F(\alpha_2) \dotplus F(-\alpha_2)$$

satisfies the conditions of Theorem 5.

THEOREM 7.   *Let $n \equiv 0 \pmod 4$.   Let A be any real n-square matrix with $\det A = 1$.   Then*

$$A = (K_1 K_2 K_1^{-1} K_2^{-1})(K_3 K_4 K_3^{-1} K_4^{-1})(K_5 K_6 K_5^{-1} K_6^{-1})(K_7 K_8 K_7^{-1} K_8^{-1})$$

is a product of four commutators of real skew symmetric matrices, with K_5, K_6, K_7, K_8 all skew orthogonal.

Proof. Use the polar factorization theorem, as in [2], in combination with Theorems 5 and 6.

THEOREM 8. *Real normal N is a commutator* (1) *with K_1 skew and K_2 skew orthogonal, if and only if N is orthogonally similar to a direct sum of types*

$$\text{diag}\,(r,\ r^{-1},\ r,\ r^{-1})\,, \qquad\qquad r > 0\,,$$
$$\text{diag}\,(-r,\ -r^{-1},\ -r,\ -r^{-1})\,, \qquad r > 0\,,$$
$$\text{diag}\,(1,\ 1)\,,$$
$$F(\varphi) + F(\varphi)\,,$$
$$RF(\varphi) + R^{-1}F(\varphi) + RF(\varphi) + R^{-1}F(\varphi)\,, \qquad R > 0\,.$$

Proof. Sufficiency follows from sufficiency part of the proof of Theorem 1. Necessity follows by using the condition (i) of Theorem 7.10 of [2] and reclassifying the types (2)-(6) of Theorem 1 above.

The author wishes to thank Mr. David Riley for his assistance in the preparation of this paper.

REFERENCES

1. H. Freudenthal, *Produkte symmetrischer und antisymmetrischer Matrizen*, Indagationes Mathematicae **14** (1952), 193-201.
2. Robert C. Thompson, *Some matrix factorization theorems*, Pacific J. Math. (1970),

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
SANTA BARBARA, CALIFORNIA

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

Mathematical papers intended for publication in the *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* should be in typed form or offset-reproduced, (not dittoed), double spaced with large margins. Underline Greek letters in red, German in green, and script in blue. The first paragraph or two must be capable of being used separately as a synopsis of the entire paper. The editorial "we" must not be used in the synopsis, and items of the bibliography should not be cited there unless absolutely necessary, in which case they must be identified by author and Journal, rather than by item number. Manuscripts, in duplicate if possible, may be sent to any one of the four editors. Please classify according to the scheme of Math. Rev. **36**, 1539-1546. All other communications to the editors should be addressed to the managing editor, Richard Arens, University of California, Los Angeles, California, 90024.

50 reprints are provided free for each article; additional copies may be obtained at cost in multiples of 50.

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

Vol. 33, No. 3   May, 1970