

## CONVEXITY OF $f(A) = (\det A)^m$

FOZI M. DANNAN

(Communicated by S. Puntanen)

*Abstract.* Sufficient conditions for the convexity of the function  $f(A) = (\det A)^m$  ( $m \geq 1$ ) has been obtained.

### 1. Introduction

We use conventional notions and notations, as in [1], where  $M_n$  denotes the set of  $n \times n$  matrices. A matrix  $X \in M_n$  is said to be positive definite if  $\operatorname{Re}(x^* X x) > 0$  for all nonzero  $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$ . The convex set of positive definite matrices is denoted by  $M_n^+$ .

**DEFINITION 1.** A real valued function  $f$  defined on  $M_n^+$  is said to be convex if  $f(\alpha A + \beta B) \leq \alpha f(A) + \beta f(B)$ , and concave if  $f(\alpha A + \beta B) \geq \alpha f(A) + \beta f(B)$  for all  $0 < \alpha < 1, \alpha + \beta = 1$  and all  $A, B \in M_n^+, A \neq B$ .

It has been proved by Horn, Johnson [1, p. 466] that the function  $f(A) = \log(\det A)$  is strictly concave function on the convex set of positive definite Hermitian matrices in  $M_n$ . Therefore

$$\log \det(\alpha A + \beta B) \geq \alpha \log \det A + \beta \log \det B, \quad (1)$$

for positive definite matrices  $A, B \in M_n$  and  $\alpha, \beta > 0$  with  $\alpha + \beta = 1$ . It is interesting to notice that the function  $f(A) = (\det A)^{1/n}$  is also concave on the set of positive definite Hermitian matrices i.e.

$$[\det(\alpha A + (1 - \alpha)B)]^{1/n} \geq \alpha(\det A)^{1/n} + (1 - \alpha)(\det B)^{1/n}. \quad (2)$$

This follows directly from the famous Minkowski inequality which states that:

If  $A, B \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$  are real positive definite matrices, then

$$[\det(A + B)]^{1/n} \geq (\det A)^{1/n} + (\det B)^{1/n}. \quad (3)$$

Although we get from (3) that

$$\det(A + B) \geq \det A + \det B, \quad (4)$$

---

*Mathematics subject classification* (2010): 15A15.

*Keywords and phrases:* convexity; power of determinant.

it is clear that inequality (4) does not imply that  $f(A) = \det A$  is concave.

In fact the function  $f(A) = (\det A)^m$  is generally not concave for  $m \neq \frac{1}{n}$ . Recently Zhan [2] obtained some sufficient conditions so that

$$[\det(A+B)]^t \geq (\det A)^t + (\det B)^t, \quad (5)$$

where  $t \in R$  and  $t \geq \frac{2}{n}$

The question of convexity of the function  $f(A) = \det A$  has not been treated up to the knowledge of the author. The purpose of this article is to discuss this question.

## 2. Main results

For the proof of the main results we need the following:

LEMMA 2. *If  $\alpha, \beta > 0$  such that  $\alpha + \beta = 1$ , and  $\lambda_i > 1$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$  or  $0 < \lambda_i < 1$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , then*

$$\prod_{i=1}^n (\alpha + \beta \lambda_i) \leq \alpha + \beta \prod_{i=1}^n \lambda_i. \quad (6)$$

*Proof.* For  $\alpha, \beta > 0$ , and  $\alpha + \beta = 1$ , the identity

$$(\alpha + \beta u)(\alpha + \beta v) = (\alpha + \beta uv) + \alpha\beta(u-1)(v-1) \quad (7)$$

implies that inequality (6) is true for  $n = 2$ .

Assume that (6) is true for  $n = m$ , we prove that it is true for  $n = m + 1$ . Since (6) holds for  $n = m$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{i=1}^{m+1} (\alpha + \beta \lambda_i) &= (\alpha + \beta \lambda_{m+1}) \prod_{i=1}^m (\alpha + \beta \lambda_i) \\ &\leq (\alpha + \beta \lambda_{m+1}) (\alpha + \beta \prod_{i=1}^m \lambda_i). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Applying the identity (7) we obtain

$$(\alpha + \beta \lambda_{m+1}) (\alpha + \beta \prod_{i=1}^m \lambda_i) = (\alpha + \beta \lambda_{m+1} \prod_{i=1}^m \lambda_i) + \alpha\beta(\lambda_{m+1} - 1)(1 - \prod_{i=1}^m \lambda_i). \quad (9)$$

Since the second term in (9) is negative for  $0 < \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{m+1} < 1$  or for  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{m+1} > 1$ . It follows from (8) and (9) that

$$\prod_{i=1}^{m+1} (\alpha + \beta \lambda_i) \leq (\alpha + \beta \lambda_{m+1} \prod_{i=1}^m \lambda_i)$$

and consequently that inequality (6) holds for  $n = m + 1$ .  $\square$

**THEOREM 3.** Let  $A, B \in M_n$  be positive definite matrices,  $\lambda_j$  ( $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ) be the eigenvalues of  $A^{-1/2} B A^{-1/2}$ . If all  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n > 1$  or  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n < 1$ , then

$$\det(\alpha A + \beta B) \leq \alpha \det A + \beta \det B, \tag{10}$$

where  $\alpha, \beta > 0$  with  $\alpha + \beta = 1$ .

*Proof.* If we multiply both sides of the asserted inequality (10) from the right and left by  $\det A^{-1/2}$ , the desired inequality is then equivalent to

$$\prod_{i=1}^n (\alpha + \beta \lambda_i) \leq \alpha + \beta \prod_{i=1}^n \lambda_i$$

which is true by Lemma 2.  $\square$

**COROLLARY 4.** If all the eigenvalues of  $A^{-1/2} B A^{-1/2}$  are either  $> 1$  or  $< 1$  for any two positive definite matrices  $A, B$ , then  $f(A) = (\det A)^m$  is a convex function over the set  $M_n^+$  for  $m > 1$ .

*Proof.* Since  $t^m$  is convex over any positive interval for  $m > 1$ , it follows  $(\alpha t + \beta s)^m \leq \alpha t^m + \beta s^m$  for  $\alpha > 0$ ,  $\alpha + \beta = 1$  and any positive real numbers  $t$  and  $s$ . Putting  $t = \det A$  and  $s = \det B$ , it follows that

$$(\alpha \det A + \beta \det B)^m \leq \alpha (\det A)^m + \beta (\det B)^m. \tag{11}$$

From (3) and (11) it follows that

$$(\det(\alpha A + \beta B))^m \leq \alpha (\det A)^m + \beta (\det B)^m,$$

and the proof is complete.  $\square$

In fact the conditions on  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$  in Theorem (3) are essential as the following example shows.

**EXAMPLE 5.** Assume that

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 5 & -3 \\ -3 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then

$$A^{-1/2} B A^{-1/2} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix} B \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 9 & 14 \\ 14 & 22 \end{pmatrix}$$

has the eigenvalues  $\lambda_1 = 0.06 < 1$  and  $\lambda_2 = 30.94 > 1$ . From the other side we can easily verify for  $\alpha = \beta = \frac{1}{2}$  that

$$\det \frac{1}{2}(A + B) \not\leq \frac{1}{2} \det A + \frac{1}{2} \det B.$$

THEOREM 6. Let  $A, B \in M_n^+$ ,  $\lambda_j(A), \lambda_j(B)$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$  be the eigenvalues of  $A$  and  $B$ ,  $\alpha, \beta > 0$  with  $\alpha + \beta = 1$ . Then

$$\det(\alpha A + \beta B) \leq \alpha \det A + \beta \det B \quad (12)$$

holds true if one of the following conditions is satisfied

$$(i) \lambda_j(B) < \lambda_{\min}(A) \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

$$(ii) \lambda_j(B) > \lambda_{\max}(A) \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

where  $\lambda_{\min}(A) = \min_{1 \leq j \leq n} \lambda_j(A)$  and  $\lambda_{\max}(A) = \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \lambda_j(A)$ .

*Proof.* It is known from [1, p. 466] that for two positive definite matrices  $A$  and  $B$  there exists a nonsingular matrix  $C$  such that  $A = CC^*$  and  $B = CAC^*$ , where  $\Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ . The asserted inequality (12) is then equivalent to

$$\det(\alpha + \beta \Lambda) \leq \alpha + \beta \det \Lambda$$

or

$$\prod_{i=1}^n (\alpha + \beta \lambda_i) \leq \alpha + \beta \prod_{i=1}^n \lambda_i$$

which is true by Lemma 2 if all  $\lambda_j > 1$  or all  $\lambda_j < 1$  for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . To complete the proof, it is sufficient to show that either  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n > 1$  or  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n < 1$ . Observing that  $A$  and  $CC^*$  has the same eigenvalues, it follows from Ostrowski Theorem [1, p. 224] that for each  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , there exists  $\theta_j > 0$  such that

$$\lambda_{\min}(A) \leq \theta_j \leq \lambda_{\max}(A) \quad (13)$$

and

$$\lambda_j(B) = \theta_j \lambda_j. \quad (14)$$

From (13) and (14) we conclude that

$$\frac{\lambda_j(B)}{\lambda_{\max}(A)} \leq \lambda_j \leq \frac{\lambda_j(B)}{\lambda_{\min}(A)}. \quad (15)$$

Therefore  $\lambda_j < 1$  for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$  if the condition (i) is satisfied and  $\lambda_j > 1$  for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$  if (ii) is satisfied. The proof is complete.  $\square$

#### REFERENCES

- [1] R. A. HORN, C. R. JOHNSON, *Matrix Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, 1999.  
 [2] S. ZHAN, *On the determinantal inequalities*, J. Inequalities in Pure Appl. Math., **6**, 4 (2005), art. 105.

(Received July 19, 2009)

Fozi M. Dannan

P. O. Box 10409

Damascus

Syria

e-mail: fmdan@scs-net.org