

SUFFICIENT CONDITIONS FOR TOTAL POSITIVITY, COMPOUNDS, AND DODGSON CONDENSATION

SHAUN FALLAT, HIMANSHU GUPTA, AND CHARLES R. JOHNSON

ABSTRACT. A n -by- n matrix is called totally positive (TP) if all its minors are positive and TP_k if all of its k -by- k submatrices are TP . For an arbitrary totally positive matrix or TP_k matrix, we investigate if the r th compound ($1 < r < n$) is in turn TP or TP_k , and demonstrate a strong negative resolution in general. Focus is then shifted to Dodgson's algorithm for calculating the determinant of a generic matrix, and we analyze whether the associated condensed matrices are possibly totally positive or TP_k . We also show that all condensed matrices associated with a TP Hankel matrix are TP .

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

Denote the set of all m -by- n matrices with entries from \mathbb{R} by $M_{m,n}(\mathbb{R})$. We write $M_n(\mathbb{R})$ when $m = n$. For $A \in M_{m,n}(\mathbb{R})$, $\alpha \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$, and $\beta \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, the submatrix of A lying in rows indexed by α and columns indexed by β is denoted by $A[\alpha, \beta]$. The complimentary submatrix obtained from A by deleting the rows indexed by α and columns indexed by β is denoted by $A(\alpha, \beta)$. If $A \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$ and $\alpha = \beta$, then the *principal submatrix* $A[\alpha, \alpha]$ is abbreviated to $A[\alpha]$, and the complementary principal submatrix to $A(\alpha)$. For a set $\alpha \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, we denote its complement by α^c , and its cardinality to $|\alpha|$. Thus, $A(\alpha, \beta) = A[\alpha^c, \beta^c]$.

A *minor* in a given matrix A is the determinant of a (square) submatrix of $A \in M_{m,n}(\mathbb{R})$. For example, if $|\alpha| = |\beta|$, the (α, β) -minor of A will be denoted by $\det A[\alpha, \beta]$, and the α -principal minor is denoted by $\det A[\alpha]$, in the case when A is square. Let $A \in M_{m,n}(\mathbb{R})$. Then A is called *totally positive* (*totally nonnegative*) if all of its minors are positive (nonnegative). The subset of $M_{m,n}(\mathbb{R})$ of totally positive matrices (totally nonnegative matrices) will be denoted by TP (TN). We often write “ A is TP ” (“ A is TN ”) to refer the fact that A is a totally positive matrix (totally nonnegative matrix). There are several references available about totally positive/nonnegative matrices. For example, see [2, 9, 12, 16, 21].

If $A \in M_{m,n}(\mathbb{R})$, then A is called TP_k (TN_k) where $1 \leq k \leq \min\{m, n\}$, if all of its minors up to and including order k are positive (nonnegative). In particular, a matrix with positive entries is TP_1 . Observe that A is TP (A is TN) is same as A is TP_n (A is TN_n) for a matrix $A \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$. A *contiguous minor* is a minor that corresponds to consecutive rows and consecutive columns of a given matrix. The following is a classical result. Not all minors need be checked to verify TP .

Theorem 1.1 (Fekete [10]). *Let $A \in M_{m,n}(\mathbb{R})$. If all contiguous minors up to and including order k are positive, then A is TP_k .*

If $A \in M_{m,n}(\mathbb{R})$ and $k \leq \min\{m, n\}$, the $\binom{m}{k}$ -by- $\binom{n}{k}$ matrix of all k -by- k minors (with index sets ordered lexicographically) of A is called the k th *compound* of A and is denoted by $C_k(A)$. Note that if we choose any ordering other than lexicographic, then we obtain a different matrix. However, it is similar to the compound matrix by some permutation matrix.

Date: May 13, 2024.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 15B48, 15A15; Secondary 15A24.

Key words and phrases. totally positive matrix, totally nonnegative matrix, compound matrix, Sylvester's identity, Dodgson condensation, Hankel matrix, bidiagonal factorisation, planar networks.

By definition if $A \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$ is TP_k , then $C_k(A)$ is TP_1 for all $1 \leq k \leq n$. Notice that $C_1(A) = A$ and $C_n(A)$ is a scalar equal to $\det A$. Thus, if A is TP , then so are $C_1(A)$ and $C_n(A)$. More interestingly, if A is TP , then $C_{n-1}(A)$ is TP . This follows from the basic fact that if A is TP , then $SA^{-1}S$ is TP , where $S = \text{diag}(1, -1, \dots, (-1)^{n-1})$ (see, for example, [12]). Furthermore, basic linear algebra dictates that $SA^{-1}S$ is equal to $\frac{1}{\det A}C_{n-1}(A)$.

A natural question is what we can say about the total positivity of $C_k(A)$ for $2 \leq k \leq n-2$. Our first main result gives an answer to this question.

Theorem A. *Let $n \geq 4$ and let $A \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$. If A is TP_{k+2} , then $C_k(A)$ is not TP_3 for any $2 \leq k \leq n-2$.*

An immediate corollary to Theorem A is as follows.

Corollary 1.2. *Let $n \geq 4$ and let $A \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$. If $C_k(A)$ is TP_3 for some $2 \leq k \leq n-2$, then A is not TP_{k+2} .*

Another important set of matrices associated with a matrix are its Dodgson condensations. The Dodgson condensation is a method developed by C. Dodgson (aka. Lewis Carol) [7] to compute the determinant of a square matrix. The set of matrices derived from this method are called Dodgson condensation matrices. A key ingredient of this technique is the well-known Sylvester's determinantal identity.

Theorem 1.3 (Sylvester's determinantal identity [15]). *Let $A \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$, $\alpha \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, and suppose $|\alpha| = k$. Define the $(n-k)$ -by- $(n-k)$ matrix $B = [b_{i,j}]$, with $i, j \in \alpha^c$, by setting $b_{i,j} = \det A[\alpha \cup \{i\}, \alpha \cup \{j\}]$, for every $i, j \in \alpha^c$. Then, for each $\delta, \gamma \subset \alpha^c$, with $|\delta| = |\gamma| = l$,*

$$\det B[\delta, \gamma] = (\det A[\alpha])^{l-1} \det A[\alpha \cup \delta, \alpha \cup \gamma]. \quad (1.1)$$

Observe that a special case of (1.1) is that $\det B = (\det A[\alpha])^{n-k-1} \det A$. Another very useful special case is the following. Let $A \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$ be the partitioned matrix

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12}^T & a_{13} \\ a_{21} & A_{22} & a_{23} \\ a_{31} & a_{32}^T & a_{33} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $A_{22} \in M_{n-2}(\mathbb{R})$, $a_{12}, a_{21}, a_{23}, a_{32} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$, and $a_{11}, a_{13}, a_{31}, a_{33}$ are scalars. Define the matrices

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12}^T \\ a_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad C = \begin{bmatrix} a_{12}^T & a_{13} \\ A_{22} & a_{23} \end{bmatrix}, \quad D = \begin{bmatrix} a_{21} & A_{22} \\ a_{31} & a_{32}^T \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad E = \begin{bmatrix} A_{22} & a_{23} \\ a_{32}^T & a_{33} \end{bmatrix}.$$

If we let $\tilde{b} = \det B$, $\tilde{c} = \det C$, $\tilde{d} = \det D$, and $\tilde{e} = \det E$, then by (1.1) it follows that

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{b} & \tilde{c} \\ \tilde{d} & \tilde{e} \end{bmatrix} = \det A_{22} \det A.$$

Hence, provided $\det A_{22} \neq 0$, we have

$$\det A = \frac{\det B \det E - \det C \det D}{\det A_{22}}.$$

Dodgson's condensation produces a sequence of matrices $D_i(A) \in M_{n-i}(\mathbb{R})$ ($1 \leq i \leq n-1$) from a given matrix $A \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$ to which a recursive step is implemented resulting in a scalar whose value equal to $\det A$ (see [7]). This algorithm can be described as follows (see also [1]): Given $A = [a_{i,j}] \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$,

Step 1: Construct a matrix $D_1(A) = [M_{i,j}^{(1)}] \in M_{n-1}(\mathbb{R})$, where for $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$,

$$M_{i,j}^{(1)} = \det \begin{bmatrix} a_{i,j} & a_{i,j+1} \\ a_{i+1,j} & a_{i+1,j+1} \end{bmatrix};$$

Step 2: Using both A and $D_1(A)$, construct another matrix $D_2(A) = [M_{i,j}^{(2)}] \in M_{n-2}(A)$, where for $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, n-2$,

$$M_{i,j}^{(2)} = \det \begin{bmatrix} M_{i,j}^{(1)} & M_{i,j+1}^{(1)} \\ M_{i+1,j}^{(1)} & M_{i+1,j+1}^{(1)} \end{bmatrix} / a_{i+1,j+1};$$

Step 3: Replace A with $D_1(A)$, $D_1(A)$ with $D_2(A)$, and repeat Step 2, until a scalar is produced.

The above algorithm is a simple mechanism for computing the determinant of a matrix. We refer to a matrix $D_k(A)$ as a *Dodgson condensation matrix*. Applying Sylvester's identity (Theorem 1.3) and following the discussion afterwards, it can be seen that the entries of $D_2(A)$ are in fact equal to

$$M_{i,j}^{(2)} = \det A[\{i, i+1, i+2\}, \{j, j+1, j+2\}].$$

In other words, the entries of $D_2(A)$ are precisely all of the contiguous minors of order 3 of A . In fact, by using the Sylvester's identity repeatedly, the above claim holds more generally as follows.

Lemma 1.4. *Let $A \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$ and let $D_k(A) = [M_{i,j}^{(k)}]$. Then for any $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, n-k$ we have*

$$M_{i,j}^{(k)} = \det A[\{i, \dots, i+k\}, \{j, \dots, j+k\}].$$

Hence, the matrix $D_k(A)$ consists of all contiguous minors of order $k+1$ of A . So if A is TP_{k+1} , then $D_k(A)$ is TP_1 for any $1 \leq k \leq n-1$. In fact, we can say more about the total positivity of a Dodgson condensation matrix. That is our second main result.

Theorem B. *Let $A \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$ and let $k \geq 1$ be an integer. Then the following statements hold:*

- (1) *If A is TP_{k+2} , then $D_k(A)$ is TP_2 .*
- (2) *If A is TP_{k+3} , then $D_k(A)$ is TP_3 .*

We demonstrate that the previous result can not be improved for others values of k (see Example 3.3). However, we prove a much broader result for a class of matrices known as Hankel matrices. For a given sequence of scalars a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{2n} , the $(n+1)$ -by- $(n+1)$ symmetric matrix

$$A = (a_{i+j})_{i,j=0}^n = \begin{bmatrix} a_0 & a_1 & \dots & a_n \\ a_1 & a_2 & \dots & a_{n+1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_n & a_{n+1} & \dots & a_{2n} \end{bmatrix}$$

is called a *Hankel matrix*. Each Dodgson condensation matrix corresponding to a totally positive Hankel matrix is totally positive.

Theorem C. *Let A be a Hankel matrix based on the sequence of scalars a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{2n} . If A is TP , then $D_k(A)$ is a Hankel and TP matrix for all $1 \leq k \leq n$.*

An important goal in the study of totally positive matrices is to find out sufficient conditions to verify the total positivity of a matrix. A matrix $A = [a_{i,j}] \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$ is called $TP_2(c)$, if there exists a positive number c such that $a_{i,j}a_{i+1,j+1} \geq ca_{i+1,j}a_{i,j+1}$ for all $i, j = 1, \dots, n$. In 2006, Katkova and Vishnyakova [17] proved the following fascinating result, which may be viewed as an improvement of the work of Craven and Csordas [4].

Theorem 1.5 (Katkova and Vishnyakova [17]). *Let $A \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$ and $c \geq 4 \cos^2\left(\frac{\pi}{n+1}\right)$ be a positive number. If A is $TP_2(c)$, then A is TP .*

We desire to determine if we can learn anything about whether a matrix A is totally positive by looking at the total positivity of compounds or Dodgson condensation matrices. Suppose a matrix A is TP_k . If $C_{k+1}(A)$ is TP_1 , then by definition A is TP_{k+1} . On the other hand, by Fekete's Theorem 1.1, if $D_k(A)$ is TP_1 , then A is TP_{k+1} . In fact, even more can be said, if A is TP_1 and $C_2(A)$ is TP , then it follows that A must also be TP . However, this fact, which may be seen to serve as a possible generalization of the sufficiency-type conditions from Theorem 1.5, is vacuous as can be seen from Corollary 1.2. Note that by Corollary 1.2 if a certain compound matrix is TP_3 or more, then A can not be totally positive. A natural question is what we can say if we know that a compound matrix or a Dodgson condensation matrix is TP_2 . Our final main result asserts an answer to this question.

Theorem D. *Let $A \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$ be TP_k for some $1 \leq k \leq n-2$. If $D_k(A)$ is TP_2 , then A is TP_{k+2} .*

Since $D_k(A)$ is a submatrix of $C_{k+1}(A)$ we obtain an immediate consequence of Theorem D.

Corollary 1.6. *Let $A \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$ be TP_k for some $1 \leq k \leq n-2$. If $C_{k+1}(A)$ is TP_2 , then A is TP_{k+2} .*

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we provide some preliminary tools needed for the proof of Theorem A. In Section 3, we provide proofs of our four main theorems, together with some remarks and examples.

2. PRELIMINARIES

We now consider an important and very useful correspondence between totally nonnegative matrices and a corresponding bidiagonal factorization. Recall that a *bidiagonal factorization* of a matrix A , is simply a decomposition of A into a product of bidiagonal matrices. A matrix $B = [b_{i,j}]$ is called *lower (upper) bidiagonal* if $b_{i,j} = 0$, whenever $i < j$ and $i > j-1$ ($i > j$ and $i < j-1$). We assume throughout that all matrices are square of order n . Let I denote the identity matrix. For $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, we let E_{ij} being the elementary standard basis matrix whose only nonzero entry is a 1 in the (i, j) position. Let us define $L_i(\ell) := I + \ell E_{i,i-1}$ and $U_j(u) := I + u E_{j-1,j}$ where $2 \leq i, j \leq n$ and $\ell, u \in \mathbb{R}$. If a matrix is of the form $L_i(\ell)$ or $U_j(u)$, then it is called an *elementary bidiagonal matrix*. We may shorten $L_i(\ell)$ to L_i or $U_j(u)$ to U_j when the choice of numbers $\ell, u \in \mathbb{R}$ are not so important.

The bidiagonal factorization associated with totally nonnegative matrices has had a long and productive history, for example, see [5, 6, 8, 14, 18, 22].

Theorem 2.1. [13, 8] *Let A be an n -by- n nonsingular totally nonnegative matrix. Then A can be written as*

$$A = (L_2(\ell_1)) \cdot (L_3(\ell_2)L_2(\ell_3)) \cdots (L_n(\ell_{k-n+1}) \cdots L_2(\ell_k)) \cdot D \cdot (U_2(u_k) \cdots U_{n-1}(u_{k-n+2})U_n(u_{k-n+1})) \cdots (U_2(u_3)U_3(u_2)) \cdot U_2(u_1), \quad (2.1)$$

where $k = \binom{n}{2}$; $\ell_i, u_j \geq 0$ for all $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$; and $D = \text{diag}(d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n)$ is a diagonal matrix with $d_i > 0$.

One of the tools used in [8, 11] is a representation of a bidiagonal factorization (see also [8, 13]) in terms of planar networks, which is well known (see e.g. [3, 8]). Recall that a *planar network* is simply a weighted directed graph without cycles. The planar networks of interest and corresponding to the factorization in (2.1) is represented as in Figure 1, and contain n sources (labelled vertices on the left) and n sinks (labelled vertices on the right). Note that each horizontal edge in this planar network has a weight of 1, except for the horizontal edges corresponding to the diagonal factor D .




FIGURE 1. Planar network corresponding to the bidiagonal factorization in Theorem 2.1

Now, given a planar network Γ such as the one in Figure 1 we have following important and tremendously useful fact, which is sometimes also referred to as Lindstrom's Lemma (see [11]). For index sets $\alpha = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_t\}$ and $\beta = \{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_t\}$, consider a collection $P(\alpha, \beta)$ of all families of vertex-disjoint paths joining the vertices $\{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_t\}$ on the left of the network Γ with the vertices $\{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_t\}$ on the right. In particular, it follows that i_r must be joined to j_r by a path for each $r = 1, 2, \dots, t$. For $\pi \in P(\alpha, \beta)$, let $w(\pi)$ be the product of all the weights assigned to edges that form a family π . Then

$$\det A[\alpha, \beta] = \sum_{\pi \in P(\alpha, \beta)} w(\pi).$$

Theorem 2.1 implies that every invertible TN matrix can be represented by a weighted planar network. More general weighted planar networks can also be associated to TN matrices (see e.g. [3, 8]). Often we may interchange the notions of bidiagonal factorizations and planar networks when dealing with various properties of TN matrices. In particular, we will often think of a TN matrix by merely representing it as a general planar network. Given such a correspondence, we can recast Theorem 2.1 and other related results in terms of planar networks.

Theorem 2.2. *If Γ is a planar network corresponding to (2.1), then:*

- (1) *The associated matrix is nonsingular and totally nonnegative if and only if all the parameters are nonnegative and all $d_i > 0$;*
- (2) *The associated matrix is totally positive if and only if all the parameters are positive and all $d_i > 0$;*

3. PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULTS AND RELATED COMMENTS

We start this section by proving Theorem A.

Proof of Theorem A. We first prove the statement for $k = n - 2$. So assume A is TP , and we want to prove that $C_{n-2}(A)$ is not TP_3 . Consider the following sets each of size $n - 2$:

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \{1, 2, \dots, n-4, n-3, n-2\}, \\ S_2 &= \{1, 2, \dots, n-4, n-3, n-1\}, \\ S_3 &= \{1, 2, \dots, n-4, n-3, n\}, \\ S_4 &= \{1, 2, \dots, n-4, n-2, n-1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us define an 4-by-4 matrix $S := (s_{i,j})$ where $s_{i,j} := \det(A[S_i, S_j])$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq 4$. Notice that S is the leading principal submatrix of $C_{n-2}(A)$. Now, assume that A is represented as a planar network according to Theorem 2.2. Given the nature of the sets S_i ($i = 1, 2, 3, 4$), so when computing the entries of S , it is sufficient to just label the top-part of the planar network representing A (see Figure 2). For the purpose of brevity in the computation below, we assume that the diagonal factor in (2.1) is the identity. The strict negativity or positivity of the minors in the matrix S identified below are not affected by introducing an arbitrary positive diagonal factor.




FIGURE 2. Planar network representing A .

By examining the disjoint paths in the planar network, Figure 2, the entries of S are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} s_{1,1} &= 1, & s_{1,2} &= h + k, & s_{1,3} &= hi, & s_{1,4} &= jh + \ell h + \ell k, \\ s_{2,1} &= b + e, & s_{2,2} &= bh + eh + bk + ek + 1, & s_{2,3} &= bhi + ehi + i, \\ s_{2,4} &= bhj + ehj + bhl + ehl + bkl + ekl + g + j + \ell, \\ s_{3,1} &= de, & s_{3,2} &= deh + dek + d, & s_{3,3} &= dehi + di + 1, \\ s_{3,4} &= dehj + dehl + dekl + dg + dj + dl, \\ s_{4,1} &= ab + ae + ce, & s_{4,2} &= abh + aeh + ceh + abk + aek + cek + a + c + f, \\ s_{4,3} &= abhi + aehi + cehi + ai + ci + fi, \\ s_{4,4} &= abhj + aehj + cehj + abhl + aehl + cehl + abkl + aekl + \\ & \quad cekl + ag + cg + fg + aj + cj + fj + al + cl + fl + 1. \end{aligned}$$

After a straightforward computation we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\det(S[\{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 3, 4\}]) &= -g - j - \ell < 0, \\ \det(S[\{1, 2, 3\}, \{2, 3, 4\}]) &= -gh - gk - jk < 0, \\ \det(S[\{1, 2, 4\}, \{1, 3, 4\}]) &= i > 0, \\ \det(S[\{1, 2, 4\}, \{2, 3, 4\}]) &= ik > 0,\end{aligned}\tag{3.1}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\det(S[\{1, 3, 4\}, \{1, 2, 3\}]) &= -a - c - f < 0, \\ \det(S[\{2, 3, 4\}, \{1, 2, 3\}]) &= -bc - bf - ef < 0, \\ \det(S[\{1, 3, 4\}, \{1, 2, 4\}]) &= d > 0, \\ \det(S[\{2, 3, 4\}, \{1, 2, 4\}]) &= bd > 0.\end{aligned}\tag{3.2}$$

This implies that S is not TP_3 , and hence, $C_{n-2}(A)$ is not TP_3 . Now, we prove the statement for $2 \leq k \leq n-3$. So assume A is TP_{k+2} and consider any submatrix B of A of order $k+2$. Notice that, B is TP , and $C_k(B)$ is a submatrix of $C_k(A)$. By the previous case $C_k(B)$ is not TP_3 , and hence $C_k(A)$ is not TP_3 . This completes the proof. \square

Remark 3.1. Recall that in the definition of compound matrix $C_k(A)$ we use lexicographic ordering of subsets. One may wonder whether using a different ordering of subsets could alter the result of Theorem A. Unfortunately, that is not the case, since in any ordering at least one of the minors from (3.1) is negative.

Indeed, any permutation of rows and columns, simultaneously, of the matrix $C_{n-2}(A)$ induces a permutation on the rows and columns of the matrix S . Considering all $4!$ permutations and using the fact that an odd permutation changes the sign of a determinant while an even permutation does not, we can conclude that in any permutation at least one of the minors from (3.1) is negative.

We provide an example which shows that the result of Theorem A can not be improved to “not TP_2 ”.

Example 3.2. Let us consider the following matrix

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1/2 & 1/3 & 1/4 & 1/5 \\ 1/3 & 1/4 & 1/5 & 1/6 \\ 1/4 & 1/5 & 1/6 & 1/7 \\ 1/5 & 1/6 & 1/7 & 1/8 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Its second compound is given by

$$C_2(A) = \begin{bmatrix} 1/72 & 1/60 & 1/60 & 1/240 & 1/180 & 1/600 \\ 1/60 & 1/48 & 3/140 & 1/180 & 4/525 & 1/420 \\ 1/60 & 3/140 & 9/400 & 1/168 & 1/120 & 3/1120 \\ 1/240 & 1/180 & 1/168 & 1/600 & 1/420 & 1/1260 \\ 1/180 & 4/525 & 1/120 & 1/420 & 1/288 & 1/840 \\ 1/600 & 1/420 & 3/1120 & 1/1260 & 1/840 & 1/2352 \end{bmatrix}$$

One can check that A is TP_4 , and, moreover $C_2(A)$ is also TP_2 .

We note in passing (see [19]) that the example of a 4-by-4 totally nonnegative Green’s matrix provided in [19] does not have a totally nonnegative second compound matrix as claimed. In fact, the 2-by-2 minor in rows $\{2, 3\}$ and columns $\{3, 4\}$ is negative.

However, computationally it seems rare to find totally positive matrices such that all of its compounds are TP_2 . It would be interesting to find out a characterization or an infinite family of totally positive matrices such that all of its compound matrices are TP_2 .

Next we prove our second main theorem.

Proof of Theorem B. For the first statement, assume A is TP_{k+2} . We know that $D_k(A)$ is TP_1 . Now, consider an arbitrary 2-by-2 contiguous submatrix of $D_k(A)$ indexed by the rows $\{i, i+1\}$ and columns $\{j, j+1\}$. Then we have

$$\det D_k(A)[\{i, i+1\}, \{j, j+1\}] = M_{i,j}^{(k)} M_{i+1,j+1}^{(k)} - M_{i,j+1}^{(k)} M_{i+1,j}^{(k)} = M_{i,j}^{(k+1)} M_{i+1,j+1}^{(k-1)}. \quad (3.3)$$

Hence, it follows by Lemma 1.4 that

$$\begin{aligned} \det D_k(A)[\{i, i+1\}, \{j, j+1\}] &= \det A[\{i, \dots, i+k+1\}, \{j, \dots, j+k+1\}] \\ &\quad \cdot \det A[\{i+1, \dots, i+k\}, \{j+1, \dots, j+k\}]. \end{aligned}$$

Both $\det A[\{i, \dots, i+k+1\}, \{j, \dots, j+k+1\}]$ and $\det A[\{i+1, \dots, i+k\}, \{j+1, \dots, j+k\}]$ are positive since A is TP_{k+2} . So $\det D_k(A)[\{i, i+1\}, \{j, j+1\}] > 0$, and hence by Fekete's Theorem 1.1, we have that $D_k(A)$ is TP_2 . For the second claim, assume A is TP_{k+3} . Then we know $D_k(A)$ is TP_2 . Consider an arbitrary 3-by-3 contiguous minor of $D_k(A)$, given by $\theta_{i,j} := \det D_k(A)[\{i, i+1, i+2\}, \{j, j+1, j+2\}]$. Applying Sylvester's identity (Theorem 1.3) and equation (3.3) we have

$$\theta_{i,j} = \frac{M_{i,j}^{(k+1)} M_{i+1,j+1}^{(k-1)} M_{i+1,j+1}^{(k+1)} M_{i+2,j+2}^{(k-1)} - M_{i,j+1}^{(k+1)} M_{i+1,j+2}^{(k-1)} M_{i+1,j}^{(k+1)} M_{i+2,j+1}^{(k-1)}}{M_{i+1,j+1}^{(k)}}.$$

Observe that $M_{i,j}^{(k+1)} M_{i+1,j+1}^{(k+1)} - M_{i,j+1}^{(k+1)} M_{i+1,j}^{(k+1)} = M_{i,j}^{(k+2)} M_{i+1,j+1}^{(k)}$, and since A is assumed to be TP_{k+3} it follows that $M_{i,j}^{(k+2)} M_{i+1,j+1}^{(k)} > 0$ which implies $M_{i,j}^{(k+1)} M_{i+1,j+1}^{(k+1)} > M_{i,j+1}^{(k+1)} M_{i+1,j}^{(k+1)}$. Similarly, we have $M_{i+1,j+1}^{(k-1)} M_{i+2,j+2}^{(k-1)} > M_{i+1,j+2}^{(k-1)} M_{i+2,j+1}^{(k-1)} > 0$. Combining these two inequalities implies

$$M_{i,j}^{(k+1)} M_{i+1,j+1}^{(k-1)} M_{i+1,j+1}^{(k+1)} M_{i+2,j+2}^{(k-1)} - M_{i,j+1}^{(k+1)} M_{i+1,j+2}^{(k-1)} M_{i+1,j}^{(k+1)} M_{i+2,j+1}^{(k-1)} > 0,$$

which proves that $\theta_{i,j} = \det D_k(A)[\{i, i+1, i+2\}, \{j, j+1, j+2\}] > 0$. Hence by Theorem 1.1, $D_k(A)$ is TP_3 . This completes the proof. \square

We provide an example that shows that in general the result of Theorem B cannot be improved to TP_4

Example 3.3. Let us consider the following matrix.

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 18 & 192 & 924 & 2332 & 420 \\ 32 & 577 & 6161 & 29692 & 75052 & 13524 \\ 425 & 7682 & 82145 & 396687 & 1004887 & 181209 \\ 2412 & 43807 & 469784 & 2277800 & 5795144 & 1046584 \\ 3080 & 56720 & 613350 & 3009027 & 7751484 & 1406076 \\ 1440 & 27360 & 301320 & 1515996 & 4007487 & 733594 \end{bmatrix}$$

Then

$$D_1(A) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 114 & 8100 & 106304 & 16128 \\ 599 & 68863 & 4939267 & 64952080 & 10006080 \\ 88991 & 10354673 & 752675392 & 9926679328 & 1566406912 \\ 1883080 & 222874970 & 16504110168 & 218585490312 & 35833764288 \\ 2592000 & 309614400 & 23156130960 & 307417847085 & 51610862484 \end{bmatrix}$$

One can check that A is TP_6 but $D_1(A)$ is not TP_4 (the leading principal minor of order 4 is negative).

The following theorem, which can be found in [20], which may not be the original source, provides a useful criteria to determine the total positivity for a Hankel matrix.

Theorem 3.4. [20, Theorem 4.4] *Let A be the $(n + 1)$ -by- $(n + 1)$ Hankel matrix based on the sequence of scalars a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{2n} , and let $A' := A[\{1, 2, \dots, n\}, \{2, 3, \dots, n + 1\}]$. Then A is TP if and only if both A and A' are positive definite matrices.*

We make use of the above result to prove Theorem C.

Proof of Theorem C. Let A be a TP Hankel matrix. Then A' is also a TP Hankel matrix (we use the same notation as defined in Theorem 3.4). Since $D_n(A)$ is a scalar equal to $\det A$, the statement follows for $k = n$. Next, we assume $1 \leq k \leq n - 1$. It is easy to check that $D_k(A)$ is also a Hankel matrix and $D_k(A)' = D_k(A')$. Therefore, by Theorem 3.4 it is enough to prove that $D_k(A)$ is a positive definite matrix as A is an arbitrary TP Hankel matrix. Now, since the matrix A is symmetric, it follows that the compound matrix $C_{k+1}(A)$ is also a symmetric matrix. Furthermore, any eigenvalue of $C_{k+1}(A)$ is a product of some subset of $k + 1$ eigenvalues of A , and consequently, is positive. That is $C_{k+1}(A)$ is a positive definite matrix. Since $D_k(A)$ is a principal submatrix of $C_{k+1}(A)$ so $D_k(A)$ is also a positive definite matrix. Hence, the proof is complete. \square

Finally, we prove our last main theorem.

Proof of Theorem D. Clearly A is TP_{k+1} by Fekete's Theorem 1.1. So we prove A is TP_{k+2} . Suppose $D_k(A)$ is TP_2 . Consider an arbitrary contiguous minor of order $k + 2$ of A given by $M_{i,j}^{(k+1)}$. An application of Sylvester's identity (Theorem 1.3) reveals,

$$M_{i,j}^{(k+1)} = \frac{M_{i,j}^{(k)} M_{i+1,j+1}^{(k)} - M_{i,j+1}^{(k)} M_{i+1,j}^{(k)}}{M_{i+1,j+1}^{(k-1)}}.$$

Upon inspection we observe that the numerator above is equal to the 2-by-2 contiguous minor of $D_k(A)$ given by $\det D_k(A)[\{i, i + 1\}, \{j, j + 1\}]$. All such minors are assumed to be positive since $D_k(A)$ is TP_2 . Further, since A is TP_k all minors of order k are positive; so in particular, $M_{i+1,j+1}^{(k-1)} > 0$. Hence $M_{i,j}^{(k+1)} > 0$. Thus, all contiguous minors of order $k + 2$ of A are positive, so by Theorem 1.1, A is TP_{k+2} . \square

Remark 3.5. Looking back at Theorem D and comparing it with the implications of Theorem B we can ask if, in general, A is TP_k and $D_k(A)$ is TP_3 , then A is TP_{k+3} ? Unfortunately, this is not the case in general. Indeed, there exists a 6-by-6 matrix B that is TP_3 and satisfies $D_3(B)$ is TP (or TP_3 as $D_3(B)$ is 3-by-3), but B is not TP_6 .

Suppose A is a 6-by-6 TP matrix, and set $k = 3$. Then using [9, Lemma 9.5.2], matrix $B = A - tE_{1,1}$ is a TP_5 singular matrix, when $t = \det(A)/\det(A(\{1\}))$ and $E_{1,1}$ is the standard basis matrix whose only nonzero entry is 1 in the (1, 1) position. Applying Theorem B, we know that $D_3(B)$ is TP_2 . Furthermore, following the argument similar to the proof of Theorem B we have

$$\begin{aligned} \det D_3(B) &= \frac{M_{1,1}^{(4)} M_{2,2}^{(2)} M_{2,2}^{(4)} M_{3,3}^{(2)} - M_{1,2}^{(4)} M_{2,3}^{(2)} M_{2,1}^{(4)} M_{3,2}^{(2)}}{M_{2,2}^{(3)}} \\ &= \frac{M_{1,1}^{(4)} M_{2,2}^{(4)} \left(M_{2,2}^{(2)} M_{3,3}^{(2)} - M_{2,3}^{(2)} M_{3,2}^{(2)} \right)}{M_{2,2}^{(3)}} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

The second equality follows since

$$0 = \det(B) = \frac{M_{1,1}^{(4)} M_{2,2}^{(4)} - M_{1,2}^{(4)} M_{2,1}^{(4)}}{M_{2,2}^{(3)}},$$

and $M_{2,2}^{(3)} > 0$, since B is TP_5 , while $M_{2,2}^{(2)} M_{3,3}^{(2)} > M_{2,3}^{(2)} M_{3,2}^{(2)}$ since $D_3(B)$ is TP_2 . Thus $D_3(B)$ is TP_3 . However B is not TP_{k+3} , and B is not TP_6 .

Acknowledgements. The workshop “Theory and applications of total positivity”, was held at the American Institute of Mathematics (AIM), from July 24-28, 2023. The authors thank AIM and NSF for their support. In addition, we also thank Sunita Chepuri, Juergen Garloff, Olga Katkova, Daniel Soskin, and Anna Vishnyakova for the thoughtful discussions that occurred during this AIM workshop.

S.M. Fallat was supported in part by an NSERC Discovery Research Grant, Application No.: RGPIN-2019-03934. The work of the PIMS Postdoctoral Fellow H. Gupta leading to this publication was supported in part by the Pacific Institute for the Mathematical Sciences

REFERENCES

- [1] F. F. Abeles. Dodgson condensation: the historical and mathematical development of an experimental method. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 429(2-3):429–438, 2008.
- [2] T. Ando. Totally positive matrices. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 90:165–219, 1987.
- [3] F. Brenti. Combinatorics and total positivity. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 71(2):175–218, 1995.
- [4] T. Craven and G. Csordas. A sufficient condition for strict total positivity of a matrix. *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, 45(1):19–34, 1998.
- [5] C. W. Cryer. The LU -factorization of totally positive matrices. *Linear Algebra and Appl.*, 7:83–92, 1973.
- [6] C. W. Cryer. Some properties of totally positive matrices. *Linear Algebra and Appl.*, 15(1):1–25, 1976.
- [7] C. L. Dodgson. Condensation of determinants, being a new and brief method for computing their arithmetical values. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London*, 15:150–155, 1866.
- [8] S. M. Fallat. Bidiagonal factorizations of totally nonnegative matrices. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 108(8):697–712, 2001.
- [9] S. M. Fallat and C. R. Johnson. *Totally nonnegative matrices*. Princeton Series in Applied Mathematics. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2011.
- [10] M. Fekete. Uber ein problem von laguerre. *Rend. Conti. Palermo*, 34:110–120, 1913.
- [11] S. Fomin and A. Zelevinsky. Total positivity: tests and parametrizations. *Math. Intelligencer*, 22(1):23–33, 2000.
- [12] F. P. Gantmacher and M. G. Krein. *Oscillation matrices and kernels and small vibrations of mechanical systems*. AMS Chelsea Publishing, Providence, RI, revised edition, 2002. Translation based on the 1941 Russian original, Edited and with a preface by Alex Eremenko.
- [13] M. Gasca and J. M. Peña. Total positivity and Neville elimination. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 165:25–44, 1992.
- [14] M. Gasca and J. M. Peña. A matricial description of Neville elimination with applications to total positivity. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 202:33–53, 1994.
- [15] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson. *Matrix analysis*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1985.
- [16] S. Karlin. *Total positivity*. Vol. I. Stanford University Press, Stanford, Calif, 1968.
- [17] O. M. Katkova and A. M. Vishnyakova. On sufficient conditions for the total positivity and for the multiple positivity of matrices. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 416(2-3):1083–1097, 2006.
- [18] C. Loewner. On totally positive matrices. *Math. Z.*, 63:338–340, 1955.
- [19] M. M. A. Murad and M. A. Ramadan. On the total positivity of compound matrices. *Ciência e Técnica Vitivinícola*, 30(10), 2015.
- [20] A. Pinkus. *Totally positive matrices*. Number 181. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010.
- [21] I. Schoenberg. Uber variationsvermindernde lineare transformationen. *Math. Z.*, 32:321–328, 1930.
- [22] A. M. Whitney. A reduction theorem for totally positive matrices. *J. Analyse Math.*, 2:88–92, 1952.

(S. Fallat) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF REGINA, REGINA, SK, CA
Email address: shaun.fallat@uregina.ca

(H. Gupta) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF REGINA, REGINA, SK, CA
Email address: himanshu.gupta@uregina.ca

(C. Johnson) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY, WILLIAMSBURG, VA, USA
Email address: crjohn@wm.edu