

A SIMPLE OBSERVATION ON RANDOM MATRICES WITH CONTINUOUS DIAGONAL ENTRIES

OMER FRIEDLAND AND OHAD GILADI

ABSTRACT. Let T be an $n \times n$ random matrix, such that each diagonal entry $T_{i,i}$ is a continuous random variable, independent from all the other entries of T . Then for every $n \times n$ matrix A and every $t \geq 0$

$$\mathbb{P}\left[|\det(A + T)|^{1/n} \leq t\right] \leq 2bnt,$$

where $b > 0$ is a uniform upper bound on the densities of $T_{i,i}$.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this note we are interested in the following question: Given an $n \times n$ random matrix T , what is the probability that T is invertible, or at least “close” to being invertible? One natural way to measure this property is to estimate the following small ball probability

$$\mathbb{P}\left[s_n(T) \leq t\right],$$

where $s_n(T)$ is the smallest singular value of T ,

$$s_n(T) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf_{\|x\|_2=1} \|Tx\|_2 = \frac{1}{\|T^{-1}\|}.$$

In the case when the entries of T are i.i.d random variables with appropriate moment assumption, the problem was studied in [3, 11, 12, 15, 17]. We also refer the reader to the survey [10]. In particular, in [12] it is shown that if the entries of T are i.i.d subgaussian random variables, then

$$\mathbb{P}\left[s_n(T) \leq t\right] \leq C\sqrt{nt} + e^{-cn}, \tag{1.1}$$

where c, C depend on the moment of the entries.

Several cases of dependent entries have also been studied. A bound similar to (1.1) for the case when the rows are independent log-concave random vectors was obtained in [1, 2]. Another case of dependent entries is when the matrix is symmetric, which was studied in [5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 19]. In particular, in [5] it is shown that if the above diagonal entries of T

Date: November 11, 2018.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 60B20,15B52.

are continuous and satisfy certain regularity conditions, namely that the entries are i.i.d subgaussian and satisfy certain smoothness conditions, then

$$\mathbb{P}\left[s_n(T) \leq t\right] \leq C\sqrt{nt}.$$

The regularity assumptions were completely removed in [6] at the cost of a $n^{5/2}$ (independence of the entries in the non-symmetric part is still needed). On the other hand, in the discrete case, the result of [19] shows that if T is, say, symmetric whose above diagonal entries are i.i.d Bernoulli random variables, then

$$\mathbb{P}\left[s_n(T) = 0\right] \leq e^{-nc},$$

where c is an absolute constant.

A more general case is the so called *Smooth Analysis* of random matrices, where now we replace the matrix T by $A + T$, where A being an arbitrary deterministic matrix. The first result in this direction can be found in [13], where it is shown that if T is a random matrix with i.i.d standard normal entries, then

$$\mathbb{P}\left[s_n(A + T) \leq t\right] \leq C\sqrt{nt}. \tag{1.2}$$

Further development in this direction can be found in [18], where estimates similar to (1.2) are given in the case when T is a Bernoulli random matrix, and in [6, 8, 9], where T is symmetric.

An alternative way to measure the invertibility of a random matrix T is to estimate $\det(T)$, which was studied in [4, 14, 16] (when the entries are discrete distributions). Here we show that if the diagonal entries are independent continuous random variables, we can easily get a small ball estimate for $\det(A + T)$, where A being an arbitrary deterministic matrix.

Theorem 1.1. *Let T be an $n \times n$ random matrix, such that each diagonal entry $T_{i,i}$ is a continuous random variable, independent from all the other entries of T . Then for every $n \times n$ matrix A and every $t \geq 0$*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[|\det(A + T)|^{1/n} \leq t\right] \leq 2bnt,$$

where $b > 0$ is a uniform upper bound on the densities of $T_{i,i}$.

We remark that the proof works if we replace the determinant by the permanent of the matrix (see [4] for the difference between the notions).

Now, we use Theorem 1.1 to get a small ball estimate on the norm and smallest singular value of a random matrix.

Corollary 1.2. *Let T be a random matrix as in Theorem 1.1. Then*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\|T\| \leq t\right] \leq 2bnt, \quad (1.3)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left[s_n(T) \leq t\right] \leq (2b)^{\frac{n}{2n-1}} (\mathbb{E}\|T\|)^{\frac{n-1}{2n-1}} t^{\frac{1}{2n-1}}. \quad (1.4)$$

Corollary 1.2 can be applied to the case when the random matrix T is symmetric, under very weak assumptions on the distributions and the moments of the entries and under *no independence* assumptions on the above diagonal entries. Note that in this case when T is symmetric, we have

$$\|T\| = \sup_{\|x\|_2=1} \langle Tx, x \rangle \geq \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |T_{i,i}|.$$

Thus, in this case we get a far better small ball estimate for the norm

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\|T\| \leq t\right] \leq (2bt)^n.$$

Finally, in Section 3 we show that in the case of 2×2 matrices, we use an ad-hoc argument to obtain a better bound than the one obtained in Theorem 1.1. We do not know what is the right order when the dimension is higher.

2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

Before we give the proof of Theorem 1.1, we fix some notation. First, let $M = A + T$, and let M_k be the matrix M after erasing the last $n - k$ rows and last $n - k$ columns. Also, let Ω_k be the σ -algebra generated by the entries of M_k *except* $M_{k,k}$.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We have

$$|\det(M_k)| = \left| M_{k,k} \det(M_{k-1}) + f_k \right|,$$

where f_k is measurable with respect to Ω_k . We also have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left[|\det(M_k)| \leq \varepsilon_k\right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}\left[|\det(M_k)| \leq \varepsilon_k \wedge |\det(M_{k-1})| \geq \varepsilon_{k-1}\right] + \mathbb{P}\left[|\det(M_{k-1})| \leq \varepsilon_{k-1}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}\left[|\det(M_k)| \leq \varepsilon_n \wedge |\det(T_{k-1})| \geq \varepsilon_{k-1}\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{P}\left[|M_{k,k} \det(M_{k-1}) + f_k| \leq \varepsilon_k \middle| \Omega_k\right] \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{|\det(M_{k-1})| \geq \varepsilon_{k-1}\}}\right] \\
&\leq \sup_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{P}\left[|M_{k,k} + \gamma| \leq \frac{\varepsilon_k}{\varepsilon_{k-1}}\right] \leq 2b \frac{\varepsilon_k}{\varepsilon_{k-1}},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact for a continuous random variable X we always have

$$\sup_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{P}\left[|X + \gamma| \leq t\right] \leq 2bt, \quad (2.1)$$

where $b > 0$ is an upper bound on the density of X .

Thus, we get

$$\mathbb{P}\left[|\det(M_k)| \leq \varepsilon_k\right] \leq 2b \frac{\varepsilon_k}{\varepsilon_{k-1}} + \mathbb{P}\left[|\det(M_{k-1})| \leq \varepsilon_{k-1}\right],$$

Also, note that

$$\mathbb{P}\left[|\det(M_1)| \leq \varepsilon_1\right] = \mathbb{P}\left[|T_{1,1} + A_{1,1}| \leq \varepsilon_1\right] \stackrel{(2.1)}{\leq} 2b\varepsilon_1.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[|\det(M_n)| \leq \varepsilon_n\right] \leq 2b \left[\varepsilon_1 + \sum_{k=2}^n \frac{\varepsilon_k}{\varepsilon_{k-1}} \right].$$

Choosing $\varepsilon_j = t^{j/n}$, the result follows. \square

Corollary 1.2 now follows immediately.

Proof of Corollary 1.2. Let $s_1(T) \geq \dots \geq s_n(T)$ be the singular values of T . We have

$$|\det(T)| = \prod_{i=1}^n s_i(T) \leq (s_1(T))^n.$$

Thus, by Theorem 1.1,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[s_1(T) \leq t\right] \leq \mathbb{P}\left[|\det(T)|^{1/n} \leq t\right] \leq 2bnt,$$

which proves (1.3).

To prove (1.4), note that

$$|\det(T)| = \prod_{i=1}^n s_i(T) \leq s_1(T)^{n-1} s_n(T) \leq \|T\|^{n-1} s_n(T). \quad (2.2)$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[s_n(T) \leq t\right] \leq \mathbb{P}\left[s_n(T) \leq t \wedge \|T\| \leq \beta\right] + \mathbb{P}\left[\|T\| > \beta\right] \quad (2.3)$$

For the first term, we have by (2.2) and Theorem 1.1,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[s_n(T) \leq t \wedge \|T\| \leq \beta\right] \leq \mathbb{P}\left[\det(T) \leq \beta^{n-1}t\right] \leq 2b\beta^{\frac{n-1}{n}}t^{1/n}.$$

Also,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\|T\| > \beta\right] \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}\|T\|}{\beta}. \quad (2.4)$$

Thus, by (2.3) and (2.4),

$$\mathbb{P}\left[s_n(T) \leq t\right] \leq 2b\beta^{\frac{n-1}{n}}t^{1/n} + \frac{\mathbb{E}\|T\|}{\beta}.$$

Optimizing over β gives (1.4). □

3. THE CASE OF 2×2 MATRICES

As discussed in the introduction, we show that for 2×2 matrices the small ball estimate on the determinant obtained in Theorem 1.1 is not sharp. To do that, we use the well known fact that if X and Y are continuous random variables with joint density function $f_{X,Y}(\cdot, \cdot)$ then $X \cdot Y$ has a density function which is given by

$$f_{X \cdot Y}(z) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_{X,Y}\left(w, \frac{z}{w}\right) \frac{dw}{|w|},$$

where f_X, f_Y are the density functions of X, Y , respectively.

We thus have the following.

Proposition 3.1. *Assume that X and Y are independent continuous random variables, with $f_X \leq b, f_Y \leq b$. Then $f_{X \cdot Y}$, the density function of $X \cdot Y$ satisfies*

$$f_{X \cdot Y}(z) \leq \begin{cases} 2b + 2b^2 |\log(|z|)| & |z| \leq 1, \\ 2b & |z| \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Assume first that $|z| \leq 1$. Write

$$\begin{aligned} f_{X \cdot Y}(z) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_{X,Y}\left(w, \frac{z}{w}\right) \frac{dw}{|w|} \\ &= \int_{|w| \leq |z|} f_{X,Y}\left(w, \frac{z}{w}\right) \frac{dw}{|w|} + \int_{|z| \leq |w| \leq 1} f_{X,Y}\left(w, \frac{z}{w}\right) \frac{dw}{|w|} + \int_{|w| \geq 1} f_{X,Y}\left(w, \frac{z}{w}\right) \frac{dw}{|w|}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

Since X and Y are independent, $f_{X,Y}(x, y) = f_X(x) \cdot f_Y(y)$. We estimate each term of (3.1) separately. Assume first that $|z| \leq 1$

$$\int_{|w| \leq |z|} f_X(w) \cdot f_Y\left(\frac{z}{w}\right) \frac{dw}{|w|} \leq b \int_{|w| \leq |z|} f_Y\left(\frac{z}{w}\right) \frac{dw}{|w|} = b \int_{|y| \geq 1} f_Y(y) \frac{dy}{|y|} \leq b \quad (3.2)$$

$$\int_{|z| \leq |w| \leq 1} f_X(w) \cdot f_Y\left(\frac{z}{w}\right) \frac{dw}{|w|} \leq b^2 \int_{|z| \leq |w| \leq 1} \frac{dw}{|w|} = 2b^2 |\log(|z|)| \quad (3.3)$$

$$\int_{|w| \geq 1} f_X(w) \cdot f_Y\left(\frac{z}{w}\right) \frac{dw}{|w|} \leq b \int_{|w| \geq 1} f_X(w) \frac{dw}{|w|} \leq b. \quad (3.4)$$

Plugging (3.2), (3.3) and (3.4) into (3.1), the result follows for $|z| \leq 1$.

Now, if $|z| \geq 1$, then write

$$\begin{aligned} f_{X \cdot Y}(z) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_{X,Y}\left(w, \frac{z}{w}\right) \frac{dw}{|w|} \\ &= \int_{|w| \leq |z|} f_X(w) \cdot f_Y\left(\frac{z}{w}\right) \frac{dw}{|w|} + \int_{|w| \geq |z|} f_X(w) \cdot f_Y\left(\frac{z}{w}\right) \frac{dw}{|w|}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

For the first term, we have

$$\int_{|w| \leq |z|} f_X(w) \cdot f_Y\left(\frac{z}{w}\right) \frac{dw}{|w|} \leq b \int_{|y| \geq 1} f_Y(y) \frac{dy}{|y|} \leq b. \quad (3.6)$$

And, for the second, by (3.4)

$$\int_{|w| \geq |z|} f_X(w) \cdot f_Y\left(\frac{z}{w}\right) \frac{dw}{|w|} \leq \int_{|w| \geq 1} f_X(w) \cdot f_Y\left(\frac{z}{w}\right) \frac{dw}{|w|} \leq b. \quad (3.7)$$

Plugging (3.6) and (3.7) into (3.5), the result follows. \square

Using Proposition 3.1, we immediately obtain the following:

Corollary 3.1. *Let X and Y be independent continuous random variables. Then for every $t \in (0, 1)$ and every $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[|X \cdot Y + \gamma| < t\right] \leq 4bt + 4b^2t(1 + |\log t|),$$

where $b > 0$ is a uniform upper bound on their densities.

Proof. Note that the function

$$g(z) = (2b + 2b^2 |\log(|z|)|) \mathbb{1}_{\{|z| \leq 1\}} + 2b \mathbb{1}_{\{|z| > 1\}}$$

satisfies $g(|z_1|) \leq g(|z_2|)$ whenever $|z_1| \geq |z_2|$. Thus, we have for every $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $t \in (0, 1)$,

$$\int_{\gamma-t}^{\gamma+t} g(z) dz \leq \int_{-t}^t g(z) dz = \int_{-t}^t (2b + 2b^2 |\log(|z|)|) dz = 4bt + 4b^2t(1 + |\log t|).$$

Thus, by Proposition 3.1 we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left[|X \cdot Y - \gamma| < t\right] \leq \int_{\gamma-t}^{\gamma+t} g(z) dz \leq 4bt + 4b^2t(1 + |\log t|).$$

□

We also obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 3.2. *Let $T = \{T_{i,j}\}_{i,j \leq 2}$ be a random matrix such that $T_{1,1}$ and $T_{2,2}$ are continuous random variables, each independent of all the other entries of T . Then for every $t \in (0, 1)$*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[|\det(T)|^{1/2} \leq t\right] \leq 4bt^2 + 4b^2t^2(1 + 2|\log t|),$$

where $b > 0$ is a uniform upper bound on the densities of $T_{1,1}$, $T_{2,2}$.

Proof. We have,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left[|\det(T)| \leq t\right] &= \mathbb{P}\left[|T_{1,1} \cdot T_{2,2} - T_{1,2} \cdot T_{2,1}| \leq t\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{P}\left[|T_{1,1} \cdot T_{2,2} - T_{1,2} \cdot T_{2,1}| \leq t \mid T_{1,1}, T_{2,2}\right]\right] \\ &\leq \sup_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{P}\left[|T_{1,1} \cdot T_{2,2} + \gamma| < t\right] \\ &\leq 4bt + 4b^2t(1 + |\log t|), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used Corollary 3.1. Replacing t by t^2 , the result follows. □

Acknowledgements. We thank Alexander Litvak and Nicole Tomczak-Jaegermann for helpful discussions and comments.

REFERENCES

- [1] Adamczak, R.; Guédon, O.; Litvak, A.; Pajor, A.; Tomczak-Jaegermann, N. Smallest singular value of random matrices with independent columns, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris, 346 (2008), 853–856.
- [2] ——— Condition number of a square matrix with i.i.d. columns drawn from a convex body. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 140 (2012), no. 3, 987–998.
- [3] Bourgain, J.; Vu, V.; Wood, P. M. On the singularity probability of discrete random matrices. J. Funct. Anal. 258 (2010), no. 2, 559–603.
- [4] Costello, K.; Vu, V. Concentration of random determinants and permanent estimators. SIAM J. Discrete Math. 23 (2009), no. 3, 1356–1371.
- [5] Erdős, L.; Schlein, B.; Yau, H. T. Wegner estimate and level repulsion for Wigner random matrices. Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN 2010, no. 3, 436–479.
- [6] Farrell B.; Vershynin R. Smoothed analysis of symmetric random matrices with continuous distributions. Preprint available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1212.3531>, 2012.

- [7] Maltsev, A.; Schlein, B. A Wegner estimate for Wigner matrices. Entropy and the quantum II, 145–160, Contemp. Math., 552, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2011.
- [8] Nguyen, H. Inverse Littlewood-Offord problems and the singularity of random symmetric matrices. Duke Math. J. 161 (2012), no. 4, 545–586.
- [9] ——— On the least singular value of random symmetric matrices. Electron. J. Probab., 17, 2012, no. 53, 1–19.
- [10] Nguyen, H.; Vu, V. Small ball probability, inverse theorems, and applications. Preprint available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1301.0019>, 2013.
- [11] Rudelson, M. Invertibility of random matrices: norm of the inverse. Ann. of Math. (2) 168 (2008), no. 2, 575–600.
- [12] Rudelson, M.; Vershynin, R. The Littlewood-Offord problem and invertibility of random matrices. Adv. Math. 218 (2008), no. 2, 600–633.
- [13] Sankar, A.; Spielman, D.; Teng, S. H. Smoothed analysis of the condition numbers and growth factors of matrices. SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl. 28 (2006), no. 2, 446–476 (electronic).
- [14] Tao, T.; Vu, V. On random ± 1 matrices: singularity and determinant. Random Structures Algorithms 28 (2006), no. 1, 1–23.
- [15] ——— Inverse Littlewood-Offord theorems and the condition number of random discrete matrices. Ann. of Math. (2) 169 (2009), no. 2, 595–632.
- [16] ——— On the permanent of random Bernoulli matrices. Adv. Math. 220 (2009), no. 3, 657–669.
- [17] ——— Random matrices: the distribution of the smallest singular values. Geom. Funct. Anal. 20 (2010), no. 1, 260–297.
- [18] ——— Smooth analysis of the condition number and the least singular value. Math. Comp. 79 (2010), no. 272, 2333–2352.
- [19] Vershynin, R. Invertibility of symmetric random matrices. To appear in Random Structures and Algorithms. Preprint available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1102.0300>, 2012.

INSTITUT DE MATHÉMATIQUES DE JUSSIEU, UNIVERSITÉ PIERRE ET MARIE CURIE, 4 RUE JUSSIEU,
PARIS, 75005, FRANCE

E-mail address: `friedland@math.jussieu.fr`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL AND STATISTICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA, EDMONTON,
AB T6G 2G1, CANADA

E-mail address: `giladi@ualberta.ca`