

# Another combinatorial determinant

Kiran S. Kedlaya  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

May 18, 1999

The following result, a special case of a theorem of Mina [1], was recently given an elegant proof by Wilf [2].

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $f = 1 + a_1x + a_2x^2 + \cdots$  be a formal power series, and define a matrix  $c$  by*

$$c_{i,j} = [x^j]f^i \quad (i, j \geq 0).$$

(Here  $[x^j]f$  denotes the coefficient of  $x^j$  in  $f$ .) Then

$$\det((c_{i,j})_{i,j=0}^n) = a_1^{n(n+1)/2} \quad (n = 0, 1, 2, \dots).$$

The purpose of this paper is to show that this result remains essentially unchanged if we take powers in the sense of composition, instead of multiplication.

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $f = x + b_1x^2 + b_2x^3 + \cdots$  be a formal power series, and define  $f^{(0)} = x$  and  $f^{(i)} = f(f^{(i-1)})$  for  $i > 0$ . Define a matrix  $c$  by*

$$c_{i,j} = [x^{j+1}]f^{(i)} \quad (i, j \geq 0).$$

Then

$$\det((c_{i,j})_{i,j=0}^n) = 1!2! \cdots n! b_1^{n(n+1)/2} \quad (n = 0, 1, 2, \dots).$$

In fact, we prove both of these theorems at once, by formulating and proving a common generalization. In both theorems, each row of the matrix is obtained from the previous row by applying a certain transformation of power series: in Theorem 1, the transformation is

$$t \mapsto t(1 + a_1x + a_2x^2 + \cdots),$$

while in Theorem 2, the transformation is

$$t \mapsto t + b_1t^2 + b_2t^3 + \cdots.$$

This suggests that more generally, we should consider transformations of the form

$$t \mapsto f(t) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_{m,n} t^m x^n.$$

**Theorem 3.** Let  $f(t) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_{m,n} t^m x^n$  be a formal power series in two variables  $t$  and  $x$ , and assume  $b_{1,0} = 1$ . Define  $f^{(0)}(t) = t$  and  $f^{(i)}(t) = f(f^{(i-1)}(t))$  for  $i > 0$ . Define a matrix  $c$  by

$$c_{i,j} = [x^{j+1}]f^{(i)}(x) \quad (i, j \geq 0).$$

Then

$$\det((c_{i,j})_{i,j=0}^n) = \prod_{k=1}^n \left( \sum_{m=0}^k m! \left\{ \begin{matrix} k+1 \\ m+1 \end{matrix} \right\} b_{2,0}^m b_{1,1}^{k-m} \right) \quad (n = 0, 1, 2, \dots),$$

where  $\left\{ \begin{matrix} x \\ y \end{matrix} \right\}$  is the Stirling number of the second kind (the number of partitions of  $x$  labeled objects into  $y$  nonempty sets).

*Proof.* Following [2], we prove that the matrix

$$b_{i,j} = (-1)^{i+j} \binom{i}{j} \quad (i, j \geq 0)$$

has the property that  $bc$  is upper triangular. Put

$$g_i(t) = \sum_k (-1)^{i+k} \binom{i}{k} f^{(k)}(t);$$

then  $(bc)_{i,j} = [x^j]g_i(x)$ , and the theorem will follow from the fact that

$$g_i(t) = \sum_{j=0}^i j! \left\{ \begin{matrix} i+1 \\ j+1 \end{matrix} \right\} b_{2,0}^j b_{1,1}^{i-j} t^{j+1} x^{i-j} + \text{higher-order terms},$$

which we prove by induction on  $i$  (the case  $i = 0$  being true by definition). If we write  $g_{i-1}(t) = \sum_{m,n} k_{m,n} t^{m+1} x^n$  (so in particular,  $k_{m,n} = 0$  for  $m+n < i-1$  and  $k_{m,n} = m! \left\{ \begin{matrix} m+n+1 \\ m+1 \end{matrix} \right\} b_{2,0}^m b_{1,1}^n$  for  $m+n = i-1$ ), then

$$\begin{aligned} g_i(t) &= g_{i-1}(f(t)) - g_{i-1}(f(t)) \\ &= \sum_{m,n} k_{m,n} x^n (f(t)^{m+1} - t^{m+1}) \\ &= \sum_{m,n} k_{m,n} x^n t^{m+1} [(m+1)(f(t)/t - 1) - \binom{m+1}{2} (f(t)/t - 1)^2 + \dots] \\ &= \sum_{m+n=i-1} (m+1) k_{m,n} t^{m+1} x^n (b_{2,0}t + b_{1,1}x) + \text{higher-order terms} \\ &= \sum_{m+n=i} t^{m+1} x^n [(m+1)b_{1,1}k_{m,n-1} + mb_{2,0}k_{m-1,n}] + \text{higher-order terms} \\ &= \sum_{m+n=i} t^{m+1} x^n m! b_{2,0}^m b_{1,1}^n \left( \left\{ \begin{matrix} i \\ m \end{matrix} \right\} + (m+1) \left\{ \begin{matrix} i \\ m+1 \end{matrix} \right\} \right) + \text{higher-order terms} \\ &= \sum_{m+n=i} t^{m+1} x^n m! b_{2,0}^m b_{1,1}^n \left\{ \begin{matrix} i+1 \\ m \end{matrix} \right\} + \text{higher-order terms}, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

It should be pointed out that the full version of Mina's theorem, which states that

$$\det \left\{ \left( \frac{d^j}{dx^j} f(x)^i \right)_{i,j=0}^n \right\} = 1!2! \cdots n! f'(x)^{n(n+1)/2},$$

does not appear to admit an analogous generalization. The difficulty seems to be that while Mina's theorem follows from applying Theorem 1 to the Taylor expansion of  $f(x)/f(t)$  at  $t$  for each  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , Theorem 2 can only be applied to the Taylor expansion of  $f$  at its fixed points.

## References

- [1] L. Mina, Formole generali delle derivate successive d'una funzione espressa mediante quelle della sua inverse, *Giornale di Mat.* **xliii** (1904), 196-212.
- [2] H. Wilf, A combinatorial determinant, to appear in *J. Comb. Theory Series A*.