

AN EXTREMAL PROBLEM FOR POSITIVE DEFINITE MATRICES

BY

T. W. ANDERSON and I. OLKIN

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 34

JULY 1978

PREPARED UNDER CONTRACT N00014-75-C-0442

(NR-042-034)

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH

THEODORE W. ANDERSON, PROJECT DIRECTOR

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

STANFORD, CALIFORNIA



AN EXTREMAL PROBLEM FOR POSITIVE DEFINITE MATRICES

by

T. W. ANDERSON and I. OLKIN

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 34

JULY 1978

PREPARED UNDER CONTRACT N00014-75-C-0442

(NR-042-034)

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH

Theodore W. Anderson, Project Director

Reproduction in Whole or in Part is Permitted for
any Purpose of the United States Government.
Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

Also issued as Technical Report No. 130 under National Science Foundation
Grant MPS 75-09450 - Department of Statistics, Stanford University.

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

AN EXTREMAL PROBLEM FOR POSITIVE DEFINITE MATRICES

T. W. Anderson and I. Olkin

Stanford University

Abstract

A problem studied by Flanders (1975) is to minimize the function $f(R) = \text{tr}(SR + TR^{-1})$ over the set of positive definite matrices R , where S and T are positive semi-definite matrices. Alternative proofs that may have some intrinsic interest are provided. The proofs explicitly yield the infimum of $f(R)$. One proof is based on a convexity argument and the other on a sequence of reductions to a univariate problem.

1. Introduction.

Flanders (1975) studied a matrix problem that arose in electric circuit theory. Let $z_1, \dots, z_m, w_1, \dots, w_m$ be complex column vectors of length n and consider the real-valued function

$$(1) \quad f(R) = z_1^* R z_1 + \dots + z_m^* R z_m + w_1^* R^{-1} w_1 + \dots + w_m^* R^{-1} w_m,$$

where $R > 0$ denotes an $n \times n$ positive definite Hermitian matrix. The problem is to minimize $f(R)$ over the set of positive definite R .

If we set

$$Z = (z_1, \dots, z_m), \quad W = (w_1, \dots, w_m),$$

$$S = ZZ^*, \quad T = WW^*,$$

then (1) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2) \quad f(R) &= \text{tr } R(z_1 z_1^* + \cdots + z_m z_m^*) + \text{tr } R^{-1}(w_1 w_1^* + \cdots + w_m w_m^*) \\
 &= \text{tr } R Z Z^* + \text{tr } R^{-1} W W^* \\
 &= \text{tr } R S + \text{tr } R^{-1} T,
 \end{aligned}$$

where S and T are positive semi-definite matrices of order n . We shall write $A \geq 0$ and $A > 0$ to denote that A is positive semi-definite and positive definite, respectively.

The result obtained by Flanders (1975) is as follows:

Theorem 1. If $f(R)$ is defined on the set of positive definite matrices by (1) or (2), and if $A = Z^* W$, then

$$(i) \quad \inf_{R > 0} f(R) = 2 \text{tr } (A A^*)^{1/2} = 2 \text{tr } (A^* A)^{1/2},$$

$$(ii) \quad f(R_0) = 2 \text{tr } (A A^*)^{1/2} \quad \text{for some } R_0 > 0 \quad \text{if and only if} \\ \text{rank } (Z) = \text{rank } (W) = \text{rank } (A).$$

Flanders first proves that

$$f(R) \geq 2 \text{tr } (A A^*)^{1/2},$$

and then discusses the approach to equality. However, the matrix R that achieves equality (when the condition of (ii) is satisfied) is not exhibited in any simple manner. We now provide alternative somewhat simpler proofs of (i) that may have some intrinsic interest.

2. Matrices are of full rank.

First Alternative Proof. This proof is based on the fact that $f(R)$ is a convex function of R . The function $\text{tr } RS$ is linear in R , and $\text{tr } R^{-1}T$ is convex in R , i.e.,

$$\text{tr}(\alpha R_1 + (1-\alpha)R_2)^{-1} T \leq \alpha \text{tr } R_1^{-1}T + (1-\alpha) \text{tr } R_2^{-1}T, \quad 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1,$$

for R_1 and R_2 positive definite. The inequality is strict unless $R_1 = R_2$ or $\alpha = 0$ or 1 . Consequently, $f(R)$ is (strictly) convex, and we need to minimize a convex function over a convex set. Since $f(R) \rightarrow \infty$ as $R \rightarrow 0$ or as $R \rightarrow \infty$, the minimum is achieved at an interior point, namely where $df(R)/dR = 0$. But

$$df = \text{tr } S(dR) - \text{tr } R^{-1} (dR)R^{-1}T = \text{tr } dR(S - R^{-1}TR^{-1}) ;$$

so that there is an interior point $\tilde{R}$ satisfying $S - \tilde{R}^{-1}T\tilde{R}^{-1} = 0$, or equivalently,

$$(3) \quad \tilde{R} S \tilde{R} = T ,$$

that is the minimizer of $f(R)$. Note that $\text{tr } \tilde{R}S = \text{tr } \tilde{R}^{-1}T$, so that

$$f(\tilde{R}) = 2 \text{tr } \tilde{R}S .$$

Furthermore, from (3),

$$S^{1/2} \tilde{R} S^{1/2} = (S^{1/2} \tilde{R} S^{1/2})^2 = S^{1/2} T S^{1/2} ;$$

so that

$$S^{1/2} \tilde{R} S^{1/2} = (S^{1/2} T S^{1/2})^{1/2} ,$$

and

$$f(\tilde{R}) = 2 \operatorname{tr} \tilde{R} S = 2 \operatorname{tr} (S^{1/2} T S^{1/2})^{1/2} .$$

Here we have used the positive definite square root. However, any square root, e.g., $S = LL^*$, $T = MM^*$ can be used, in which case the result is

$$f(\tilde{R}) = 2 \operatorname{tr} (L^* M M^* L)^{1/2} = 2 \operatorname{tr} (M^* L L^* M)^{1/2} .$$

Let $\lambda_i(A)$ denote the characteristic roots of the matrix A . Because

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{tr} (L^* M M^* L)^{1/2} &= \sum \lambda_i [(L^* M M^* L)^{1/2}] = \sum [\lambda_i (L^* M M^* L)]^{1/2} \\ &= \sum [\lambda_i (M M^* L L^*)]^{1/2} = \sum [\lambda_i (T S)]^{1/2} , \\ &= \operatorname{tr} (T^{1/2} S T^{1/2})^{1/2} = \operatorname{tr} (S^{1/2} T S^{1/2})^{1/2} , \end{aligned}$$

we see that all square roots yield the same result.

Second Alternative Proof. This proof is based on a sequence of reductions until finally we obtain an extremal problem of distinct variables. There exists a nonsingular matrix H such that

$$T^{-1} = HH^*, \quad S = HD_d H^*,$$

where D_d is a diagonal matrix with real elements $(d_1, \dots, d_n)$ ordered $0 < d_1 \leq \dots \leq d_n$, which are the roots of

$$0 = |S - yT^{-1}| = |T^{-1}| \cdot |ST - yI| = |T^{-1}| \cdot |S^{1/2} T S^{1/2} - yI|.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} f(R) &= \text{tr } RHD_d H^* + \text{tr } R^{-1} H^*^{-1} H^{-1} \\ &= \text{tr } H^* RHD_d + \text{tr } (H^* R H)^{-1} \equiv \text{tr } G D_d + \text{tr } G^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where $G = H^* R H$. Let $G = Q D_\lambda Q^*$, where Q is unitary and $D_\lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ is diagonal with positive diagonal elements ordered $0 < \lambda_n \leq \dots \leq \lambda_1$. The function to be minimized (with respect to Q and D_λ) is

$$(4) \quad \text{tr } Q D_\lambda Q^* D_d + \text{tr } D_\lambda^{-1} = \sum_{i,j=1}^n d_i \lambda_j |q_{ij}|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j^{-1}.$$

By a theorem of von Neumann (1937) [see also Fan (1951)], the minimum of the first sum in (4) with respect to Q is $\sum_{j=1}^n d_j \lambda_j$, and

the minimizing Q is I . Then the minimum of $\sum_{j=1}^n d_j \lambda_j + \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j^{-1}$ with respect to $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$, is attained at $\lambda_j = d_j^{-1/2}$ and the minimized value of (4) is $2 \sum_{j=1}^n d_j^{1/2}$.

Remark. If one or more of the d_j are 0, then the infimum cannot be attained.

The minimizing matrix R is

$$R = (H^*)^{-1} G H^{-1} = (H^*)^{-1} D_d^{-1/2} H^{-1} = (H D_d^{-1/2} H^*)^{-1}.$$

This matrix satisfies (3).

3. Matrices not full of rank.

In the case when $\text{rank}(S)$ and/or $\text{rank}(T)$ is less than n we show how to reduce the problem to a canonical form from which we may then invoke the result for full rank.

Note that $f(R) = \text{tr } RS + \text{tr } R^{-1}T$ is invariant with respect to the transformation

$$(R, S, T) \rightarrow (QRQ^*, Q^{*-1}SQ^{-1}, QTQ^*)$$

for any nonsingular matrix Q . Furthermore, the ranks of S , T and ST are invariant under this transformation. By judiciously choosing a matrix Q we can effect a simplification of the problem.

Theorem 2. If $S \geq 0$, $T \geq 0$, then there exists a nonsingular matrix V such that

$$(5) \quad \tilde{T} = VT V^* = \begin{pmatrix} I_\tau & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{S} \equiv V^{*-1} S V^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} D_d & 0 \\ 0 & M \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\tau = \text{rank}(T)$, $D_d = \text{diag}(d_1, \dots, d_\tau)$, $\text{rank}(M) = \text{rank}(S) - \text{rank}(ST)$, and $\text{rank}(D_d) = \text{rank}(ST)$.

Suppose for the moment that Theorem 2 holds. Then

$$\begin{aligned} f(R) &= \text{tr} R V^* \begin{pmatrix} D_d & 0 \\ 0 & M \end{pmatrix} V + \text{tr} R^{-1} V^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} I_\tau & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} V^{*-1} \\ &= \text{tr} \tilde{R} \begin{pmatrix} D_d & 0 \\ 0 & M \end{pmatrix} + \text{tr} \tilde{R}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} I_\tau & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{R} = VRV^*$. Minimization of $f(R)$ over $R > 0$ is equivalent to minimization over $\tilde{R} > 0$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} f(R) &= \text{tr} \tilde{R}_{11} D_d + \text{tr} \tilde{R}_{22} M + \text{tr} (\tilde{R}^{-1})_{11} \\ &= \text{tr} \tilde{R}_{11} D_d + \text{tr} \tilde{R}_{22} M + \text{tr} (\tilde{R}_{11}^{-1} - \tilde{R}_{12} \tilde{R}_{22}^{-1} \tilde{R}_{21})^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\text{tr} (\tilde{R}_{11}^{-1} - \tilde{R}_{12} \tilde{R}_{22}^{-1} \tilde{R}_{21})^{-1} \geq \text{tr} \tilde{R}_{11}^{-1}$, $f(R)$ is minimized by taking $\tilde{R}_{12} = 0$. Then

$$\text{Min}_{\tilde{R}_{12}, \tilde{R}_{11}, \tilde{R}_{22}} f(R) = \text{Min}_{\tilde{R}_{11}, \tilde{R}_{22}} [\text{tr} \tilde{R}_{11} D_d + \text{tr} \tilde{R}_{11}^{-1} + \text{tr} \tilde{R}_{22} M].$$

Three rank cases need to be considered.

(i) $\text{Rank}(T) > \text{rank}(ST)$. Then one or more of the d_j are 0, in which case the infimum is not attained. (See discussion leading to the remark in the second alternative proof.)

(ii) $\text{Rank}(S) > \text{rank}(ST)$. Then $M \neq 0$ and the infimum of 0 is not attained.

(iii) $\text{Rank}(T) = \text{rank}(S) = \text{rank}(ST)$. Then $M = 0$ and $\text{rank}(D_d) = \tau$, so that

$$\inf_{\tilde{R} > 0} f(\tilde{R}) = \inf_{\tilde{R}_{11} > 0} (\text{tr } \tilde{R}_{11} D_d + \text{tr } \tilde{R}_{11}^{-1})$$

and the problem has been reduced to the case of the one with full rank.

This completes the proof of Theorem 1. ||

To prove Theorem 2 we use the following two lemmas.

Lemma 1. A nonsingular matrix

$$G = \begin{pmatrix} G_{11} & G_{12} \\ G_{21} & G_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \quad G_{11}: \tau \times \tau$$

satisfies

$$(6) \quad G \begin{pmatrix} I_\tau & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} G^* = \begin{pmatrix} I_\tau & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

if and only if $G_{21} = 0$, G_{11} is unitary, and G_{22} is nonsingular.

Proof. Multiply in (6) to obtain $G_{11} G_{11}^* = I_\tau$, $G_{21} G_{21}^* = 0$, from which the conclusion follows. ||

Lemma 2. Given $Q \geq 0$ there exists a G_{12} and a nonsingular G_{22} such that

$$Q_{11} G_{12} + Q_{12} G_{22} = 0.$$

Proof. Q has the triangular decomposition

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} T'_{11} & 0 \\ T'_{12} & T'_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} T_{11} & T_{12} \\ 0 & T_{22} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} T'_{11}T_{11} & T'_{11}T_{12} \\ T'_{12}T_{11} & T'_{12}T_{12} + T'_{22}T_{22} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The rows of (T_{11}, T_{12}) span a space of dimension less than or equal to τ . The $n-\tau$ columns of $\begin{pmatrix} G_{12} \\ G_{22} \end{pmatrix}$ can be chosen to be orthogonal to the rows of (T_{11}, T_{12}) and linearly independent (so that G_{22} is nonsingular). ||

Proof of Theorem 2. Let U be any nonsingular matrix such that

$$T = U \begin{pmatrix} I_\tau & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} U^*,$$

and define

$$\hat{S} = U^* S U,$$

Let G be any nonsingular matrix satisfying Lemma 2 and define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{S} &= G^* \hat{S} G \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} G_{11}^* \hat{S}_{11} G_{11} & G_{11}^* (\hat{S}_{11} G_{12} + \hat{S}_{12} G_{22}) \\ (G_{12}^* \hat{S}_{11} + G_{22}^* \hat{S}_{21}) G_{11} & G_{12}^* (\hat{S}_{11} G_{12} + \hat{S}_{12} G_{22}) + G_{22}^* (\hat{S}_{11} G_{12} + \hat{S}_{22} G_{22}) \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 2, the matrix G_{12} can be chosen so that $\hat{S}_{11} G_{12} + \hat{S}_{12} G_{22} = 0$; so that

$$\tilde{S} = \begin{pmatrix} G_{11}^* \hat{S}_{11} G_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & G_{22}^* (\hat{S}_{21} G_{12} + \hat{S}_{22} G_{22}^{-1}) G_{22} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since G_{11} is unitary, we may choose it to diagonalize $\hat{S}_{11}$. This completes the proof of Theorem 2. $\parallel$

Remark. In the second alternative proof we used the fact that if A and B are positive definite, then both can be diagonalized simultaneously by a nonsingular matrix W, i.e.,

$$(7) \quad A = WW^*, \quad B = WD_{\theta}W^*,$$

where $D_{\theta} = \text{diag}(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n)$, and $\theta_1 \geq \dots \geq \theta_n \geq 0$ are the characteristic roots of $A^{-1}B$. When the hypotheses of positive definiteness are removed the simultaneous decomposition may no longer be accomplished in general. Theorem 2 complements the above result by providing a simultaneous decomposition. This can be stated in a form parallel to (7).

Theorem 3. If $A \geq 0$, $B \geq 0$, then there exists a nonsingular matrix W such that

$$WAW^* = \begin{pmatrix} I_r & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad WBW^* = \begin{pmatrix} D_{\theta} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $D_\theta = \text{diag}(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r)$ are the nonzero characteristic roots of $|B - \theta A| = 0$.

Proof. The result follows from Theorem 2 by noting that if V is a matrix satisfying (5), then for any nonsingular matrix C ,

$$W = V \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & C \end{pmatrix}$$

also satisfies (5). Since $M \geq 0$, there exists a C such that $CMC^* = \text{diag}(I, 0)$. ||

An equivalent form of Theorem 3 was obtained (but not published) by Olkin (1951). We suspect that this result is even older, but have not been able to locate a reference.

References

1. Fan, K. (1951). Maximum Properties and Inequalities for the Eigenvalues of Completely Continuous Operators. Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA 37, 760-766.
2. Flanders, H. (1975). An Extremal Problem in the Space of Positive Definite Matrices. Linear and Multilinear Algebra 3, 33-39.
3. Von Neumann, J. (1937). Some Matrix Inequalities and Metrization of Matric-Space. Tomsk, University Review 1, 286-300.
Reprinted in John Von Neumann Collected Works, Vol. 4, (ed. by A.H. Taub), Pergamon Press, New York, 1962.
4. Olkin, I. (1951). On Distribution Problems in Multivariate Analysis. Thesis, (Technical Report) University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C.

TECHNICAL REPORTS

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH CONTRACT N00014-67-A-0112-0030 (NR-042-034)

1. "Confidence Limits for the Expected Value of an Arbitrary Bounded Random Variable with a Continuous Distribution Function," T. W. Anderson, October 1, 1969.
2. "Efficient Estimation of Regression Coefficients in Time Series," T. W. Anderson, October 1, 1970.
3. "Determining the Appropriate Sample Size for Confidence Limits for a Proportion," T. W. Anderson and H. Burstein, October 15, 1970.
4. "Some General Results on Time-Ordered Classification," D. V. Hinkley, July 30, 1971.
5. "Tests for Randomness of Directions against Equatorial and Bimodal Alternatives," T. W. Anderson and M. A. Stephens, August 30, 1971.
6. "Estimation of Covariance Matrices with Linear Structure and Moving Average Processes of Finite Order," T. W. Anderson, October 29, 1971.
7. "The Stationarity of an Estimated Autoregressive Process," T. W. Anderson, November 15, 1971.
8. "On the Inverse of Some Covariance Matrices of Toeplitz Type," Raul Pedro Mentz, July 12, 1972.
9. "An Asymptotic Expansion of the Distribution of "Studentized" Classification Statistics," T. W. Anderson, September 10, 1972.
10. "Asymptotic Evaluation of the Probabilities of Misclassification by Linear Discriminant Functions," T. W. Anderson, September 28, 1972.
11. "Population Mixing Models and Clustering Algorithms," Stanley L. Sclove, February 1, 1973.
12. "Asymptotic Properties and Computation of Maximum Likelihood Estimates in the Mixed Model of the Analysis of Variance," John James Miller, November 21, 1973.
13. "Maximum Likelihood Estimation in the Birth-and-Death Process," Niels Keiding, November 28, 1973.
14. "Random Orthogonal Set Functions and Stochastic Models for the Gravity Potential of the Earth," Steffen L. Lauritzen, December 27, 1973.
15. "Maximum Likelihood Estimation of Parameters of an Autoregressive Process with Moving Average Residuals and Other Covariance Matrices with Linear Structure," T. W. Anderson, December, 1973.
16. "Note on a Case-Study in Box-Jenkins Seasonal Forecasting of Time series," Steffen L. Lauritzen, April, 1974.

TECHNICAL REPORTS (continued)

17. "General Exponential Models for Discrete Observations,"
Steffen L. Lauritzen, May, 1974.
18. "On the Interrelationships among Sufficiency, Total Sufficiency and
Some Related Concepts," Steffen L. Lauritzen, June, 1974.
19. "Statistical Inference for Multiply Truncated Power Series Distributions,"
T. Cacoullos, September 30, 1974.

Office of Naval Research Contract N00014-75-C-0442 (NR-042-034)

20. "Estimation by Maximum Likelihood in Autoregressive Moving Average Models
in the Time and Frequency Domains," T. W. Anderson, June 1975.
21. "Asymptotic Properties of Some Estimators in Moving Average Models,"
Raul Pedro Mentz, September 8, 1975.
22. "On a Spectral Estimate Obtained by an Autoregressive Model Fitting,"
Mituaki Huzii, February 1976.
23. "Estimating Means when Some Observations are Classified by Linear
Discriminant Function," Chien-Pai Han, April 1976.
24. "Panels and Time Series Analysis: Markov Chains and Autoregressive
Processes," T. W. Anderson, July 1976.
25. "Repeated Measurements on Autoregressive Processes," T. W. Anderson,
September 1976.
26. "The Recurrence Classification of Risk and Storage Processes,"
J. Michael Harrison and Sidney I. Resnick, September 1976.
27. "The Generalized Variance of a Stationary Autoregressive Process,"
T. W. Anderson and Raul P. Mentz, October 1976.
28. "Estimation of the Parameters of Finite Location and Scale Mixtures,"
Javad Behboodian, October 1976.
29. "Identification of Parameters by the Distribution of a Maximum
Random Variable," T. W. Anderson and S.G. Ghurye, November 1976.
30. "Discrimination Between Stationary Gaussian Processes, Large Sample
Results," Will Gersch, January 1977.
31. "Principal Components in the Nonnormal Case: The Test for Sphericity,"
Christine M. Waternaux, October 1977.
32. "Nonnegative Definiteness of the Estimated Dispersion Matrix in a
Multivariate Linear Model," F. Pukelsheim and George P.H. Styan, May 1978.

TECHNICAL REPORTS (continued)

33. "Canonical Correlations with Respect to a Complex Structure,"
Steen A. Andersson, July 1978.
34. "An Extremal Problem for Positive Definite Matrices," T.W. Anderson and
I. Olkin, July 1978.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER 34	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) AN EXTREMAL PROBLEM FOR POSITIVE DEFINITE MATRICES		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Technical Report
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) T. W. ANDERSON and I. OLKIN		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) N00014-75-C-0442
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Department of Statistics Stanford University Stanford, California		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS (NR-042-034)
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Office of Naval Research Statistics & Probability Program Code 436 Arlington, Virginia 22217		12. REPORT DATE July 1978
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 12
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (If different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Issued also as Technical Report No. 130 under National Science Foundation Grant MPS 75-09450 - Department of Statistics, Stanford University		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Extremal problem, positive definite matrices, electric circuit theory, diagonalization of matrices		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) A problem studied by Flanders (1975) is to minimize the function $f(R) = \text{tr}(SR + TR^{-1})$ over the set of positive definite matrices R , where S and T are positive semi-definite matrices of rank m . Alternative proofs that may have some intrinsic interest are provided. The proofs explicitly yield the infimum to $f(R)$. One proof is based on a convexity argument and the other on a sequence of reductions to a univariate problem.		