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#### Abstract

Let $L$ be a lower triangular $n \times n$-Toeplitz matrix with first column $(\mu, \alpha, \beta, \alpha, \beta, \ldots)^{T}$, where $\mu, \alpha, \beta \geq 0$ fulfill $\alpha-\beta \in[0,1)$ and $\alpha \in$ $[1, \mu+3]$. Furthermore let $D$ be the diagonal matrix with diagonal entries $1,2, \ldots, n$. We prove that the smallest singular value of the matrix $A:=$ $L+D$ is bounded from below by a constant $\omega=\omega(\mu, \alpha, \beta)>0$ which is independent of the dimension $n$. Mathematics Subject Classification (2010). Primary 15A18, Secondary 15B05.
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In the "Open problems" session of the workshop "Numerical Verification (NIVEA) 2019" in Hokkaido, Yoshitaka Watanabe from Kyushu University posed the problem to bound the smallest singular value of a specific infinite dimensional triangular matrix. The problem arises in the rigorous estimation of an error constant in the Fourier expansion related to numerical verification of the solution of some ordinary differential equation.

In the following we prove such a bound in a more general setting. The original problem is stated as Example 2 at the end of this note.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}:=\{1,2,3, \ldots\}, \mu, \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$, and let $A$ be the lower triangular matrix with

$$
A:=\left(\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\mu+1 & & & & & &  \tag{1}\\
\alpha & \mu+2 & & & & & \\
\beta & \alpha & \mu+3 & & & & \\
\alpha & \beta & \alpha & \mu+4 & & & \\
\beta & \alpha & \beta & \alpha & \mu+5 & & \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \\
\cdots & \cdots & \beta & \alpha & \beta & \alpha & \mu+n
\end{array}\right) .
$$

[^0]In the mentioned application the question arose under which conditions the smallest singular value $\sigma_{n}$ of such Toeplitz-like matrices with linearly increasing diagonal entries is uniformly bounded from below by a positive constant independent of $n$. We will prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1. Let $\mu, \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ fulfill

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \leq \beta \leq \alpha<\beta+1 \quad \text { and } \quad 1 \leq \alpha \leq \mu+3 \quad \text { and } \quad \mu>0 \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then, the matrix $A$ defined in (1) satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|A^{-1}\right\|_{F}^{-1} \geq \sqrt{\frac{\mu+1}{1+\theta(\mu)}}=: \omega \quad \text { where } \theta(\mu):=\frac{\alpha^{2} \mu(1+4 / \mu)^{2-\alpha+\beta}}{(1-\alpha+\beta)(\mu+2)^{2}} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $\|\cdot\|_{F}$ denotes the Frobenius norm. Thus, $\omega$ is a uniform lower bound for the smallest singular value $\sigma_{n}$ of $A$ independent of the dimension $n$.

Replacing the $i$-th row of $A$ by the $i$-th row minus the $(i-2)$-nd row for $i=n, n-1, \ldots, 4$ is performed by multiplying $A$ from the left by the matrix

$$
R:=\left(\begin{array}{c|ccccc}
1 & & & & &  \tag{4}\\
\hline & 1 & & & & \\
& 0 & 1 & & & \\
& & 0 & 1 & & \\
& & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \\
& & & -1 & 0 & 1
\end{array}\right)
$$

Note that $R$ is the identity matrix if $n \in\{1,2,3\}$. For example, for $n=7$ the row-transformed matrix $\tilde{A}:=R A$ reads

$$
\tilde{A}:=\left(\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\mu+1 & & & & & & \\
\alpha & \mu+2 & & & & & \\
\beta & \alpha & \mu+3 & & \mu+4 & & \\
& \beta-\mu-2 & \alpha & \mu+5 & & \\
& & \beta-\mu-3 & \alpha & \mu+5 & \mu+6 & \\
& & & \beta-\mu-4 & \alpha & \beta-\mu-5 & \alpha \\
& & & & \beta+7
\end{array}\right) .
$$

The first column $c$ of $A^{-1}$ is the solution of the linear system $A c=e_{1}$, where $e_{1}=(1,0, \ldots, 0)^{T}$ is the first standard basis vector. Since $R e_{1}=e_{1}$, we have $\tilde{A} c=e_{1}$. i.e., $c$ is also the first column of $\tilde{A}^{-1}$ which computes recursively to

$$
\begin{align*}
& c_{1}=\frac{1}{\mu+1}  \tag{5}\\
& c_{2}=\frac{-\alpha c_{1}}{\mu+2}  \tag{6}\\
& c_{3}=\frac{-\alpha c_{2}-\beta c_{1}}{\mu+3}  \tag{7}\\
& c_{i}=\frac{-\alpha c_{i-1}+(\mu+i-2-\beta) c_{i-2}}{\mu+i} \quad \text { for } i \geq 4 \tag{8}
\end{align*}
$$

Until further notice we will only use

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \leq \beta \leq \alpha \leq \beta+2 \quad \text { and } \quad 1 \leq \alpha \leq \mu+3 \quad \text { and } \quad \mu \geq 0 \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is weaker than (2). Define

$$
\begin{align*}
\psi_{k} & :=\frac{\mu+2 k-2+\alpha-\beta}{\mu+2 k} \quad \text { for } k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}  \tag{10}\\
\varphi_{k} & :=\prod_{j=2}^{k} \psi_{j} \quad \text { for } k \in \mathbb{N} . \tag{11}
\end{align*}
$$

Note that $\varphi_{1}:=1$, by definition of an empty product, and that $\psi_{k}, \varphi_{k} \leq 1$ by (9). We will now prove by induction that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|c_{2 k}\right| \leq \varphi_{k}\left|c_{2}\right| \quad \text { and } \quad\left|c_{2 k+1}\right| \leq \varphi_{k}\left|c_{2}\right| \quad \text { for all } k \in \mathbb{N} \text {. } \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $\varphi_{1}=1$, the left inequality of 12 is trivial for $k=1$ and the right inequality follows from (6), (7), and (9):

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|c_{3}\right| & =\frac{\left|\beta c_{1}-\alpha\right| c_{2}| |}{\mu+3}=\frac{\left|\frac{\beta(\mu+2)}{\alpha}-\alpha\right|}{\mu+3} \cdot\left|c_{2}\right| \leq \max \left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha} \cdot \frac{\mu+2}{\mu+3}, \frac{\alpha}{\mu+3}\right) \cdot\left|c_{2}\right| \\
& \leq\left|c_{2}\right|
\end{aligned}
$$

For $k \geq 1$, using induction and (8), we derive

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|c_{2 k+2}\right| & \leq \frac{\alpha\left|c_{2 k+1}\right|+(\mu+2 k-\beta)\left|c_{2 k}\right|}{\mu+2 k+2} \leq \frac{\alpha+\mu+2 k-\beta}{\mu+2 k+2} \varphi_{k}\left|c_{2}\right| \\
& =\psi_{k+1} \varphi_{k}\left|c_{2}\right|=\varphi_{k+1}\left|c_{2}\right| \tag{13}
\end{align*}
$$

This is the left inequality of (12) for $k+1$. For the right inequality we use (8), (13), and the induction hypothesis $\left|c_{2 k+1}\right| \leq \varphi_{k}\left|c_{2}\right|$ to obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|c_{2 k+3}\right| & \leq \frac{\alpha\left|c_{2 k+2}\right|+(\mu+2 k+1-\beta)\left|c_{2 k+1}\right|}{\mu+2 k+3} \\
& \leq \frac{\alpha \psi_{k+1}+\mu+2 k+1-\beta}{\mu+2 k+3} \cdot \varphi_{k}\left|c_{2}\right|
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, since $\varphi_{k+1}=\psi_{k+1} \varphi_{k}$, it remains to show that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\alpha \psi_{k+1}+\mu+2 k+1-\beta}{\mu+2 k+3} \leq \psi_{k+1} . \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

By (9), $\mu+2 k+3-\alpha \geq 2 k>0$ and $2-(\alpha-\beta) \geq 0$, so that (14) transforms to

$$
\begin{array}{ll} 
& \frac{\mu+2 k+1-\beta}{\mu+2 k+3-\alpha} \leq \psi_{k+1} \\
\Leftrightarrow \quad & 1-\frac{2-(\alpha-\beta)}{\mu+2 k+3-\alpha} \leq \psi_{k+1}=1-\frac{2-(\alpha-\beta)}{\mu+2 k+2} \\
\Leftarrow \quad & \mu+2 k+3-\alpha \leq \mu+2 k+2 \\
\Leftrightarrow \quad & 1 \leq \alpha .
\end{array}
$$

Since $\alpha \geq 1$ holds true by (9), this finishes the proof of 12 .
The recurrence relation $\Gamma(z+1)=z \Gamma(z)$ of the gamma function gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
\prod_{k=0}^{m} \frac{x+k}{y+k}=\frac{\Gamma(y) \Gamma(x+m+1)}{\Gamma(x) \Gamma(y+m+1)} \quad \text { for } x, y \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \text { and } m \in \mathbb{N} \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

because

$$
\frac{\Gamma(x+m+1)}{\Gamma(y+m+1)}=\frac{\Gamma(x+m)}{\Gamma(y+m)} \cdot \frac{x+m}{y+m}=\cdots=\frac{\Gamma(x)}{\Gamma(y)} \prod_{k=0}^{m} \frac{x+k}{y+k}
$$

Abbreviate, for $m \geq 1$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
z_{m}:=\max \left(\left|c_{2 m}\right|,\left|c_{2 m+1}\right|\right), \quad \hat{x}:=(\mu+\alpha-\beta) / 2+1, \quad \hat{y}:=\mu / 2+2 . \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that $z_{1}=\left|c_{2}\right|$ by the right inequality in 12 for $k=1$. Then $\psi_{k}=\frac{\hat{x}+k-2}{\hat{y}+k-2}$ for $k \geq 2$, and by (9) and $\mu \geq 0$ we have $\hat{x} \geq 1>0$ and $\hat{y} \geq 2>0$. Thus, (12) and (15) imply
$z_{m} \leq \prod_{k=2}^{m} \frac{\hat{x}+k-2}{\hat{y}+k-2} \cdot z_{1}=\prod_{k=0}^{m-2} \frac{\hat{x}+k}{\hat{y}+k} \cdot z_{1}=\frac{\Gamma(\hat{y}) \Gamma(\hat{x}+m-1)}{\Gamma(\hat{x}) \Gamma(\hat{y}+m-1)} \cdot z_{1}$.
Next, recall Gautschi's inequality for the gamma function (1], 5.6.4, p. 138):

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{1-r} \leq \frac{\Gamma(x+1)}{\Gamma(x+r)} \leq(x+1)^{1-r} \quad \text { for } x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \text { and } r \in[0,1]^{1} \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

and also the remainder estimate for the Hurwitz zeta function $\zeta(s, q):=$ $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(k+q)^{-s}$, see [1], 25.11.5, p. 608:

$$
\begin{align*}
\sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(k+q)^{s}} & =\zeta(s, q)-\sum_{k=0}^{N} \frac{1}{(k+q)^{s}} \\
& =\frac{(N+q)^{1-s}}{s-1}-s \int_{N}^{\infty} \frac{x-\lfloor x\rfloor}{(x+q)^{s+1}} d x \\
& \leq \frac{(N+q)^{1-s}}{s-1} \quad \text { for } s>1, q>0, N \in \mathbb{N}_{0} \tag{19}
\end{align*}
$$

Since $r:=\hat{x}-\hat{y}+1=\frac{\alpha-\beta}{2} \in[0,1]$, 17) and (18) with $x:=\hat{x}-r=\hat{y}-1>0$ and $x:=\hat{y}+m-2>0$, respectively, imply

$$
\begin{aligned}
z_{m} & \leq \frac{\Gamma(\hat{y})}{\Gamma(\hat{x})} \cdot \frac{\Gamma(\hat{x}+m-1)}{\Gamma(\hat{y}+m-1)} z_{1} \leq \hat{y}^{1-r}(\hat{y}-2+m)^{r-1} z_{1} \\
& =(\mu / 2+2)^{1-\frac{\alpha-\beta}{2}}(\mu / 2+m)^{\frac{\alpha-\beta}{2}-1} z_{1} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Using $z_{1}=\left|c_{2}\right|$, set

$$
\begin{equation*}
\nu:=\left((\mu / 2+2)^{1-\frac{\alpha-\beta}{2}} z_{1}\right)^{2}=(\mu / 2+2)^{2-(\alpha-\beta)} \frac{\alpha^{2}}{(\mu+1)^{2}(\mu+2)^{2}} . \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

[^1]From now on, we need the original assumption (22). Then, using (19) with $s:=2-(\alpha-\beta)>1, q:=\mu / 2>0$, and $N:=0$, the Euclidean norm of $z=\left(z_{m}\right)_{m=1, \ldots,\lfloor n / 2\rfloor}$ is bounded by

$$
\begin{align*}
\|z\|^{2} & \leq \nu \cdot \sum_{m=1}^{\infty}(\mu / 2+m)^{\alpha-\beta-2} \leq \nu \cdot \frac{(\mu / 2)^{\alpha-\beta-1}}{1-\alpha+\beta} \\
& =\frac{\alpha^{2}}{(1-\alpha+\beta)} \cdot \frac{(\mu+4)(1+4 / \mu)^{1-\alpha+\beta}}{(\mu+2)^{2}} \cdot \frac{1}{2(\mu+1)^{2}} \\
& =\frac{\theta(\mu)}{2(\mu+1)^{2}} \tag{21}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\theta(\mu)$ is defined by (3). For later use, we note that $\theta(\mu)$ is monotonically decreasing. This is because both functions $\frac{(\mu+4)}{(\mu+2)^{2}}$ and $(1+4 / \mu)^{1-\alpha+\beta}$ decrease in $\mu$, where $1-\alpha+\beta>0$ is used. Combining (5), 16), and (21) supplies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|c\|^{2} \leq c_{1}^{2}+2\|z\|^{2} \leq \frac{1+\theta(\mu)}{(\mu+1)^{2}} \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

For $j \in\{1, \ldots, n\}$ let $\widehat{A}$ denote the lower right submatrix of $A$ of order $n-j+1$. Then $\widehat{A}$ has the same pattern as $A$ with $\hat{\mu}:=\mu+j$ instead of $\mu$. Since $A$ is a lower triangular matrix, $\widehat{A}^{-1}$ is the lower right submatrix of $A^{-1}$. Thus, the norm of the first column $\hat{c}$ of $\widehat{A}^{-1}$ is that of the $j$-th column of $A^{-1}$. From 22) and since $\theta(\mu)$ is decreasing it follows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|\hat{c}\|^{2} \leq \frac{1+\theta(\mu+j)}{(\mu+j+1)^{2}} \leq \frac{1+\theta(\mu)}{(\mu+j+1)^{2}} \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus, using also 19 with $s:=2, q:=\mu+1$, and $N:=0$, the Frobenius norm of $A^{-1}$ is estimated by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|A^{-1}\right\|_{F}^{2} \leq(1+\theta(\mu)) \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(\mu+j+1)^{2}} \leq \frac{1+\theta(\mu)}{\mu+1} \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore the smallest singular value $\sigma_{n}$ of $A$ is bounded from below by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma_{n} \geq \sqrt{\frac{\mu+1}{1+\theta(\mu)}}=: \omega \tag{25}
\end{equation*}
$$

and this positive lower bound $\omega$ does not depend on the dimension $n$.

Example 2. The original values in Watanabe's problem are $\alpha:=\frac{7}{3}, \beta:=\frac{5}{3}$, $\mu:=100-\frac{1}{6}$, and they fulfill (2).

For Watanabe's problem we obtain $\omega=9.300556 \ldots$... The following MATLAB program computes for varying dimension $n$ the smallest singular value $\sigma_{n}$ of $A$ as well as $\left\|A^{-1}\right\|_{F}^{-1}$ and plots the result. The figure shows that $\omega$ is close to the asymptotically sharp lower bound of $\left\|A^{-1}\right\|_{F}^{-1}$ which seems to be about 10 .

The asymptotically sharp lower bound for $\sigma_{n}$ seems to be about 98 which is a factor 10.5 larger than $\omega$.

```
alpha = 7/3;
beta = 5/3;
mu = 100-1/6;
theta = alpha^2*mu*(1+4/mu)^(2-alpha+beta)/((1-alpha+beta)*(mu+2)^2);
omega = sqrt((mu+1)/(1+theta));
N = [5:9,10:10:1000];
sigma_n = zeros(size(N));
f = zeros(size(N));
for i = 1:length(N)
    n = N(i);
    col = zeros(n,1);
    col(2:2:end) = alpha;
    col(3:2:end) = beta;
    A = toeplitz(col,zeros(1,n)) + diag(mu+(1:n));
    B = inv(A);
    sigma_n(i) = min(svd(A));
    f(i) = 1/norm(B,'fro');
end
plot(N,sigma_n,'.r',N,f,'.g',N,omega*ones(size(N)),'.b');
legend({'\sigma_n','||A^{-1}||_F`{-1}','\omega'},'FontSize',14)
xlabel('n'); axis([min(N),max(N),0,110]); grid on
```
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