2002

A Partial Order on the Orthogonal Group

Colum Watt
Technological University Dublin, colum.watt@TUDublin.ie

Thomas Brady
Dublin City University, thomas.brady@dcu.ie

Recommended Citation

Watt, C., Brady, T. : A Partial Order on the Orthogonal Group. Communications in Algebra, Vol. 30, (2002), no. 8, pp 3749–3754 doi.org/10.21427/gbt1-8m22

A partial order on the Orthogonal Group

Thomas Brady
School of Mathematical Sciences
Dublin City University
Glasnevin, Dublin 9
Ireland
tom.brady@dcu.ie

Colum Watt
School of Mathematics
Trinity College
Dublin 2
Ireland
colum@maths.tcd.ie

Abstract: We define a natural partial order on the orthogonal group and completely describe the intervals in this partial order. The main technical ingredient is that an orthogonal transformation induces a unique orthogonal transformation on each subspace of the orthogonal complement of its fixed subspace.

Keywords: orthogonal group, partial order.

Let V be an n-dimensional vector space over a field $\mathbf{F}$ and let $O(V)$ be the orthogonal group of V with respect to a fixed anisotropic symmetric bilinear form $\langle\ ,\ \rangle$. In this note we will define a natural partial order on $O(V)$ and completely describe the intervals in this partial order. The main technical ingredient is that an orthogonal transformation A on V induces a unique orthogonal transformation on each subspace of the orthogonal complement of the fixed subspace of A.

Recall that $A \in O(V)$ if $A : V \to V$ is linear and satisfies $\langle A(\vec{v}), A(\vec{w})\rangle = \langle \vec{v}, \vec{w}\rangle$ for all $\vec{v}, \vec{w} \in V$. For standard results on symmetric bilinear forms and their associated orthogonal groups see [**1**], but note that we are making the further assumption that the form is anisotropic.

For each $A \in O(V)$, we define two subspaces of V, $F(A) = \ker(A - I)$ and $M(A) = \mathrm{im}(A - I)$, where I is the identity operator on V. We note that $F(A)$ is the $+1$-eigenspace of A, sometimes called the fixed subspace of A. We will write $V = V_1 \perp V_2$ whenever V is the orthogonal direct sum of subspaces V_1 and V_2.

Proposition 1 $V = F(A) \perp M(A)$

Proof. Since the dimensions of $F(A)$ and $M(A)$ are complementary and the form is anisotropic, it suffices to show that these subspaces are orthogonal. So let $\vec{x} \in F(A)$ and $\vec{y} \in M(A)$. Then $\vec{x} = A(\vec{x})$ and $\vec{y} = (A - I)\vec{z}$ for some $\vec{z} \in V$. Thus

$$\langle \vec{x}, \vec{y} \rangle = \langle \vec{x}, (A - I)\vec{z} \rangle = \langle \vec{x}, A(\vec{z}) \rangle - \langle \vec{x}, \vec{z} \rangle = \langle A(\vec{x}), A(\vec{z}) \rangle - \langle \vec{x}, \vec{z} \rangle = 0.$$

q.e.d.

We will be concerned with how the dimensions of these subspaces behave when we take products in $O(V)$. For notational convenience we will write $|U|$ for $\dim(U)$.

Proposition 2 $|M(AB)| \leq |M(A)| + |M(B)|$ *for* $A, B \in O(V)$.

Proof. Using the identities $|U| + |V| = |U + V| + |U \cap V|$, $F(A) \cap F(B) \subseteq F(AB)$ and $F(A) + F(B) \subseteq V$ we find that

$$|F(A)| + |F(B)| = |F(A) + F(B)| + |F(A) \cap F(B)| \leq n + |F(AB)|,$$

from which the result follows. q.e.d.

This result is proved in a more general setting in [**2**]. However, from the proof above we see that equality occurs if and only if

$$F(A) \cap F(B) = F(AB) \quad \text{and} \quad F(A) + F(B) = V.$$

Thus, using the identities $[U + V]^{\perp} = U^{\perp} \cap V^{\perp}$ and $U^{\perp} + V^{\perp} = [U \cap V]^{\perp}$ we get the following characterization.

Corollary 1 $|M(AB)| = |M(A)| + |M(B)| \Leftrightarrow M(AB) = M(A) \oplus M(B)$.

Definition 1 *We will write* $A \leq C$ *if* $|M(C)| = |M(A)| + |M(A^{-1}C)|$.

Proposition 3 *The relation* $\leq$ *is a partial order on* $O(V)$ *and satisfies*

$$A \leq B \leq C \Rightarrow A^{-1}B \leq A^{-1}C.$$

Proof. Reflexivity is immediate. To establish antisymmetry suppose $A \le C$ and $C \le A$. Then

$$|M(C)| = |M(A)| + |M(A^{-1}C)| = |M(C)| + |M(C^{-1}A)| + |M(A^{-1}C)|$$

giving $F(C^{-1}A) = F(A^{-1}C) = V$ or $A = C$.

To establish transitivity, suppose $A \le B$ and $B \le C$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |M(C)| &\le |M(A)| + |M(A^{-1}C)| \\ &= |M(A)| + |M(A^{-1}BB^{-1}C)| \\ &\le |M(A)| + |M(A^{-1}B)| + |M(B^{-1}C)| \\ &= |M(A)| + \{|M(B)| - |M(A)|\} + \{|M(C)| - |M(B)|\} \\ &= |M(C)| \end{aligned}$$

So both of the inequalities are actually equalities. The first line gives $A \le C$ and $\le$ is transitive. The third line gives the second assertion above. q.e.d.

The association of the subspace $M(A)$ to an element $A \in O(V)$ defines a map M from $O(V)$ to the set of subspaces of V. The next sequence of lemmas shows that the restriction of M to the interval $[I, C] = \{A \in O(V) \mid A \le C\}$ is a bijection onto the set of subspaces of $M(C)$.

In what follows we fix C and a subspace W of $M(C)$ and we suppose that $A \in O(V)$ satisfies $M(A) = W$. We define U to be the unique subspace of $M(C)$ which satisfies $|U| = |W|$ and $(C - I)U = W$. This is possible since $C - I$ is invertible when restricted to $M(C)$.

Lemma 1 *If $W \subseteq M(C)$ then $V = W^\perp \oplus U$.*

Proof. Since the subspaces have complementary dimensions it suffices to show that their intersection is trivial. So let $\vec{x} \in W^\perp \cap U$. Then $\vec{x} \in W^\perp$ and $(C - I)\vec{x} = \vec{w}$ for some $\vec{w} \in W$. Thus $C\vec{x} = \vec{x} + \vec{w}$, with $\vec{x} \in W^\perp$ and $\vec{w} \in W$ so that

$$\langle \vec{x}, \vec{x} \rangle = \langle C\vec{x}, C\vec{x} \rangle = \langle \vec{x} + \vec{w}, \vec{x} + \vec{w} \rangle = \langle \vec{x}, \vec{x} \rangle + \langle \vec{w}, \vec{w} \rangle.$$

Thus $\vec{w} = \vec{0}$ since $\langle\, ,\, \rangle$ is anisotropic and $\vec{x} = \vec{0}$ since $C - I$ is an isomorphism on $M(C)$. q.e.d.

Lemma 2 *$F(A^{-1}C) \subseteq F(C) \perp U$.*

Proof. Let $\vec{x} \in F(A^{-1}C)$. Then $A^{-1}C\vec{x} = \vec{x}$, which implies $C\vec{x} = A\vec{x}$ and $(C-I)\vec{x} = (A-I)\vec{x}$. Using $V = F(C) \perp M(C)$ we can express $\vec{x}$ uniquely as $\vec{x} = \vec{y} + \vec{z}$ with $\vec{y} \in F(C)$ and $\vec{z} \in M(C)$. Thus

$$(C-I)\vec{z} = (C-I)\vec{x} = (A-I)\vec{x} \in M(A) = W,$$

giving $\vec{z} \in U$. This gives $F(A^{-1}C) \subseteq F(C) + U$ and the orthogonality of the subspaces follows since $U \subseteq M(C)$. q.e.d.

Lemma 3 *If $M(A) = W$ and $A \leq C$ then $F(A^{-1}C) = F(C) \perp U$.*

Proof. Since $A \leq C$ we have $|M(A^{-1}C)| = |M(C)| - |M(A)|$ so that

$$|F(A^{-1}C)| = n - |M(A^{-1}C)| = n - |M(C)| + |W| = |F(C)| + |U|.$$

This dimension calculation can now be combined with Lemma 2. q.e.d.

It is now possible to give a formula for A. If $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$ we define the projection $Proj_{V_1}^{V_2}$ to be the linear transformation which coincides with the identity on V_1 and with the zero transformation on V_2.

Lemma 4 *If $A \leq C$ and $M(A) = W$ then $A = I + (C-I)Proj_U^{W^\perp}$.*

Proof. If $M(A) = W$ then $F(A) = W^\perp$ so that A coincides with I on $W^\perp$. Since $F(A^{-1}C)$ contains U by Lemma 3, A coincides with C on U. Thus $A - I$ coincides with the zero transformation on $W^\perp$ and with $C - I$ on U, giving $A - I = (C-I)\mathrm{Proj}_U^{W^\perp}$, by Lemma 1. q.e.d.

It is not at all clear from this formula that A is orthogonal. However this is indeed the case.

Lemma 5 *$A = I + (C-I)Proj_U^{W^\perp} \in O(V)$.*

Proof. Let $\vec{x}, \vec{y} \in V$ and use Lemma 1 to express $\vec{x} = \vec{x}_1 + \vec{x}_2$, $\vec{y} = \vec{y}_1 + \vec{y}_2$, with $\vec{x}_1, \vec{y}_1 \in U$ and $\vec{x}_2, \vec{y}_2 \in W^\perp$. Then, using the fact that A coincides with I on $W^\perp$ and with C on U,

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle A(\vec{x}), A(\vec{y})\rangle &= \langle C(\vec{x}_1) + \vec{x}_2, C(\vec{y}_1) + \vec{y}_2\rangle \\
&= \langle C\vec{x}_1, C\vec{y}_1\rangle + \langle C\vec{x}_1, \vec{y}_2\rangle + \langle \vec{x}_2, C\vec{y}_1\rangle + \langle \vec{x}_2, \vec{y}_2\rangle \\
&= \langle \vec{x}_1, \vec{y}_1\rangle + \langle C\vec{x}_1, \vec{y}_2\rangle + \langle \vec{x}_2, C\vec{y}_1\rangle + \langle \vec{x}_2, \vec{y}_2\rangle \\
&= \langle \vec{x}, \vec{y}\rangle + \langle (C-I)\vec{x}_1, \vec{y}_2\rangle + \langle \vec{x}_2, (C-I)\vec{y}_1\rangle \\
&= \langle \vec{x}, \vec{y}\rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

since both $(C-I)\vec{x}_1$ and $(C-I)\vec{y}_1$ lie in W. q.e.d.

We will call A *the transformation induced by C on W*. Combining the above lemmas we get the following result.

Theorem 1 *If $C \in O(V)$ and W is a subspace of $M(C)$ then there exists a unique $A \in O(V)$ satisfying $A \leq C$ and $M(A) = W$.*

The induced transformations are familiar objects for two special classes of subspace.

Corollary 2 *If $W \subseteq M(C)$ is an invariant subspace of C, then the induced transformation on W is the restriction of C to W.*

Proof. In this case, $U = W$ and the projection in the formula for A becomes an orthogonal projection. q.e.d.

Corollary 3 *If char($\mathbf{F}$) $\neq 2$ and W is a one dimensional subspace of $M(C)$ then the orthogonal transformation induced by C on W is always the orthogonal reflection in $W^{\perp}$.*

Proof. Since W is one-dimensional A must act on W by multiplication by a scalar α. The orthogonality of A forces $\alpha^2 = 1$ and $W = M(A)$ gives $\alpha \neq 1$. q.e.d.

The poset $(O(V), \leq)$ is not a lattice, since distinct elements C_1 and C_2 with $M(C_1) = M(C_2)$ cannot have a common upper bound. However the intervals are lattices and can be easily described.

Theorem 2 *If $A \leq C$ in $O(V)$ and $|M(C)| - |M(A)| = m$ then the interval $[A, C] = \{B \in O(V) \mid A \leq B \leq C\}$ is isomorphic to the lattice of subspaces of $\mathbf{F}^m$ under inclusion.*

Proof. The lattices of subspaces of $\mathbf{F}^m$ under inclusion is isomorphic to the interval $[M(A), M(C)]$ in the lattice of subspaces of V. The function $B \mapsto M(B)$ is a bijection from the interval $[A, C]$ to the latter interval by Theorem 1. This map respects the partial orders by Corollary 1. To see that the inverse map respects the partial orders suppose that $M(A) \subseteq W_1 \subseteq W_2 \subseteq M(C)$. Let B_1, B_2 be the transformations induced on W_1, W_2 respectively by C and let B_1' be the transformation induced on W_1 by B_2. Then $B_1' \leq B_2 \leq C$ gives $B_1' \leq C$, but $M(B_1) = M(B_1') = W_1$ so the uniqueness part of Theorem 1 gives $B_1 = B_1'$ and $B_1 \leq B_2$. q.e.d.

Each chain in $M(C)$ thus gives rise to a special factorization of C.

Corollary 4 *If $C \in O(V)$ and $W_1 \subset W_2 \subset \cdots \subset W_k = M(C)$ is a chain of subspaces in $M(C)$ then C factors uniquely as a product of k transformations $C = B_1 B_2 \ldots B_k$, with $B_1 B_2 \ldots B_i \leq C$ and $M(B_1 B_2 \ldots B_i) = W_i$.*

Proof. If we define C_i to be the transformation induced by C on W_i then $B_i = (C_{i-1})^{-1} C_i$. q.e.d.

The case where this chain is maximal gives a strong version of the Cartan-Dieudonné theorem.

Corollary 5 *If char($\mathbf{F}$) $\neq 2$, $C \in O(V)$ with $|M(C)| = k$ and $W_1 \subset W_2 \subset \cdots \subset W_k = M(C)$ is a maximal flag in $M(C)$ then C factors uniquely as a product of k reflections, $C = R_1 R_2 \ldots R_k$, with $M(R_1 R_2 \ldots R_i) = W_i$.*

Proof. Here the transformation B_i defined in Corollary 4 satisfies $|M(B_i)| = 1$ so that B_i is a reflection by Corollary 3. q.e.d.

Note 1 Using similar methods one can prove analogs of all the above results in the case of a unitary transformation over a finite-dimensional complex vector space. In this case we deal with complex linear subspaces, the induced transformations are unitary (and hence complex linear) and complex reflections replace the above reflections.

References

[**1**] N. Jacobson. *Basic Algebra I*, Second edition. Freeman: San Francisco, 1985.

[**2**] P. Scherk. On the decomposition of orthogonalities into symmetries, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **1950**, *1*, 481–491.