

# Two Determinants

*Nicolae ANGHEL*<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract.** In this short Note, a sufficient condition for the equality of two determinants is given.

**Keywords:** determinants, matrices.

**MSC 2010:** 51M16.

Let  $A, B, C$  and  $D$  be four real square matrices in  $\text{Mat}(n, \mathbf{R})$ . Under what conditions is it true that

$$(1) \quad \det \left( \begin{bmatrix} A & C \\ B & D \end{bmatrix} \right) = \det(AD - BC),$$

where  $\begin{bmatrix} A & C \\ B & D \end{bmatrix}$  is a block matrix from  $\text{Mat}(2n, \mathbf{R})$ ?

In a Matrix Analysis class taught by author, many students believed, incorrectly, that (1) was true in general, by analogy with its  $n = 1$  counterpart. In fact, for  $n = 2$ ,  $A = D = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$  and  $B = C = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$  gives a simple counterexample.

Below we indicate a nice sufficient condition under which (1) holds true. There seem to be no simple necessary and sufficient descriptions of (1) for arbitrary matrices.

**Proposition.** Let  $A, B, C$  and  $D$  be four real square matrices in  $\text{Mat}(n, \mathbf{R})$ . If  $A$  and  $B$  commute then (1) holds true.

**Proof.** Assume first that  $A$  is invertible. Then the following LU-decomposition holds true:

$$(2) \quad \begin{bmatrix} A & C \\ B & D \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ BA^{-1} & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A & C \\ 0 & D - BA^{-1}C \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $I$  and  $0$  are the identity, respectively zero,  $n \times n$  matrices. Then

$$(3) \quad \begin{aligned} \det \left( \begin{bmatrix} A & C \\ B & D \end{bmatrix} \right) &= \det \left( \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ BA^{-1} & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A & C \\ 0 & D - BA^{-1}C \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &= \det \left( \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ BA^{-1} & I \end{bmatrix} \right) \det \left( \begin{bmatrix} A & C \\ 0 & D - BA^{-1}C \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &= \det A \det(D - BA^{-1}C) = \det(AD - ABA^{-1}C) \\ &= \det(AD - BAA^{-1}C) = \det(AD - BC). \end{aligned}$$

In (3) we have used, besides the hypothesis, the simple fact that for upper/lower triangular block matrices we have

$$(4) \quad \det \left( \begin{bmatrix} P & Q \\ 0 & S \end{bmatrix} \right) = \det \left( \begin{bmatrix} P & 0 \\ R & S \end{bmatrix} \right) = \det P \det S,$$

even if the square matrices  $P$  and  $S$  have different sizes.

If  $A$  is not invertible, in the above argument we replace  $A$  by  $A + \epsilon I$ ,  $\epsilon > 0$  small enough, and get the desired result by a continuity argument, letting  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ .

---

<sup>1</sup>Department of Mathematics, University of North Texas, Denton, TX 76203, USA; [anghel@unt.edu](mailto:anghel@unt.edu)