

matrix

Note: (i) In general any 3×3 A

(or $n \times n$) whose eigenvalues are distinct is diagonalisable

(ii) If there is a repeated eigenvalue in the 3×3 case e.g. $\lambda = 1, 1, 2$ then:

(a) if when solving $(A - \lambda I)X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$

to find the eigen vectors corresponding to $\lambda = 1$ we just get a line

of solutions (ie get 2 linearly indep eqns) the A is not diagonalisable (because missing an eigenvector to put in E)

(b) if when solving $(A - \lambda I)X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$

we get a plane of solutions ie only one equation; then we can find 2 linearly indep eigenvectors corresponding to $\lambda = 1$ (giving us 2 columns for E) and A is diagonalisable.

(c) If all 3 eigenvalues are rep.
eg $\lambda = 1, 1, 1$ (PG1) = $(\lambda - 1)$

Then A is not diagonalisable
unless A is already diagonal

MORE OBSERVATIONS: Recall we
saw that for any upper (or lower)
TRIANGULAR MATRIX $A = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & & * \\ & a_{22} & \\ 0 & & \ddots \\ & & & a_{nn} \end{pmatrix}$

$\det(A) = a_{11} \cdot a_{22} \cdot \dots \cdot a_{nn}$ is the product
of the diagonal entries of A . So

in particular for a diagonal
matrix

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\det(D) = \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \lambda_3 \quad \& \text{ so}$$

$$\det(D) = 0 \iff \text{one of } \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3 \text{ (or more)} = 0$$

Recall also: as we saw last year
in the 2×2 case

$$\det(AB) = \det(A) \cdot \det(B)$$

$$\Rightarrow \det(A^{-1}) = \frac{1}{\det A}$$

Therefore for an $n \times n$ matrix A

Which is diagonalizable $\det A$

$$= \det (EDE^{-1}) = \det D = 0$$

(\Rightarrow) A has an eigen value $= 0$.

(\Rightarrow) A^{-1} exists.

EVEN IF A is any $n \times n$ Matrix

If $\lambda = 0$ is an eigenvalue of A

With eigen vector $v \neq 0$ (vector)

$$\text{i.e. } Av = \lambda v = 0v = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow v \in \text{ker } A \quad \Rightarrow \dim \text{ker } A \geq 1$$

$\&$ Since $n = \dim \text{ker } A + \text{rank } A$

$$\Rightarrow \text{rank } A < n$$

$\Rightarrow A$ has no inverse

The converse is also true.