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## 1 Sylvester's criterion

Given an $n \times n$ symmetric matrix $A$ with $(i, j)$-th entry $a_{i j}=a_{j i}$, let $A^{(k)}$ denote the $k \times k$ submatrix taken from the top left corner of $A$. That is,

$$
A^{(k)}=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
a_{11} & a_{12} & \cdots & a_{1 k} \\
a_{21} & a_{22} & \cdots & a_{2 k} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
a_{k 1} & a_{k 2} & \cdots & a_{k k}
\end{array}\right] .
$$

In particular, $A^{(1)}=\left[a_{11}\right]$ and $A^{(n)}=A$.
Let $\Delta_{k}=\operatorname{det}\left(A^{(k)}\right)$. (So $\Delta_{n}=\operatorname{det}(A)$.)
We're motivated to look at the determinant of $A$ based on the eigenvalue test. Since

$$
\operatorname{det}(A-x I)=\left(\lambda_{1}-x\right)\left(\lambda_{2}-x\right) \cdots\left(\lambda_{n}-x\right),
$$

by setting $x=0$ we get $\operatorname{det}(A)=\lambda_{1} \lambda_{2} \cdots \lambda_{n}$. When $A \succ 0$, all the eigenvalues are positive, so $\operatorname{det}(A)>0$ as well.
We're motivated to look at the $k \times k$ submatrices for a different reason. Suppose we're looking at the quadratic form $\mathbf{u}^{\top} A \mathbf{u}$. If we set $u_{k+1}=u_{k+2}=\cdots=u_{n}=0$, then the quadratic form for $A$ simplifies to the quadratic form for $A^{(k)}$. Therefore we expect $A^{(k)} \succ 0$ as well, which means we must have $\Delta_{k}>0$ for each $k$.

Sylvester's criterion says that actually, this characterizes positive definite matrices:
Theorem 1.1 (Sylvester's criterion). Let $A$ be an $n \times n$ symmetric matrix. Then:

- $A \succ 0$ if and only if $\Delta_{1}>0, \Delta_{2}>0, \ldots, \Delta_{n}>0$.
- $A \prec 0$ if and only if $(-1)^{1} \Delta_{1}>0,(-1)^{2} \Delta_{2}>0, \ldots,(-1)^{n} \Delta_{n}>0$.
- $A$ is indefinite if the first $\Delta_{k}$ that breaks both patterns is the wrong sign.
- Sylvester's criterion is inconclusive (A can be positive or negative semidefinite, or indefinite) if the first $\Delta_{k}$ that breaks both patterns is 0 .

Proof. We prove that having $\Delta_{1}, \ldots, \Delta_{n}>0$ guarantees $A \succ 0$ by induction on $n$. For a $1 \times 1$ matrix $A$, we have $A \succ 0 \Longleftrightarrow a_{11}>0 \Longleftrightarrow \Delta_{1}>0$, which is exactly Sylvester's criterion.

[^0]Assume that Sylvester's criterion works for $(n-1) \times(n-1)$ matrices, and that $A$ is an $n \times n$ matrix with $\Delta_{1}, \ldots, \Delta_{n}>0$. By the induction hypothesis, $A^{(n-1)}$ is positive definite.

First, we show that $A$ has at most one negative eigenvalue. Suppose not: suppose that $A$ has two negative eigenvalues. Then their eigenvectors $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}$ are two independent vectors with $\mathbf{u}^{\top} A \mathbf{u}<0$ and $\mathbf{v}^{\top} A \mathbf{v}<0$. The spectral theorem means that they're orthogonal: $\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v}=0$. Let $\mathbf{w}=v_{n} \mathbf{u}-u_{n} \mathbf{v}$.
On the one hand, $w_{n}=0$, so $\mathbf{w}^{\top} A \mathbf{w}$ is plugging in $\left(w_{1}, w_{2}, \ldots, w_{n-1}\right)$ into $A^{(n-1)}$ 's quadratic form. Since $A^{(n-1)} \succ 0$, we must have $\mathbf{w}^{\top} A \mathbf{w}>0$. On the other hand, $\mathbf{w}^{\top} A \mathbf{w}=\left(v_{n} \mathbf{u}-u_{n} \mathbf{v}\right)^{\top} A\left(v_{n} \mathbf{u}-\right.$ $\left.u_{n} \mathbf{v}\right)$ simplifies to $v_{n}^{2}\left(\mathbf{u}^{\top} A \mathbf{u}\right)+u_{n}^{2}\left(\mathbf{v}^{\top} A \mathbf{v}\right)$, so we must have $\mathbf{w}^{\top} A \mathbf{w}<0$. This is a contradiction, so having two negative eigenvalues is impossible.

Having just one negative eigenvalue is also impossible. Then the product $\lambda_{1} \lambda_{2} \cdots \lambda_{n}$ would be a product of $n-1$ positive values and 1 negative value, so $\operatorname{det}(A)=\lambda_{1} \lambda_{2} \cdots \lambda_{n}<0$. But we know that $\operatorname{det}(A)=\Delta_{n}>0$. Similarly, $A$ can't have any zero eigenvalues, since $\Delta_{n} \neq 0$.

Therefore all the eigenvalues are positive, which means $A \succ 0$ by the eigenvalue test.
The condition for $A \prec 0$ is proven by applying Sylvester's criterion to $-A$. Multiplying every entry in $A$ by -1 has weird effects on determinants. A determinant flips sign if you change the sign of just one of the rows, so flipping all $k$ rows of $A^{(k)}$ multiplies $\Delta_{k}$ by $(-1)^{k}$. Therefore Sylvester's criterion for negative definite matrices asks for $\Delta_{1}, \Delta_{2}, \ldots$ to alternate signs, starting from negative.

Suppose Sylvester's criterion fails because $\Delta_{k}$ has the wrong sign: for example, $\Delta_{1}, \ldots, \Delta_{k-1}>0$, but $\Delta_{k}<0$. By looking carefully at our inductive proof, we see that this means that $A^{(k)}$ has exactly one negative eigenvalue. This makes it indefinite, and therefore $A$ is indefinite as well.
However, if Sylvester's criterion fails because $\Delta_{k}=0$, that means that one of $A^{(k)}$ 's eigenvalues was 0 . This rules out being positive or negative definite, but the matrix might be semidefinite. It also might not be: later on, we might encounter eigenvalues that are the wrong sign, but we'll never know, because we can't continue the proof. In this case, Sylvester's criterion is inconclusive.

In theory, some extra work lets us test if a matrix is positive semidefinite. The criterion there, which we're not going to prove, is the following.
If $I$ is a subset of $\{1,2, \ldots, n\}$, let $A^{(I)}$ be the matrix obtained by taking rows and columns indexed by elements of $i$. For example, if $I=\{1,3\}$, then

$$
A^{(I)}=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
a_{11} & a_{13} \\
a_{31} & a_{33}
\end{array}\right]
$$

As before, let $\Delta_{I}=\operatorname{det}\left(A^{(I)}\right)$. Then the matrix $A$ is positive semidefinite if and only if $\Delta_{I} \geq 0$ for every subset $I$.

This is a reasonable test for small matrices. For larger matrices, we quickly run into trouble, because we'll need to compute $2^{n}$ determinants.

## 2 Classifying critical points locally

Sylvester's criterion lets us prove the following result:
Theorem 2.1. Let $f: \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function with continuous $H f$, and let $\mathbf{x}^{*} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ be a critical point of $f$.
If $\operatorname{Hf}\left(\mathbf{x}^{*}\right) \succ 0$, then $\mathbf{x}^{*}$ is a strict local minimizer.
If $H f\left(\mathbf{x}^{*}\right) \prec 0$, then $\mathbf{x}^{*}$ is a strict local maximizer.
This adds on to our result from the previous lecture: if $\operatorname{Hf}\left(\mathbf{x}^{*}\right)$ is indefinite, then $\mathbf{x}^{*}$ is a saddle point.

Proof. The missing ingredient provided by Sylvester's criterion is this: $\Delta_{1}, \Delta_{2}, \ldots, \Delta_{n}$ are continuous functions of the entries of the matrix. So if each of them is positive for $\operatorname{Hf}\left(\mathbf{x}^{*}\right)$, then we can pick a positive radius $r>0$ such that each of them is still positive for $\operatorname{Hf}(\mathbf{x})$ when $\left\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^{*}\right\|<r$.
As a result, $H f$ is positive definite everywhere in the open ball $B\left(\mathbf{x}^{*}, r\right)$, and therefore $\mathbf{x}^{*}$ is a strict minimizer on this ball. This is precisely what it means to be a strict local minimizer.

It is still the case that we don't know exactly what happens if $H f\left(\mathbf{x}^{*}\right) \succeq 0$ or $H f\left(\mathbf{x}^{*}\right) \preceq 0$. That's not entirely true: we know a little. If $H f\left(\mathbf{x}^{*}\right)$ has at least one positive eigenvalue, then its eigenvector is a direction $\mathbf{u}$ such that $f\left(\mathbf{x}^{*}+t \mathbf{u}\right)$ is strictly minimized at $t=0$. So $\mathbf{x}^{*}$ is a local minimizer if it's anything. Similarly, if $H f\left(\mathbf{x}^{*}\right)$ has a negative eigenvalue, then $\mathbf{x}^{*}$ is either a saddle point or a local maximizer.

It's only when $\operatorname{Hf}\left(\mathbf{x}^{*}\right)$ is the zero matrix that none of these occur, and we can't predict anything at all about the point $\mathbf{x}^{*}$ based on its Hessian matrix. There are examples of this: for example, the Hessian matrix can't help us tell that $(0,0)$ is a local minimizer of $x^{4}+y^{4}$, a local maximizer of $-x^{4}-y^{4}$, and a saddle point of $x^{4}-y^{4}$.

## 3 Example of classifying critical points

Consider the two-variable function $f(x, y)=x^{2}+3 y^{2}+2 x y^{3}$.
First, we begin by taking the gradient to find the critical points. We have

$$
\nabla f(x, y)=\left[\begin{array}{c}
2 x+2 y^{3} \\
6 y+6 x y^{2}
\end{array}\right]
$$

Starting with $6 y+6 x y^{2}$ seems easier because it factors as $6 y(1+x y)$ : we have either $y=0$ or $y=-\frac{1}{x}$.
If $y=0$, then the first equation tells us $x=0$, so we get the critical point $(0,0)$. If $y=-\frac{1}{x}$, then we get

$$
2 x-\frac{2}{x^{3}}=0 \Longleftrightarrow x=\frac{1}{x^{3}} \Longleftrightarrow x^{4}=1 \Longleftrightarrow x= \pm 1
$$

so we get two further critical points $(1,-1)$ and $(-1,1)$.

Now we must classify them. We have

$$
H f(x, y)=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
2 & 6 y^{2} \\
6 y^{2} & 12 x y+6
\end{array}\right] .
$$

Therefore

$$
H f(0,0)=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
2 & 0 \\
0 & 6
\end{array}\right], \quad H f(1,-1)=H f(-1,1)=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
2 & 6 \\
6 & -6
\end{array}\right] .
$$

The first matrix is positive definite because it's a diagonal matrix and $2,6>0$. So $(0,0)$ is a strict local minimizer. (Whenever we're definitely able to tell that a point is a local minimizer by looking at the Hessian matrix, it'll be a strict one.)

The second matrix is indefinite: $\Delta_{1}=2$ while $\Delta_{2}=-48$. So $(1,-1)$ and $(-1,1)$ are both saddle points.
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