A LOWER BOUND FOR MAXIMUM ZERO-ONE DETERMINANTS

B.L. Foster

Denver Research Center, Marathon Oil Company Littleton, Colo.

What is the largest possible determinant of order n, if zero and one are the only entries allowed? This question, last posed by Harary [1], seems difficult.

Williamson [2] obtained the values 1, 1, 2, 3, 5, 9 for n = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6; and proved the general problem equivalent to a similar Hadamard question with allowed entries 1 and -1.

Cohn [3] derived an asymptotic lower bound,

$$(n+1)^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}(n+1)/2^n$$

where ϵ is any positive number. The upper bound

$$(n+1)^{(n+1)/2}/2^n$$

follows from Hadamard's inequality [4], applied to the 1, -1 version of the problem.

Clements and Lindstrom [5] have announced the lower bound

$$(n+1)^{K}/2^{n}$$
,

where $K = (n+1)(1-(\log 4/3)/\log(n+1))/2$, and the logarithms are base two.

In this note, I show that the Fibonacci sequence 1, 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, ... is a lower bound for the sequences of maximum zero-one determinants. Also, I compare this bound with the Clements-Lindström bound.

Theorem: The maximum zero-one determinant of order ${\tt n}$ is at least as large as the ${\tt n}^{{\tt th}}$ Fibonacci number.

This is proved by exhibiting zero-one matrices whose determinants are the Fibonacci numbers.

Let a(n) be the row vector with n entries which are alternately one and zero, starting with one. Consider the $n^{\mbox{th}}$ order matrix

For example,

$$F(1) = (1), F(2) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, and $F(3) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$.$$

Notice that det F(1) = 1, det F(2) = 1, and det F(3) = 2.

Expanding det F(n) by the first column gives det F(n) =

$$\det\begin{pmatrix} a(n-1) & & & & \\ 1 & . & & & \\ 0 & . & & & \\ . & & & a(2) \\ 0 & & & & 1 & a(1) \end{pmatrix} - \det\begin{pmatrix} 0 & a(n-2) & & & \\ 1 & a(n-2) & & & \\ 0 & 1 & a(n-3) & & \\ . & 0 & 1 & . & \\ . & . & a(2) & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & a(1) \end{pmatrix}$$

= $\det F(n-1) + \det F(n-2)$. Therefore, the sequence $\det F(n)$ is the Fibonacci sequence.

To compare this bound with the Clements-Lindström bound, examine the following table.

-	n	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
-	det F(n)	1	1	2	3	5	8	13	21	34
	$(n+1)^{K}/2^{n}$. 8	. 9	1.1	1.7	2.8	5.2	10.1	21.1	46.3

10	11	12	13	14	15
55	89	144	233	377	610
107.2	259.5	654.9	1,717.7	4,669	13,122

If n is greater than 8, the Clements-Lindström bound is better.

For special n, still better bounds can be found. One of Cohn's inequalities [3] becomes, for zero-one determinants,

$$M(mn-1) \ge 2^{(m-1)(n-1)} [M(m-1)]^n [M(n-1)]^m$$

where M(i) is the maximum determinant of order i. If mn-1=14 and mn-1=15, then

$$M(14) \ge 6,912$$
, and $M(15) \ge 131,072$.

The numbers in the table above were bought from Diane K. Middents for 2 palindromes.

REFERENCES

- 1. F. Harary, Research Problem 1, <u>Bulletin of the American Math</u> ematical Society 68 (1962) no. 1, p. 21.
- 2. J. Williamson, "Determinants whose elements are 0 and 1, "The American Mathematical Monthly 53 (1946), pp. 427-34.
- 3. J. H. E. Cohn, "On the value of determinants," Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society, 14 (1963) no. 4, pp. 581-88.
- 4. J. Hadamard, "Résolution d'une question relative aux detérminants," Bulletin des Sciences Mathématiques (2), Vol. 17, 1893, pp. 240-246.
- 5. G. F. Clements and B. Lindström, "A sequence of (±1)-determinants with large values," Notices of the American Mathematical Society 12 (1965) no. 1, pp. 75-76.
- 6. Don Walters, American Mathematical Monthly, June-July 1949
 Problem E-834.