

ON THE MAXIMUM OF THE PERMANENT OF  $(I - A)$ 

ZHI CHEN AND LEI CAO

ABSTRACT. Let  $A$  be an  $n \times n$  doubly substochastic matrix and denote by  $\sigma(A)$  the sum of all elements of  $A$ . In this paper we give the upper bound of the permanent of  $(I - A)$  with respect to  $n$  and  $\sigma(A)$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $A = [a_{ij}]$  be an  $n \times n$  matrix and  $S_n$  be the symmetric group of order  $n$ . The *permanent* of  $A$  is the scalar-valued function of  $A$  defined by

$$\text{per}(A) = \sum_{\pi \in S_n} a_{1\pi(1)} a_{2\pi(2)} \cdots a_{n\pi(n)},$$

where the summation extends over all  $n!$  permutations in  $S_n$ . This function has been studied intensively (see [9], [10] and [11]) and it appears naturally in many combinatorial settings where a count of the number of systems of distinct representatives of some configuration is required [12].

An  $n \times n$  nonnegative matrix is said to be a *doubly stochastic matrix* if the sum of each row and column is one. If we allow the sum of each row and column to be less than or equal to one, then we get a *doubly substochastic matrix*. Denote by  $\Omega_n$  the set of all  $n \times n$  doubly stochastic matrices and  $\omega_n$  the set of all  $n \times n$  doubly substochastic matrices. Let  $I$  be the  $n \times n$  identity matrix. In this paper, we focus on  $\text{per}(I - A)$  for  $A \in \omega_n$ , which was brought to people's attention by Marcus and Minc in 1965 who conjectured the following lower bound of  $\text{per}(I - A)$ :

$$(1.1) \quad \text{per}(I - A) \geq 0$$

for all  $A \in \Omega_n$  (See Conjecture 7 in [9]). It was firstly solved by Brualdi and Newman [2] who showed that (1.1) is true in a more general case when  $A$  is a row substochastic matrix. A row substochastic matrix, or sometimes a substochastic matrix, is a nonnegative matrix with all row sums less than or equal to one. We

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 15A18, 15A42; Secondary: 05A17.

*Key words and phrases.* Permanent, Doubly Substochastic Matrices, Sub-defect.

Z. Chen is supported by the Natural Science Foundation of Jiangsu Province (BK20160708); the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (No.KJQN201718); the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No.11601233).

denote the set of all  $n \times n$  row substochastic matrices by  $\tilde{\omega}_n$ . Gibson then gave another short proof in [6] and later improved (1.1) in [7] to the following inequality:

$$(1.2) \quad \text{per}(I - A) \geq \det(I - A) \geq 0$$

for  $A \in \tilde{\omega}_n$ . The upper bound was given by Malek [8] who showed that

$$(1.3) \quad \text{per}(I - A) \leq 2^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}$$

for  $A \in \tilde{\omega}_n$ , where  $\lfloor x \rfloor$  takes the greatest integer less than or equal to  $x$ . Since a doubly substochastic matrix is surely to be row substochastic, (1.3) also provides an upper bound for all matrices in  $\omega_n$ . However, (1.3) is not that accurate regarding to the row substochastic matrices with summation of all elements far less than its size. Therefore in this paper we explore a finer upper bound of  $\text{per}(I - A)$  for a doubly substochastic matrix  $A$  with fixed summation of all elements. To do this, we partition  $\omega_n$  with respect to the sum of all elements in the matrices. Let  $A = [a_{ij}]$  be an  $n$ -square matrix and denote by  $\sigma(A)$  the sum of all elements  $\sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij}$ . It is easy to see that for any  $0 \leq s \leq n$ , the sets

$$\omega_n^s := \{A \in \omega_n \mid \sigma(A) = s\} \text{ and } \tilde{\omega}_n^s := \{A \in \tilde{\omega}_n \mid \sigma(A) = s\}$$

are convex. Moreover in this paper we shall give an upper bound for both of the sets

$$\{\text{per}(I - A) \mid A \in \omega_n^s\} \text{ and } \{\text{per}(I - A) \mid A \in \tilde{\omega}_n^s\},$$

for every  $0 \leq s \leq n - 1$ . Moreover, the matrices in  $\omega_n^s$  which makes the upper bound attained are also given. For  $n - 1 < s \leq n$ , the upper bound is known in the case when  $n$  is even, but getting complicated and unclear when  $n$  is odd. We will discuss the problem in the last section of this paper.

Another interesting characteristic on doubly substochastic matrices called *sub-defect* was first defined by Cao, Koyuncu and Parmer in [5]. It is the smallest integer  $k$  such that there exists an  $(n + k) \times (n + k)$  doubly stochastic matrix containing  $A$  as a submatrix. We often use  $sd(A)$  to denote the sub-defect of a matrix  $A \in \omega_n$ . For more details about the definition, please see [5]. It has been shown by Theorem 2.1 in [5] that the sub-defect can be calculated easily by taking the ceiling of the difference of its size and the sum of all entries. That is for  $A \in \omega_n$ , we have

$$sd(A) = \lceil n - \sigma(A) \rceil.$$

Denote by  $\omega_{n,k}$  the set of all  $n \times n$  doubly substochastic matrices with sub-defect equal to  $k$ . Then we can partition  $\omega_n$  into  $n + 1$  convex subsets which are  $\omega_{n,0} = \Omega_n, \omega_{n,1}, \dots, \omega_{n,n}$ . Namely,

- (1)  $\omega_{n,k}$  is convex for all  $k$ ;
- (2)  $\omega_{n,i} \cap \omega_{n,j} = \emptyset$  for  $i \neq j$ ;
- (3)  $\bigcup_{i=0}^n \omega_{n,i} = \omega_n$ .

Also we see that

$$\omega_{n,k} = \bigcup_{n-k \leq s < n-k+1} \{A \in \omega_n \mid \sigma(A) = s\}.$$

As a consequence, we obtain the upper bound of  $\text{per}(I - A)$  with respect to the sub-defect of  $A$  as well.

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we use Ryser's representation of permanent to show that if  $A \in \omega_n$  which maximizes  $\text{per}(I - A)$ , then all elements on the main diagonal of  $A$  are zero. In section 3, we give the upper bound of  $\text{per}(I - A)$  for both  $A \in \omega_n^s$  and  $A \in \tilde{\omega}_n^s$  satisfying either  $n$  even or  $\sigma(A) \leq n - 1$ . For the case that  $n$  is odd and  $n - 1 < \sigma(A)$ , the upper bound of  $\text{per}(I - A)$  for  $A \in \tilde{\omega}_n^s$  is given in section 4. For  $A \in \omega_n^s$ , the upper bound of  $\text{per}(I - A)$  still remains mystery. We discuss the case when  $n$  is small and a few conjectures are also given in the last section.

## 2. PRELIMINARY

In [8], one of the main results is that if  $\text{per}(I - A)$  is maximum for  $A \in \tilde{\omega}_n$ , then  $A$  has a zero main diagonal. To show this, for a given  $A \in \tilde{\omega}_n$  with non-zero diagonal elements, Malek in [8] constructed another matrix  $B \in \tilde{\omega}_n$  which has more zero elements on the main diagonal such that  $\text{per}(I - B) > \text{per}(I - A)$ . However,  $\sigma(B) > \sigma(A)$  in Malek's construction, so we can not use the result. Here we give an alternative proof via the representation of the permanent given by Ryser (See Theorem 7.1.1 in [1], also [12]). To state the representation, we need some notations.

Let  $A$  be an  $n \times n$  matrix. We denote by  $r_i(A)$  the sum of all elements in the  $i$ th row of  $A$ . Let  $A(j_1, j_2, \dots, j_m)$  be the matrix obtained from  $A$  by replacing the elements in columns  $j_1, j_2, \dots, j_m$  by zero's. Thus  $r_i(A(j_1, j_2, \dots, j_m))$  is the sum of all elements in the  $i$ th row of  $A$  except for  $a_{ij_1}, a_{ij_2}, \dots, a_{ij_m}$ . Let  $S(A) = \prod_{i=1}^n r_i(A)$ , the product of all row sums of  $A$ . Thus  $S(A_m(j_1, j_2, \dots, j_m)) = \prod_{i=1}^n r_i(A(j_1, j_2, \dots, j_m))$ . Denote by  $A_m$  the matrix obtained from  $A$  by replacing some  $m$  columns of  $A$  by zero columns. We also use  $\sum (-1)^m S(A_m)$  to denote the sum over all  $n$  choose  $m$  replacements of  $m$  columns of  $A$  by zero columns.

**Proposition 2.1.** *Let  $A = [a_{ij}] \in \omega_n$  and  $P = I - A$ . Then*

- (1)  $r_i(P) \geq 0$ .
- (2)  $r_i(P(j_1, j_2, \dots, j_m)) \leq 0$  if  $i = j_t$  for some  $1 \leq t \leq m$ .
- (3)  $S(P_m(j_1, j_2, \dots, j_m)) \leq 0$  if  $m$  is odd, and  $S(P_m(j_1, j_2, \dots, j_m)) \geq 0$  if  $m$  is even.

*Proof.* (1) It is because  $r_i(P) = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \geq 0$ .

(2) Notice that in each row  $i$  of  $P$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , only the diagonal entry  $1 - a_{ii}$  is nonnegative. If  $i = j_t$  for some  $1 \leq t \leq m$ , that means the diagonal element  $1 - a_{ii}$

needed to be replaced by 0 when we calculate  $r_i(P(j_1, j_2, \dots, j_m))$ . Thus the  $i$ th row of  $P(j_1, \dots, j_m)$  only contains non-positive entries. Therefore  $r_i(P(j_1, j_2, \dots, j_m)) \leq 0$ .

(3) It follows from (2) because in  $S(P_m(j_1, j_2, \dots, j_m))$  there are  $m$  non-positive factors, which are  $r_{j_1}(P(j_1, j_2, \dots, j_m)), \dots, r_{j_m}(P(j_1, j_2, \dots, j_m))$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 2.2.** (Ryser's presentation of the permanent [1, 12]) Let  $A$  be a matrix, then

$$\text{per}(A) = S(A_0) + \sum (-1)S(A_1) + \dots + \sum (-1)^r S(A_r) + \dots + \sum (-1)^{n-1} S(A_{n-1}).$$

**Lemma 2.3.** Let  $A = [a_{ij}]$  be an  $n \times n$  matrix with all entries nonnegative and  $a_{ii} \neq 0$  for some  $i$ . Define a matrix  $\tilde{A} = [\tilde{a}_{ij}]$  where all elements in  $\tilde{A}$  are the same as elements in  $A$  except

$$\tilde{a}_{ii} = a_{ii} - \epsilon, \quad \tilde{a}_{ij} = a_{ij} + \epsilon$$

for some  $j \neq i$ . Then

$$\text{per}(I - A) \leq \text{per}(I - \tilde{A}).$$

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we prove the case when  $i = 1$  and  $j = 2$ . Assume that  $a_{11} \neq 0$  and let

$$\tilde{a}_{11} = a_{11} - \epsilon, \quad \tilde{a}_{12} = a_{12} + \epsilon,$$

then we need to show that

$$\text{per}(I - A) \leq \text{per}(I - \tilde{A}).$$

Otherwise, one can always consider  $PAQ$  instead of  $A$ , where  $P, Q$  are permutation matrices such that the element in the first row and first column of  $PAQ$  is positive.

Denote

$$M = I - A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - a_{11} & -a_{12} & \cdots & -a_{1n} \\ -a_{21} & 1 - a_{22} & \cdots & -a_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -a_{n1} & -a_{n2} & \cdots & 1 - a_{nn} \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$N = I - \tilde{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - a_{11} + \epsilon & -a_{12} - \epsilon & \cdots & -a_{1n} \\ -a_{21} & 1 - a_{22} & \cdots & -a_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -a_{n1} & -a_{n2} & \cdots & 1 - a_{nn} \end{pmatrix}.$$

In order to show that  $\text{per}(M) \leq \text{per}(N)$ , we apply Theorem 2.2 to both  $M$  and  $N$  and compare corresponding terms in (2.1) and (2.2).

(2.1)

$$\text{per}(M) = S(M_0) + \sum (-1)S(M_1) + \dots + \sum_4 (-1)^r S(M_r) + \dots + \sum (-1)^{n-1} S(M_{n-1})$$

(2.2)

$$\text{per}(N) = S(N_0) + \sum (-1)S(N_1) + \dots + \sum (-1)^r S(N_r) + \dots + \sum (-1)^{n-1} S(N_{n-1})$$

For all  $1 \leq j \leq n$ , we have  $r_j(M) = r_j(N)$ , which implies  $S(M_0) = S(N_0)$ . Notice that

$$\sum S(M_1) = \sum_{i=1}^n \prod_{j=1}^n r_j(M(i)),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum S(N_1) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \prod_{j=1}^n r_j(N(i)) \\ &= (r_1(M(1)) - \epsilon)r_2(M(1)) \cdots r_n(M(1)) \\ &\quad + (r_1(M(2)) + \epsilon)r_2(M(2)) \cdots r_n(M(2)) + \sum_{i=3}^n \prod_{j=1}^n r_j(M(i)) \\ &= \sum S(M_1) + \epsilon[r_2(M(2)) \cdots r_n(M(2)) - r_2(M(1)) \cdots r_n(M(1))], \end{aligned}$$

where  $r_2(M(2)) \leq 0$  and all other row sums are nonnegative due to Proposition 2.1 (ii). Thus we have

$$\sum [S(N_1) - S(M_1)] = \epsilon[r_2(M(2)) \cdots r_n(M(2)) - r_2(M(1)) \cdots r_n(M(1))].$$

Therefore  $\sum [S(N_1) - S(M_1)] \leq 0$ . We can write  $\sum [S(N_1) - S(M_1)] = (-1)C_1$ , where  $C_1 \geq 0$  a positive constant.

In general for  $t \geq 2$ , we have

$$\sum S(M_t) = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_t \leq n} \prod_{j=1}^n r_j(M(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_t)),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum S(N_t) &= \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_t \leq n} \prod_{j=1}^n r_j(N(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_t)) \\
&= \sum_{3 \leq i_2 < i_3 < \dots < i_t \leq n} \left[ \prod_{j=1}^n r_j(N(1, i_2, \dots, i_t)) + \prod_{j=1}^n r_j(N(2, i_2, \dots, i_t)) \right] \\
&\quad + \sum_{3 \leq i_3 < i_4 < \dots < i_t \leq n} \prod_{j=1}^n r_j(N(1, 2, i_3, \dots, i_t)) + \sum_{3 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_t \leq n} \prod_{j=1}^n r_j(N(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_t)) \\
&= \sum_{3 \leq i_2 < i_3 < \dots < i_t \leq n} \left[ (r_1(M(1, i_2, \dots, i_t)) - \epsilon) \prod_{j=2}^n r_j(M(1, i_2, \dots, i_t)) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (r_1(M(2, i_2, \dots, i_t)) + \epsilon) \prod_{j=2}^n r_j(M(2, i_2, \dots, i_t)) \right] \\
&\quad + \sum_{3 \leq i_3 < i_4 < \dots < i_t \leq n} \prod_{j=1}^n r_j(M(1, 2, i_3, \dots, i_t)) + \sum_{3 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_t \leq n} \prod_{j=1}^n r_j(M(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_t)).
\end{aligned}$$

So

$$\sum [S(N_t) - S(M_t)] = \sum_{3 \leq i_2 < i_3 < \dots < i_t \leq n} \epsilon \left[ \prod_{j=2}^n r_j(M(2, i_2, \dots, i_t)) - \prod_{j=2}^n r_j(M(1, i_2, \dots, i_t)) \right].$$

Notice that as  $j$  runs from 2 to  $n$ ,  $r_j(M(2, i_2, \dots, i_t)) \leq 0$  when  $j = 2, i_2, \dots, i_t$ . In the same while,  $r_j(M(1, i_2, \dots, i_t)) \leq 0$  when  $j = i_2, \dots, i_t$ . Thus we have

$$(2.3) \quad \sum [S(N_t) - S(M_t)] = (-1)^t C_t$$

where  $C_t \geq 0$  a constant. Now we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{per}(N) - \text{per}(M) &= S(N_0) - S(M_0) + \sum_{t=1}^{n-1} (-1)^t [S(N_t) - S(M_t)] \\
&= \sum_{t=1}^{n-1} (-1)^{2t} C_t = \sum_{t=1}^{n-1} C_t \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\text{per}(I - \tilde{A}) \geq \text{per}(I - A).$$

□

**Corollary 2.4.** *Let  $A = [a_{ij}]$  be an  $n \times n$  row substochastic(stochastic) matrix satisfying  $\sigma(A) = s$  and*

$$\text{per}(I - A) = \max\{\text{per}(I - B) \mid B \text{ is row substochastic(stochastic), and } \sigma(B) = s\}.$$

*Then all the main diagonal entries of  $A$  are zero.*

*Proof.* Notice that in the proof of Lemma 2.3,  $\tilde{A}$  and  $A$  have the same row sums and  $\sigma(\tilde{A}) = \sigma(A)$ . Applying Lemma 2.3 as many times as possible we get the corollary.  $\square$

This corollary can be viewed as a refinement of Corollary 2 in [8] since the matrices considered here have the same summation of all entries. Due to the different method in the proof of Corollary 2.4, we can also refine Proposition 1 in [8] as the following lemma. Denote by  $\tilde{\omega}_n^s$  the set of all  $n \times n$  row substochastic matrices such that the sum of all entries is equal to constant  $s$ .

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $A = [a_{ij}]$  be an  $n \times n$  row substochastic matrix satisfying  $\sigma(A) = s$  and*

$$\text{per}(I - A) = \max\{\text{per}(I - B) \mid B \in \tilde{\omega}_n^s\}.$$

*We have*

(1) *if there exist  $a_{ki} \neq 0$  and  $a_{kj} \neq 0$  for distinct indices  $i, j$  and  $k$ , then*

$$\text{per}(A(k|i)) = \text{per}(A(k|j)),$$

*where  $A(i|j)$  is the submatrix of  $A$  obtained by removing the  $i$ th row and  $j$ th column from  $A$ .*

(2) *there exists a row substochastic matrix  $C$  such that*

- (a) *all diagonal elements are zero;*
- (b) *at most one positive entry contained in each row;*
- (c)  *$\sigma(A) = \sigma(C)$  and*
- (d)  *$\text{per}(I - C) = \text{per}(I - A)$ .*

*Proof.* (1) Assume that  $\text{per}(A(k|j)) \geq \text{per}(A(k|i))$ . Let  $\epsilon = \min\{a_{ki}, a_{kj}\}$ . Define a matrix  $B = [b_{ij}]$  to be the following row substochastic matrix:

$$b_{ki} = a_{ki} - \epsilon, \quad b_{kj} = a_{kj} + \epsilon,$$

and  $b_{ij} = a_{ij}$  otherwise. Then

$$\text{per}(I - B) = \text{per}(I - A) + \epsilon(\text{per}(A(k|j)) - \text{per}(A(k|i))).$$

Since  $\text{per}(I - A)$  is maximum and  $\epsilon > 0$ , we conclude that

$$\text{per}(A(k|i)) = \text{per}(A(k|j)).$$

(2) It follows from Lemma 2.3 and the result of part (1).  $\square$

### 3. THE MAXIMUM OF THE PERMANENT OF $I - A$

In this section, we shall prove the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $A \in \omega_n$ , satisfying either*

- (1)  *$n$  is even, or*
- (2)  *$n$  is odd and  $\sigma(A) \leq n - 1$ .*

*Let  $\sigma(A) = s$  and denote by  $e$  the greatest even integer less than or equal to  $s$ . Then*

$$\max\{\text{per}(I - A) | A \in \omega_n^s\} = 2^{e/2} \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{s - e}{2} \right)^2 \right].$$

Theorem 3.1 can also be rephrased with respect to the sub-defect  $k$  as the following corollary.

**Corollary 3.2.** *Let  $A \in \omega_{n,k}$ , where either*

- (1)  *$n$  is even, or*
- (2)  *$n$  is odd and  $k > 1$ .*

*Denote by  $e$  the greatest even integer less than or equal to  $n - k + 1$ . Then*

$$\sup\{\text{per}(I - A) | A \in \omega_{n,k}\} = 2^{e/2} \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{n - k + 1 - e}{2} \right)^2 \right].$$

For any  $n$ -square matrix  $A$ , we can always associate with  $A$  a directed weighted graph  $G_A$  with  $n$  vertices  $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ , such that  $a_{ij} \neq 0$  if and only if there is a directed edge (vector)  $\overrightarrow{V_i V_j}$  with weight  $a_{ij}$ . Let  $\tilde{\omega}_n^{0,1}$  be the set of all  $n \times n$  row substochastic matrices with zero diagonal and at most one positive element in each row. For  $A \in \tilde{\omega}_n^{0,1}$ , since each row of  $A$  contains at most one positive element, there is at most one directed edge starting from each vertex in  $G_A$ . Consider the matrix  $P = I - A$ , the corresponding directed graph  $G_P$  can be obtained from  $G_A$  by adding a negative sign before each weight and also adding a ‘‘loop’’  $\overrightarrow{V_i V_i}$  with weight 1 at each vertex  $V_i$ . From definition, we know that

$$\text{per}P = \text{per}(I - A) = \sum_{\pi \in S_n} p_{1\pi(1)} p_{2\pi(2)} \cdots p_{n\pi(n)},$$

where the sum is over all permutations  $\pi \in S_n$ . Since each permutation can also be written in cycle notation, we can write

$$(3.1) \quad \pi = (i_1 i_2 \cdots i_{r_1})(i_{r_1+1} i_{r_1+2} \cdots i_{r_2}) \cdots (i_{r_{l-1}+1} i_{r_{l-1}+2} \cdots i_{r_l(\pi)}),$$

where  $l = l(\pi)$  for convenience, and thus

$$\text{per}(I - A) = \sum_{\pi \in S_n} (p_{i_1 i_2} p_{i_2 i_3} \cdots p_{i_{r_1} i_1})(p_{i_{r_1+1} i_{r_1+2}} \cdots p_{i_{r_2} i_{r_1+1}}) \cdots (p_{i_{r_{l-1}+1} i_{r_{l-1}+2}} \cdots p_{i_{r_l(\pi)} i_{r_{l-1}+1}}).$$



Therefore for  $0 \leq t \leq l(\pi) - 1$  and in case  $t = 0$  setting  $r_0 = 0$ , each cycle  $(i_{r_t+1} i_{r_t+2} \cdots i_{r_{t+1}})$  in permutation  $\pi$  corresponds to a directed cycle in  $G_P$ :

$$V_{i_{r_t+1}} \xrightarrow{p_{i_{r_t+1} i_{r_t+2}}} V_{i_{r_t+2}} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow V_{i_{r_{t+1}}} \xrightarrow{p_{i_{r_{t+1}} i_{r_t+1}}} V_{i_{r_t+1}} .$$

Clearly, the term  $(p_{i_1 i_2} p_{i_2 i_3} \cdots p_{i_{r_1} i_1})(p_{i_{r_1+1} i_{r_1+2}} \cdots p_{i_{r_2} i_{r_1+1}}) \cdots (p_{i_{r_{l-1}+1} i_{r_{l-1}+2}} \cdots p_{i_{r_l(\pi)} i_{r_{l-1}+1}})$  does not vanish if and only if the weights in each directed circle are all positive. Now we can prove the following theorem.

**Lemma 3.3.** *For  $A \in \tilde{\omega}_n^{0,1}$  such that the corresponding directed graph  $G_A$  has only one connected component, then*

- (1)  $\text{per}(I - A) = 1$  if there is no directed cycle in  $G_A$ ;
- (2)  $\text{per}(I - A) = 1 + (-1)^r a_{i_1 i_2} a_{i_2 i_3} \cdots a_{i_r i_1}$  if there is a cycle with length  $r$  and  $a_{i_1 i_2}, a_{i_2 i_3}, \dots, a_{i_r i_1}$  are weights of edges in the cycle

$$V_{i_1} \xrightarrow{a_{i_1 i_2}} V_{i_2} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow V_{i_r} \xrightarrow{a_{i_r i_1}} V_{i_1} .$$

*Proof.* Since  $A \in \tilde{\omega}_n^{0,1}$  has at most one positive element in each row, there is at most one vector pointing out from each vertex in  $G_A$ . Therefore every connected component contains either no cycles or at most one directed cycle. If there is no cycles in  $G_A$ , then  $G_{I-A}$  contains no nontrivial directed cycles. Thus there is only one nonzero term in the expansion of  $\text{per}(I - A)$ , which corresponds to  $id \in S_n$ , i.e., all loops in  $G_{I-A}$ . So in this case  $\text{per}(I - A) = 1$ . Suppose  $G_A$  contains one directed cycle  $C$  with  $r$  edges. The weights in the cycle are  $a_{i_1 i_2}, a_{i_2 i_3}, \dots, a_{i_r i_1}$ . Then there are two nonzero terms in the expansion of  $\text{per}(I - A)$  which correspond to  $id \in S_n$  and  $(i_1 i_2 \cdots i_r)$  respectively. Therefore in this case

$$\text{per}(I - A) = 1 + (-1)^r a_{i_1 i_2} a_{i_2 i_3} \cdots a_{i_r i_1} .$$

□

For  $C$  a cycle in  $G_A$  consisting of  $r$  edges with weights  $a_{i_1 i_2}, a_{i_2 i_3}, \dots, a_{i_r i_1}$ , denote the length of  $C$  by  $l(C)$  and then  $l(C) = r$ . Let  $1 + (-1)^{l(C)} C = 1 + (-1)^r a_{i_1 i_2} a_{i_2 i_3} \cdots a_{i_r i_1}$ . We give some results of  $\text{per}(I - A)$  for general  $A \in \tilde{\omega}_n^{0,1}$ .

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $A \in \tilde{\omega}_n^{0,1}$ . If  $G_A$  contains a cycle  $C$  which consists of edges with weights  $a_{i_1 i_2}, a_{i_2 i_3}, \dots, a_{i_r i_1}$ , then*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{per}(I - A) &= \text{per}(I - \tilde{A}) (1 + (-1)^r a_{i_1 i_2} a_{i_2 i_3} \cdots a_{i_r i_1}) \\ &= \text{per}(I - \tilde{A}) (1 + (-1)^{l(C)} C), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{A}$  is the submatrix obtained by removing the  $r$  rows and columns containing  $a_{i_1 i_2}, a_{i_2 i_3}, \dots, a_{i_r i_1}$ .

*Proof.* From the definition of  $\text{per}(I - A)$  we know that the nonzero terms in the expansion correspond to permutations having cycles either  $(i_1 i_2 \cdots i_r)$  or  $(i_1)(i_2) \cdots (i_r)$ . Therefore the lemma holds.  $\square$

For  $A \in \tilde{\omega}_n^{0,1}$ , by removing the rows and columns containing  $a_{i_1 i_2}, a_{i_2 i_3}, \dots, a_{i_r i_1}$  we get the submatrix  $\tilde{A}$ , which is in  $\tilde{\omega}_{n-r}^{0,1}$ . Thus keep applying Lemma 3.4 and we get the following lemma which expresses  $\text{per}(I - A)$  into the product of factors  $(1 + (-1)^{l(C)} C)$ .

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $A \in \tilde{\omega}_n^{0,1}$  whose corresponding graph contains  $k$  cycles  $C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k$  in total, then*

$$(3.2) \quad \text{per}(I - A) = \prod_{i=1}^k (1 + (-1)^{l(C_i)} C_i).$$

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $A$  be an  $n$ -square row substochastic matrix with at most one positive entry contained in each row.*

(1) *If  $A$  contains even number of positive elements, then*

$$\text{per}(I - A) \leq (1 + x_1 x_2)(1 + x_3 x_4) \cdots (1 + x_{2t-1} x_{2t})$$

*where  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{2t}$  is a labeling of the even positive elements in  $A$ .*

(2) *If  $A$  contains odd number of positive elements, then*

$$\text{per}(I - A) < (1 + x_1 x_2)(1 + x_3 x_4) \cdots (1 + x_{2t-1} x_{2t}) \left(1 + \frac{x_{2t+1}^2}{4}\right)$$

*where  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{2t}, x_{2t+1}$  is a labeling of the odd positive elements in  $A$ .*

*Proof.* Since by Lemma 3.5, we can write  $\text{per}(I - A)$  into products as in equation (3.2). We first label the elements appearing in (3.2) by  $x_1, x_2, \dots$ , and then we label the remaining positive elements left in  $A$ . For example we can relabel the sequence  $a_{i_1 i_2}, a_{i_2 i_3}, a_{i_3 i_4}, \dots, a_{i_r i_1}$  appearing in one factor  $(1 + (-1)^r a_{i_1 i_2} a_{i_2 i_3} \cdots a_{i_r i_1})$  by  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_r$ , respectively. Such a sequence forms a factor  $(1 + (-1)^r x_1 x_2 \cdots x_r)$  in  $\text{per}(I - A)$ . If  $r$  is even, then

$$1 + (-1)^r x_1 x_2 \cdots x_r \leq (1 + x_1 x_2)(1 + x_3 x_4) \cdots (1 + x_{r-1} x_r).$$

If  $r$  is odd, then

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + (-1)^r x_1 x_2 \cdots x_r &= 1 - x_1 x_2 \cdots x_r \\ &< (1 + x_1 x_2)(1 + x_3 x_4) \cdots (1 + x_{r-2} x_{r-1}) \\ &< (1 + x_1 x_2)(1 + x_3 x_4) \cdots (1 + x_{r-2} x_{r-1}) \left(1 + \frac{x_r^2}{4}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Also notice that for  $r$  and  $r'$  odd, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 + (-1)^r x_1 x_2 \cdots x_r)(1 + (-1)^r x_{r+1} x_{r+2} \cdots x_{r+r'}) \\ & < (1 + x_1 x_2) \cdots (1 + x_{r-2} x_{r-1})(1 + x_r x_{r+1}) \cdots (1 + x_{r+r'-1} x_{r+r'}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the lemma holds.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.7.** *Let  $A$  be an  $n$ -square row substochastic matrix with at most one positive entry contained in each row.*

- (1) *If  $A$  contains even number of positive elements, and  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{2t}$  is a labeling of the  $2t$  positive elements in  $A$  for  $0 \leq 2t \leq n$ , then  $A$  can be permuted by some permutation matrices to the following form*

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_1 \\ x_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \oplus \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_3 \\ x_4 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \oplus \cdots \oplus \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_{2t-1} \\ x_{2t} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \oplus \mathbf{0}_{n-2t}.$$

- (2) *If  $A$  contains odd number of positive elements, and  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{2t}, x_{2t+1}$  is a labeling of the  $2t + 1$  positive elements in  $A$  for  $1 \leq 2t + 1 \leq n - 1$ , then we can construct another  $n$ -square row substochastic matrix  $\tilde{A}$  satisfying  $\sigma(\tilde{A}) = \sigma(A)$ . Also  $\tilde{A}$  can be permuted by some permutation matrices to the following form*

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_1 \\ x_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \oplus \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_3 \\ x_4 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \oplus \cdots \oplus \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_{2t-1} \\ x_{2t} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \oplus \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_{2t+1}/2 \\ x_{2t+1}/2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \oplus \mathbf{0}_{n-2t-2}$$

such that

$$\text{per}(I - A) < \text{per}(I - \tilde{A}).$$

*Proof.* (1) It is not difficult to see that the matrix in (3.3) maximizes the value of  $\text{per}(I - A)$ , which is equal to  $(1 + x_1 x_2)(1 + x_3 x_4) \cdots (1 + x_{2t-1} x_{2t})$ .

- (2) Substituting (3.4) to  $\text{per}(I - \tilde{A})$  we get

$$\text{per}(I - \tilde{A}) = (1 + x_1 x_2)(1 + x_3 x_4) \cdots (1 + x_{2t-1} x_{2t}) \left(1 + \frac{x_{2t+1}^2}{4}\right).$$

By Lemma 3.6 (2) we know that  $\text{per}(I - A) < \text{per}(I - \tilde{A})$ .  $\square$

We can then get a property of row substochastic matrices.

**Corollary 3.8.** *For  $n$  even and  $A$  an  $n$ -square row substochastic matrix, we have*

$$(3.5) \quad \text{per}(I - A) \leq (1 + x_1 x_2)(1 + x_3 x_4) \cdots (1 + x_{n-1} x_n)$$

where  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$  is a labeling of the row sums of  $A$ .

*Proof.* It follows from Lemma 2.5 and Lemma 3.6.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.9.** *Let  $A, B$  be square matrices, then*

$$\text{per} \begin{pmatrix} A & \\ & B \end{pmatrix} = \text{per}(A)\text{per}(B)$$

*Proof.* It follows from the definition of the permanent.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.10.** *Let  $x, y$  be non-negative numbers and the sum of  $x$  and  $y$  is fixed. Then*

$$\max \text{per} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & x \\ y & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \max(1 + xy) = 1 + \left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right)^2.$$

*Proof.* It follows from the arithmetic-geometric inequality that  $xy \leq \left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right)^2$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.11.** *For a sequence satisfying  $0 < z_n \leq z_{n-1} \leq \dots \leq z_2 \leq z_1 < 1$  with  $\sum_{i=1}^n z_i = \bar{s}$  fixed, let  $\epsilon = \min\{1 - z_1, z_n\}$ . Define*

$$y_1 = z_1 + \epsilon, y_n = z_n - \epsilon$$

and  $y_i = z_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . Then

$$(3.6) \quad \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k \leq n} z_{i_1}^2 z_{i_2}^2 \cdots z_{i_k}^2 < \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k \leq n} y_{i_1}^2 y_{i_2}^2 \cdots y_{i_k}^2.$$

*Proof.* First we show (3.6) holds when  $n = 2$ . In this case  $y_1 = z_1 + \epsilon \leq 1$  and  $y_2 = z_2 - \epsilon \geq 0$ . We need to prove that

$$y_1^2 + y_2^2 + y_1^2 y_2^2 - (z_1^2 + z_2^2 + z_1^2 z_2^2) > 0,$$

which is equivalent to

$$(3.7) \quad (z_1 + \epsilon)^2 + (z_2 - \epsilon)^2 + (z_1 + \epsilon)^2 (z_2 - \epsilon)^2 - (z_1^2 + z_2^2 + z_1^2 z_2^2) > 0.$$

Since  $\epsilon = \min\{1 - z_1, z_2\}$ , there are two possibilities: either  $\epsilon = 1 - z_1$  or  $\epsilon = z_2$ . We discuss the two cases separately as follows.

(1) If  $\epsilon = 1 - z_1$ , then  $y_1 = 1$  and  $y_2 = z_1 + z_2 - 1 \geq 0$ . Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} & y_1^2 + y_2^2 + y_1^2 y_2^2 - (z_1^2 + z_2^2 + z_1^2 z_2^2) \\ &= 1 + (z_1 + z_2 - 1)^2 + (z_1 + z_2 - 1)^2 - z_1^2 - z_2^2 - z_1^2 z_2^2 \\ &= 3 + z_1^2 + z_2^2 + 4z_1 z_2 - 4z_1 - 4z_2 - z_1^2 z_2^2 \\ &= (z_1^2 + z_2^2 - z_1^2 z_2^2 - 1) + 4(z_1 z_2 - z_1 - z_2 + 1) \\ &= -(1 - z_1^2)(1 - z_2^2) + 4(1 - z_1)(1 - z_2) \\ (3.8) \quad &= (1 - z_1)(1 - z_2)[4 - (1 + z_1)(1 + z_2)] \end{aligned}$$

By the assumption that  $0 < z_2 \leq z_1 < 1$ , all factors in (3.8) are positive, so (3.7) holds.

(2) If  $\epsilon = z_2$ , then  $y_2 = 0$  and  $y_1 = z_1 + z_2 \leq 1$ . Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} & y_1^2 + y_2^2 + y_1^2 \cdot y_2^2 - (z_1^2 + z_2^2 + z_1^2 z_2^2) \\ &= (z_1 + z_2)^2 - z_1^2 - z_2^2 - z_1^2 z_2^2 \\ &= z_1^2 z_2^2 > 0 \end{aligned}$$

So (3.7) holds.

To show (3.6) in general cases, notice that

$$(3.9) \quad \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k \leq n} y_{i_1}^2 y_{i_2}^2 \dots y_{i_k}^2 - \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k \leq n} z_{i_1}^2 z_{i_2}^2 \dots z_{i_k}^2 \\ = (y_1^2 + y_n^2 + y_1^2 y_n^2 - z_1^2 - z_n^2 - z_1^2 z_n^2) \left( 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{n-2} \sum_{2 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k \leq n-1} \prod_{m=1}^k z_{i_m}^2 \right).$$

The second factor on the righthand side of equation (3.9) is obviously positive. Due to (3.7), we know that

$$\begin{aligned} & y_1^2 + y_n^2 + y_1^2 y_n^2 - z_1^2 - z_n^2 - z_1^2 z_n^2 \\ &= (z_1 + \epsilon)^2 + (z_n - \epsilon)^2 + (z_1 + \epsilon)^2 (z_n - \epsilon)^2 - (z_1^2 + z_n^2 + z_1^2 z_n^2) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore (3.9) is strictly greater than zero and (3.6) is proved.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.12.** *Let  $0 \leq z_n \leq z_{n-1} \leq \dots \leq z_2 \leq z_1 \leq 1$  satisfying  $\sum_{i=1}^n z_i = \bar{s}$ . Then*

$$(3.10) \quad \max \left( 1 + \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k \leq n} z_{i_1}^2 z_{i_2}^2 \dots z_{i_k}^2 \right) = 2^{\lfloor \bar{s} \rfloor} [1 + (\bar{s} - \lfloor \bar{s} \rfloor)^2],$$

where  $\lfloor \bar{s} \rfloor$  denotes the greatest integer less than or equal to  $\bar{s}$ .

*Proof.* First if we let  $y_1 = y_2 = \dots = y_{\lfloor \bar{s} \rfloor} = 1, y_{\lfloor \bar{s} \rfloor + 1} = \bar{s} - \lfloor \bar{s} \rfloor$ , and  $y_i = 0$  for  $\lfloor \bar{s} \rfloor + 1 < i \leq n$ , then

$$1 + \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k \leq n} y_{i_1}^2 y_{i_2}^2 \dots y_{i_k}^2 = 2^{\lfloor \bar{s} \rfloor} [1 + (\bar{s} - \lfloor \bar{s} \rfloor)^2].$$

Next we need to show it is the maximum. Indeed, suppose there exists  $0 < z_n \leq z_{n-1} \leq \dots \leq z_2 \leq z_1 \leq 1$  with  $\sum_{i=1}^m z_i = \bar{s}$ . According to Lemma 3.11, let  $\epsilon = \min\{1 - z_r, z_m\}$  and we can add  $\epsilon$  to some  $z_r$  where  $r$  is the smallest index such that  $z_r < 1$ . We then subtract  $\epsilon$  from  $z_n$ . This makes either  $z_r$  be 1 or  $z_n$  be 0, and the sum in (3.10) greater than before without changing the sum of  $z_i$ 's. Repeat this process as many times as possible until we cannot do it any more. Eventually the sequence  $\{z_i\}$  will be changed into  $\{y_i\}$  and then the corresponding value attained is maximum.  $\square$

Now, we are ready to prove Theorem 3.1 which is a direct consequence of the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.13.** *For  $A$  an  $n$ -square row substochastic matrix with  $\sigma(A) = s$ . Denote by  $e$  the greatest even integer less than or equal to  $s$ . If  $n$  and  $s$  satisfying either*

- (1)  $n$  is even, or
- (2)  $n$  is odd and  $s \leq n - 1$ ,

then

$$\max\{\text{per}(I - A) | A \in \tilde{\omega}_n^s\} = 2^{e/2} \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{s - e}{2} \right)^2 \right].$$

*Proof.* First we consider the case when  $n$  is even. According to Lemma 2.5 and 3.7, to maximize the value of  $\text{per}(I - A)$ ,  $A$  must be in the form (3.3). Due to Proposition 3.9,

$$\text{per}(I - A) = \prod_{i=1}^{n/2} \text{per}(I_2 - X_i)$$

where  $X_i = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_{2i-1} \\ x_{2i} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n/2$ . By direct calculation and the arithmetic-geometric inequality,

$$\text{per}(I_2 - X_i) = 1 + x_{2i-1}x_{2i} \leq 1 + \left( \frac{x_{2i-1} + x_{2i}}{2} \right)^2.$$

In order to maximize  $\text{per}(I_2 - X_i)$ , we should let  $x_{2i-1} = x_{2i}$  due to Proposition 3.10. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \text{per}(I - A) &= \prod_{i=1}^{n/2} (1 + x_{2i}^2) = \prod_{i=1}^{n/2} (1 + y_i^2) \\ (3.11) \quad &= 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k \leq n/2} y_{i_1}^2 y_{i_2}^2 \dots y_{i_k}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $y_i = x_{2i}$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n/2$ . Apply Lemma 3.12 to (3.11), we get

$$\max\{\text{per}(I - A) | A \in \tilde{\omega}_n^s\} = 2^{e/2} \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{s - e}{2} \right)^2 \right].$$

In this case,

$$y_1 = y_2 = \dots = y_{e/2} = 1, y_{\frac{e}{2}+1} = \frac{s - e}{2},$$

and

$$y_{\frac{e}{2}+2} = \dots = y_{n/2} = 0.$$

That means we can actually choose a doubly substochastic matrix  $\tilde{A}$  with  $\sigma(\tilde{A}) = s$  as follows

$$\tilde{A} = M_2 \oplus M_2 \oplus \dots \oplus M_2 \oplus S_2 \oplus \mathbf{0}_{n-e-2},$$

where  $M_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  with  $e/2$  copies in total,  $S_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{s-e}{2} \\ \frac{s-e}{2} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ , and  $\mathbf{0}_{n-e-2}$  is the zero matrix with order  $n - e - 2$ . If  $e = n$  then  $\mathbf{0}_{n-e-2}$  won't show up. It is easy to see that such an  $\tilde{A}$  maximize the value  $\text{per}(I - A)$ , where  $A$  can be any  $n$ -square row substochastic matrix satisfying  $\sigma(A) = s$ .

In the case when  $n$  is odd and  $s \leq n - 1$ , by Corollary 3.7 we can always construct a row substochastic matrix  $B$  with row sum equals to  $s$ , such that  $B$  contains even number of positive elements with at most one positive element in each row. Actually from Corollary 3.7 we can see that  $B$  is also doubly substochastic. Using the similar method in proving the above case when  $n$  is even, we get the result of the theorem. Notice that here  $B$  takes the same form as  $\tilde{A}$  except that  $n$  is odd.  $\square$

*Remark 1.* According to the proof of Theorem 3.13, both  $\tilde{A}$  and  $B$  are doubly substochastic, which maximize the value of  $\text{per}(I - A)$ . Therefore Theorem 3.1 follows from Theorem 3.13 naturally.

**Example** Denote by  $\mathbf{0}_n$  the  $n \times n$  zero matrix and  $M_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ . If  $A \in \omega_9$  with  $\sigma(A) = 5$ , then one can construct

$$\tilde{A} = M_2 \oplus M_2 \oplus \frac{1}{2}M_2 \oplus \mathbf{0}_3,$$

which maximizes  $\text{per}(I - A)$  for all  $A$  doubly substochastic with fixed total sum 5. It is easy to calculate that

$$\text{per}(I - \tilde{A}) = 2 \cdot 2 \cdot \left(1 + \frac{1}{4}\right) = 5.$$

#### 4. FURTHER QUESTIONS

The conditions in Theorem 3.1 require that either  $n$  is even or  $\sigma(A) \leq n - 1$ , which leaves the case that  $n$  is odd and  $\sigma(A) > n - 1$  uncovered. The requirement is due to the way provided in Corollary 3.7 to construct the doubly substochastic matrix which maximizes  $\text{per}(I - A)$ . It is worth to point out that for  $A \in \tilde{\omega}_n^s$ , the maximum of  $\text{per}(I - A)$  can be easily obtained from Lemma 2.5, Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 3.6. We state the result as the following theorem.

**Theorem 4.1.** *For  $n$  odd and  $n - 1 < \sigma(A) \leq n$ , let  $\sigma(A) = s$  and then we have*

$$\max\{\text{per}(I - A) | A \in \tilde{\omega}_n^s, n - 1 < s \leq n\} = 2^{\frac{n-1}{2}}.$$

To get the maximum value, we can simply take

$$\tilde{A} = M_2 \oplus M_2 \oplus \dots \oplus M_2 \oplus M_3,$$

where  $M_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  with  $(n-3)/2$  copies in total, and  $M_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & s - (n-1) & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ .

Notice that the above  $\tilde{A}$  is a row substochastic matrix but not a doubly substochastic matrix since the second column sum of  $M_3$  is strictly greater than one. Thus the question that finding the maximum value of  $\text{per}(I - A)$  for  $A \in \omega_n^s$  where  $n$  is odd and  $n-1 < s \leq n$  becomes particularly difficult. In this section, we explore the special case when  $n = s = 3$ , which is for all  $A \in \Omega_3$ . Then we give some conjectures based on this result.

**Lemma 4.2.**

$$\max_{A \in \Omega_3} \{\text{per}(I - A)\} = \frac{3}{2}.$$

*Proof.* Suppose  $A_0 \in \Omega_3$  such that  $\text{per}(I - A_0)$  is the maximum. Due to Corollary 2.4,  $A_0$  must have zero diagonal. Since  $A_0$  is also doubly stochastic, we can assume that  $A_0$  has the following form

$$A_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x & 1-x \\ 1-x & 0 & x \\ x & 1-x & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

By direct computation we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{per}(I - A_0) &= \text{per} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -x & -1+x \\ -1+x & 1 & -x \\ -x & -1+x & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= 6x(1-x), \end{aligned}$$

which takes the maximum value  $\frac{3}{2}$  when  $x = \frac{1}{2}$ . That is equivalent to say

$$A_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$\max_{A \in \Omega_3} \{\text{per}(I - A)\} = \text{per}(I - A_0) = \frac{3}{2}.$$

□

We then make the following conjecture.



**Conjecture 4.3.** Let  $n$  be a positive odd integer. Then

$$\max\{\text{per}(I - A) | A \in \Omega_n\} = 2^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \cdot 3.$$

The maximum can be obtained by letting

$$A = M_2 \oplus M_2 \oplus \dots \oplus M_2 \oplus M_3,$$

where  $M_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  with  $\frac{n-1}{2}$  copies, and  $M_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ .

**Lemma 4.4.** Let  $A \in \omega_3$  and  $2 < \sigma(A) \leq 3$ , then

$$\max_{A \in \omega_3} \{\text{per}(I - A)\} \geq \max\left\{\frac{\sigma^2(A) - 5\sigma(A) + 12}{4}, 6 - 2\sigma(A)\right\}.$$

*Proof.* Let

$$A_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{\sigma(A)}{2} - 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{\sigma(A)}{2} - 1 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sigma(A) - 2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus we have

$$\text{per}(I - A_0) = \frac{\sigma^2(A) - 5\sigma(A) + 12}{4},$$

and

$$\text{per}(I - A_1) = 6 - 2\sigma(A).$$

□

**Conjecture 4.5.**

$$\max_{A \in \omega_3} \{\text{per}(I - A)\} = \begin{cases} \frac{\sigma^2(A) - 5\sigma(A) + 12}{4} & \text{if } \frac{-3 + \sqrt{57}}{2} < \sigma(A) \leq 3 \\ 6 - 4\sigma(A) & \text{if } 2 < \sigma(A) \leq \frac{-3 + \sqrt{57}}{2}. \end{cases}$$

**Conjecture 4.6.** Let  $n$  be odd and  $A \in \omega_n$  with  $n - 1 < \sigma(A) \leq n$ . Denote  $\sigma(A)$  by  $s$ . Then

$$\max\{\text{per}(I - A) | A \in \omega_n^s\} = 2^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \cdot c$$

where  $c = \max\{\text{per}(I - B) | B \in \omega_3^{s'}\}$  and  $s' = s - n + 3$ . The maximum can be obtained by letting

$$A = M_2 \oplus M_2 \oplus \dots \oplus M_2 \oplus B_3$$

where  $M_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  with  $\frac{n-1}{2}$  copies, and  $B_3$  is the  $3 \times 3$  matrix maximizing  $\text{per}(I-B)$  for all  $B \in \omega_3^s$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] Richard A. Brualdi and Herbert John Ryser. *Combinatorial Matrix Theory*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge [England]; New York, 1991.
- [2] Richard A. Brualdi and Morris Newman. Proof of a permanental inequality. *Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser.*, 17(2):234–238, 1966.
- [3] Lei Cao. A short note on doubly substochastic analogue of Birkhoff’s theorem. *To appear on Electronic Journal of Linear Algebra*.
- [4] Lei Cao and Selcuk Koyuncu. Sub-defect of product of doubly substochastic matrices. *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, 65(4):653–657, 2017.
- [5] Lei Cao, Selcuk Koyuncu, and Timmothy Parmer. A minimal completion of doubly substochastic matrix. *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, 64(11):2313–2334, 2016.
- [6] P. M. Gibson. A short proof of an inequality for the permanent function. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 17(2):535–536, 1966.
- [7] P. M. Gibson. An inequality between the permanent and determinant. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 19(4):971–972, 1968.
- [8] Massoud Malek. On the maximum of  $\text{per}(I-A)$ . *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, 19(4):347–355, 1986.
- [9] M. Marcus and H. Minc. Permanents. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, (72):577–591, 1965.
- [10] Henryk Minc. Theory of permanents 1978-1981. *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, 12(4):227–263, 1983.
- [11] Henryk Minc. Theory of permanents 1982-1985. *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, 21(2):109–148, 1987.
- [12] Herbert John Ryser. *Combinatorial Mathematics*. Mathematical Association of America, 1963.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NANJING AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY, JIANGSU, 210095, CHINA

*E-mail address:* chenzhi@njau.edu.cn

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, GEORGIAN COURT UNIVERSITY, LAKEWOOD, NJ 08701, USA

*E-mail address:* lcao@georgian.edu