







11 M x112 % x byt inbhite bound for all Need So need a good net, union bound pieces - can not have too large a net Not enough on growth Unit and e ionstant mm n:/p2 n.1p n./py d 31/2 - change Normalize Xn=1 Construct net prece by prece good net: d'2-net in Ko-norm NISCION, Ind Spinzdky Chet Zero m non, 123 う n21 going to split matrix M Cor en reflected reinor Axed 00000 T MMx/Ksmall m-n \sim Not many Estimate probability 1-5 Estinate (R:x) Þ. that many



The smallest singular value of a *d*-regular random square matrix

Alexander Litvak

University of Alberta

based on a joint work with

A. Lytova, K. Tikhomirov, N. Tomczak-Jaegermann, and P. Youssef

MSRI, Berkeley, 2017

Alexander Litvak (Univ. of Alberta)

We consider adjacency matrices of random d-regular directed graphs (digraphs) on n vertices, which can be also seen as bipartive graphs (bigraphs).

We consider adjacency matrices of random *d*-regular directed graphs (digraphs) on *n* vertices, which can be also seen as bipartive graphs (bigraphs). Thus, we deal with a set of $n \times n$ matrices $M = {\mu_{ij}}$ with 0/1-entries and such that every row and every column has exactly *d* ones and with uniform probability on this set.

We consider adjacency matrices of random *d*-regular directed graphs (digraphs) on *n* vertices, which can be also seen as bipartive graphs (bigraphs). Thus, we deal with a set of $n \times n$ matrices $M = \{\mu_{ij}\}$ with 0/1-entries and such that every row and every column has exactly *d* ones and with uniform probability on this set. In the case of undirected graphs, matrices are additionally symmetric.

We consider adjacency matrices of random *d*-regular directed graphs (digraphs) on *n* vertices, which can be also seen as bipartive graphs (bigraphs). Thus, we deal with a set of $n \times n$ matrices $M = \{\mu_{ij}\}$ with 0/1-entries and such that every row and every column has exactly *d* ones and with uniform probability on this set. In the case of undirected graphs, matrices are additionally symmetric. We assume $3 \le d \le n/2$.

We consider adjacency matrices of random *d*-regular directed graphs (digraphs) on *n* vertices, which can be also seen as bipartive graphs (bigraphs). Thus, we deal with a set of $n \times n$ matrices $M = \{\mu_{ij}\}$ with 0/1-entries and such that every row and every column has exactly *d* ones and with uniform probability on this set. In the case of undirected graphs, matrices are additionally symmetric. We assume $3 \le d \le n/2$.

Conjecture (e.g., Vu, survey, 2008; Frieze and Vu, ICM talks 2014)

Such a random matrix is non-singular with high probability

We consider adjacency matrices of random *d*-regular directed graphs (digraphs) on *n* vertices, which can be also seen as bipartive graphs (bigraphs). Thus, we deal with a set of $n \times n$ matrices $M = \{\mu_{ij}\}$ with 0/1-entries and such that every row and every column has exactly *d* ones and with uniform probability on this set. In the case of undirected graphs, matrices are additionally symmetric. We assume $3 \le d \le n/2$.

Conjecture (e.g., Vu, survey, 2008; Frieze and Vu, ICM talks 2014)

Such a random matrix is non-singular with high probability (that is $\mathbf{Pr} \rightarrow 1$ with *n*).

We consider adjacency matrices of random *d*-regular directed graphs (digraphs) on *n* vertices, which can be also seen as bipartive graphs (bigraphs). Thus, we deal with a set of $n \times n$ matrices $M = \{\mu_{ij}\}$ with 0/1-entries and such that every row and every column has exactly *d* ones and with uniform probability on this set. In the case of undirected graphs, matrices are additionally symmetric. We assume $3 \le d \le n/2$.

Conjecture (e.g., Vu, survey, 2008; Frieze and Vu, ICM talks 2014)

Such a random matrix is non-singular with high probability (that is $\mathbf{Pr} \rightarrow 1$ with *n*).

The conjecture was formulated in the symmetric setting, however it is natural to ask the same question in the general setting as well (Cook, **2014**).

We consider adjacency matrices of random *d*-regular directed graphs (digraphs) on *n* vertices, which can be also seen as bipartive graphs (bigraphs). Thus, we deal with a set of $n \times n$ matrices $M = \{\mu_{ij}\}$ with 0/1-entries and such that every row and every column has exactly *d* ones and with uniform probability on this set. In the case of undirected graphs, matrices are additionally symmetric. We assume $3 \le d \le n/2$.

Conjecture (e.g., Vu, survey, 2008; Frieze and Vu, ICM talks 2014)

Such a random matrix is non-singular with high probability (that is $\mathbf{Pr} \rightarrow 1$ with *n*).

The conjecture was formulated in the symmetric setting, however it is natural to ask the same question in the general setting as well (Cook, **2014**).

Remark 1. If d = 1 the matrix is a permutation matrix, hence invertible.

We consider adjacency matrices of random *d*-regular directed graphs (digraphs) on *n* vertices, which can be also seen as bipartive graphs (bigraphs). Thus, we deal with a set of $n \times n$ matrices $M = \{\mu_{ij}\}$ with 0/1-entries and such that every row and every column has exactly *d* ones and with uniform probability on this set. In the case of undirected graphs, matrices are additionally symmetric. We assume $3 \le d \le n/2$.

Conjecture (e.g., Vu, survey, 2008; Frieze and Vu, ICM talks 2014)

Such a random matrix is non-singular with high probability (that is $\mathbf{Pr} \rightarrow 1$ with *n*).

The conjecture was formulated in the symmetric setting, however it is natural to ask the same question in the general setting as well (Cook, **2014**).

Remark 1. If d = 1 the matrix is a permutation matrix, hence invertible.

Remark 2. If d = 2 the conjecture fails (see e.g., Vu, Cook).

(I) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1))

We consider adjacency matrices of random *d*-regular directed graphs (digraphs) on *n* vertices, which can be also seen as bipartive graphs (bigraphs). Thus, we deal with a set of $n \times n$ matrices $M = \{\mu_{ij}\}$ with 0/1-entries and such that every row and every column has exactly *d* ones and with uniform probability on this set. In the case of undirected graphs, matrices are additionally symmetric. We assume $3 \le d \le n/2$.

Conjecture (e.g., Vu, survey, 2008; Frieze and Vu, ICM talks 2014)

Such a random matrix is non-singular with high probability (that is $\mathbf{Pr} \rightarrow 1$ with *n*).

The conjecture was formulated in the symmetric setting, however it is natural to ask the same question in the general setting as well (Cook, **2014**).

Remark 1. If d = 1 the matrix is a permutation matrix, hence invertible.

Remark 2. If d = 2 the conjecture fails (see e.g., Vu, Cook).

Remark 3. The cases $d = d_0$ and $d = n - d_0$ are essentially the same (by interchanging zeros and ones).

・ロト ・ 日 ・ ・ ヨ ・ ・ ヨ ・ ・

Theorem (Cook, 2014)

The conjecture holds for $d \gg \ln^2 n$ with probability $1 - 1/d^c$.

ヨトィヨト

Theorem (Cook, 2014)

The conjecture holds for $d \gg \ln^2 n$ with probability $1 - 1/d^c$.

Remark 1. $d \gg \ln^2 n$ means $d/\ln^2 n \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$.

Theorem (Cook, 2014)

The conjecture holds for $d \gg \ln^2 n$ with probability $1 - 1/d^c$.

Remark 1. $d \gg \ln^2 n$ means $d/\ln^2 n \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$.

Remark 2. Erdos–Renyi model: A random graph G, whose edges appear with probability p_n .

Theorem (Cook, 2014)

The conjecture holds for $d \gg \ln^2 n$ with probability $1 - 1/d^c$.

Remark 1. $d \gg \ln^2 n$ means $d/\ln^2 n \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$.

Remark 2. Erdos–Renyi model: A random graph G, whose edges appear with probability p_n . Adjacency matrix: entries are independent 0/1 Bernoulli random variables.

Theorem (Cook, 2014)

The conjecture holds for $d \gg \ln^2 n$ with probability $1 - 1/d^c$.

Remark 1. $d \gg \ln^2 n$ means $d/\ln^2 n \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$.

Remark 2. Erdos–Renyi model: A random graph G, whose edges appear with probability p_n . Adjacency matrix: entries are independent 0/1 Bernoulli random variables. "In average" the sums of entries in each column and each rows equals $p_n n$.

Theorem (Cook, 2014)

The conjecture holds for $d \gg \ln^2 n$ with probability $1 - 1/d^c$.

Remark 1. $d \gg \ln^2 n$ means $d/\ln^2 n \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$.

Remark 2. Erdos–Renyi model: A random graph *G*, whose edges appear with probability p_n . Adjacency matrix: entries are independent 0/1 Bernoulli random variables. "In average" the sums of entries in each column and each rows equals $p_n n$. Thus it is natural to assume that this model (with $p_n = d/n$) behaves similarly to regular digraphs.

Theorem (Cook, 2014)

The conjecture holds for $d \gg \ln^2 n$ with probability $1 - 1/d^c$.

Remark 1. $d \gg \ln^2 n$ means $d/\ln^2 n \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$.

Remark 2. Erdos–Renyi model: A random graph *G*, whose edges appear with probability p_n . Adjacency matrix: entries are independent 0/1 Bernoulli random variables. "In average" the sums of entries in each column and each rows equals $p_n n$. Thus it is natural to assume that this model (with $p_n = d/n$) behaves similarly to regular digraphs.

Basak, Rudelson (2015): Indeed, a random matrix in this model is non-singular with high probability if $d \gg \ln n$

Theorem (Cook, 2014)

The conjecture holds for $d \gg \ln^2 n$ with probability $1 - 1/d^c$.

Remark 1. $d \gg \ln^2 n$ means $d/\ln^2 n \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$.

Remark 2. Erdos–Renyi model: A random graph *G*, whose edges appear with probability p_n . Adjacency matrix: entries are independent 0/1 Bernoulli random variables. "In average" the sums of entries in each column and each rows equals $p_n n$. Thus it is natural to assume that this model (with $p_n = d/n$) behaves similarly to regular digraphs.

Basak, Rudelson (2015): Indeed, a random matrix in this model is non-singular with high probability if $d \gg \ln n$ (if $d \le \ln n$ then there is a zero row with prob. $\ge 1/2$).

Theorem (Cook, 2014)

The conjecture holds for $d \gg \ln^2 n$ with probability $1 - 1/d^c$.

Remark 1. $d \gg \ln^2 n$ means $d/\ln^2 n \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$.

Remark 2. Erdos–Renyi model: A random graph *G*, whose edges appear with probability p_n . Adjacency matrix: entries are independent 0/1 Bernoulli random variables. "In average" the sums of entries in each column and each rows equals $p_n n$. Thus it is natural to assume that this model (with $p_n = d/n$) behaves similarly to regular digraphs.

Basak, Rudelson (2015): Indeed, a random matrix in this model is non-singular with high probability if $d \gg \ln n$ (if $d \le \ln n$ then there is a zero row with prob. $\ge 1/2$).

Behavior of directed graphs is different for small d – no zero rows.

Theorem (Cook, 2014)

The conjecture holds for $d \gg \ln^2 n$ with probability $1 - 1/d^c$.

Remark 1. $d \gg \ln^2 n$ means $d/\ln^2 n \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$.

Remark 2. Erdos–Renyi model: A random graph *G*, whose edges appear with probability p_n . Adjacency matrix: entries are independent 0/1 Bernoulli random variables. "In average" the sums of entries in each column and each rows equals $p_n n$. Thus it is natural to assume that this model (with $p_n = d/n$) behaves similarly to regular digraphs.

Basak, Rudelson (2015): Indeed, a random matrix in this model is non-singular with high probability if $d \gg \ln n$ (if $d \le \ln n$ then there is a zero row with prob. $\ge 1/2$).

Behavior of directed graphs is different for small d – no zero rows.

Theorem (LLTTP, 2015)

The conjecture holds for $C \le d \le n/\ln^2 n$ with probability $1 - C \ln^3 d/\sqrt{d}$.

Can we estimate the smallest singular number $s_n(M)$ from below?

Can we estimate the smallest singular number $s_n(M)$ from below? Such bounds are interesting by itself and have many applications in several areas – Geometric Functional Analysis, Compressed Sensing, Computer Science, and others.

Can we estimate the smallest singular number $s_n(M)$ from below? Such bounds are interesting by itself and have many applications in several areas – Geometric Functional Analysis, Compressed Sensing, Computer Science, and others. They also play an essential role in establishing the circular law.

Can we estimate the smallest singular number $s_n(M)$ from below? Such bounds are interesting by itself and have many applications in several areas – Geometric Functional Analysis, Compressed Sensing, Computer Science, and others. They also play an essential role in establishing the circular law. Huge amount of results for matrices with independent entries or with independent rows.

Can we estimate the smallest singular number $s_n(M)$ from below?

Such bounds are interesting by itself and have many applications in several areas – Geometric Functional Analysis, Compressed Sensing, Computer Science, and others. They also play an essential role in establishing the circular law.

Huge amount of results for matrices with independent entries or with independent rows.

Sparse matrices are very important in statistics, neural network, electrical engineering, wireless communications, and in many other fields. In standard iid model we refer to recent works by Tao–Vu, Götze–A.Tikhomirov, Wood, Basak–Rudelson.

Can we estimate the smallest singular number $s_n(M)$ from below?

Such bounds are interesting by itself and have many applications in several areas – Geometric Functional Analysis, Compressed Sensing, Computer Science, and others. They also play an essential role in establishing the circular law.

Huge amount of results for matrices with independent entries or with independent rows.

Sparse matrices are very important in statistics, neural network, electrical engineering, wireless communications, and in many other fields. In standard iid model we refer to recent works by Tao–Vu, Götze–A.Tikhomirov, Wood, Basak–Rudelson. However our model is completely different as there are many dependencies.

Can we estimate the smallest singular number $s_n(M)$ from below?

Such bounds are interesting by itself and have many applications in several areas – Geometric Functional Analysis, Compressed Sensing, Computer Science, and others. They also play an essential role in establishing the circular law.

Huge amount of results for matrices with independent entries or with independent rows.

Sparse matrices are very important in statistics, neural network, electrical engineering, wireless communications, and in many other fields. In standard iid model we refer to recent works by Tao–Vu, Götze–A.Tikhomirov, Wood, Basak–Rudelson. However our model is completely different as there are many dependencies.

Theorem (BR, 2015)

In Erdos–Renyi model with $p_n = d/n$ one has

$$\mathbb{P}\left(s_n(M) \geq \varepsilon c_{n,d} \, \frac{\sqrt{d}}{n}\right) \geq 1 - \varepsilon - e^{-d},$$

where $c_{n,d} = \exp\left(-\frac{c\ln(n/d)}{\ln d}\right)$.

Theorem (Cook, 2016)

Let $d > \ln^{c} n$. Let M be d-regular random square matrix. Then

$$\mathbb{P}\left(s_n(M) \ge n^{-c_0 \ln n / \ln d}\right) \ge 1 - \ln^c n / \sqrt{d}.$$

Moreover, the circular law holds.

Theorem (Cook, 2016)

Let $d > \ln^{c} n$. Let M be d-regular random square matrix. Then

$$\mathbb{P}\left(s_n(M) \ge n^{-c_0 \ln n / \ln d}\right) \ge 1 - \ln^c n / \sqrt{d}.$$

Moreover, the circular law holds.

Theorem (LLTTY, 2017)

Let $C < d < n/\log^2 n$. Then

$$\mathbb{P}\left(s_n(M) \ge 1/n^6\right) \ge 1 - \ln^2 d/\sqrt{d}.$$

1. Matrices with large zero minors:

1. Matrices with large zero minors: there are large $I, J \subset [n]$ such that $\mu_{ij} = 0$ whenever $i \in I, j \in J$.

- **1.** Matrices with large zero minors: there are large $I, J \subset [n]$ such that $\mu_{ij} = 0$ whenever $i \in I, j \in J$.
- 2. Matrices with overlapping pairs of rows:

1. Matrices with large zero minors: there are large $I, J \subset [n]$ such that $\mu_{ij} = 0$ whenever $i \in I, j \in J$.

2. Matrices with overlapping pairs of rows: there are two rows such that intersection of their supports is larger than εd .

1. Matrices with large zero minors: there are large $I, J \subset [n]$ such that $\mu_{ij} = 0$ whenever $i \in I, j \in J$.

2. Matrices with overlapping pairs of rows: there are two rows such that intersection of their supports is larger than εd .

3. Matrices with a set of overlapping columns:

1. Matrices with large zero minors: there are large $I, J \subset [n]$ such that $\mu_{ij} = 0$ whenever $i \in I, j \in J$.

2. Matrices with overlapping pairs of rows: there are two rows such that intersection of their supports is larger than εd .

3. Matrices with a set of overlapping columns: there exist k columns such that cardinality of union of their supports is $\leq (1 - \varepsilon)dk$.

1. Matrices with large zero minors: there are large $I, J \subset [n]$ such that $\mu_{ij} = 0$ whenever $i \in I, j \in J$.

2. Matrices with overlapping pairs of rows: there are two rows such that intersection of their supports is larger than εd .

3. Matrices with a set of overlapping columns: there exist *k* columns such that cardinality of union of their supports is $\leq (1 - \varepsilon)dk$. (Of course, **2** is a partial case of **3** with k = 2.)