## How to compare the size of covariance matrices?

Consider two covariance matrices  $\mathbf{A}_{n \times n}$  and  $\mathbf{B}_{n \times n}$ . We say that  $\mathbf{A}$  is *bigger* than  $\mathbf{B}$ , often denoted by  $\mathbf{A} \geq \mathbf{B}$  or  $\mathbf{A} \succeq \mathbf{B}$ , if  $\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}$  is semi-positive definite. Why do we use the "definiteness" of a matrix to compare the size of two covariance matrices?

First, notice that a covariance matrix is not only symmetrical, but also semi-positive definite. Consider a random vector  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, ..., x_n)^{\top}$ . The covariance matrix is defined by

$$\mathbf{K} \coloneqq \mathbf{E}[(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{x}])(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{x}])^{\top}].$$

Given any constant vector  $\mathbf{v}$  of length n, we have

$$\mathbf{v}^{\top}\mathbf{K}\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{v}^{\top}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{x}])(\mathbf{v}^{\top}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{x}]))^{\top}] \geq 0$$

by the definition of **K**. Therefore, the covariance matrix **K** is semi-positive definite. In fact,  $\mathbf{v}^{\top}\mathbf{K}\mathbf{v}$  is zero iff **x** has no variance at all.

There is another intuitive way of interpreting the definiteness described above. Consider the same vector  $\mathbf{v}$  and the random vector  $\mathbf{x}$ . The dot product  $\mathbf{v}^{\top}\mathbf{x}$  is the projection of the random vector from *n*-dimensional space on a one-dimensional space along the direction of  $\mathbf{v}$ , i.e., this collapse the *n*dimensional random variable to a one-dimensional random variable through some linear combination. If we calculate the variance of the one-dimensional random variable  $\mathbf{v}^{\top}\mathbf{x}$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Var}[\mathbf{v}^{\top}\mathbf{x}] &= \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{v}^{\top}\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{v}^{\top}\mathbf{x})^{\top}] - \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{v}^{\top}\mathbf{x}] \,\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{v}^{\top}\mathbf{x}]^{\top} \\ &= \mathbf{v}^{\top} \big( \,\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^{\top}] - \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{x}] \,\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{x}]^{\top} \big) \mathbf{v} \\ &= \mathbf{v}^{\top} \mathbf{K} \mathbf{v}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the variance assumes the exact form as before. And since variance is non-negative, it is clear that the covariance matrix must be semipositive definite. That is, for any direction  $\mathbf{v}$ , the variance of " $\mathbf{x}$  projected on that direction" is (clearly) non-negative.

Motivated by the intuitive interpretation, lets now compare two covariance matrices. Let  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, ..., x_n)^{\top}$  and  $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, ..., y_n)^{\top}$  be random vectors with mean  $(0, ..., 0)^{\top}$  for simplicity. Let  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^{\top}]$  and  $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{y}\mathbf{y}^{\top}]$  be the covariance matrices. Our goal is to compare  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$  in some meaningful way. We can project  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$  on a vector  $\mathbf{v}$ , and then compare the variance (non-negative real number) of the two projections. To make the comparison 2024-10-14 jessekelighine.com Jesse C. Chen 陳捷

meaningful, it is reasonable to compare all possible projections, i.e., consider all possible choices of **v**.

Formally, consider any vector **v**. The projection of **x** on **v** is  $\mathbf{v}^{\top}\mathbf{x}$ . The variance of  $\mathbf{v}^{\top}\mathbf{x}$  is

$$\begin{split} \mathbf{E}[(\mathbf{v}^{\top}\mathbf{x})^2] &= \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{v}^{\top}\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^{\top}\mathbf{v}] \\ &= \mathbf{v}^{\top}\,\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^{\top}]\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}^{\top}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v} \end{split}$$

where **A** is the covariance matrix. Similarly, consider the same for **y**. If we find that  $\forall$ **v**,

$$\mathbf{v}^{\top} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}^{\top} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}^{\top} (\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}) \mathbf{v} \ge 0,$$

then, by definition,  $\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}$  is semi-positive definite. Now we know why we say  $\mathbf{A}$  is *larger* than  $\mathbf{B}$  when  $\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}$  is positive definite:

If  $\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}$  is positive definite, then for all possible directions  $\mathbf{v}$ , the variance of  $\mathbf{x}$  is larger than  $\mathbf{y}$ 's. <sup>a</sup>

 $^a{\rm This}$  order of semi-positive definite matrices is called the Löwner ordering.

This interpretation of the partial ordering can be understood easily through visualisation. The following are representations of the distributions  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$  where the two random vectors are twodimensional:



Let  $\mathbf{x}$  with covariance matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  be the blue distribution and  $\mathbf{y}$  with covariance matrix  $\mathbf{B}$  be the red distribution. It is clear that in case 1,  $\mathbf{A}$  is *bigger* than  $\mathbf{B}$  since the variance of  $\mathbf{x}$  is bigger that  $\mathbf{y}$ 's in *every* direction. (every possible direction of projection) However, the same statement is not true in case 2. In some directions (e.g.  $\mathbf{v}_1$ ), the variance of  $\mathbf{x}$  is larger; in other directions (e.g.  $\mathbf{v}_2$ ), the variance of  $\mathbf{y}$  is larger. Thus,  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$  are not comparable by the partial order in case 2. #