

## CHARACTERIZATION OF BIJECTIVE AND BIMEASURABLE TRANSFORMATIONS FOR BIVARIATE NORMAL VARIATES

By C. G. KHATRI

Gujarat University, India

and

RAHUL MUKERJEE

Indian Statistical Institute

**SUMMARY.** Ghosh's result (1969) in the case of univariate normal distribution based on two parametric points is extended to bivariate normal distribution based on three parametric points establishing Khatri's conjecture (1986) for bivariate situation. This result was established by Khatri (1990) under some restrictions on covariance matrices. The general multivariate situation is under consideration.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $\mathbf{x}$  be a  $p$ -vector variable and  $g(\mathbf{x})$  be a bijective and bimeasurable transformation of  $\mathbf{x}$ . When  $p = 1$ , Ghosh (1969) proved that if  $x \sim N(\mu_1, \sigma_1^2)$  implies  $g(x) \sim N(\eta_1, \psi_1)$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , and  $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$ , then  $g(x)$  is essentially linear in  $x$ . For the  $p$ -variate normal distribution, Khatri (1986) established that if  $\mathbf{x} \sim N(\mu_i, \Sigma_i)$  implies  $g(\mathbf{x}) \sim N(\eta_i, V_i)$  for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, p$ , where  $\Sigma_i = \Sigma_0$  for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, r$  ( $r > 0$ ) and  $\Sigma_i = \Sigma_p$  for  $i = r+1, \dots, p$  with  $\Sigma_0 \neq \Sigma_p$ , and

$$[\Sigma_1^{-1}(\mu_0 - \mu_1), \Sigma_2^{-1}(\mu_0 - \mu_2), \dots, \Sigma_p^{-1}(\mu_0 - \mu_p)]$$

is nonsingular, then  $g(\mathbf{x})$  is essentially linear in  $\mathbf{x}$ . Further, he conjectured that this is true even without the conditions on  $\Sigma_i$ 's as in Khatri (1986). This conjecture is established here for  $p = 2$  and this can be mentioned as

**Theorem 1 :** Let  $\mathbf{x} \sim N(\mu_i, \Sigma_i)$  imply  $g(\mathbf{x}) \sim N(\eta_i, V_i)$  for  $i = 0, 1, 2$  and  $p = 2$ . Assume that

$$(\Sigma_1^{-1}(\mu_1 - \mu_0), \Sigma_2^{-1}(\mu_2 - \mu_0))$$

is nonsingular. Then  $g(\mathbf{x})$  is essentially linear in  $\mathbf{x}$ . Here  $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \Sigma_0, V_1, V_2, V_0$  are all  $2 \times 2$  positive definite matrices and  $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \Sigma_0$  may be all distinct.

---

AMS (1980) subject classification : 62H05.

Key words and phrases : determinantal equation, orthogonal transformation, essential linearity.

Further, the following result is established :

Theorem 2 : Let  $x \sim N(0, \Sigma_i)$  imply  $g(x) \sim N(\eta_i, V_i)$  for  $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$ , where  $p = 2$  and  $\Sigma_i$  and  $V_i$  ( $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$ ) are positive definite. Let

$$A_i = \Sigma_0^{-1} \Sigma_i^{-1} \Sigma_0 - I = \begin{pmatrix} a_{1i} & a_{2i} \\ a_{3i} & a_{3i} \end{pmatrix}$$

for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , and assume that

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{21} & a_{31} \\ a_{12} & a_{22} & a_{32} \\ a_{13} & a_{23} & a_{33} \end{pmatrix}$$

is nonsingular. Then  $\eta_i = \eta_0$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , and there exists a non-singular matrix  $P$  such that

$$(g(x) - \eta_0)(g(x) - \eta_0)' = P x x' P'.$$

## 2. SOME LEMMAS AND PROOFS OF MAIN THEOREMS

We shall first prove some results necessary for the proof of the main theorem mentioned in section 1.

Lemma 1 : Let  $A_i$  and  $B_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, k (> 1)$ ) be  $2 \times 2$  symmetric matrices and

$$\left| I_2 + \sum_{t=1}^k v_t A_t \right| = \left| I_2 + \sum_{t=1}^k v_t B_t \right|,$$

for all real  $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k$ . Then there exists an orthogonal matrix  $P$  such that  $A_i = P B_i P'$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ .

*Proof :* The given equation implies that for each  $i$ ,  $|I + v_i A_i| = |I + v_i B_i|$  for every real  $v_i$  and this implies that  $A_i$  and  $B_i$  have the same eigenvalues. Hence, if  $A = \alpha I$  for some  $\alpha$ , then  $B_i = \alpha I$ . Then any orthogonal matrix will be suitable for the result. From this point, we shall assume that none of the  $A_i$ 's is proportional to  $I$ . Without loss of generality, assume that

$$A_1 = B_1 = \begin{pmatrix} h_1 & 0 \\ 0 & h_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad h_1 \neq h_2.$$

Taking  $A_j = \begin{pmatrix} a_{1j} & a_{2j} \\ a_{2j} & a_{3j} \end{pmatrix}$  and  $B_j = \begin{pmatrix} b_{1j} & b_{2j} \\ b_{2j} & b_{3j} \end{pmatrix}$  for  $j = 2, 3, \dots, k$ ,

the given equation is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(1+h_1v_1+\sum_{j=2}^k v_j a_{1j}\right) \left(1+h_2v_1+\sum_{j=2}^k v_j a_{2j}\right) - \left(\sum_{j=2}^k v_j a_{2j}\right)^2 = \\ & \left(1+h_1v_1+\sum_{j=2}^k v_j b_{1j}\right) \left(1+h_2v_1+\sum_{j=2}^k v_j b_{2j}\right) - \left(\sum_{j=2}^k v_j b_{2j}\right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

for all  $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k$ . Equating the coefficients of  $v_i^2$ 's,  $v_i v_j$ 's, we get

$$a_{1j}+a_{2j} = b_{1j}+b_{2j}, \quad h_1 a_{2j}+h_2 a_{1j} = h_1 b_{2j}+h_2 b_{1j} \quad \text{for } j = 2, 3, \dots, k;$$

$$a_{1j} a_{2j} - a_{2j}^2 = b_{1j} b_{2j} - b_{2j}^2 \quad \text{for } j = 2, 3, \dots, k;$$

$$a_{1i} a_{2j} + a_{1j} a_{2i} - 2a_{2i} a_{2j} = b_{1i} b_{2j} + b_{1j} b_{2i} - 2b_{2i} b_{2j}$$

$$\text{for all } i \neq j, i, j = 2, 3, \dots, k.$$

From the above equalities, we get

$$a_{1j} = b_{1j}, \quad a_{2j} = b_{2j}, \quad a_{2j}^2 = b_{2j}^2, \quad a_{2i} a_{2j} = b_{2i} b_{2j},$$

for all  $i \neq j, i, j = 2, 3, \dots, k$ . This shows that

$$A_j = V B_j V \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \dots, k,$$

$$\text{where } V = I, \text{ or } V = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ or } V = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ or } V = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

This proves the lemma.

*Remark 1:* Suppose  $|I_p + \sum_{t=1}^k v_t A_t| = |I_p + \sum_{t=1}^k v_t B_t|$  for all real  $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k$ , where  $A_1, \dots, A_k, B_1, \dots, B_k$  are  $p \times p$  symmetric matrices and  $p \geq 3$ . Consider for example,

$$A_1 = B_1 = \begin{pmatrix} h_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & h_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & h_3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_2 = \begin{pmatrix} a & x & 0 \\ x & a & z \\ 0 & z & a \end{pmatrix}, \quad B_2 = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & y \\ 0 & a & w \\ y & w & a \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $h_1 > h_2 > h_3 > 0$ . Note that  $A_2$  and  $B_2$  will be positive definite if  $a > 0$ ,  $a^2 > x^2 + z^2$  and  $a^2 > y^2 + w^2$ . It may be seen that

$$|I_3 + v_1 A_1 + v_2 A_2| = |I_3 + v_1 B_1 + v_2 B_2|$$

holds for all real  $v_1, v_2$  provided

$$x^2 = (h_1 - h_2)y^2 / (h_1 - h_3), \quad z^2 = ((h_1 - h_3)w^2 + (h_2 - h_3)y^2) / (h_1 - h_3).$$

Considering non-zero choices of  $x, z, y, w$ , satisfying the above conditions, it follows that Lemma 1 does not hold for  $p \geq 3$  and  $k \geq 2$ .

Lemma 2: Let  $A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2$  be nonsingular  $2 \times 2$  symmetric matrices on the real space and  $\mu_1, \mu_2, \nu_1, \nu_2$  be  $2 \times 1$  vectors such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \sum_{t=1}^2 v_t A_t \mu_t \right)' \left( I + \sum_{t=1}^2 v_t A_t \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{t=1}^2 v_t A_t \mu_t \right) \\ &= \left( \sum_{t=1}^2 v_t B_t \nu_t \right)' \left( I + \sum_{t=1}^2 v_t B_t \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{t=1}^2 v_t B_t \nu_t \right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\left| I + \sum_{t=1}^2 v_t A_t \right| = \left| I + \sum_{t=1}^2 v_t B_t \right|$$

for all real  $v_1, v_2$ . Then there exists an orthogonal matrix  $P$  such that  $\mu_i = P\nu_i$  and  $A_i = PB_iP'$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , provided  $(A_1\mu_1, A_2\mu_2) = \Delta$  is nonsingular.

*Proof:* By Lemma 1, there exists an orthogonal matrix  $Q$  such that  $A_i = QB_iQ'$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , or  $(I + v_1A_1 + v_2A_2) = Q(I + v_1B_1 + v_2B_2)Q'$ , for all real  $v_1, v_2$ . Then, defining

$$\alpha_i = A_i \mu_i, \beta_i = QB_i \nu_i \quad (i = 1, 2),$$

the first equation yields

$$\left| \begin{array}{cc} 1 & v_1\alpha_1' + v_2\alpha_2' \\ v_1\alpha_1 + v_2\alpha_2 & I + \sum_{t=1}^2 v_t A_t \end{array} \right| = \left| \begin{array}{cc} 1 & v_1\beta_1' + v_2\beta_2' \\ v_1\beta_1 + v_2\beta_2 & I + \sum_{t=1}^2 v_t B_t \end{array} \right|$$

for all real  $v_1, v_2$ . Hence for all real  $v_1, v_2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| I + \sum_{t=1}^2 v_t A_t - (v_1\alpha_1 + v_2\alpha_2)(v_1\alpha_1 + v_2\alpha_2)' \right| \\ &= \left| I + \sum_{t=1}^2 v_t A_t - (v_1\beta_1 + v_2\beta_2)(v_1\beta_1 + v_2\beta_2)' \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Now, directly equating the coefficients of the powers of  $v_t$ 's, we get the following equations:

$$\alpha_1' \alpha_1 = \beta_1' \beta_1, \alpha_2' \alpha_2 = \beta_2' \beta_2, \alpha_1' \alpha_2 = \beta_1' \beta_2, \quad \dots \quad (2.1)$$

$$\alpha_1' A_1^{-1} \alpha_1 = \beta_1' A_1^{-1} \beta_1, \quad \dots \quad (2.2a)$$

$$\alpha_2' A_2^{-1} \alpha_2 = \beta_2' A_2^{-1} \beta_2, \quad \dots \quad (2.2b)$$

$$2 |A_1| \alpha_1' A_1^{-1} \alpha_2 + |A_2| \alpha_2' A_2^{-1} \alpha_1 = 2 |A_1| \beta_1' A_1^{-1} \beta_2 + |A_2| \beta_2' A_2^{-1} \beta_1, \quad \dots \quad (2.2c)$$

$$2 |A_2| \alpha_2' A_2^{-1} \alpha_1 + |A_1| \alpha_1' A_1^{-1} \alpha_2 = 2 |A_2| \beta_2' A_2^{-1} \beta_1 + |A_1| \beta_1' A_1^{-1} \beta_2. \quad \dots \quad (2.2d)$$

The solution of (2.1) shows that

$$(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = R(\beta_1, \beta_2), \quad \dots \quad (2.3)$$

where  $R$  is an orthogonal matrix and  $(\beta_1, \beta_2)$  is nonsingular. Using this in (2.2) and defining  $C_i = |A_i| (RA_i^{-1}R' - A_i^{-1})$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_i' C_i \alpha_i &= 0 \quad (i = 1, 2), \quad 2\alpha_1' C_1 \alpha_2 + \alpha_1' C_2 \alpha_1 = 0, \\ 2\alpha_2' C_2 \alpha_1 + \alpha_2' C_1 \alpha_2 &= 0, \quad \text{tr } C_i = 0 \quad (i = 1, 2). \end{aligned} \quad \dots \quad (2.4)$$

Let us write

$$\alpha_1 = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} \\ a_{12} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha_2 = \begin{pmatrix} a_{21} \\ a_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \quad C_1 = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & x_2 \\ x_2 & -x_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad C_2 = \begin{pmatrix} y_1 & y_2 \\ y_2 & -y_1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Notice that given  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$ , (2.4) represents a system of linear equations in  $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2$ , and can be written as

$$Td = 0, \quad \dots \quad (2.4a)$$

where  $d = (x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2)'$ , and

$$T = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11}^2 - a_{12}^2 & 2a_{11}a_{12} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & a_{21}^2 - a_{22}^2 & 2a_{21}a_{22} \\ a_1^* & a_2^* & a_{11}^* - a_{12}^* & 2a_{11}a_{12} \\ a_{21}^* - a_{22}^* & 2a_{21}a_{22} & a_1^* & a_2^* \end{bmatrix},$$

with  $a_1^* = 2(a_{11}a_{21} - a_{12}a_{22})$ ,  $a_2^* = 2(a_{12}a_{21} + a_{11}a_{22})$ . Note that by routine explicit calculation,  $|T| = 4(a_{11}a_{22} - a_{12}a_{21})^4 > 0$ . Hence, (2.4a) shows that  $d = 0$ , i.e.,  $C_1 = C_2 = 0$ . Therefore, we have

$$QB_iQ' = A_i = RA_iR' \text{ and } A_i\mu_i = RQB_i\nu_i \quad (i = 1, 2).$$

From these, we get  $\mu_i = P\nu_i$  and  $A_i = PB_iP'$  with  $P = RQ$  and  $A_i = RA_iR'$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , where  $P, R$  and  $Q$  are orthogonal matrices. This proves Lemma 2.

*Remark 2:* Is Lemma 2 true for  $p > 3$ ? In view of Remark 1, it appears that Lemma 2 will not be true for  $p > 3$  and  $k > 3$ .

*Proof of Theorem 1:* Since  $g(x)$  is bijective and bimeasurable function of  $x$ , using Theorem 1 of Khatri (1986), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (x - \mu_0)' (\Sigma_i^{-1} - \Sigma_0^{-1})(x - \mu_0) + 2(\mu_0 - \mu_i)' \Sigma_i^{-1}(x - \mu_0) \\ &= (g(x) - \eta_0)' (V_i^{-1} - V_0^{-1})(g(x) - \eta_0) + 2(\eta_0 - \eta_i)' V_i^{-1}(g(x) - \eta_0), \quad \dots \quad (2.5) \end{aligned}$$

for all real  $x$  and for  $i = 1, 2$ ,

$$\left| I - t \sum_{i=1}^k v_i (\Sigma_i^{-1} - \Sigma_0^{-1}) \Sigma_0 \right| = \left| I - t \sum_{i=1}^k v_i (V_i^{-1} - V_0^{-1}) V_0 \right| \quad \dots \quad (2.6a)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \sum_{t=1}^s v_t \Sigma_0^{-1}(\mu_t - \mu_0) \right)' \left( \Sigma_0^{-1} - t \sum_{t=1}^s v_t (\Sigma_t^{-1} - \Sigma_0^{-1}) \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{t=1}^s v_t \Sigma_t^{-1}(\mu_t - \mu_0) \right) \\ & = \left( \sum_{t=1}^s v_t V_t^{-1}(\eta_t - \eta_0) \right)' \left( V_0^{-1} - t \sum_{t=1}^s v_t (V_t^{-1} - V_0^{-1}) \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{t=1}^s v_t V_t^{-1}(\eta_t - \eta_0) \right) \dots \quad (2.6b) \end{aligned}$$

for all real  $t$ ,  $v_1$ ,  $v_2$ . Taking

$$A_t = \Sigma_0^{-1} \Sigma_t^{-1} \Sigma_0 B_t = V_0^{-1} V_t^{-1} V_0, \mu_{(t)} = \Sigma_0^{-1}(\mu_0 - \mu_t), \eta_{(t)} = V_0^{-1}(\eta_0 - \eta_t),$$

for  $i = 1, 2$ , and defining  $x_0 = \Sigma_0^{-1}(x - \mu_0)$ ,  $y_0 = V_0^{-1}(g(x) - \eta_0)$ , we can rewrite (2.5) and (2.6) as

$$x_0'(A_i - I)x_0 + 2\mu_{(i)}'A_i x_0 = y_0'(B_i - I)y_0 + 2\eta_{(i)}B_i y_0 \quad (i = 1, 2), \quad \dots \quad (2.7)$$

and

$$\left| I + \sum_{t=1}^s v_t A_t \right| = \left| I + \sum_{t=1}^s v_t B_t \right|, \quad \dots \quad (2.8a)$$

for all real  $v_1$ ,  $v_2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \sum_{t=1}^s v_t A_t \mu_{(t)} \right)' \left( I + \sum_{t=1}^s v_t A_t \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{t=1}^s v_t A_t \mu_{(t)} \right) \\ & = \left( \sum_{t=1}^s v_t B_t \eta_{(t)} \right)' \left( I + \sum_{t=1}^s v_t B_t \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{t=1}^s v_t B_t \eta_{(t)} \right), \quad \dots \quad (2.8b) \end{aligned}$$

for all real  $v_1$ ,  $v_2$ . By Lemma 2, (2.8) shows that there exists an orthogonal matrix  $P$  such that

$$\mu_{(i)} = P\eta_{(i)}, \quad A_i = PB_iP' \quad (i = 1, 2), \quad \dots \quad (2.9)$$

when  $p = 2$ . Using these in (2.7), we have

$$(x_0 - Py)'(2\Delta + H) = 0 \quad \dots \quad (2.10)$$

for all real  $x$ , where

$$2\Delta + H = [2A_1\mu_{(1)} + (A_1 - I)(x_0 + Py_0), 2A_2\mu_{(2)} + (A_2 - I)(x_0 + Py_0)].$$

Then, arguing as done by Ghosh (1969) or Khatri (1986), we get

$$Py_0 = x_0 \text{ or } g(x) = \eta_0 + V_0^{-1}P'\Sigma_0^{-1}(x - \mu_0),$$

for almost all real  $x$ , which proves Theorem 1.

*Proof of Theorem 2:* Since  $g(x)$  is bijective and bimeasurable function of  $x$ , by Theorem 1 of Khatri (1986),

$$x'(\Sigma_t^{-1} - \Sigma_0^{-1})x = (g(x) - \eta_0)'(V_t^{-1} - V_0^{-1})(g(x) - \eta_0) \quad (i = 1, 2, 3), \quad \dots \quad (2.11)$$

for all real  $\mathbf{x}$ , and for all real  $v_1, v_2, v_3$ ,

$$\left| I + \sum_{i=1}^3 v_i A_i \right| = \left| I + \sum_{i=1}^3 v_i B_i \right| \text{ and } \eta_i = \eta_0 \quad (i = 1, 2, 3), \quad \dots \quad (2.12)$$

where  $A_i = \Sigma_i^{-1} \Sigma_i - I$ ,  $B_i = V_i^{-1} V_i - I$  ( $i = 1, 2, 3$ ). Using Lemma 1 in (2.12), there exists an orthogonal matrix  $P$  such that

$$A_i = P B_i P' \quad (i = 1, 2, 3).$$

Using this in (2.11), we have

$$(\Sigma_0^{-1} \mathbf{x})' A_i (\Sigma_0^{-1} \mathbf{x}) = (P V_0^{-1} (g(\mathbf{x}) - \eta_0))' A_i (P V_0^{-1} (g(\mathbf{x}) - \eta_0)), \quad \dots \quad (2.13)$$

for all real  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . Taking

$$(\Sigma_0^{-1} \mathbf{x}) (\Sigma_0^{-1} \mathbf{x})' - (P V_0^{-1} (g(\mathbf{x}) - \eta_0)) (P V_0^{-1} (g(\mathbf{x}) - \eta_0))' = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & x_2 \\ x_2 & x_3 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$A_i = \begin{pmatrix} a_{1i} & a_{2i} \\ a_{2i} & a_{3i} \end{pmatrix} \quad (i = 1, 2, 3), \quad \delta' = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$$

and

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & 2a_{21} & a_{31} \\ a_{12} & 2a_{22} & a_{32} \\ a_{13} & 2a_{23} & a_{33} \end{pmatrix},$$

(2.13) gives  $T\delta = 0$  and hence  $\delta = 0$ , or

$$(g(\mathbf{x}) - \eta_0) (g(\mathbf{x}) - \eta_0)' = A \mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}' A',$$

with  $A = V_0^{-1} P' \Sigma_0^{-1}$ , for all real  $\mathbf{x}$ . This proves Theorem 2.

*Acknowledgement.* The second author is thankful to Mr. Subir Kumar Bhandari, Indian Statistical Institute, for some helpful discussion.

#### REFERENCES

- GROSH, J. K. (1969): Only linear transformations preserve normality. *Sankhyā*, Ser. A, 31, 309-312.  
 KEATRI, C. G. (1986): Characterization of bijective and bimeasurable transformations of normal variates. *Sankhyā*, 49, Ser. A, Pt. 3.

*Paper received: September, 1986.*

*Revised: April, 1987.*