## ONE WAY TO THINK ABOUT: CHANGE OF BASIS MATRICES

## 1. Introduction

Suppose $\alpha=\left\{e_{1}, e_{2}\right\}$ is the standard basis in $\mathbb{R}^{2}$. We can express any vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^{2}$ as a linear combination of vectors in $\alpha$ : there exist real numbers $x_{\alpha}, y_{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$
x_{\alpha} e_{1}+y_{\alpha} e_{2}=v .
$$

The coefficients $x_{\alpha}, y_{\alpha}$ are called the coordinates of $v$ with respect to $\alpha$.
Of course, we may use a different basis: for instance, consider the basis $\beta=\left\{g_{1}=(1,1), g_{2}=\right.$ $(2,1)\}$. It is easily verified that $\beta$ is a basis; and hence, we can, again express $v$ as a linear combination of vectors in $\beta$ : there exist reals $x_{\beta}, y_{\beta}$ such that

$$
x_{\beta} g_{1}+y_{\beta} g_{2}=v .
$$

Example 1. Suppose $v=(2,3)$. Then

$$
v=2 e_{1}+3 e_{2}
$$

so $x_{\alpha}=2$ and $y_{\alpha}=3$, and

$$
v=4 g_{1}-g_{2}
$$

and hence $x_{\beta}=4$ and $y_{\beta}=-1$.
This note covers the question: how can we transform $\left(x_{\alpha}, y_{\alpha}\right)$ into $\left(x_{\beta}, y_{\beta}\right)$ ?

## 2. Always remember the basis

Whenever we consider a "point" in $\mathbb{R}^{2}$, we implicitly express the point with respect to some basis. Most of the time, this fact stays under the radar as there is a canonical choice for said basis: the standard basis $\alpha$, mentioned above.

Once we introduce a second basis, $\beta$, things get tricky. What is important to remember is that the idea of expressing points with respect to some basis is not new - it is mostly taken for granted.

Consider the example above. We could express the expression of $v$ using the basis $\alpha$, i.e.

$$
v=2 e_{1}+3 e_{2}
$$

as the matrix equation

$$
v=\left[\begin{array}{l}
2 \\
3
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
1 & 0 \\
0 & 1
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
2 \\
3
\end{array}\right]
$$

which, of course, looks unnecessarily complicated: normally we wouldn't care to write down the identity matrix. But now look what happens when we do the same with the basis $\beta$ : we obtain

$$
v=\left[\begin{array}{l}
2 \\
3
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
1 & 2 \\
1 & 1
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c}
4 \\
-1
\end{array}\right]
$$

and here it is clear why we cannot omit the matrix.
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## 3. NOW TRANSFORM

With the matrix equation above in mind, we may write

$$
v=\left[\begin{array}{l}
2 \\
3
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
1 & 0 \\
0 & 1
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
2 \\
3
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
1 & 2 \\
1 & 1
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c}
4 \\
-1
\end{array}\right]
$$

from which we isolate the equation
(*)

$$
\left[\begin{array}{ll}
1 & 0 \\
0 & 1
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
2 \\
3
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
1 & 2 \\
1 & 1
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c}
4 \\
-1
\end{array}\right]
$$

This is the equation we always want to keep in mind. What is it saying: it says that the point whose coordinates are $(2,3)$ with respect to the standard basis $\alpha$ is the same point point whose coordinates are $(4,-1)$ with respect to the basis $\beta$ !

We will now give these matrices names: let

$$
\left[\begin{array}{ll}
1 & 0 \\
0 & 1
\end{array}\right]=A_{\alpha} \quad \text { and } \quad\left[\begin{array}{ll}
1 & 2 \\
1 & 1
\end{array}\right]=A_{\beta}
$$

In particular, observe that the columns of $A_{\alpha}$ are exactly the basis vectors of $\alpha$, and, similarly, for $\beta$. Moreover, the vectors $(2,3)$ and $(4,-1)$ are, in fact, the coordinates of $v$ with respect to $\alpha$ and $\beta$ ! So we have

$$
A_{\alpha}\left[\begin{array}{l}
x_{\alpha} \\
y_{\alpha}
\end{array}\right]=A_{\beta}\left[\begin{array}{l}
x_{\beta} \\
y_{\beta}
\end{array}\right]
$$

which is true in general, for any bases $\alpha, \beta$, and any size square matrix (and not just $n=2$ ).
To emphasise how useful equation (*) and its more general version ( $\dagger$ ) above is, we stick with our bases $\alpha$ and $\beta$ but consider a new point $w$. Assume we have the coordinates for $w$ with respect to $\alpha$, let's say they are $(-3,1)$, but not with respect to $\beta$. What can we do? Recall that we have

$$
A_{\alpha}\left[\begin{array}{c}
-3 \\
1
\end{array}\right]=A_{\beta}\left[\begin{array}{l}
x_{\beta} \\
y_{\beta}
\end{array}\right]
$$

and hence

$$
A_{\beta}^{-1} A_{\alpha}\left[\begin{array}{c}
-3 \\
1
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{l}
x_{\beta} \\
y_{\beta}
\end{array}\right]
$$

which allows us to transform the coordinates of $w$ (or any point) from $\alpha$ to $\beta$. Hence, we define the change of basis matrix from $\alpha$ to $\beta$ by

$$
A_{\alpha \rightarrow \beta}=A_{\beta}^{-1} A_{\alpha}
$$

and, for the other direction, we have

$$
A_{\beta \rightarrow \alpha}=A_{\alpha}^{-1} A_{\beta}
$$

as needed.

## 4. Conclusion

For any two bases $\alpha$ and $\beta$, consider the matrix $A_{\alpha}$, whose columns are exactly the vectors of $\alpha$, and similarly $A_{\beta}$, which is constructed from $\beta$ in the same way. The change of basis matrices $A_{\alpha \rightarrow \beta}$ and $A_{\beta \rightarrow \alpha}$ are constructed from them via

$$
A_{\alpha \rightarrow \beta}=A_{\beta}^{-1} A_{\alpha} \quad \text { and } \quad A_{\beta \rightarrow \alpha}=A_{\alpha}^{-1} A_{\beta} .
$$

If there is one equation to remember for this construction, it is equation ( $\dagger$ ): it emphasises how every expression of a vector comes with a basis - even though it may be implicit.
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