

Re: pivot = leading entry

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2006-02/msg01281.html>

- *From:* David C. Ullrich <ullrich@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 08 Feb 2006 04:49:32 -0600
-

On 7 Feb 2006 18:37:15 -0800, "G Patel" <gaya.patel@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

My Lin Alg prof uses "pivot column" and "leading entry column" interchangeably all the time. She even says "pivot, or leading entry if you like" vise versa a lot.

The text we use doesn't really explain pivots, and when it did lightly touch on it, it was explained as a number used to zap zeros in all the entries below it in the column. If that is the case, then the pivot entries should be a subset (sometimes proper subset) of the set of leading entries.

Am I right? Because sometimes when doing the pivoting, other entries in other columns are zapped to zero, creating a leading entry automatically with zeros below it (thus not needing to use this leading entry at any time for pivoting)

Is my reasoning correct?

I'm not sure what your reasoning is trying to say.

But in fact a pivot is exactly the same as the first non-zero entry in a non-zero row. What it's used for is not part of the definition.

Thanks for the help.

David C. Ullrich

.