

A new solution to square matrix completion problem

Marija Dodig*

Marko Stošić†

Abstract

In this paper we give a novel solution to a classical completion problem for square matrices. This problem was studied by many authors through time, and it is completely solved in [2, 3]. In this paper we relate this classical problem to a purely combinatorial question involving partitions of integers and their majorizations studied in [4]. We show surprising relations in these approaches and as a corollary, we obtain a new combinatorial result on partitions of integers.

AMS classification: 05A17, 15A83

Keywords: Completion of matrix pencils, partitions of integers, classical majorization.

1 Introduction

In this paper we consider the following classical matrix completion problem:

Problem 1 *Describe the possible similarity class of a square matrix with a prescribed submatrix.*

Problem 1 has a long history - it is one of the most studied matrix completion problems. Various particular cases have been solved, see e.g. [9, 10, 11, 12]. The necessary conditions for it were obtained by Gohberg, Kaashoek, and van Schagen in [7]. Significantly more difficult is proving the sufficiency of the conditions from [7]. First attempt of proving sufficiency was made by Cabral and Silva in [1], where an implicit solution to Problem 1 was obtained. Later on in [2], Dodig and Stošić gave a complete, explicit and

*CEAFEL, Departamento de Matemática, Universidade de Lisboa, Edifício C6, Campo Grande, 1749-016 Lisbon, Portugal, and Mathematical Institute SANU, Knez Mihajlova 36, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia. (msdodig@fc.ul.pt). Corresponding author.

†CAMGSD, Departamento de Matemática, Instituto Superior Técnico, Av. Rovisco Pais 1, 1049-001 Lisbon, Portugal, and Mathematical Institute SANU, Knez Mihajlova 36, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia.

constructive solution to Problem 1 [2, Theorem 1]. Recently, in [3] a new, purely combinatorial and more direct and elegant way to solve Problem 1 was given in [3, Corollary 5]. In fact, in [3, Section 4] (see also [2]) has been shown that Problem 1 has a solution if and only if the following theorem is valid. Throughout the paper \mathbb{F} is an algebraically closed field.

Theorem 1 [2, 3] *Let $\tilde{\alpha} : \tilde{\alpha}_1 | \cdots | \tilde{\alpha}_n$ and $\tilde{\gamma} : \tilde{\gamma}_1 | \cdots | \tilde{\gamma}_{n+m+p}$ be chains of homogeneous polynomials from $\mathbb{F}[\lambda, \mu]$, and let $c_1 \geq \cdots \geq c_m$ and $r_1 \geq \cdots \geq r_p$ be nonnegative integers, such that*

- (i) $\tilde{\gamma}_i | \tilde{\alpha}_i | \tilde{\gamma}_{i+m+p}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$
- (ii) $(c_1 + 1, \dots, c_m + 1) \cup (r_1 + 1, \dots, r_p + 1) \prec (d(\tilde{\sigma}_{m+p}(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\gamma})), \dots, d(\tilde{\sigma}_1(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\gamma}))).$

Then there exists a chain of homogeneous polynomials $\tilde{\beta} : \tilde{\beta}_1 | \cdots | \tilde{\beta}_{n+m}$, from $\mathbb{F}[\lambda, \mu]$ which satisfies:

$$\tilde{\beta}_i | \tilde{\alpha}_i | \tilde{\beta}_{i+m}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (1)$$

$$\tilde{\gamma}_i | \tilde{\beta}_i | \tilde{\gamma}_{i+p}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n + m, \quad (2)$$

$$(c_1 + 1, \dots, c_m + 1) \prec (d(\tilde{\sigma}_m(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta})), \dots, d(\tilde{\sigma}_1(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}))), \quad (3)$$

$$(r_1 + 1, \dots, r_p + 1) \prec (d(\tilde{\sigma}_p(\tilde{\beta}, \tilde{\gamma})), \dots, d(\tilde{\sigma}_1(\tilde{\beta}, \tilde{\gamma}))). \quad (4)$$

Here for any two polynomial chains $\tilde{\delta} : \tilde{\delta}_1 | \cdots | \tilde{\delta}_x$ and $\tilde{\epsilon} : \tilde{\epsilon}_1 | \cdots | \tilde{\epsilon}_{x+y}$ such that $\tilde{\epsilon}_i | \tilde{\delta}_i | \tilde{\epsilon}_{i+y}$, $i = 1, \dots, x$, we define:

$$\tilde{\sigma}_i(\tilde{\delta}, \tilde{\epsilon}) = \frac{\tilde{\pi}_i(\tilde{\delta}, \tilde{\epsilon})}{\tilde{\pi}_{i-1}(\tilde{\delta}, \tilde{\epsilon})}, \quad \tilde{\pi}_i(\tilde{\delta}, \tilde{\epsilon}) = \prod_{j=1}^{x+i} \text{lcm}(\tilde{\delta}_{j-i}, \tilde{\epsilon}_j), \quad i = 0, \dots, y.$$

Thus, in order to solve Problem 1, we are left with proving Theorem 1. This has been done in two completely different ways in [2] and in [3]. However, in this paper we present another solution to Problem 1. We study and show surprising equivalence between Theorem 1 and combinatorial results on majorization of partitions obtained in [4]. As a corollary of these relations we obtain a new combinatorial result on majorization of partitions in Lemma 2.

2 Notation

Throughout the paper we deal with (chains of) homogeneous polynomials from $\mathbb{F}[\lambda, \mu]$. By homogeneous irreducible factors of the homogeneous polynomial $\tilde{f} \in \mathbb{F}[\lambda, \mu]$, we mean homogeneous irreducible polynomials from $\mathbb{F}[\lambda, \mu]$ that divide \tilde{f} . For a polynomial chain $\tilde{\alpha}_1 | \cdots | \tilde{\alpha}_n$, we assume $\tilde{\alpha}_i \in \mathbb{F}[\lambda, \mu]$ are all monic, nonzero polynomials. By convention we have $\tilde{\alpha}_i = 1$,

for $i \leq 0$, and $\tilde{\alpha}_i = 0$, for $i \geq n + 1$. Also, we assume $d(1) = \deg(1) = 0$, and $d(0) = +\infty$.

By a partition of integers, we mean a non-increasing sequence of non-negative integers. For a partition $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_m)$, we assume $a_{m+1} = a_{m+2} = \dots = 0$, and we identify two partitions differing only by a tail of zeros. Also, by $|\mathbf{a}|$ we denote $\sum_{i=1}^m a_i$, and by $\bar{\mathbf{a}} = (\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_{|\mathbf{a}|})$ we denote the dual partition of \mathbf{a} . Here $\bar{a}_i = \#\{j | a_j \geq i\}$, $i = 1, \dots, |\mathbf{a}|$.

For any two partitions $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, \dots)$, and $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, b_2, \dots)$ with $a_i \geq b_i$, $i \geq 1$, by $\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}$ we denote a partition obtained by ordering the elements $a_i - b_i$, $i \geq 1$, in the non-increasing order. Also, we put $\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b} = (a_1 + b_1, a_2 + b_2, \dots)$. The partition $\mathbf{a} \cup \mathbf{b}$ is defined as a partition whose non-zero elements are precisely the non-zero elements of partitions \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} ordered in non-increasing order. Recall that

$$\overline{\mathbf{a} \cup \mathbf{b}} = \bar{\mathbf{a}} + \bar{\mathbf{b}}.$$

We also recall the definition of the classical majorization, [8]:

Definition 1 Let $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$ and $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n)$ be two sequences of nonnegative integers, not necessarily non-increasing. Let σ^1 and σ^2 be two permutations of the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $a_{\sigma^1(1)} \geq a_{\sigma^1(2)} \geq \dots \geq a_{\sigma^1(n)}$ and $b_{\sigma^2(1)} \geq b_{\sigma^2(2)} \geq \dots \geq b_{\sigma^2(n)}$.
If

$$\sum_{i=1}^n a_i = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i,$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^j a_{\sigma^1(i)} \leq \sum_{i=1}^j b_{\sigma^2(i)}, \quad j = 1, \dots, n-1,$$

then we say that \mathbf{a} is majorized by \mathbf{b} , and write $\mathbf{a} \prec \mathbf{b}$.

We note that $\mathbf{a} \prec \mathbf{b}$ is equivalent to $\bar{\mathbf{b}} \prec \bar{\mathbf{a}}$, and also if $\mathbf{a} \prec \mathbf{b}$ and $\mathbf{b} \prec \mathbf{c}$, then $\mathbf{a} \prec \mathbf{c}$.

3 Combinatorial lemmas

In [4] we have studied series connections of arbitrarily many linear systems. As the main result, we completely determined the controllability and the possible controllability indices of a system obtained by a special series connection of arbitrarily many linear systems. As the crucial part of the proof of the main result in [4], we have obtained the following combinatorial result involving classical majorizations of partitions of integers:

Lemma 1 [4, Lemma 5] Let $d_1 \geq \dots \geq d_s \geq 0$ and $t_1 \geq \dots \geq t_s \geq 0$ be nonincreasing sequences of nonnegative integers, such that $d_i \geq t_i$, $i = 1, \dots, s$. Let $A_1 \geq \dots \geq A_s \geq 0$ and $B_1 \geq \dots \geq B_s \geq 0$ be nonincreasing sequences of nonnegative integers such that

$$(d_1 - t_1, \dots, d_s - t_s) \prec (A_1 + B_1, \dots, A_s + B_s). \quad (5)$$

Then there exists a nonincreasing sequence $f_1 \geq \dots \geq f_s$ of non-negative integers such that

$$d_i \geq f_i \geq t_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, s, \quad (6)$$

and such that

$$(f_1 - t_1, \dots, f_s - t_s) \prec (A_1, \dots, A_s), \quad (7)$$

$$(d_1 - f_1, \dots, d_s - f_s) \prec (B_1, \dots, B_s). \quad (8)$$

Remark 1 In the original formulation of this lemma in [4], it was required that d_i , t_i and f_i are strictly positive for all $i = 1, \dots, s$, — this was motivated by the particular completion problem that this was related to. However, it is clear that the conditions of the lemma depend only on the differences $d_i - t_i$ and therefore clearly remain valid if one increases (or decreases) all d_i 's, f_i 's, and t_i 's by the same value. Therefore one can assume that all d_i 's, f_i 's, and t_i 's are nonnegative integers.

In this paper we shall show remarkable relationship between Lemma 1 and Theorem 1, see Remark 2. Moreover, inspired by this relation we give a new combinatorial result on partitions of integers and their majorizations that we show to be equivalent to Theorem 1. It is a very surprising connection between two completely unrelated problems. This novel, general and interesting combinatorial result is given in the following lemma:

Lemma 2 Let $\mathbf{d}^i = (d_1^i, \dots, d_s^i)$ and $\mathbf{t}^i = (t_1^i, \dots, t_s^i)$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, be partitions of nonnegative integers, such that $d_j^i \geq t_j^i$, $j = 1, \dots, s$, $i = 1, \dots, k$. Let $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_s)$ and $\mathbf{B} = (B_1, \dots, B_s)$ be partitions of non-negative integers such that

$$(\mathbf{d}^1 - \mathbf{t}^1) \cup \dots \cup (\mathbf{d}^k - \mathbf{t}^k) \prec \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}. \quad (9)$$

Then there exist partitions $\mathbf{f}^i = (f_1^i, \dots, f_s^i)$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, of nonnegative integers such that

$$d_j^i \geq f_j^i \geq t_j^i, \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, k, \quad j \geq 1 \quad (10)$$

$$(\mathbf{f}^1 - \mathbf{t}^1) \cup (\mathbf{f}^2 - \mathbf{t}^2) \cup \dots \cup (\mathbf{f}^k - \mathbf{t}^k) \prec \mathbf{A} \quad (11)$$

$$(\mathbf{d}^1 - \mathbf{f}^1) \cup (\mathbf{d}^2 - \mathbf{f}^2) \cup \dots \cup (\mathbf{d}^k - \mathbf{f}^k) \prec \mathbf{B}. \quad (12)$$

Clearly, for $k = 1$ Lemma 2 reduces to Lemma 1.

4 A new proof of Problem 1

Before proceeding with our main result, let us introduce some notation. Let $\tilde{\alpha} : \tilde{\alpha}_1 | \cdots | \tilde{\alpha}_n$ and $\tilde{\gamma} : \tilde{\gamma}_1 | \cdots | \tilde{\gamma}_{n+m+p}$ be polynomial chains of homogeneous polynomials from $\mathbb{F}[\lambda, \mu]$, and let $c_1 \geq \cdots \geq c_m$ and $r_1 \geq \cdots \geq r_p$ be nonnegative integers. Let ψ_1, \dots, ψ_k be irreducible factors of $\tilde{\gamma}_{n+m+p}$. For every $i = 1, \dots, k$, let $\mathbf{a}^i = (a_1^i, \dots, a_n^i)$ and $\mathbf{g}^i = (g_1^i, \dots, g_{n+m+p}^i)$ be partitions corresponding to the ψ_i elementary divisor of the polynomial chains $\tilde{\alpha} : \tilde{\alpha}_1 | \cdots | \tilde{\alpha}_n$ and $\tilde{\gamma} : \tilde{\gamma}_1 | \cdots | \tilde{\gamma}_{n+m+p}$, respectively. More precisely:

$$\tilde{\alpha}_i = \psi_1^{a_1^{n+1-i}} \psi_2^{a_2^{n+1-i}} \cdots \psi_k^{a_k^{n+1-i}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

$$\tilde{\gamma}_i = \psi_1^{g_1^{n+m+p+1-i}} \psi_2^{g_2^{n+m+p+1-i}} \cdots \psi_k^{g_k^{n+m+p+1-i}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n+m+p.$$

Then, if

$$\tilde{\gamma}_i | \tilde{\alpha}_i | \tilde{\gamma}_{i+m+p}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

from the definition of $\tilde{\sigma}(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\gamma}), \mathbf{g}^1, \dots, \mathbf{g}^k, \mathbf{a}^1, \dots, \mathbf{a}^k$, we have

$$(d(\tilde{\sigma}_{m+p}(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\gamma})), \dots, d(\tilde{\sigma}_1(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\gamma}))) = d(\psi_1) \overline{\mathbf{g}^1 - \mathbf{a}^1} + \cdots + d(\psi_k) \overline{\mathbf{g}^k - \mathbf{a}^k}. \quad (13)$$

Since \mathbb{F} is algebraically closed field, we have that $d(\psi_i) = 1, i = 1, \dots, k$, i.e. (13) is equal to

$$(d(\tilde{\sigma}_{m+p}(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\gamma})), \dots, d(\tilde{\sigma}_1(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\gamma}))) = \overline{\mathbf{g}^1 - \mathbf{a}^1} + \cdots + \overline{\mathbf{g}^k - \mathbf{a}^k}. \quad (14)$$

Now we can give our main result:

Theorem 2 *Theorem 1 is equivalent to Lemma 2.*

Proof: We start by proving that Lemma 2 implies Theorem 1.

Thus, let the conditions (i) and (ii) from Theorem 1 be valid. Then (ii) and (14) together give

$$\overline{\overline{\mathbf{g}^1 - \mathbf{a}^1} + \cdots + \overline{\mathbf{g}^k - \mathbf{a}^k}} \prec \overline{(c_1 + 1, \dots, c_m + 1) \cup (r_1 + 1, \dots, r_p + 1)} \quad (15)$$

Let $\mathbf{c} = (c_1 + 1, \dots, c_m + 1)$ and let $\mathbf{r} = (r_1 + 1, \dots, r_p + 1)$, and let $\mathbf{A} := \overline{\mathbf{c}}$ and $\mathbf{B} := \overline{\mathbf{r}}$, $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, A_2, \dots)$ and $\mathbf{B} = (B_1, B_2, \dots)$. Then $A_1 = m$ and $B_1 = p$. Since $\overline{\mathbf{c} \cup \mathbf{r}} = \overline{\mathbf{c}} + \overline{\mathbf{r}}$, we have that

$$\overline{(c_1 + 1, \dots, c_m + 1) \cup (r_1 + 1, \dots, r_p + 1)} = \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}.$$

Thus, (15) is equal to

$$\overline{\overline{\mathbf{g}^1 - \mathbf{a}^1} + \cdots + \overline{\mathbf{g}^k - \mathbf{a}^k}} \prec \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}. \quad (16)$$

Let us denote by $\mathbf{d}^i := \overline{\mathbf{g}^i}$, with $\mathbf{d}^i = (d_1^i, d_2^i, \dots)$, and $\mathbf{t}^i := \overline{\mathbf{a}^i}$ with $\mathbf{t}^i = (t_1^i, t_2^i, \dots)$, $i = 1, \dots, k$. Then (16) becomes

$$(\mathbf{d}^1 - \mathbf{t}^1) \cup (\mathbf{d}^2 - \mathbf{t}^2) \cup \dots \cup (\mathbf{d}^k - \mathbf{t}^k) \prec \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}. \quad (17)$$

By Lemma 2, there exist partitions $\mathbf{f}^1, \dots, \mathbf{f}^k$ such that

$$d_j^i \geq f_j^i \geq t_j^i, \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, k, \quad j \geq 1 \quad (18)$$

$$(\mathbf{f}^1 - \mathbf{t}^1) \cup (\mathbf{f}^2 - \mathbf{t}^2) \cup \dots \cup (\mathbf{f}^k - \mathbf{t}^k) \prec \mathbf{A} \quad (19)$$

$$(\mathbf{d}^1 - \mathbf{f}^1) \cup (\mathbf{d}^2 - \mathbf{f}^2) \cup \dots \cup (\mathbf{d}^k - \mathbf{f}^k) \prec \mathbf{B}. \quad (20)$$

Let

$$\mathbf{b}^i = \overline{\mathbf{f}^i}, \quad i = 1, \dots, k,$$

and let $\tilde{\beta} : \tilde{\beta}_1 | \dots | \tilde{\beta}_{n+m}$, be a polynomial chain such that the only irreducible factors of $\tilde{\beta}_{n+m}$ are ψ_1, \dots, ψ_k , and such that for all $i = 1, \dots, k$, \mathbf{b}^i is the partition corresponding to the ψ_i elementary divisor of $\tilde{\beta}$, i.e.

$$\tilde{\beta}_i = \psi_1^{b_1^{n+m+1-i}} \psi_2^{b_2^{n+m+1-i}} \dots \psi_k^{b_k^{n+m+1-i}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n+m.$$

From (19) we have that for every $i = 1, \dots, k$, it is valid that $\max\{f_j^i - t_j^i | j \geq 1\} \leq A_1 = m$, and so $\overline{t_j^i} \geq \overline{f_{j+m}^i}$, for all i and j . Analogously from (20) we have that for every $i = 1, \dots, k$, it is valid that $\max\{d_j^i - f_j^i | j \geq 1\} \leq B_1 = p$, and so $\overline{f_j^i} \geq \overline{d_{j+p}^i}$, for all i and j . Together with (18) this gives

$$b_j^i \geq a_j^i \geq b_{j+m}^i, \quad \text{and} \quad g_j^i \geq b_j^i \geq g_{j+p}^i, \quad i = 1, \dots, k, \quad j \geq 1.$$

Hence,

$$\tilde{\beta}_i | \tilde{\alpha}_i | \tilde{\beta}_{i+m}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (21)$$

$$\tilde{\gamma}_i | \tilde{\beta}_i | \tilde{\gamma}_{i+p}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n+m. \quad (22)$$

Then the duals of (19) and (20) give

$$\begin{aligned} (c_1 + 1, \dots, c_m + 1) &= \overline{\mathbf{A}} \prec \overline{(\mathbf{b}^1 - \mathbf{a}^1)} \cup \dots \cup \overline{(\mathbf{b}^k - \mathbf{a}^k)} = \\ &= \overline{(\mathbf{b}^1 - \mathbf{a}^1)} + \dots + \overline{(\mathbf{b}^k - \mathbf{a}^k)} = (d(\tilde{\sigma}_m(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta})), \dots, d(\tilde{\sigma}_1(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}))) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (r_1 + 1, \dots, r_p + 1) &= \overline{\mathbf{B}} \prec \overline{(\mathbf{g}^1 - \mathbf{b}^1)} \cup \dots \cup \overline{(\mathbf{g}^k - \mathbf{b}^k)} = \\ &= \overline{(\mathbf{g}^1 - \mathbf{b}^1)} + \dots + \overline{(\mathbf{g}^k - \mathbf{b}^k)} = (d(\tilde{\sigma}_p(\tilde{\beta}, \tilde{\gamma})), \dots, d(\tilde{\sigma}_1(\tilde{\beta}, \tilde{\gamma}))). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, such defined $\tilde{\beta}_i$'s satisfy (1)–(4), as wanted.

Now, suppose that Theorem 1 is valid, and let us prove Lemma 2. Let $\mathbf{d}^i = (d_1^i, \dots, d_s^i)$, $\mathbf{t}^i = (t_1^i, \dots, t_s^i)$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, and let $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_s)$ and $\mathbf{B} = (B_1, \dots, B_s)$ be partitions such that

$$d_j^i \geq t_j^i, \quad i = 1, \dots, k, \quad j = 1, \dots, s, \quad (23)$$

and such that

$$(\mathbf{d}^1 - \mathbf{t}^1) \cup (\mathbf{d}^2 - \mathbf{t}^2) \cup \dots \cup (\mathbf{d}^k - \mathbf{t}^k) \prec \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}. \quad (24)$$

Let $m = A_1$, $p = B_1$, and let $(c_1 + 1, \dots, c_m + 1)$ and $(r_1 + 1, \dots, r_p + 1)$ be partitions defined by

$$(c_1 + 1, \dots, c_m + 1) := \overline{\mathbf{A}},$$

$$(r_1 + 1, \dots, r_p + 1) := \overline{\mathbf{B}}.$$

Let denote by $\mathbf{g}^i := \overline{\mathbf{d}^i}$ with $\mathbf{g}^i = (g_1^i, g_2^i, \dots)$, and $\mathbf{a}^i := \overline{\mathbf{t}^i}$ with $\mathbf{a}^i = (a_1^i, a_2^i, \dots)$, $i = 1, \dots, k$. Let $n = \max\{t_1^i | i = 1, \dots, k\}$. Let ψ_1, \dots, ψ_k be distinct irreducible homogeneous polynomials from $\mathbb{F}[\lambda, \mu]$, and let $\tilde{\alpha} : \tilde{\alpha}_1 | \dots | \tilde{\alpha}_n$ and $\tilde{\gamma} : \tilde{\gamma}_1 | \dots | \tilde{\gamma}_{n+m+p}$ be polynomial chains defined by

$$\tilde{\alpha}_i = \psi_1^{a_{n+1-i}^1} \psi_2^{a_{n+1-i}^2} \dots \psi_k^{a_{n+1-i}^k}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

and

$$\tilde{\gamma}_i = \psi_1^{g_{n+m+p+1-i}^1} \psi_2^{g_{n+m+p+1-i}^2} \dots \psi_k^{g_{n+m+p+1-i}^k}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n + m + p.$$

Condition (23) is equivalent to

$$g_j^i \geq a_j^i, \quad i = 1, \dots, k, \quad j \geq 1. \quad (25)$$

Also, (24) implies that for all $i = 1, \dots, k$, we have $\max\{d_j^i - t_j^i | j \geq 1\} \leq A_1 + B_1 = m + p$. Thus, $\max\{\overline{g_j^i} - \overline{a_j^i} | j \geq 1\} \leq m + p$, i.e.

$$a_j^i \geq g_{j+m+p}^i, \quad i = 1, \dots, k, \quad j \geq 1. \quad (26)$$

Hence, (25) and (26) give

$$\tilde{\gamma}_i | \tilde{\alpha}_i | \tilde{\gamma}_{i+m+p}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (27)$$

Then by (14) we have

$$(d(\tilde{\sigma}_{m+p}(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\gamma})), \dots, d(\tilde{\sigma}_1(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\gamma}))) = \overline{\mathbf{g}^1} - \overline{\mathbf{a}^1} + \dots + \overline{\mathbf{g}^k} - \overline{\mathbf{a}^k}. \quad (28)$$

Therefore (24) becomes

$$(c_1 + 1, \dots, c_m + 1) \cup (r_1 + 1, \dots, r_p + 1) \prec (d(\tilde{\sigma}_{m+p}(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\gamma})), \dots, d(\tilde{\sigma}_1(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\gamma}))). \quad (29)$$

So by Theorem 1, since (27) and (29) are valid, we have that there exists a polynomial chain $\tilde{\beta} : \tilde{\beta}_1 | \cdots | \tilde{\beta}_{n+m}$ satisfying (1)–(4). Since $\tilde{\beta}_{n+m} | \tilde{\gamma}_{n+m+p}$, the only irreducible factors of $\tilde{\beta}_i$'s are ψ_1, \dots, ψ_k . Let $\mathbf{b}^i = (b_1^i, \dots, b_{n+m}^i)$ be the corresponding partitions of ψ_i -elementary divisors of $\tilde{\beta}$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, i.e.

$$\tilde{\beta}_i = \psi_1^{b_1^{n+m+1-i}} \psi_2^{b_2^{n+m+1-i}} \cdots \psi_k^{b_k^{n+m+1-i}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n+m.$$

Then (1)–(4) imply:

$$\begin{aligned} g_j^i &\geq b_j^i \geq a_j^i, \quad i = 1, \dots, k, \quad j \geq 1, \\ (c_1 + 1, \dots, c_m + 1) &\prec \overline{\mathbf{b}^1 - \mathbf{a}^1} + \cdots + \overline{\mathbf{b}^k - \mathbf{a}^k} \\ (r_1 + 1, \dots, r_p + 1) &\prec \overline{\mathbf{g}^1 - \mathbf{b}^1} + \cdots + \overline{\mathbf{g}^k - \mathbf{b}^k}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathbf{f}^i = \overline{\mathbf{b}^i}$, $i = 1, \dots, k$. Then duals of the conditions from above give

$$\begin{aligned} d_j^i &\geq f_j^i \geq t_j^i, \quad i = 1, \dots, k, \quad j \geq 1, \\ (\mathbf{f}^1 - \mathbf{t}^1) \cup (\mathbf{f}^2 - \mathbf{t}^2) \cup \cdots \cup (\mathbf{f}^k - \mathbf{t}^k) &\prec \mathbf{A} \\ (\mathbf{d}^1 - \mathbf{f}^1) \cup (\mathbf{d}^2 - \mathbf{f}^2) \cup \cdots \cup (\mathbf{d}^k - \mathbf{f}^k) &\prec \mathbf{B}, \end{aligned}$$

which proves Lemma 2, as wanted. ■

Remark 2 Since for if $k = 1$ Lemma 2 reduces to Lemma 1, we have that Theorem 1 for $k = 1$, i.e. in the case when γ_{n+m+p} has only one irreducible factor, is equivalent to Lemma 1.

Since Theorem 2 proves the equivalence between Lemma 2 and Theorem 1, as a corollary of Theorem 2 we obtain that Lemma 2 holds. It is a novel combinatorial result, that generalises Lemma 1, whose applications in the control theory of linear systems are expected, and will be pursued in a future work.

Example 1 It is well known that Theorem 1 works over algebraically closed field (see e.g. [1]). Let us comment how this translates into Lemmas 1 and 2.

The difference between arbitrary and algebraically closed field appears in the difference between (13) and (14). Even in the case $k = 1$ and $d(\psi_1) = 2$, we would have

$$(d(\tilde{\sigma}_{m+p}(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\gamma})), \dots, d(\tilde{\sigma}_1(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\gamma}))) = 2 \overline{\mathbf{g}^1 - \mathbf{a}^1}. \quad (30)$$

The analog of Lemma 1 that would be required in this case would be:

If \mathbf{d} , \mathbf{t} , \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} are partitions with $d_i \geq t_i$, $i \geq 1$, such that

$$2(\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{t}) \prec \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B} \quad (31)$$

then there exists a partition \mathbf{f} such that

$$d_i \geq f_i \geq t_i, \quad i \geq 1,$$

$$2(\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{t}) \prec \mathbf{A}$$

$$2(\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{f}) \prec \mathbf{B}.$$

However, this can be easily seen to be false. For example, let $\mathbf{A} = (1, 1)$, $\mathbf{B} = (1, 1)$, $d_1 = t_1 + 1$ and $d_2 = t_2 + 1$. Then (31) is satisfied, while there is no $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, f_2)$ such that

$$d_i \geq f_i \geq t_i, \quad i \geq 1, \quad (32)$$

$$(2(f_1 - t_1), 2(f_2 - t_2)) \prec (1, 1) \quad (33)$$

$$(2(d_1 - f_1), 2(d_2 - f_2)) \prec (1, 1). \quad (34)$$

References

- [1] I. Cabral, F. C. Silva, Similarity invariants of completions of submatrices, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 169 (1992) 151-161.
- [2] M. Dodig, M. Stošić, Similarity class of a matrix with prescribed submatrix, *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, 57 (2009) 217-245.
- [3] M. Dodig, M. Stošić, Combinatorics of polynomial paths, submitted.
- [4] M. Dodig, F. C. Silva, Controllability of series connections of arbitrarily many linear systems, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 429 (2008) 122-141.
- [5] M. Dodig, Completion of quasi-regular matrix pencils, *Linear Algebra and its Applications* 501 (2016) 198-241.
- [6] M. Dodig, Descriptor systems under feedback and output injection, *Operator Theory, Operator Algebras, and Matrix Theory*, 2018.
- [7] I. Gohberg, M. A. Kaashoek, F. van Schagen, Eigenvalues of completions of submatrices, *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, 25 (1989) 55-70.
- [8] G. Hardy, J. E. Littlewood, G. Pólya, *Inequalities*, Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- [9] G. N. de Oliveira, Matrices with prescribed characteristic polynomial and a prescribed submatrix III, *Monatsh. Math.* 75 (1971), 441-446.
- [10] E. M. Sá, Imbedding conditions for λ -matrices, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 24 (1979) 33-50.
- [11] R. C. Thompson, Interlacing inequalities for invariant factors, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 24 (1979) 1-31.
- [12] I. Zaballa, Matrices with prescribed rows and invariant factors, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 87 (1987) 113-146.