

# On the rank of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -matrices with free entries on the diagonal

E. Kogan \*

## Abstract

For an  $n \times n$  matrix  $M$  with entries in  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  denote by  $R(M)$  the minimal rank of all the matrices obtained by changing some numbers on the main diagonal of  $M$ . We prove that for each non-negative integer  $k$  there is a polynomial in  $n$  algorithm deciding whether  $R(M) \leq k$  (whose complexity may depend on  $k$ ). We also give a polynomial in  $n$  algorithm computing a number  $m$  such that  $m/2 \leq R(M) \leq m$ . These results have applications to graph drawings on non-orientable surfaces.

For an  $n \times n$  matrix  $M$  with entries in  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  denote by  $R(M)$  the minimal rank of all the matrices obtained by changing some numbers on the main diagonal of  $M$ . We present two algorithms estimating  $R(M)$ . These results (Theorems 1 and 2) have applications to graph drawings on non-orientable surfaces, see Appendix A. For a brief overview of the history of the problem, see Remark 4.

Denote by  $M_n(\mathbb{Z}_2)$  the set of all  $n \times n$  matrices with entries in  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ .

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $k$  be a fixed non-negative integer. There is an algorithm with the complexity of  $O(n^{k+4})$  deciding for an arbitrary matrix  $M \in M_n(\mathbb{Z}_2)$  whether  $R(M) \leq k$ .*

The proof of Theorem 1 uses Lemma 5 and well known Lemma 6.

**Theorem 2.** *There is an algorithm with the complexity of  $O(n^4)$  calculating for an arbitrary matrix  $M \in M_n(\mathbb{Z}_2)$  a number  $k$  such that*

$$k/2 \leq R(M) \leq k.$$

---

\*We would like to thank R. Fulek, B. Mohar, V. Podolskii, D. Pozdeev, A. Skopenkov, I. Soloveychik, M. Tancer, and D. Trushin for helpful discussions and suggestions.

The proof of Theorem 2 uses Lemma 7 which in turn uses well known Lemma 6.

**Remark 3.** Let  $M$  be an  $n \times n$  matrix with entries in  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ . A matrix  $M'$  obtained from  $M$  by changing some numbers on the main diagonal of  $M$  is called *k-good* if  $\text{rk } M' \leq k$  and *k-realising* if  $\text{rk } M' = k$ . The algorithm presented in the proof of Theorem 1 can be easily modified to calculate the numbers on the main diagonal of a *k-good* matrix if such numbers exist. The algorithm presented in the proof of Theorem 2 can be easily modified to calculate the numbers on the main diagonal of a *k-realising* matrix.

**Remark 4.** There is a related Low-Rank Matrix Completion Problem (LRMC) which has been extensively studied, see survey [NKS].

Consider the following problem which we call *F-LRMC*.

Let  $F$  be a field. Let  $M$  be an  $n \times m$  matrix with entries in  $F$ . Let  $\Omega$  be a set of cells of  $M$ . What is the minimal rank of all the  $n \times m$  matrices obtained from  $M$  by changing some entries having indices not in  $\Omega$ ?

LRMC is a special case of *F-LRMC* with  $F = \mathbb{R}$ .

In our paper, a special case of  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -LRMC is considered with  $m = n$  and  $\Omega = \overline{\Omega_{diag}} := \{(i, j) \mid i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}, i \neq j\}$ .

In [GKO<sup>+</sup>],  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ -LRMC is considered. In the case of the main diagonal having entries to change (i.e. in the case of  $\Omega = \overline{\Omega_{diag}}$ ) the results obtained in [GKO<sup>+</sup>] give algorithms with larger complexity than the algorithm given by Theorem 1.

$\mathbb{Z}_2$ -LRMC is NP-hard [Pe96].

In [NKS], LRMC is considered. The methods used in [NKS] give results based on minimizing different approximations of the rank of a matrix, for example, the sum of the singular values of a matrix [SVD]. Thus, none of the results of [NKS] can be applied to the problem of finding  $R(M)$ .

In [SFH], a problem similar to  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -LRMC is considered with the difference being the assumption that  $\Omega$  is formed by choosing cells at random independently from each other with the same probability. The provided algorithm is probabilistic.

In [FK19], the following variation of  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -LRMC is considered. Take a symmetric matrix  $M$  with entries in  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  whose rows and columns are indexed by the edges of a connected graph. Let  $\Omega$  be equal to the set of pairs of independent edges of the graph. What is the minimal rank of all *symmetric* matrices obtained from  $M$  by changing some entries having indices not in  $\Omega$ ?

**Lemma 5.** *There is an algorithm with the complexity of  $O(n^4)$  which for an arbitrary matrix  $M \in M_n(\mathbb{Z}_2)$  finds some numbers from  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  to replace the entries on the main diagonal of  $M$  with such that the resulting matrix  $M'$  is non-degenerate.*

*Proof.* The proof consists of two parts: a description and an estimation of the complexity of the algorithm and a proof of that the algorithm gives the required numbers.

*Part 1. Description and estimation of the complexity of the algorithm.*

Denote by  $a_i$  the desired numbers to put on the main diagonal of  $M'$ . Let us calculate these numbers one by one from top-left to bottom-right. Suppose we have calculated  $a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}$ . Then calculate the corner minor  $\Delta_i$  with the size  $i \times i$  assuming that a zero is on the  $i$ -th place on the main diagonal of the matrix  $M'$ . Put  $a_i = 1 + \Delta_i$  on the  $i$ -th place on the diagonal.

There is an algorithm computing the determinant of a  $m \times m$  matrix with the complexity of  $O(m^3)$  [Ga]. Then, since the presented algorithm is essentially a computation of the determinants of  $n$  submatrices with sizes  $1 \times 1, 2 \times 2, \dots, n \times n$ , its complexity is  $O(1^3 + 2^3 + \dots + n^3) = O(n^4)$ .

*Part 2. Proof that the algorithm gives the required numbers.*

Let us prove by induction by  $i$  that after step  $i$  of the first part of the algorithm the corner minor  $\Delta'_i$  of  $M'$  with the side  $i$  is equal to 1.

*Base.*  $i = 1$ .  $\Delta_i = 0 \Rightarrow$  we put 1 in the first diagonal element. Hence  $\Delta'_i = 1$ .

*Step.*  $i \rightarrow i + 1$ . By the induction hypothesis  $\Delta'_i = 1$ . By the decomposition formula of the determinant  $\Delta'_{i+1}$  by the last row of the corresponding submatrix of  $M'$

$$\Delta'_{i+1} = \Delta_{i+1} + (1 + \Delta_{i+1})\Delta'_i = \Delta_{i+1} + (1 + \Delta_{i+1}) = 1$$

Thus,  $\det M' = \Delta'_n = 1$ . □

A matrix is called **diagonal** if all its entries outside of the main diagonal are equal to 0.

**Lemma 6.** *Let  $M, D$  be matrices of the same size with entries in  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  such that  $D$  is diagonal. Then  $\text{rk}(M + D) \geq \text{rk } M - \text{rk } D$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $D$  has  $\text{rk } D$  nonzero rows, upon addition to  $M$  it changes  $\text{rk } D$  rows. Since there are  $\text{rk } M$  linearly independent rows in the matrix  $M$  and at least  $\text{rk } M - \text{rk } D$  of them remain the same after the addition of  $D$ , it

follows that there are  $\text{rk } M - \text{rk } D$  linearly independent rows in the matrix  $M + D$ . Hence  $\text{rk}(M + D) \geq \text{rk } M - \text{rk } D$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.* The proof consists of two parts: a description and an estimation of the complexity of the algorithm and a proof that the algorithm gives the right answer.

*Part 1. Description and estimation of the complexity of the algorithm.*

Since  $k$  is fixed, it is sufficient to estimate the complexity of the algorithm for  $n \geq 2k$ .

Apply the algorithm given by Lemma 5. Denote by  $M'$  the non-degenerate matrix given by the applied algorithm.

There is an algorithm searching through all diagonal  $n \times n$  matrices with  $l$  zeroes and  $n - l$  identities on the main diagonal with the complexity of  $O\left(n \binom{n}{l}\right)$ . Hence there is an algorithm searching through all diagonal  $n \times n$  matrices with  $\leq k$  zeroes on the main diagonal with the complexity of

$$\begin{aligned} O\left(n \binom{n}{0} + n \binom{n}{1} + \dots + n \binom{n}{k}\right) \\ = O\left(n(k+1) \binom{n}{\min(n/2, k)}\right) = O\left(n(k+1) \binom{n}{k}\right) \\ = O(n \cdot n^k) = O(n^{k+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Apply the algorithm searching through all diagonal  $n \times n$  matrices with  $\leq k$  zeroes on the main diagonal. For every such matrix  $D$  calculate  $\text{rk}(M' + D)$ . If for at least one such matrix  $D$  the rank of  $M' + D$  is less than or equal to  $k$  then return that it is possible to achieve a rank  $\leq k$ . Otherwise return that it is not possible to achieve a rank  $\leq k$ .

For each matrix  $M' + D$  where  $D$  is a diagonal matrix with  $\leq k$  zeroes on the main diagonal the algorithm described above calculates  $\text{rk}(M' + D)$ . Since the rank of a matrix can be calculated by an algorithm with the complexity of  $O(n^3)$ , the total complexity of the algorithm described in the previous paragraph is  $O(n^{k+1}n^3) = O(n^{k+4})$ . Thus, the complexity of the whole algorithm is  $O(n^4) + O(n^{k+4}) = O(n^{k+4})$ .

*Part 2. Proof that the algorithm gives the right answer.*

Note that any matrix  $M''$  formed as a result of putting numbers from  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  in the elements on the main diagonal of  $M$  can be uniquely represented as the sum  $M' + D$  where  $D$  is a diagonal matrix. By Lemma 6 every diagonal

matrix  $D$  with  $l < n - k$  identities on the main diagonal satisfies

$$\text{rk}(M' + D) \geq \text{rk } M' - \text{rk } D = n - l > n - (n - k) = k.$$

Thus, it is sufficient to search through matrices  $D$  with at least  $n - k$  identities on the main diagonal which is exactly what the algorithm does.  $\square$

**Lemma 7.** *Let  $M, D$  be matrices of the same size with entries in  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  such that  $M$  is non-degenerate and  $D$  is diagonal. Then  $\text{rk}(M + D) \geq \text{rk}(M + I)/2$  where  $I$  is the identity matrix.*

*Proof.* Denote by  $n$  the amount of columns of  $M$  and  $D$ . By Lemma 6 we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \text{rk}(M + D) &= \text{rk}(M + D) + \text{rk}((M + I) + (I + D)) \\ &\geq (\text{rk } M - \text{rk } D) + (\text{rk}(M + I) - \text{rk}(I + D)) \\ &= n - \text{rk } D + \text{rk}(M + I) - (n - \text{rk } D) = \text{rk}(M + I). \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.* Let us describe the algorithm.

Apply the algorithm given by Lemma 5 to the matrix  $M$ . Denote by  $M'$  the matrix obtained by this algorithm. Denote  $k := \text{rk}(M' + I)$ . The number  $k$  can be computed in time  $O(n^3)$ .

By Lemma 7 and the fact that  $M' + I$  can be obtained from  $M$  by changing some numbers on the main diagonal,

$$k/2 \leq R(M) \leq k$$

as required.

The total complexity of the algorithm is  $O(n^4) + O(n^3) = O(n^4)$ .  $\square$

**Remark 8.** Let  $M$  be an  $n \times n$  matrix with entries in  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ . Then  $R(M) \leq n - 1$ .

*Proof.* If we change the numbers on the main diagonal of  $M$  so that the sum of the entries in each row is even, the resulting matrix  $M'$  will obviously be degenerate. Hence  $\text{rk } M' \leq n - 1$  and  $R(M) \leq n - 1$ .  $\square$

## A Appendix

This appendix describes the applications of the main results to graph drawings on non-orientable surfaces (Corollaries A1, A2). The problem of graph drawings on non-orientable surfaces has been extensively studied (for example, see [MT01]). See the definitions of an hieroglyph, weak realizability, the disk with  $k$  Möbius strips below. Our results are different from [Mo89] because there, realizability is studied which comes down to calculating  $\text{rk } M$  (see Theorem A3), and we study weak realizability which comes down to calculating  $R(M)$ . The paper [Bi20] gives an algorithmic criterion for the weak realizability of an hieroglyph on the Möbius strip (the disk with 1 Möbius strip).

Let us introduce the notion of weak realizability.

The **disk with  $k$  Möbius strips** is the figure shown on the left of fig. 1.<sup>1</sup> More precisely, the disk with  $k$  Möbius strips is the union of a disk and  $k$  pairwise disjoint ribbons having their ends glued to  $2k$  pairwise disjoint arcs on the boundary circle of the disk (the ribbons do not have to lie in the plane of the disk) so that

- (a) the orientations of the ends of each ribbon given by an orientation of the boundary circle of the disk have “the same direction along the ribbon”, and
- (b) the ribbons are “separated”, i. e. there are  $k$  pairwise disjoint arcs  $A_i$  of the boundary circle of the disk such that the ends of the  $i$ -th ribbon are glued to two disjoint arcs contained in  $A_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ ).

An **hieroglyph** on  $n$  letters is an unoriented cyclic letter sequence of length  $2n$  such that each letter from the sequence appears in the sequence twice.

Take a hieroglyph  $H$  on  $n$  letters. Take a convex polygon with  $2n$  sides. Put the letters in the hieroglyph on the sides of the convex polygon in the nonoriented cyclic order. For each letter glue the ends of a ribbon to the pair of sides corresponding to the letter so that the glued ribbons are pairwise disjoint. Call the resulting surface a **disk with ribbons** corresponding to

---

<sup>1</sup>Since any nonorientable 2-surface of nonorientable genus  $k$  is homeomorphic to the disk with  $k$  Möbius strips, in this definition the term “disk with  $k$  Möbius strips” can be replaced with “non-orientable 2-surface of nonorientable genus  $k$ ”.




Figure 1: On the left: the disk with 3 Möbius strips which is a disk with ribbons corresponding to the hieroglyph  $aabbcc$ . On the right: a disk with ribbons corresponding to the hieroglyph  $aabc bc$  which is not the disk with 3 Möbius strips (because the bottom ribbons violate each condition of the definition of the disk with  $k$  Möbius strips) but is homeomorphic to the disk with 3 Möbius strips.

the hieroglyph  $H$  (see fig. 1). Since each ribbon can be either twisted or not twisted, several surfaces may correspond to a single hieroglyph.

A hieroglyph  $H$  is **weakly realizable** on the disk with  $k$  Möbius strips if some disk with ribbons corresponding to  $H$  can be cut out of the disk with  $k$  Möbius strips.

For a hieroglyph  $H$  denote by  $R(H)$  the minimal number  $k$  such that the hieroglyph  $H$  is weakly realizable on the disk with  $k$  Möbius strips. Such a number exists by the classification theorem for compact surfaces with boundary.

**Corollary A1.** *For each non-negative integer  $k$  there is an algorithm with the complexity of  $O(n^{k+4})$  which for an arbitrary hieroglyph  $H$  on  $n$  letters decides whether  $R(H) \leq k$ .*

**Corollary A2.** *There is an algorithm with the complexity of  $O(n^4)$  which for an arbitrary hieroglyph  $H$  on  $n$  letters computes a number  $k$  such that*

$$k/2 \leq R(H) \leq k.$$

Two letters  $a, b$  in a hieroglyph  $H$  **overlap in  $H$**  if they interlace in the cyclic sequence of the hieroglyph (i.e. they appear in the sequence in the order  $abab$  but not  $aabb$ ). Take an  $n \times n$  matrix with entries in  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  with zeroes on the main diagonal. Put 1 in the cell  $(i, j)$  for  $i \neq j$  if the letters  $i, j$

overlap in  $H$  and 0 otherwise. Call the resulting matrix the **overlap matrix** of the hieroglyph  $H$ .

**Theorem A3** (Mohar). *Let  $M$  be the overlap matrix of a hieroglyph  $H$ . Then  $R(H) = R(M)$ .*

Theorem A3 is a corollary of [Mo89, Theorem 3.1] (see also [Sk20, §2.8, statement 2.8.8(c)]).

The following Lemma A4 is well known.

**Lemma A4.** *There is an algorithm with the complexity of  $O(n^2)$  which for an arbitrary hieroglyph on  $n$  letters constructs its overlap matrix.*

*Proof.* The following is a rough description of the algorithm.

Take an  $n \times n$  matrix  $M$  with zeroes on the main diagonal. For each letter  $i$  do the following. The two occurrences of  $i$  split the hieroglyph into two sequences of letters  $A_i$  and  $B_i$ . Go through all the letters in any one sequence  $A_i$  or  $B_i$ . For each occurrence of such a letter  $j$  add 1 to the cell  $(i, j)$  of  $M$ . Return the resulting matrix.

The complexity of the presented algorithm is obviously  $O(n^2)$ .

The algorithm gives the required matrix since the letters  $i, j$  overlap if and only if  $j$  appears in the sequence  $A_i$  or  $B_i$  an odd number of times (once).  $\square$

*Proof of Corollary A1.* The following is a description of the algorithm.

Denote by  $M$  the overlap matrix of the hieroglyph  $H$ . It can be calculated by the algorithm given by Lemma A4. Apply the algorithm given by Theorem 1 to  $M$ . Return the result of the last applied algorithm.

The total complexity of the presented algorithm is  $O(n^2) + O(n^{k+4}) = O(n^{k+4})$ .

The presented algorithm gives the right answer by Theorem A3.  $\square$

The *proof of Corollary A2* can be obtained from the proof of Corollary A1 by replacing Theorem 1 and  $O(n^{k+4})$  by Theorem 2 and  $O(n^4)$ , respectively.

**Remark A5.** For a multigraph  $G$ , a **half-edge** of  $G$  is an orientation of one of its edges. For a vertex  $v$  of a multigraph an (oriented or unoriented) **local rotation at  $v$**  is an (oriented or unoriented) cyclic ordering of the half-edges incident to  $v$ . A multigraph  $G$  with a family of unoriented local rotations at its vertices is called **weakly realizable** on the disk with  $k$  Möbius strips



if  $G$  can be drawn on the disk with  $k$  Möbius strips so that for each vertex  $v$  of  $G$  the local orientation at  $v$  matches the cyclic ordering at which the half-edges incident to  $v$  intersect the boundary of a small circle around  $v$ . A natural generalization of finding  $R(H)$  for a hieroglyph  $H$  is finding the least integer  $k$  such that a given multigraph with a family of unoriented local rotations at its vertices is weakly realizable on the disk with  $k$  Möbius strips. However, this problem cannot be reduced to the problem of finding  $R(H)$  by contracting spanning trees of the components of the multigraph because upon contracting an edge  $(v, u)$ , it is unclear how to combine the unoriented local orientations at  $v$  and  $u$ .

## References

- [Bi20] *A. Bikeev*. The realizability of discs with ribbons on a Möbius strip (in Russian). <https://arxiv.org/abs/2012.12070>
- [FK19] *R. Fulek, J. Kynčl*.  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -genus of graphs and minimum rank of partial symmetric matrices. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.08637>
- [Ga] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gaussian\\_elimination](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gaussian_elimination)
- [GKO<sup>+</sup>] *R. Ganian, I. Kanj, S. Ordyniak, S. Szeider*. Parameterized algorithms for the matrix completion problem. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1804.03423>
- [Mo89] *B. Mohar*. An obstruction to embedding graphs in surfaces. *Discrete Math.* 1989. V. 78. Pp. 135-142.
- [MT01] *B. Mohar, C. Thomassen*. *Graphs on Surfaces*. The Johns Hopkins University Press. 2001.
- [NKS] *L. T. Nguyen, J. Kim, B. Shim*. Low-rank matrix completion: a contemporary survey. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.11705>
- [Pe96] *R. Peeters*. Orthogonal representations over finite fields and the chromatic number of graphs. *Combinatorica*. 1996. V. 16(3). Pp. 417-431.
- [SFH] *J. Saunderson, M. Fazel, B. Hassibi*. Simple algorithms and guarantees for low rank matrix completion over  $F_2$ . In *Proceedings of*

*The IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, pp. 86-90. IEEE, 2016.

- [Sk20] *A. Skopenkov*. Algebraic Topology from Geometric Viewpoint (in Russian). MCCME. Moscow. 2020 (2nd edition). <http://www.mccme.ru/circles/oim/obstruct.pdf>
- [SVD] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Singular\\_value\\_decomposition](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Singular_value_decomposition)