SEMI SYMMETRIC NONNEGATIVE MATRIX FACTORIZATION
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Abstract. The Semi Symmetric Nonnegative Factorization is a factorization of an \( n \times n \) nonnegative symmetric matrix \( A \) of the form \( BCB^T \), where \( C \) is a \( k \times k \) symmetric matrix, and both \( B \) and \( C \) are required to be nonnegative. The minimal \( k \) for which such factorization exists is called the SSNF-rank of \( A \). In this work, basic properties of the SSNF-rank are given, SSNF-rank of low rank matrices is explored, and selected constructions of matrices that control the SSNF-rank are presented.

1. Introduction and Notation

Factorizations of matrices, where the factors are required to be entry-wise nonnegative, have seen a lot of attention in the recent years, since they provide a powerful tool in analysing nonnegative data. Here, we consider a factorization of nonnegative symmetric matrices, which takes into account symmetry, nonnegativity and low rank of a matrix. This factorization is well suited to the analysis of symmetric nonnegative data. This article provides a foundation results that can help inform the approximation algorithms, in particular in choosing the rank of the approximation, questions of uniqueness, and identifying separability.

Denote by \( \mathbb{R}_+ \) the set of nonnegative real numbers, by \( \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}_+ \) the set of \( n \times m \) real matrices, and by \( \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}_+ \) the set of \( n \times m \) entry-wise nonnegative matrices. Our investigation is focused on symmetric nonnegative matrices. For simplicity we will generally assume our matrices have no zero rows or columns. To this end we define

\[
S^+_n = \{ A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}_+; A = A^T \},
\]

\[
\hat{S}^+_n = \{ A \in S^+_n; A \text{ has no zero rows} \},
\]

and we denote diag \((a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n)\) to be the diagonal matrix with diagonal entries \(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n\).

Two central factorizations that feature nonnegative factors are Nonnegative Matrix Factorization and Completely Positive Factorization. We briefly introduce both factorizations below.
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1.1. Nonnegative Matrix Factorization. Given a nonnegative $n \times m$ matrix $A$ and a positive integer $k$, the Nonnegative Matrix Factorization (NM-Factorization) consists of finding matrices $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}_+$ and $V \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times k}_+$ so that $UV^T$ approximates $A$. The most frequently used measure of approximation is the Frobenius norm, hence the goal is to find $U$ and $V$ that minimise $\| A - UV^T \|_F$.

The exact version of NM-Factorization is looking for a minimal $k_0$ for which there exist matrices $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k_0}_+$ and $V \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times k_0}_+$ with $A = UV^T$. We will denote such $k_0$ by $rk_+(A)$, where $rk(A)$ will denote the rank of $A$. Clearly,

$$rk(A) \leq rk_+(A) \leq \min\{m, n\}.$$ 

The approximate NM-factorisation, contributed to Paatero and Tapper [22], has seen a tremendous growth after a seminal paper of Lee and Sung [19]. We refer the reader to the following recent publications [12, 13] for background on the problem, and offer a sample of the works that consider the exact version of the problem [6, 20, 26].

1.2. Symmetric NM-Factorization and Completely Positive Factorization. When dealing with nonnegative symmetric matrices, it makes sense to look for factorizations that exhibit not only nonnegativity but also symmetry. The most influential factorization that fits this requirement imposes also positive semidefiniteness on a matrix.

The Symmetric NM-Factorization (SN-Factorization) is a variant of NM-Factorization where $U = V$. Hence, we are looking for approximations of a given symmetric nonnegative matrix by a matrix of the form $UU^T$. If a matrix can be written as $UU^T$ exactly, for some nonnegative matrix $U$, then it is said to be completely positive. We call such factorization completely positive factorization and use the abbreviation CP-Factorization. Note that completely positive matrices are necessarily positive semidefinite. On the other hand, not every nonnegative positive semidefinite matrix is completely positive [4, Example 2.4].

For a completely positive matrix $A$, we define $cp(A)$ to be the minimal $k$ such that there exist $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}_+$ with $A = UU^T$. If a matrix $A$ is not completely positive we define $cp(A)$ to be equal to infinity.

For the background on the completely positive factorization we refer the reader to the following works [3, 11, 24].

1.3. Semi Symmetric Nonnegative factorization. Neither the NM-Factorization nor CP-factorization is fitted to symmetric matrices with large negative eigenvalues, as the first one ignores the symmetry, and the second one requires positive definiteness. In this note we propose a factorization that attends to both of those drawbacks.

An approach suited to approximate factoring of symmetric nonnegative matrices that have relatively large negative eigenvalues, is factorization of the form $BCB^T$, where $B$ and $C$ are nonnegative, and $C$ is symmetric. As above, the Frobenius norm is used to measure
the approximation. Such factorization is called *Semi (or weighted) Symmetric Nonnegative factorization (SSNMF).* In contrast to the factorizations above, we were able to find only few treatments of SSNMF in the literature [8, 16, 28].

In this work we consider the exact version of SSNMF, which we refer to by the acronym *SSN-Factorization.*

**Definition 1.1.** Let $A$ be an $n \times n$ entry-wise nonnegative symmetric matrix. Then we define the SSNF-rank of $A$, denoted by $ss_+(A)$, to be the minimal $k$ for which $A = BCB^T$ for some nonnegative matrix $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ and a nonnegative symmetric matrix $C \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$.

A factorization of a nonnegative symmetric matrix $A$ of the form $BCB^T$, where the factors $B$ and $C$ are nonnegative and $C$ is symmetric, is called SSN-Factorization.

1.4. **Overview.** To our knowledge, this paper presents the first treatment of (exact) SSN-Factorization and SSNF-rank in the literature, that is why we dedicate Section 2 to initial observations, that compare SSNF-rank with related parameters, and investigate which properties of the classical rank transfer to SSNF-rank. In Section 3 we look at matrices of rank 2 and of rank 3. In particular, we show that any nonnegative symmetric matrix $A$ with $\text{rk}(A) = 2$ satisfies $ss_+(A) = 2$, and that this observation cannot be extended to matrices with $\text{rk}(A) = 3$. Section 4 gathers a few constructions of symmetric nonnegative matrices, where the rank of the constructed matrix can be deduced, and considers the SSNF-rank. We conclude this work by proposing a handful of questions for further research.

2. **Basic Observations**

In the introduction we met three different ranks of a matrix that are defined through factorizations involving nonnegative factors: $\text{rk}_+(A)$, $ss_+(A)$ and $\text{cp}(A)$. First, we take a look at how they compare.

**Proposition 2.1.** Let $A$ be a nonnegative symmetric matrix. Then:

1. $\text{rk}(A) \leq ss_+(A) \leq n$,
2. $\text{rk}_+(A) \leq ss_+(A) \leq \text{cp}(A)$.

**Proof.** Both items are quickly deduced from arguments below:

1. From $A = BCB^T$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$, we get $\text{rk}(A) \leq \text{rk}(B) \leq k$. On the other hand, every $A \in S_n^+$ can be written as $A = IAI^T$, so $ss_+(A) \leq n$.
2. Factorization $A = BCB^T$ can be considered as NM-Factorization with $U = B$ and $V^T = CB^T$. If $\text{cp}(A) < \infty$ then $A = U1U^T$ and $ss_+(A) \leq \text{cp}(A)$.

\[\square\]
Example 2.1. The matrix
\[
A = \begin{pmatrix}
1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 1
\end{pmatrix},
\]
also considered [6], has \( \text{rk}(A) = 3, \) \( \text{rk}_+(A) = \text{ss}_+(A) = 4, \) and \( \text{cp}(A) = \infty. \)

On the other hand, the matrix
\[
B = \begin{pmatrix}
4 & 2 & 2 & 0 \\
2 & 3 & 1 & 2 \\
2 & 1 & 3 & 2 \\
0 & 2 & 2 & 4
\end{pmatrix}
= \begin{pmatrix}
2 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & \sqrt{2} & 0 \\
1 & 0 & \sqrt{2} \\
0 & \sqrt{2} & \sqrt{2}
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
2 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & \sqrt{2} & 0 & \sqrt{2} \\
0 & 0 & \sqrt{2} & \sqrt{2}
\end{pmatrix}
\]
has \( \text{rk}(B) = \text{rk}_+(B) = \text{ss}_+(B) = \text{cp}(B) = 3. \)

In the following simple result we identify trivial ambiguities in the SNN-Factorization. In the proofs we often use them to make assumptions on the matrix that reduce the number of cases to look at.

Lemma 2.1. Let \( A = BCB^T \) be a SSN-Factorization for \( A, \) \( P \) a permutation matrix, and \( D \) a diagonal matrix with positive diagonal elements.

1. Taking \( B_1 = BPD \) and \( C_1 = D^{-1}P^T CDP^{-1}, \) we get another SSN-Factorization for \( A: \) \( A = B_1C_1B_1^T. \)

2. The matrix \( A_2 = DPBP^T D^T \) has a SSN-Factorization \( A_2 = B_2CB_2^T \) for \( B_2 = DPB. \)

Both factorizations exhibit the same SSN-rank as the original factorization.

Another useful and straightforward tool comes from the pattern requirements on nonnegative factors that multiply to a zero matrix.

Lemma 2.2. Let \( B' \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times s}, \) \( B'' \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times t}, C \in \mathbb{R}^{s \times t} \) satisfy \( B'C(B'')^T = 0. \) If neither \( B' \) nor \( B'' \) has a zero column, then \( C = 0. \)

Proof. From
\[
(B'CB'')_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^{s} \sum_{l=1}^{t} (B')_{ik}(C)_{kl}(B'')_{jl} = 0,
\]
we conclude that \( (B')_{ik}(C)_{kl}(B'')_{jl} = 0 \) for any collection of four indices \( i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}, j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}, k \in \{1, \ldots, s\}, \) and \( l \in \{1, \ldots, t\}. \)

From the assumption that neither \( B' \) nor \( B'' \) have a zero column, we deduce that for any \( k \in \{1, \ldots, s\} \) there exists \( i(k) \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \) with \( (B')_{i(k)k} \neq 0, \) and for any \( l \in \{1, \ldots, t\} \) there exists \( j(l) \in \{1, \ldots, m\} \) with \( (B'')_{j(l)l} \neq 0. \) The claim follows.

Some properties of the classical rank extend to SSN-rank.
Proposition 2.2. Let $A, A' \in S^+_n$, $A'' \in S^+_m$ and let $A_0$ be a principal submatrix of $A$. Then:

1. $ss_+(A + A') \leq ss_+(A) + ss_+(A')$.
2. $ss_+(A' \oplus A'') = ss_+(A') + ss_+(A'')$.
3. $ss_+(A) \geq ss_+(A_0)$.
4. $ss_+(A^m) \leq ss_+(A)$ for any positive integer $m$.

Proof. (1) Let $A = BCB^T$ and $A' = B'C'B'^T$. Then

$$A + A' = (B \  B') \begin{pmatrix} C & 0 \\ 0 & C' \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} B^T \\ B'^T \end{pmatrix},$$

(2) Similarly, $A' = B'C'B'^T$ and $A'' = B''C''B''^T$ gives us:

$$\begin{pmatrix} A' & 0 \\ 0 & A'' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} B' & 0 \\ 0 & B'' \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} C' & 0 \\ 0 & C'' \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} B'^T \\ B''^T \end{pmatrix},$$

proving $ss_+(A' \oplus A'') \leq ss_+(A') + ss_+(A'')$.

Conversely, let $ss_+(A' \oplus A'') = s$ with a corresponding SSN-Factorization $A' \oplus A'' = BCB^T$. Using Lemma 2.1 we can assume that $B$ and $C$ are of the following form:

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} B_{11} \\ B_{21} \end{pmatrix}, \quad C = \begin{pmatrix} C_{11} & C_{12} \\ C_{12} & C_{22} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $B_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^n \times s_1$, $B_{22} \in \mathbb{R}^m \times (s-s_1)$, $C_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^s \times (s-s_1)$, and $B_{11}$ has no zero columns. Since the factorization corresponds to $ss_+(A' \oplus A'')$, $B_{22}$ also has no zero columns. From $B_{11}C_{11}B_{21}^T + B_{11}C_{12}B_{22}^T = 0$, we get $B_{11}C_{12}B_{22}^T = 0$, and thus $C_{12} = 0$ by Lemma 2.2. Now, $C_{11}$ has no zero rows or columns, so $B_{11}C_{11}$ has no zero columns. Since $B_{11}C_{11}B_{21}^T = 0$, we have $B_{21} = 0$ again by Lemma 2.2. We now have $A' = B_{11}C_{11}B_{11}^T$ and $A'' = B_{22}C_{22}B_{22}^T$, proving $ss_+(A') \leq s_1$ and $ss_+(A'') \leq s - s_1$.

(3) Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ have a principal submatrix $A_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, $m < n$. Using Lemma 2.1, we can without loss of generality assume $A = \begin{pmatrix} A_0 & * \\ * & * \end{pmatrix}$. If $A = BCB^T$ with $B \in \mathbb{R}^n \times k$, then $A_0 = B_1C_1B_1^T$, where $B = \begin{pmatrix} B_1 \\ * \end{pmatrix}$, $B_1 \in \mathbb{R}^m \times k$. This proves: $ss_+(A') \leq ss_+(A)$.

(4) Suppose that $A = BCB^T$. Then $A^m = (CB^T)^{m-1}CB^T$ is a SSN-Factorization of $A^m$, since the matrix $(CB^T)^{m-1}C$ is symmetric.

\[ \square \]

Proposition 2.3. Let $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, and $A = M + M^T$. Then $ss_+(A) \leq 2\text{rk}_+(M)$. In particular, for any nonnegative symmetric matrix $A$ we have $ss_+(A) \leq 2\text{rk}_+(A)$.
Proof. Let \( \text{rk}_+(M) = k \) and \( M = UV^T \) be a NM-Factorization of \( M \), \( U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}_+ \) and \( V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}_+ \). We have

\[
A = (U \ V) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I_k \\ I_k & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} U^T \\ V^T \end{pmatrix},
\]

proving \( \text{ss}_+(A) \leq 2k \), as required. \( \square \)

As we illustrate in the example below, it can happen that \( \text{ss}_+(A) < 2\text{rk}_+(M) \) for all nonnegative \( M \) satisfying \( A = M + M^T \).

Example 2.2. Let \( e = (1 \ 1 \ldots \ 1)^T \in \mathbb{R}^n \) be a vector of all 1’s,

\[
M := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0_{1 \times n} \\ 1 & 0 & 0_{1 \times n} \\ e & e & 0_{n \times n} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+2) \times (n+2)}_+ \text{ and } A := M + M^T = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2 & e^T \\ 2 & 0 & e^T \\ e & e & 0 \end{pmatrix}.
\]

From \( \text{rk}(M) = \text{rk}_+(M) = 2 \) and \( \text{rk}(A) = 3 \), we get \( 3 \leq \text{ss}_+(A) \leq 4 \) by Proposition 2.3. Actually, \( \text{ss}_+(A) = 3 \), since \( A = BCB^T \) with

\[
B = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+2) \times 3}_+ \text{ and } C = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2 & 1 \\ 2 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.
\]

Next, we present a family of matrices that achieve equality in Proposition 2.3.

Proposition 2.4. Let \( X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}_+ \) be nonnegative matrix with no zero rows or columns and

\[
A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & X \\ X^T & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{S}^{n+m}_+.
\]

Then \( \text{ss}_+(A) = 2\text{rk}_+(X) \).

Proof. Let \( \text{rk}_+(X) = k \). Then \( X = X_1X_2 \), where \( X_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}_+ \) and \( X_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}_+ \). We have

\[
A = \begin{pmatrix} X_1 & 0 \\ 0 & X_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I_k \\ I_k & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} X_1^T \\ 0 \\ X_2 \end{pmatrix},
\]

so \( \text{ss}_+(A) \leq 2k \).

Let \( \text{ss}_+(A) = s \), and let \( A = BCB^T \) be a corresponding SSN-Factorization. Using Lemma 2.1, we can assume that \( B \) and \( C \) are of the following form:

\[
B = \begin{pmatrix} B_{11} & 0 \\ B_{21} & B_{22} \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } C = \begin{pmatrix} C_{11} & C_{12} \\ C_{12}^T & C_{22} \end{pmatrix},
\]

where \( B_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times s_1}_+ \), \( B_{22} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times (s-s_1)}_+ \), \( C_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{s_1 \times (s-s_1)}_+ \), and \( B_{11} \) has no zero columns. We have \( B_{11}C_{11}B_{11}^T = 0 \), so by Lemma 2.2 it follows \( C_{11} = 0 \). Now \( X = B_{11}C_{12}B_{22}^T \), hence \( \text{rk}(X) \leq \min\{s_1, s-s_1\} \leq \lfloor s/2 \rfloor \), proving \( 2\text{rk}_+(X) \leq s \), as required. \( \square \)
Finally, we note a connection between the eigenvalues of $A$ and the eigenvalues of $C$, when $A = BCB^T$. Result below is does not require any nonnegativity assumptions. Nevertheless, it may be useful to restrict $C$ given $A$.

**Definition 2.1.** Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be a symmetric matrix. The inertia of $A$ is the triple $\text{In}(A) = (\pi_+, \pi_-, \pi_0)$, where $\pi_+$, $\pi_-$, $\pi_0$ are, respectively, the number of positive, negative and zero eigenvalues of $A$.

The following well known result [17] implies a connection between the inertia of $A$ and $C$ given a factorization of the form $A = BCB^T$.

**Proposition 2.5.** Let $C \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ be a symmetric matrix, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$, $\text{In}(C) = (\pi_+, \pi_-, \pi_0)$, and $\text{In}(BCB^T) = (\pi'_+, \pi'_-, \pi'_0)$. Then $\pi_+ \geq \pi'_+$ and $\pi_- \geq \pi'_-$. Furthermore, if $B \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ is invertible, then $\text{In}(C) = \text{In}(BCB^T)$.

### 3. Matrices with Low Rank

Separable NMF is a variation of NMF, where the columns of the first factor in $A = UV^T$ are chosen from the columns of the matrix $A$, [9]. It turns out that with separability condition added, SSN-rank and NMF-rank agree.

**Lemma 3.1.** Let $A \in S^+_n$ be a nonnegative symmetric matrix and $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ a permutation matrix. If

\[
P^TAP = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & \mathbf{Q} \\
\mathbf{Q}^T & \mathbf{Q}^T \\
\end{pmatrix}
\]

for some nonnegative matrix $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times (n-k)}$, then $\text{ss}_{+}(A) \leq k$.

**Proof.** Since $A = A^T$ we have $P^TAP = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_k & \mathbf{Q} \\
\mathbf{Q}^T & \mathbf{Q}^T \\
\end{pmatrix} A_{11} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_k & \mathbf{Q} \\
\end{pmatrix}$. \hfill $\square$

If the condition that $Q$ is nonnegative is removed, then a factorization of the form (1) exists for every symmetric matrix $A$, with $k = \text{rk}(A)$. In particular, any rank 1 matrix $A \in S^+_n$ can be written as $A = vv^T$ for some $v \in \mathbb{R}_n$. Thus $ss_{+}(A) = 1$. The following theorem proves that a similar conclusion is true also for matrices of rank 2. The proof is an adaptation of a corresponding result for NMF-rank, see [6, Theorem 4.1].

**Theorem 3.1.** Let $A \in S^+_n$ be a nonnegative symmetric matrix of rank 2. Then $ss_{+}(A) = 2$.

**Proof.** Without loss of generality we can assume that $A$ doesn’t have any zero rows, i.e. $A \in \hat{S}^+_n$, and using item 2 in Lemma 2.1 we can further assume that the first two columns (rows) of $A$ are linearly independent. We will show that $A$ has a decomposition of the form (1) for $k = 2$. 

For $i = 1, \ldots, n$, let $a_i$ denote the columns of $A$ and let $f_i := \frac{a_i}{a_{2i}}$. If we one of the fractions requires division by zero, we define it to be $\infty$. Now let $i_0$ be one of the indices for which $f_i$ is maximal, and $j_0$ be one of the indices for which $f_i$ is minimal. We claim that $a_i = \alpha_i a_{i_0} + \beta_i a_{j_0}$ for some $\alpha_i \geq 0$ and $\beta_i \geq 0$, or in other words:

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} a_{i_0} & a_{j_0} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 & \cdots & \alpha_n \\ \beta_1 & \cdots & \beta_n \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\alpha_i \geq 0$, $\beta_i \geq 0$. Indeed, in the case $f_{i_0} < \infty$ we have

$$\alpha_i = \frac{a_{2i}(f_i - f_{j_0})}{a_{2i_0}(f_{i_0} - f_{j_0})},$$
$$\beta_i = \frac{a_{2i}(f_{i_0} - f_i)}{a_{2j_0}(f_{i_0} - f_{j_0})}.$$

In the case $f_{i_0} = \infty$ we have $a_{2i_0} = 0$ and

$$\alpha_i = \frac{a_{2i}(f_i - f_{j_0})}{a_{1i_0}},$$
$$\beta_i = \frac{a_{2i}}{a_{2j_0}}.$$

Since we necessarily have $\alpha_{i_0} = 1$, $\alpha_{j_0} = 0$, $\beta_{i_0} = 0$ and $\beta_{j_0} = 1$, there exists a permutation matrix $P$ satisfying

$$\begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 & \cdots & \alpha_n \\ \beta_1 & \cdots & \beta_n \end{pmatrix} P = \begin{pmatrix} I_z & Q \end{pmatrix}.$$

With this we have proved that $A$ has a decomposition for the from (1), as required.

\[\square\]

Theorem 3.1 cannot be generalised to matrices with $\text{rk}(A) = 3$, or even to matrices with $r_+(A) = 3$. This is shown in our next Example, that also illustrates that $ss_+(A) > r_+(A)$ can happen, showing that $ss_+(A)$ is indeed a new parameter.

**Example 3.1.** Let

$$A = B_1C_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 & 2 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$  

Clearly, $\text{rk}(A) = 3$ and $ss_+(A) = 3$, $ss_+(A) \in \{3, 4\}$. Assuming $ss_+(A) = 3$, we have $A = BCB^T$ with $B \in \mathbb{R}_+^{4 \times 3}$, $C \in \mathbb{R}_+^{3 \times 3}$, and $\text{rk}(C) = 3$.

With the aim of arriving at contradiction, we first consider the pattern restrictions on $B$ and $C$ coming from the two zero entries in $A$. Let us denote the rows of $B$ by $b_i^T$, $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Hence, $b_2^T C b_2 = b_3^T C b_3 = 0$. If either $b_2$ or $b_3$ have two positive entries, then $C$ needs to have a $2 \times 2$ principal submatrix equal to zero, contradicting $\text{rk}(C) = 3$.

Now that we know that $b_2$ and $b_3$ each have only one positive entry, we
further note that those entries have to appear in different positions, for otherwise we would have $a_{23} = 0$.

Replacing $B$ with $BP$ and $C$ with $P^T C P$, where $P$ is a permutation matrix, we may assume that $b_2^T = \alpha (1 \ 0 \ 0)$, $b_3^T = \beta (0 \ 1 \ 0)$, and $c_{11} = c_{22} = 0$. Let $D$ be a diagonal matrix $D = \text{diag} (\alpha \ \beta \ \gamma)$. Replacing $B$ by $BD^{-1}$ and $C$ by $DCD$, we may further assume that $\alpha = \beta = 1$. From $a_{23} = 1$, we now get $c_{12} = 1$.

Since $B$ shares a column space with $B_1$ defined in (2), we have $B = B_1 X$, for $X \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$. From the information that we already have on $B$, we deduce:

$$X = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 1 & 0 \\
x_{21} & x_{22} & x_{23} \\
1 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix},$$

which in turn gives us:

$$B = \begin{pmatrix}
x_{21} + 1 & x_{22} & x_{23} \\
1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 \\
x_{21} & x_{22} + 1 & x_{23}
\end{pmatrix}.$$

Again replacing $B$ with $BD^{-1}$ and $C$ with $DCD$, this time for $D = \text{diag} (1 \ 1 \ 1)$, we get:

$$B = \begin{pmatrix}
x_{21} + 1 & x_{22} & 1 \\
1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 \\
x_{21} & x_{22} + 1 & 1
\end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad C = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 1 & c_{13} \\
1 & 0 & c_{23} \\
c_{13} & c_{23} & c_{33}
\end{pmatrix}.$$

From $a_{21} = 1$ and $a_{31} = 2$ we get $c_{13} = 1 - x_{22}$ and $c_{23} = 1 - x_{21}$, in particular showing $x_{21}, x_{22} \in (0, 1)$. Finally, $a_{11} = 1$, gives us $c_{33} = -1 - 2x_{21} - 2x_{22} + 2x_{21}x_{22} = 2(1 - x_{21})(1 - x_{22}) - 3$, which is negative for all $x_{21}, x_{22} \in (0, 1)$, a contradiction. Hence, $ss_+(A) = 4 > \text{rk}_+(A) = 3$.

Note that in the example above we were not able to exclude $ss_+(A) = 3$ based on the pattern of $A$ alone. This example also allows us to show that the property of rank: $\text{rk}(A^n) = \text{rk}(A)$ for $A = A^T$, does not extend to $ss_+$.

**Example 3.2.** For the matrix $A$ from Example 3.1 we have

$$A^2 = \begin{pmatrix}
10 & 7 & 5 & 8 \\
7 & 6 & 4 & 5 \\
5 & 4 & 6 & 7 \\
8 & 5 & 7 & 10
\end{pmatrix} = BCB^T,$$

where

$$B = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 1 \\
1 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 1 & 0
\end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad C = \begin{pmatrix}
6 & 1 & 4 \\
1 & 2 & 1 \\
4 & 1 & 6
\end{pmatrix},$$
The fact that $ss_+(A)$ can be arbitrarily large for matrices with $\text{rk}(A) = 3$ can be deduced from the equivalent statement for $\text{rk}_+(A)$. This was first observed in [2], where it was shown that for the Euclidian distance matrix $M_n \in S_n^+$, defined by $(M_n)_{ij} = (i - j)^2$, we have $\text{rk}(M_n) = 3$ but $\text{rk}_+(M_n)$ cannot be bounded independently of $n$. The paper [14] gives some lower bounds for NMF-rank of $M_n$ in Corollary 6, and the upper bound $\text{rk}_+(M_n) \leq \lceil \frac{n^2}{2} \rceil + 2$ in Theorem 9. This upper bound is proved by constructing a corresponding NM-Factorization, that we modify below to SSN-Factorization. The NMF-rank for Euclidean distance matrices has been also considered in [18, 21, 27].

**Proposition 3.1.** Let $M_n \in S_n^+$ be Euclidian distance matrix. Then $ss_+(M_n) \leq \lceil \frac{n^2}{2} \rceil + 2$.

**Proof.** First suppose that $n$ is even. Let $v = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 3 & \ldots & n-1 \end{pmatrix}^T \in \mathbb{R}^{\frac{n}{2}}$ and $K_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be the matrix with ones on the anti-diagonal and zeros elsewhere. For

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} K_{n/2} v & 0 & I_{n/2} \\ 0 & v & K_{n/2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad C = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & M_{n/2} \end{pmatrix}$$

we get $M_n = BCB^T$. If $n$ is odd, $M_n$ is a principal submatrix of $M_{n+1}$, so $ss_+(M_n) \leq ss_+(M_{n+1}) \leq \lceil \frac{n+1}{2} \rceil + 2 = \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil + 2$. \qed

4. Constructions that control the rank

This section presents some constructions of matrices that preserve nonnegativity and control the rank. We are interested in the behaviour of the SSN-rank. We start with an example that we will use to illustrate a few different notions in this section.

**Example 4.1.** The matrix

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2 & 1 & 1 \\ 2 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 2 \\ 1 & 1 & 2 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

has the normalized Perron eigenvector $v = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^T$, $\text{rk}(A) = 3$, and $\text{rk}_+(A) = ss_+(A) = 4$.

To show that $\text{rk}_+(A) = 4$, we can consider the Boolean rank of its derangement matrix

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$
It is known that the Boolean rank of $D$ is $\min\{k, 4 \leq \binom{k}{k/2}\} = 4$, see [2].

Our first construction is a simple rank one perturbation. If $v$ is the Perron eigenvector of a symmetric nonnegative matrix $A$ (normalised so that $v^Tv = 1$), then it is straightforward to see that $\text{rk}(A + \alpha vv^T) = \text{rk}(A)$, and if we require $\alpha \geq 0$, then clearly $A + \alpha vv^T$ remains nonnegative. The following theorem shows that if $\alpha$ is chosen to be sufficiently large, then $\text{ss}_+(A + \alpha vv^T)$ drops down to $\text{rk}(A)$. This type of perturbation was considered in connection with the completely positive rank in [5].

**Proposition 4.1.** Let $A \in \mathcal{S}_n^+$ be an irreducible symmetric nonnegative matrix with the Perron eigenvector $v$, $v^Tv = 1$. Then $\text{ss}_+(A + \alpha vv^T) \leq \text{ss}_+(A)$ for all $\alpha \geq 0$, and there exists $\alpha_0$, so that $\text{ss}_+(A + \alpha vv^T) = \text{rk}(A)$ for all $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$.

**Proof.** Let $A = BCB^T$, and $Av = \lambda_1 v$ with $v^Tv = 1$. Direct calculation gives us:

$$(B + \beta vv^T)C(B + \beta vv^T)^T = A + \lambda_1(2\beta + \beta^2)vv^T = A + \alpha vv^T,$$

for an appropriate choice of $\beta \geq 0$. This proves $\text{ss}_+(A + \alpha vv^T) \leq \text{ss}_+(A)$.

To prove that there exists $\alpha$ with $\text{ss}_+(A + \alpha vv^T) = \text{rk}(A) =: r$, we start with a spectral decomposition of $A + \alpha vv^T$:

$$A + \alpha vv^T = \begin{pmatrix} v & U_1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 + \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & D_1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} v^T \\ U_1^T \end{pmatrix},$$

where $D_1$ is a $(r-1) \times (r-1)$ diagonal matrix containing nonzero, non-Perron eigenvalues of $A$, and $U_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (r-1)}$ a matrix whose columns are equal to the corresponding normalised eigenvectors of $A$. Let $\beta > 0$, $q_1 \in \mathbb{R}_+^r$ be a positive vector satisfying $q_1^Tq_1 = 1$, and $Q = (q_1, Q_1) \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ an orthogonal matrix. Let

$$B(\beta) := \begin{pmatrix} v & U_1 \end{pmatrix} (\beta \oplus I_{r-1}) Q^T,$$

$$C(\alpha, \beta) := Q \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \beta & D_1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 + \alpha \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} (\beta \oplus I_{r-1}) Q^T.$$

Then $A + \alpha vv^T = B(\beta)C(\alpha, \beta)B(\beta)^T$ for all $\alpha, \beta > 0$. It remains to show that we can choose $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta > 0$ so that $B(\beta) > 0$ and $C(\alpha, \beta) > 0$. Note that:

$$B(\beta) = \beta q_1^Tv + U_1Q_1^T,$$

and since $vq_1^T > 0$ we can choose $\beta > 0$ so that $B(\beta) > 0$. On the other hand, we have:

$$C(\alpha, \beta) = \frac{(\lambda_1 + \alpha)}{\beta^2} q_1^Tvq_1^T + Q_1D_1Q_1^T.$$
Since $q_1q_1^T > 0$, we can choose $\alpha$ so that $C(\alpha, \beta) > 0$ for any fixed $\beta > 0$. □

**Remark 4.1.** Given a symmetric matrix $A$, it seems to be a hard problem to determine minimal $\alpha$ satisfying $ss_+(A + \alpha vv^T) = \text{rk}(A)$. Following the proof above, the choice of $Q$ will determine the minimal choice that we get for $\alpha$ for that $Q$, thus producing an upper bound on the minimal $\alpha$. In fact, in the proof, an orthogonal matrix $Q$ can be replaced by any $r \times r$ invertible matrix $S$ with the first column of $S$ and the first row of $S^{-1}$ are both positive.

Specifically, let $U$ be an orthogonal matrix that diagonalises $A$ and has the first column equal to the Perron eigenvector $v$ of $A$. Further, let $S$ be an invertible matrix with both $Se_1$ and $e_1^T S^{-1}$ positive. We define:

$$B(\beta, S) := U(\beta \oplus I_{r-1})S^{-1},$$

$$C(\alpha, \beta, S) := S(\frac{1}{\beta} \oplus I_{r-1}) \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 + \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & D_1 \end{pmatrix} (\frac{1}{\beta} \oplus I_{r-1})S^T.$$

Then $A + \alpha vv^T = B(\beta, S)C(\alpha, \beta, S)B(\beta, S)^T$. As in the proof above, we can find $\beta$ that makes $B(\beta, S)$ nonnegative, and given $\beta$ and $S$ we can find $\alpha$ so that $C(\alpha, \beta, S)$ is nonnegative.

Conversely, if $A + \alpha vv^T = BCB^T$, where $B$ is $n \times \text{rk}(A)$, and $C$ is $\text{rk}(A) \times \text{rk}(A)$, then it is easy to see that $B$ is of the form (4) and $C$ is of the form (5) for some invertible matrix $S$. If we further assume that $B$ and $C$ are nonnegative, then we can show that the first row of $S^{-1}$, denoted below by $t_1^T$ and the first column of $S$, denoted below by $s_1$, have to be positive. Indeed,

$$v^T B = v^T U(\beta \oplus I_{r-1})S^{-1} = \beta t_1^T > 0,$$

$$t_1^T C = t_1^T S(\frac{1}{\beta} \oplus I_{r-1}) \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 + \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & D_1 \end{pmatrix} (\frac{1}{\beta} \oplus I_{r-1})S^T = \beta s_1^T > 0.$$

Hence, in the search for optimal $\alpha$ we can optimise over all such invertible matrices.

Example 4.2 considers a few different choices of $S$ for the matrix $A$ in Example 4.1.

**Example 4.2.** Let $A$ be the matrix in (3), and we assume the notation from Remark 4.1. Taking

$$S_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2} & \sqrt{3} & 1 \\ \sqrt{2} & -\sqrt{3} & 1 \\ \sqrt{2} & 0 & -2 \end{pmatrix}$$
SSNMF gives us optimal $\beta = 2$ and $\alpha = 12$. Hence, $ss_+(A + 12vv^T) = 3$, as it is illustrated by $A + 12vv^T = B(2, S_1)C(12, 2, S_1)B(2, S_1)^T$ with

$$B(2, S_1) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 4 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 3 & 3 \\ 2 & 2 + \sqrt{3} & 2 - \sqrt{3} \\ 2 & 2 - \sqrt{3} & 2 + \sqrt{3} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad C(12, 2, S_1) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 0 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$  

Taking

$$S_2 = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 - 1 + \sqrt{3} \\ 2 & 2 - 1 - \sqrt{3} \\ 2 & 2 - 1 + \sqrt{3} \end{pmatrix}$$

gives us optimal $\beta = \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{6} - \sqrt{2})$ and $\alpha = 4(1 + \sqrt{3}) \approx 10.92$. Thus $ss_+(A + 4(1 + \sqrt{3})vv^T) = 3$, as can be illustrated by the SSN-Factorization using the following factors:

$$B(\frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{6} - \sqrt{2}), S_2) = \frac{1}{6\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 3 - \sqrt{3} & 6 + 2\sqrt{3} & 2\sqrt{3} \\ 3 + 3\sqrt{3} & 0 & 6 \\ 3 - \sqrt{3} & 2\sqrt{3} & 6 + 2\sqrt{3} \\ 3 + 3\sqrt{3} & 6 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$C(4(1 + \sqrt{3}), \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{6} - \sqrt{2}), S_2) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 0 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$  

Finally, taking non-orthogonal

$$S_3^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 + s \\ 1 & s & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $s$ is the real root of $p(s) = s^3 + s^2 + 5s + 1$, approximately equal to $-0.207$, we get

$$B(\sqrt{2}, S_3) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 + s & 2 \\ 2 & 1 - s & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 1 + s \\ 2 & 0 & 1 - s \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$C(\alpha, \sqrt{2}, S_3) = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & \frac{2}{s^2 + 4s + 3} & \frac{2}{4(s^2 + 4s + 3)(s^2 - 1)^2} \\ \frac{2}{s^2 + 4s + 3} & 0 & \frac{4(2s^2 + 4s + 1)}{(s + 3)(s^2 - 1)^2} \\ \frac{2}{s^2 + 4s + 3} & \frac{2}{4(s^2 + 4s + 3)} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \geq 0,$$

where $\alpha = \frac{4(-s^2 - 2s + 1)}{(s^2 - 1)^2}$ is the real root of $q(\alpha) = \alpha^3 + 2\alpha^2 - 64\alpha - 256$, approximately equal to $8.71$. It can be shown that such low value of $\alpha$ is not possible to achieve with an orthogonal matrix $S$.  

Next, we consider two constructions that involve two nonnegative matrices.

**Proposition 4.2.** Let \( A = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & a \\ a^T & \alpha \end{pmatrix} \in S^+_n \) be a symmetric nonnegative matrix, \( A_2 \) be a symmetric nonnegative matrix with the Perron eigenvalue \( \alpha \) and corresponding eigenvector \( u \), \( u^T u = 1 \). Let

\[
\hat{A} = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & au^T \\ ua^T & A_2 \end{pmatrix}.
\]

Then:

1. \( \operatorname{rank}(\hat{A}) = \operatorname{rank}(A) + \operatorname{rank}(A_2) - 1 \)
2. \( \max\{\operatorname{ss}(A), \operatorname{ss}(A_2)\} \leq \operatorname{ss}(A) \leq \operatorname{ss}(A) + \operatorname{ss}(A_2) \).
3. If \( \operatorname{rank}(A_2) = 1 \), then \( \operatorname{ss}(\hat{A}) = \operatorname{ss}(A) \).

**Proof.**

1. Proved in [29, Lemma 5].
2. The upper bound is shown by the SSN-Factorizations of \( \hat{A} \) that is built from SSN-Factorizations of \( A \) and \( B \) as follows. Let

\[
A = \begin{pmatrix} F & 0 \\ f^T & G \end{pmatrix} N \begin{pmatrix} F^T & f \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad A_2 = GMG^T.
\]

Then

\[
\hat{A} = \begin{pmatrix} F & 0 \\ 0 & G \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\alpha} N & 0 \\ \frac{1}{\alpha} Mf & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} f^T & 0 \\ u^T & M \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} F^T & 0 \\ 0 & G^T \end{pmatrix}.
\]

We have \( \operatorname{ss}(A_2) \leq \operatorname{ss}(\hat{A}) \) by Proposition 2.2. Finally, let

\[
STST^T = \begin{pmatrix} S_1 \\ S_2 \end{pmatrix} T \begin{pmatrix} S_1^T & S_2^T \end{pmatrix}
\]

be a SSN-Factorization of \( \hat{A} \) that achieves \( \operatorname{ss}(\hat{A}) \), where the partition of \( S \) respects the partition of \( \hat{A} \) in (6). Then

\[
A = \begin{pmatrix} S_1 \\ u^T S_2 \end{pmatrix} T \begin{pmatrix} S_1^T & S_2^T \end{pmatrix} u
\]

is the SSN-Factorization of \( A \), hence \( \operatorname{ss}(A) \leq \operatorname{ss}(\hat{A}) \).
3. If \( \operatorname{rank}(A_2) = 1 \), then \( A_2 = \alpha uu^T \) and

\[
\hat{A} = \begin{pmatrix} F \\ U^T \end{pmatrix} N \begin{pmatrix} F^T & u \end{pmatrix},
\]

hence \( \operatorname{ss}(\hat{A}) \leq \operatorname{ss}(A) \). The other inequality follows from 2. \( \Box \)

**Example 4.3.** The matrix \( A \) in (3) can be constructed by two applications of Proposition 4.2 to \( 2 \times 2 \) matrices as follows. Let

\[
A_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad A_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ 2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.
\]
The matrix $A_2$ has the Perron eigenvalue $2$ and corresponding eigenvector $u = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^T$. Joining $A_0$ and $A_2$ as in Proposition 4.2 we get

$$A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & \sqrt{2} & \sqrt{2} \\ \sqrt{2} & 0 & 2 \\ \sqrt{2} & 2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. $$

One more application of Proposition 4.2, this time joining $PA_1P^T$ with $A_2$, where $P$ is a permutation matrix switching the first and the third row, gives us $A$.

By [10], this proves that $A$ is a nonnegative matrix generated by a Soules matrix. In [23] it is shown that the ep-rank of a positive semidefinite nonnegative matrix generated by a Soules matrix is equal to its rank. Since $\text{rk}(A) = 3 < \text{ss}_+(A) = 4$, we note that this result does not extend to the SSNF-rank.

Furthermore, we have $\text{rk}(A_1) = \text{ss}_+(A_1) = 2$, $\text{ss}_+(A_2) = 2$ and $\text{ss}_+(A) = 4$ from Example 4.1. This shows that the upper bound in item 2. of Proposition 4.2 is tight.

Example 4.4. Let us write the matrix $A$ from Example 3.1 as

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & a \\ a^T & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \text{ where } A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 2 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } a = \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 2 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}. $$

Let $v \in \mathbb{R}^k_+$, $v^Tv = 1$, and $R := vv^T$. Inserting $A$ and $R$ in Proposition 4.2, we can construct a matrix:

$$\hat{A} = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & av^T \\ a^T v & R \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(k+3)\times(k+3)}$$

with $\text{rk}(\hat{A}) = r_+(\hat{A}) = 3$ and $\text{ss}_+(\hat{A}) = 4$, giving us a family of matrices satisfying $\text{rk}_+(A) < \text{ss}_+(A)$. Indeed, $\text{ss}_+(\hat{A}) = \text{ss}_+(A) = 4$ by item 3. of Proposition 4.2. Further, $r_+(\hat{A}) = 3$ can be deduced from the decomposition below:

$$\hat{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ v & v & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 2v^T \end{pmatrix}. $$

Proposition 4.3. Let $A_1 \in \mathcal{S}_n^+$ and $A_2 \in \mathcal{S}_m^+$ with the Perron eigenvalues $\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$, respectively. Furthermore, let $u_i$, $i = 1, 2$, be the corresponding Perron eigenvectors, $u_i^Tu_i = 1$, and let $\rho \geq 0$. Let

$$\hat{A} = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & \rho u_1u_2^T \\ \rho u_2u_1^T & A_2 \end{pmatrix}. $$

Then:

(1) $\text{rank}(A_1) + \text{rank}(A_2) - 1 \leq \text{rank}(\hat{A}) \leq \text{rank}(A_1) + \text{rank}(A_2)$.
\[(2) \max\{\ss_+(A_1), \ss_+(A_2)\} \leq \ss_+(\hat{A}) \leq \ss_+(A_1) + \ss_+(A_2).\]

**Proof.** (1) Proved in [11, Lemma 2.2].

(2) The lower bound follows from Proposition 2.2. From \(A_i = B_i C_i B_i^T\) we construct
\[
\hat{B} = \begin{pmatrix} B_1 & 0 \\ 0 & B_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{C} = \begin{pmatrix} C_1^T \\ X \\ C_2^T \end{pmatrix},
\]
where \(X = \frac{\rho}{\alpha_1 \alpha_2} C_1 B_1^T u_1^T B_2 C_2^T\). We can check that \(\hat{A} = \hat{B} \hat{C} \hat{B}^T\), by straightforward calculation.

\[\square\]

**Example 4.5.** The matrix \(A\) in (3) can be constructed by applying Proposition 4.3 to \(2 \times 2\) matrices \(A_1 = A_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ 2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\), that have the Perron eigenvalue 2 with the corresponding eigenvector \(u_1 = u_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}\). Taking \(\rho = 2\) we get the matrix \(A\) from (3).

Note that \(\ss_+(A_1) = \ss_+(A_2) = 2\), and \(\ss+(A) = 4\), see Example 4.4. This shows that the upper bound in item 2. of Proposition 4.3 is tight.

Our final construction borrows from the theory of Schur complements, and allows us to construct low rank matrices \(M\), with \(\ss_+(M)\) remaining low.

**Proposition 4.4.** Let \(A \in \mathbb{S}_n^+, B \in \mathbb{S}_m^+, N \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}\), and
\[
M = \begin{pmatrix} A & AN \\ N^T A & B + N^T A N \end{pmatrix}.
\]

Then \(\text{rk}(M) = \text{rk}(A) + \text{rk}(B)\) and \(\ss_+(M) \leq \ss_+(A) + \ss_+(B)\).

**Proof.** Let \(A = STS^T\) and \(B = GRG^T\). Then
\[
M = \begin{pmatrix} S & 0 \\ N^T S & G \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} T & 0 \\ 0 & R \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} S^T & S^T N \\ 0 & G^T \end{pmatrix},
\]
showing \(\ss_+(M) \leq \ss_+(A) + \ss_+(B)\).

**Example 4.6.** Let
\[
A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad N = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.
\]
We have \( \text{rk}(A) = \text{rk}(B) = 2 \), hence \( ss_+(A) = ss_+(B) = 2 \). Following the construction in Proposition 4.4, we get

\[
M = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 2 \\
1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 2 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
1 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 1
\end{pmatrix}
\]

with \( \text{rk}(M) = ss_+(M) = 4 \).

Example 4.7. The matrix

\[
M = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & t + 2 & t \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & t & t + 2
\end{pmatrix}
\]

has \( \text{rk}(M) = 5 \). We apply Proposition 4.4 by taking \( A \) to be the permutation matrix in the upper-right \( 4 \times 4 \) corner. Then \( N^T AN = 2I_2 \), and \( B = \begin{pmatrix} t \\ t \\ t \\ t \\ t + 2 \\ t \end{pmatrix} \) satisfies \( \text{rk}(B) = ss_+(B) = 1 \). This proves \( ss_+(M) = 4 \).

## 5. Conclusion and open questions

The aim of this work is to present a collection of basic properties of SNN-Factorization and SSNF-rank. Since the SNN-Factorization can be connected to both the NM-Factorization and the CP-Factorization, motivation for further work can be easily found in the extensive literature on those factorizations. Here, we suggest a handful of questions, that can be motivated by the results in this work.

1. In [13], the restricted nonnegative rank of a matrix \( A \), denoted by \( \text{rk}_+^*(A) \), is defined to be the minimum value of \( k \) such that there exist \( U \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times k}_+ \) and \( V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}_+ \) satisfying \( A = UV^T \) and \( \text{rk}(A) = \text{rk}(U) \). Further, it is shown that \( \text{rk}_+(A) \) can be smaller than \( \text{rk}_+^*(A) \). Similarly, one can define \( \text{ss}_+^*(A) \) to be the minimal \( k \) so that \( A = BCB^T \) and \( \text{rk}(A) = \text{rk}(B) \) for \( B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times k}_+, C = C^T \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}_+ \). It would be interesting to explore to what extent the geometric interpretation of \( \text{rk}_+^* \) can be adapted to \( \text{ss}_+^* \), and find examples of matrices \( A \) with \( \text{ss}_+(A) < \text{ss}_+^*(A) \).

2. Shitov [25] showed for \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}_+ \) with \( \text{rk}(A) = 3 \) we have \( \text{rk}_+(A) \leq \lceil \frac{6 \min\{m,n\}}{7} \rceil \). On the other hand, Hannah and Laffey [15] and Barioli and Berman [1] bounded the \( \text{cp}(A) \) in terms of
rk(A), for a completely positive matrix A. In particular, they showed: \( \text{cp}(A) \leq \frac{\text{rk}(A)(\text{rk}(A)+1)}{2} - 1 \). From our discussion above it is clear that bounding \( \text{ss}_+(A) \) solely in terms of \( \text{rk}(A) \) is not possible. However, it would be interesting to explore if bounds similar to the one derived in [25] can be found for \( \text{ss}_+(A) \).

(3) In [8] an algorithm for SSNMF, approximate version of SSN-Factorization, is given. It should be possible to modify this algorithm to cater to Proposition 4.1. In particular, to find upper bounds for optimal \( \alpha \), and to investigate how increasing \( \alpha \) affects norm of the difference between the approximation and the matrix.
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