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A UNIFICATION OF TWO CLASSES OF Q-MATRICES
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ABSTRACT. This note presents a class of Q-matrices which includes Saigal's class N of Q-matrices with negative principal minors and the class E of strictly semi-monotone Q-matrices.
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1. **Introduction.** Given a real square matrix $M$ and a real vector $q$ of the same size, the linear complementarity problem $(q, M)$ is to find a vector $x$ such that

$$q + Mx \geq 0, \quad x \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad x^T(q + Mx) = 0.$$ 

The matrix $M$ is a Q-matrix if the problem $(q, M)$ has a solution for all vectors $q$.

The problem of constructively identifying a Q-matrix has yet to be solved. Over the past years, numerous classes of matrices have been shown to belong to this large yet very much unknown class of Q-matrices. Two such classes are discovered by Eaves [2] and Saigal [7]. Eaves' class is $L_1 \cap L_2 \cap S$ where $L_1$ consists of the semi-monotone matrices $M$ which are square matrices such that for each vector $0 \neq x \geq 0$, there is an index $k$ such that $x_k > 0$ and $(Mx)_k \geq 0$; $L_2$ consists of the square matrices $M$ such that if $x$ is a nonzero solution of the problem $(0, M)$, then there exist nonnegative diagonal matrices $D_1$ and $D_2$ with $D_2x \neq 0$ and $(D_1M + M^TD_2)x = 0$; and $S$ consists of matrices $M$ for which there is a vector $x > 0$ such that $Mx > 0$. Saigal's class is $N \cap S$ where $N$ consists of square matrices $M$ with negative principal minors. These two classes, namely, $L \cap S$ and $N \cap S$ where $L = L_1 \cap L_2$, are in fact distinct because

$$\begin{bmatrix} -1 & 2 \\ 4 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \notin (N \cap S) \setminus L_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \notin (L \cap S) \setminus N.$$ 

Included among Eaves' class of Q-matrices is the subclass $E$ of strictly semi-monotone matrices which are square matrices $M$ such that for each $0 \neq x \geq 0$, there is an index $k$ with $x_k > 0$ and $(Mx)_k > 0$. The two matrices just given illustrate that the two classes $E$ and $N \cap S$ are not contained in one another.
Our purpose in the note is to present a class of Q-matrices which properly contains the two classes E and N \( \cap S \). The construction of this unifying class is very much motivated by the proof used in [7] to establish that \( N \cap S \subseteq Q \).

2. Main Results. Let \( A \) be an \( n \times n \) matrix and \( \alpha \) an index subset of \( [1, \ldots, n] \). Suppose that the principal submatrix \( A_{\alpha\alpha} \) is nonsingular. Let \( P \) be a permutation matrix such that \( P^TAP \) has \( A_{\alpha\alpha} \) as a leading principal submatrix. The \( \alpha \)-principal pivot transform of \( A \) is defined as the matrix \( PA^*P^T \) where

\[
A^* = \begin{pmatrix}
A_{\alpha\alpha}^{-1} & -A_{\alpha\alpha}^{-1}A_{\alpha\beta} \\
A_{\beta\alpha}^{-1} & A_{\beta\beta}^{-1} - A_{\beta\alpha}^{-1}A_{\alpha\alpha}^{-1}A_{\alpha\beta}
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

Following the notations of Garcia [4], we let \( E^*(d) \) for \( d > 0 \) or \( d = 0 \), to denote the class of square matrices \( M \) for which the problem \( (d, M) \) has zero as the unique solution.

We note that \( A \) is a Q-matrix if and only if each of its principal pivot transforms is so, i.e., Q-matrices are invariant under principal pivot transforms. Notice however, that the two classes E and \( N \cap S \) are not invariant under such transforms.

We say that an \( n \times n \) matrix \( A \) is an \( \tilde{N} \)-matrix if there is a vector \( f > 0 \) and a subset \( \alpha \) of \( [1, \ldots, n] \) satisfying the conditions below

(i) \( Af > 0 \)

(ii) \( A_{\alpha\alpha} \) is nonsingular

(iii) For any \( (n - 1) \) by \( (n - 1) \) principal submatrix \( \tilde{A} \) of the \( \alpha \)-principal pivot transform of \( A \), it holds that \( \tilde{A} \in E^*(\tilde{f}) \cap E^*(0) \) where \( \tilde{f} \) is the \( (n - 1) \)-
subvector of the (positive) vector \( \tilde{f} \) which in partitioned form (according to \( A^* \) given in (1)) is defined as

\[
\tilde{f} = \left( \begin{array}{c}
\tilde{f} \\
\alpha \tilde{f} + \beta \tilde{f} \\
\end{array} \right).
\]

The components of \( \tilde{f} \) are in correspondence with the rows of \( \tilde{A} \).

In the above definition of an \( \tilde{N} \)-matrix, we allow \( \alpha = \beta = \delta \). Of course, the \( \delta \)-principal pivot transform of \( A \) is \( A \) itself. Note that condition (i) implies that an \( \tilde{N} \)-matrix is necessarily an \( S \)-matrix. According to (4), the principal submatrix \( \tilde{A} \) is a \( Q \)-matrix. The result below shows that an \( \tilde{N} \)-matrix is in fact a \( Q \)-matrix.

**Theorem 1.** An \( \tilde{N} \)-matrix is a \( Q \)-matrix.

**Proof.** Let \( A \) be a \( \tilde{N} \)-matrix and let \( A^* \) be the matrix given in (1). Let \( q \) be a given vector and let

\[
q^* = \begin{pmatrix}
-A^{-1}q \\
q - A^{-1}q \\
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

It suffices to show that the linear complementarity problem \((q^*, A^*)\) has a solution. We may write this latter problem as

\[
x' = -A^{-1}q + A^{-1}u - A^{-1}A\beta x\beta \geq 0, \quad u_\alpha \geq 0
\]

\[
u_\beta = q - A\beta A^{-1}q + A\beta u_\alpha + (A\beta - A\beta A^{-1}A\alpha) x\beta \geq 0, \quad x\beta \geq 0
\]

\[
(x')^T u_\alpha = (x_\beta)^T u_\beta = 0.
\]

Consider the solution of the problem by Lemke's almost complementary
pivoting algorithm [6] using \( \bar{t} \) defined in condition (iii) above as the artificial vector. If at some point in the solution process, both \( x_\alpha \) and \( u_\beta \) become nonbasic, then the system below has a solution:

\[
0 = -A^{-1}_{\alpha \alpha} \lambda \alpha + A^{-1}_{\alpha \beta} u_\alpha - A^{-1}_{\alpha \beta} A_{\beta \alpha} x_\beta, \quad u_\alpha \geq 0, \quad \lambda \geq 0, \quad x_\beta \geq 0
\]

\[
0 = q_\beta - A_{\beta \alpha} A^{-1}_{\alpha \alpha} \lambda \alpha + \lambda (A_{\beta \alpha} f_{\alpha} + A_{\beta \beta} f_{\beta}) + A_{\beta \alpha} A^{-1}_{\alpha \alpha} u_\alpha + (A_{\beta \beta} - A_{\beta \alpha} A^{-1}_{\alpha \alpha} A_{\alpha \beta}) x_\beta.
\]

This latter system is clearly equivalent to the one

\[
0 = q_\beta + A_{\beta \beta} (x_\beta + \lambda f_{\beta}), \quad x_\beta \geq 0, \quad \lambda \geq 0
\]

\[
\bar{u}_\alpha = q_\alpha - \lambda (A_{\alpha \alpha} f_{\alpha} + A_{\alpha \beta} f_{\beta}) + A_{\alpha \beta} (x_\beta + \lambda f_{\beta}) \geq 0.
\]

The consistency of the last system implies that the one below is solvable

\[
0 = q_\beta + A_{\beta \beta} \bar{x}_\beta, \quad \bar{x}_\beta \geq 0
\]

\[
\bar{u}_\alpha = q_\alpha + A_{\alpha \beta} \bar{x}_\beta \geq 0.
\]

In fact, we have \( \bar{x}_\beta = x_\beta + \lambda f_{\beta} \) and \( \bar{u}_\alpha = u_\alpha + \lambda (A_{\alpha \alpha} f_{\alpha} + A_{\alpha \beta} f_{\beta}) \). Therefore in this case, the problem \((q, A)\) has a solution. So suppose that throughout the solution of the problem \((q^*, A^*)\) by Lemke's algorithm (with the above choice of artificial vector \( \bar{t} \)), at least one variable in \( \begin{bmatrix} x_\alpha \\ u_\beta \end{bmatrix} \) is basic. If the algorithm terminates in a ray, then the problem \((\tilde{x}, A^*)\) for some nonnegative \( \tilde{x} \), has a nonzero solution. This implies by the fact that at least one variable in \( \begin{bmatrix} u_\alpha \\ x_\beta \end{bmatrix} \) must be zero, that a certain principal subproblem \((\tilde{x}, \tilde{A})\) (in the case \( \tilde{x} > 0 \)) or \((0, \tilde{A})\) (in the case \( \tilde{x} = 0 \)) where \( \tilde{A} \) is an \((n - 1)\) principal submatrix of \( A^* \) and \( \tilde{x} \) the corresponding \((n - 1)\)-subvector of \( \tilde{x} \), would have a nonzero solution. But this contradicts
condition (iii). Consequently, Lemke's algorithm must compute a solution of \((q^*, A^*)\). This completes the proof of the theorem.

The proof of the theorem is based on an extension of the argument used in Saigal [7] for the special case \(N \cap S\). As a matter of fact, the proof also suggests a constructive method for actually computing a solution to \((q, A)\) with \(A\) an \(\tilde{N}\)-matrix, provided that the index set \(\alpha\) and vector \(f\) are available readily. Indeed, one can apply Lemke's algorithm to the problem \((q^*, A^*)\) using \(\tilde{f}\) as the artificial vector. As soon as the artificial variable \(\lambda\) reaches zero or all the \(u_\beta\) and \(x_\alpha\) variables become nonbasic, a solution to the given problem \((q, A)\) can be obtained easily.

If a square matrix \(A\) is such that some \(\alpha\)-principal pivot transform is strictly semi-monotone, then \(A\) is an \(\tilde{N}\)-matrix. This follows from the fact that principal submatrices of strictly semi-monotone matrices are themselves strictly semi-monotone and that a strictly semi-monotone matrix must be in \(E^*(d) \cap E^*(0)\) for any positive \(d\) (see [2] e.g.). Hence in particular, if \(A\) is itself strictly semi-monotone, then \(A\) is an \(\tilde{N}\)-matrix.

On the other hand, if a square \(S\)-matrix \(A\) is such that some \(\alpha\)-principal pivot transform \(\tilde{A}\) has all proper principal minors positive, then \(\tilde{A}\) is an \(\tilde{N}\)-matrix. This is because any \((n-1)\) by \((n-1)\) principal submatrix of \(\tilde{A}\) must then be a \(P\)-matrix, i.e. has all principal minors positive, and thus belong to \(E^*(d) \cap E^*(0)\) for any positive \(d\) (see [8]). Hence, in particular, if \(A\) is in \(\tilde{N} \cap S\) then \(A\) is an \(\tilde{N}\)-matrix. This follows from the fact that \(A^{-1}\) which is the \([1, \ldots, n]\)-principal pivot transform of \(A\), has all proper principal minors positive (see [7]).
That the class of $\tilde{N}$-matrices properly contains the union $E \cup (N \cap S)$ can be seen from the example

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
-1 & 2 \\
-4 & 7
\end{bmatrix}
$$

which is an $\tilde{N}$-matrix (its $[2]$-principal pivot transform is a positive matrix) but certainly not strictly semi-monotone or has negative principal minors.

In [5], it is shown that the linear complementarity problem $(q, A)$ with $A \in N$ has 0, 1, 2 or 3 solutions. The theorem below extends this result. Recall that a square matrix is nondegenerate if all its principal minors are nonzero.

Theorem 2. Let $A$ be a nondegenerate matrix such that some $\alpha$-principal pivot transform $\tilde{A}$ has all proper principal minors positive. Then for every vector $q$, the linear complementarity problem $(q, A)$ has 0, 1, 2, or 3 solutions.

Proof. If $\tilde{A}$ has positive determinant, then $\tilde{A}$ and thus $A$ is a $P$-matrix. Hence the problem $(q, A)$ has a unique solution for all vectors $q$. On the other hand, if $\tilde{A}$ does not have positive determinant, then it must have negative determinant. This is because $\tilde{A}$ must be nonsingular. In fact, its inverse is a principal rearrangement of the $\beta$-principal pivot transform of $A$ with $\beta$ the complement of $\alpha$. This latter principal pivot transform is well-defined by the nondegeneracy of $A$. Consequently, it follows that the inverse of $\tilde{A}$ is in class $N$. Hence, by the result established in [5], the linear complementarity problem $(q, \tilde{A}^{-1})$ has 0, 1, 2 or 3 solutions. As $\tilde{A}^{-1}$ is also a principal pivot transform of $A$, the same conclusion is true for each $(q, A)$. This completes the proof of the theorem.
We gave an example earlier to show that there are matrices in $N \cap S$ which are not in the class $E$. The following result establishes that the inverse of a matrix in $N \cap S$ in fact belongs to $E$.

**Theorem 3.** Let $A$ be in $N \cap S$. Then the inverse of $A$ is in $E$.

**Proof.** In fact, if $A$ is in $N \cap S$, then each proper principal submatrix of $A^{-1}$ is a P-matrix. In particular, each $(n-1)$ by $(n-1)$ principal submatrix of $A^{-1}$ is strictly semi-monotone (see [3]). As $A^{-1}$ is also an S-matrix, the desired conclusion now follows from a result established in [1].
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