

Generalized Principal Pivot Transform and its Inheritance Properties

K. Kamaraj · P. Sam Johnson · Sachin Manjunath Naik

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract In this paper, some more properties of the generalized principal pivot transform are derived. Necessary and sufficient conditions for the equality between Moore-Penrose inverse of a generalized principal pivot transform and its complementary generalized principal pivot transform are presented. It has been shown that the generalized principal pivot transform preserves the rank of symmetric part of a given square matrix. These results appear to be more generalized than the existing ones. Inheritance property of P_{\dagger} -matrix are also characterized for generalized principal pivot transform.

Keywords Moore-Penrose Inverse · Generalized Principal Pivot Transform · Range-Hermitian Matrix · Almost Skew-Symmetric Matrix · Inheritance Properties.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010) 15A09 · 15B48

1 Introduction

Let M be an $n \times n$ complex matrix partitioned into blocks as $\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$ where A is an invertible matrix. The principal pivot transform of M with respect to

K. Kamaraj
Department of Mathematics, University College of Engineering Arni,
Anna University, Arni 632326, India.
E-mail: krajkj@yahoo.com

P. Sam Johnson
Department of Mathematical and Computational Sciences,
National Institute of Technology Karnataka (NITK), Surathkal, Mangaluru 575 025, India
E-mail: sam@nitk.edu.in

Sachin Manjunath Naik
Department of Mathematical and Computational Sciences,
National Institute of Technology Karnataka (NITK), Surathkal, Mangaluru 575 025, India
E-mail: sachinmaths46@gmail.com

A is defined as $\widetilde{M} = \begin{pmatrix} A^{-1} & -A^{-1}B \\ CA^{-1} & S \end{pmatrix}$, where $S = D - CA^{-1}B$ is the Schur complement of A in M . The operation that transforms $M \mapsto \widetilde{M}$ is called the principal pivot transform of M with respect to A , denoted by $ppt(M, A)$. Properties and applications of the principal pivot transform with an interesting history are found in the elegant papers [2,10].

AR. Meenakshi [5] was perhaps the first to study the generalized principal pivot transform in the context of finding relationship between the generalized principal pivot transform and range-Hermitian matrices. Rajesh Kannan and Bapat [7,6] defined generalized principal pivot transform and discussed its properties.

In this paper, we derive some characterizations on generalized principal pivot transform of complex partitioned matrices of the form $M = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$. In Section 2, we state some definitions and results which are useful in the sequel. In Section 3, we give some necessary and sufficient conditions to express the Moore-Penrose inverse of M in terms of generalized principal pivot transform of a suitable matrix. Few necessary conditions are given in [6] for preserving symmetric part of the matrix by generalized principal pivot transform. We prove the results with weaker assumptions. We also prove the domain-range exchange property for a larger class of matrices using generalized principal pivot transform. In the concluding section, we discuss inheritance properties of the generalized principal pivot transform of P_{\dagger} -matrices which are relevant and useful in the context of the linear complementarity problem.

2 Notations, Definitions and Preliminary Results

Throughout this paper, we shall deal with $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$, the space of $m \times n$ complex matrices. For any $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$, let A^* , $R(A)$, $N(A)$ and $rank(A)$ denote the complex conjugate transpose, range space, null space and rank of A , respectively. The Moore-Penrose inverse of $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$, denoted by A^{\dagger} is the unique solution $X \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$ of the equations : $AXA = A$, $XAX = X$, $(AX)^* = AX$ and $(XA)^* = XA$.

If X satisfies the first equation, then X is called an $\{1\}$ -inverse of A and is denoted by $A^{(1)}$. The set of all $\{1\}$ -inverses of A is denoted by $A\{1\}$. In a similar way, we denote the sets by $A\{1,2\}$ and $A\{1,2,3\}$. Note that $A\{1\}$ is non-empty. A matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ is said to be range-Hermitian if $R(A) = R(A^*)$. An easy consequence of the definition gives that A is range-Hermitian if and only if $AA^{\dagger} = A^{\dagger}A$ [1].

Definition 1 [7] Let $M = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$ be a complex partitioned matrix. Then the generalized principal pivot transform of M with respect to A is defined by $gppt(M, A) = \begin{pmatrix} A^{\dagger} & -A^{\dagger}B \\ CA^{\dagger} & D - CA^{\dagger}B \end{pmatrix}$. Similarly, the generalized principal pivot

transform of M with respect to D is defined by $gppt(M, D) = \begin{pmatrix} A - BD^\dagger C & BD^\dagger \\ -D^\dagger C & D^\dagger \end{pmatrix}$.

Here $D - CA^\dagger B$ and $A - BD^\dagger C$ are called the generalized Schur complements of M with respect to A and D respectively.

The following theorem is well-known and quite useful in the sequel.

Theorem 1 [1] *The system of equation $AXB = C$ is consistent if and only if $AA^{(1)}CB^{(1)}B = C$, for any $A^{(1)} \in A\{1\}$ and $B^{(1)} \in B\{1\}$. In this case, the general solution is*

$$X = A^{(1)}CB^{(1)} + Z - A^{(1)}AZBB^{(1)}$$

where Z is an arbitrary matrix. In particular, if $Z = 0$, then $X = A^{(1)}CB^{(1)}$.

The following result is given in [6] which is in general not true as illustrated in the example given after the statement of the theorem.

Theorem 2 ([6], **Theorem 3.3**) *Let $M = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$ be a complex partitioned matrix such that $N(D^*) \subseteq N(C^*)$ and $N(A^*) \subseteq N(B^*)$. Then $gppt(M, A)^\dagger = gppt(M, D)$.*

Example 1 Let $M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ with $A = B = 0$ and $C = D = 1$. Then by an easy computation, we can show that $gppt(M, A) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ and $gppt(M, D) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. Clearly, $N(D^*) = N(C^*)$ and $N(A^*) = N(B^*)$. In addition to the above, $gppt(M, A) = gppt(M, A)^\dagger$. But $gppt(M, A)^\dagger \neq gppt(M, D)$.

In fact, a revised version of the Theorem 2 was proved in [2] and it is given below for the sake of completeness.

Theorem 3 ([2], **Theorem 4.1**) *Let $M = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$ be a complex partitioned matrix such that $N(A) \subseteq N(C)$, $N(A^*) \subseteq N(B^*)$, $N(D) \subseteq N(B)$ and $N(D^*) \subseteq N(C^*)$. Then $gppt(M, A)^\dagger = gppt(M, D)$.*

Note that the above theorem has only given a sufficient condition. But one of the objectives of this paper is to give sufficient as well as necessary conditions for the complex partitioned matrix $M = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$ to have $gppt(M, A)^\dagger = gppt(M, D)$. Another objective is to generalize the rank condition in the following theorem by dropping null-space inclusions in the hypothesis.

Theorem 4 ([6], **Theorem 4.2**) *Let $M = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$ be a complex partitioned matrix such that $N(A) \subseteq N(C)$ and $N(A^*) \subseteq N(B^*)$. If A is range-Hermitian, then $rank(S(gppt(M, A))) = rank(S(M))$.*

Note that the symmetric part of $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ is defined by $\frac{A+A^*}{2}$ and is denoted by $S(A)$. A matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ is said to be almost skew-Hermitian if $\text{rank}(S(A)) = 1$. Properties of skew-Hermitian matrices can be found in [3, 4] and the references cited therein.

Theorem 5 ([3], Theorem 4.1) *Let A be a square matrix. Then A is almost skew-Hermitian if and only if A^\dagger is almost skew-Hermitian.*

Definition 2 ([8]) A real $n \times n$ square matrix A is said to be a P_\dagger -matrix if for each non zero $x \in R(A^*)$ there is an $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ such that $(x)_i(Ax)_i > 0$. Equivalently, for any $x \in R(A^*)$ the inequalities $(x)_i(Ax)_i \leq 0$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ imply that $x = 0$. It is proved in [8] that a real matrix A is a P_\dagger -matrix if and only if A^\dagger is a P_\dagger -matrix.

Given $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$, the linear complementarity problem denoted by $LCP(Q, q)$ is to determine if there exists $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $x \geq 0$, $y = Qx + q \geq 0$ and $x^*y = 0$.

Definition 3 ([9]) Let $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. Then M is called a R_\dagger -matrix if the solution for $LCP(M, 0)$ in $R(M^*)$ is the zero solution.

The following results in [2] are used in the section to discuss inheritance properties of the generalized principal pivot transform.

Theorem 6 ([2], Theorem 3.1) *Let $M = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$ be a real matrix and $F = D - CA^\dagger B$. Then $R(C^*) \subseteq R(A^*)$, $R(B) \subseteq R(A)$, $R(C) \subseteq R(F)$ and $R(B^*) \subseteq R(F^*)$ if and only if $M^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} A^\dagger + A^\dagger B F^\dagger C A^\dagger & -A^\dagger B F^\dagger \\ -F^\dagger C A^\dagger & F^\dagger \end{pmatrix}$.*

Theorem 7 ([2], Theorem 3.2) *Let $M = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$ be a real matrix and $G = A - BD^\dagger C$. Then $R(B^*) \subseteq R(D^*)$, $R(C) \subseteq R(D)$, $R(B) \subseteq R(G)$ and $R(C^*) \subseteq R(G^*)$ if and only if $M^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} G^\dagger & -G^\dagger B D^\dagger \\ -D^\dagger C G^\dagger & D^\dagger + D^\dagger C G^\dagger B D^\dagger \end{pmatrix}$.*

We provide a general version of the following theorems in the paper.

Theorem 8 ([2], Theorem 5.10) *Let $M = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$ with A, B, C and D be square matrices of same order satisfying $R(B) \subseteq R(A)$, $R(C^*) \subseteq R(A^*)$, $R(C) \subseteq R(F)$ and $R(B^*) \subseteq R(F^*)$. If M is a R_\dagger -matrix, then $\text{gppt}(M, A)$ is a R_\dagger -matrix.*

Theorem 9 ([2], Theorem 5.11) *Let $M = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$ with A, B, C and D be square matrices of same order satisfying $R(B^*) \subseteq R(D^*)$, $R(C) \subseteq R(D)$, $R(B) \subseteq R(G)$ and $R(C^*) \subseteq R(G^*)$. If M is a R_\dagger -matrix, then $\text{gppt}(M, D)$ is a R_\dagger -matrix.*

3 Characterizations and Properties

We start with some characterizations to express the Moore-Penrose inverse of M in terms of generalized principal pivot transform of a suitable matrix.

Theorem 10 Let $M = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$. Then the following are equivalent :

1. $gppt(M, A)^\dagger = gppt(M, D)$;
2. $CA^\dagger A = DD^\dagger C$ and $AA^\dagger B = BD^\dagger D$;
3. $N(A) \subseteq N(D^*C)$, $N(A^*) \subseteq N(DB^*)$, $N(D) \subseteq N(A^*B)$ and $N(D^*) \subseteq N(AC^*)$.

Proof (1) \iff (2) : Let

$$P = gppt(M, A) = \begin{pmatrix} A^\dagger & -A^\dagger B \\ CA^\dagger & D - CA^\dagger B \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$Q = gppt(M, D) = \begin{pmatrix} A - BD^\dagger C & BD^\dagger \\ -D^\dagger C & D^\dagger \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then

$$PQ = \begin{pmatrix} A^\dagger A & 0 \\ CA^\dagger A - DD^\dagger C & DD^\dagger \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$QP = \begin{pmatrix} AA^\dagger & BD^\dagger D - AA^\dagger B \\ 0 & D^\dagger D \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus PQ and QP are Hermitian if and only if $CA^\dagger A = DD^\dagger C$ and $AA^\dagger B = BD^\dagger D$. It is also easy to verify that $Q \in P\{1, 2\}$. Therefore $P^\dagger = Q$ if and only if $CA^\dagger A = DD^\dagger C$ and $AA^\dagger B = BD^\dagger D$.

(2) \implies (3) : Suppose that $CA^\dagger A = DD^\dagger C$ and $AA^\dagger B = BD^\dagger D$. Then pre-multiplying by D^\dagger and post-multiplying by A^\dagger in the first equation, we get $D^\dagger CA^\dagger A = D^\dagger C$ and $CA^\dagger = DD^\dagger CA^\dagger$, respectively. Thus $N(A) \subseteq N(D^*C)$ and $N(D^*) \subseteq N(AC^*)$. Similarly, if we pre-multiply by A^\dagger and post-multiply by D^\dagger in the second equation, we will get the other two inclusions.

(3) \implies (2) : Suppose that $N(A) \subseteq N(D^*C)$, $N(A^*) \subseteq N(DB^*)$, $N(D) \subseteq N(A^*B)$ and $N(D^*) \subseteq N(AC^*)$. It is straightforward to prove that $N(D^*C) = N(D^\dagger C)$ and $N(AC^*) = N((A^\dagger)^*C^*)$. Thus $N(A) \subseteq N(D^\dagger C)$ and $N(D^*) \subseteq N((A^\dagger)^*C^*)$ which are equivalent to $D^\dagger CA^\dagger A = D^\dagger C$ and $DD^\dagger CA^\dagger = CA^\dagger$ respectively. Pre-multiply by D in the first equation and using the second equation we get that $CA^\dagger A = DD^\dagger C$. Similarly, we can show the other relation. This completes the proof of the theorem.

The following example shows that the assumptions in Theorem 10 are relatively weaker than the ones given in Theorem 3.

Example 2 Let $M = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$ with $A = D = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ and $B = C = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Then $A^\dagger = D^\dagger = \frac{1}{4}A$. Hence $CA^\dagger A = DD^\dagger C$ and $AA^\dagger B = BD^\dagger D$ but $N(A) \not\subseteq N(C)$, $N(A^*) \not\subseteq N(B^*)$, $N(D) \not\subseteq N(B)$ and $N(D^*) \not\subseteq N(C^*)$. Further,

$$gppt(M, A) = \frac{1}{4} \begin{pmatrix} A & -A \\ A & 3A \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$gppt(M, A)^\dagger = \frac{1}{4} \begin{pmatrix} 3A & A \\ -A & A \end{pmatrix} = gppt(M, D).$$

If the generalized principal pivot transform with respect to suitable matrices is applied twice to a complex partitioned matrix M , we have found some conditions under which one would get back to the same matrix M . One way of implications of the following result has already been proved by Bisht et. al. ([2], Lemma 4.1). We shall now prove that the sufficient conditions given in the said results are necessary as well.

Theorem 11 Let $M = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$. Then the following statements hold true.

1. $gppt(gppt(M, A), A^\dagger) = M$ if and only if $N(A) \subseteq N(C)$ and $N(A^*) \subseteq N(B^*)$.
2. $gppt(gppt(M, D), D^\dagger) = M$ if and only if $N(D) \subseteq N(B)$ and $N(D^*) \subseteq N(C^*)$.

Proof Let $P = \begin{pmatrix} A^\dagger & -A^\dagger B \\ CA^\dagger & D - CA^\dagger B \end{pmatrix}$. Then we have

$$gppt(gppt(M, A), A^\dagger) = gppt(P, A^\dagger) = \begin{pmatrix} A & AA^\dagger B \\ CA^\dagger A & D \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus $gppt(P, A^\dagger) = M$ if and only if $N(A) \subseteq N(C)$ and $N(A^*) \subseteq N(B^*)$. Similarly, we can also prove the other one. This completes the proof.

The next result is an immediate consequence of Theorems 10 and 11.

Theorem 12 Let $M = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$, $F = D - CA^\dagger B$ and $E = A - BD^\dagger C$. If $P = gppt(M, A)$ and $Q = gppt(M, D)$, then the following statements hold true.

1. $M^\dagger = gppt(P, F)$ if and only if $N(A) \subseteq N(C)$, $N(A^*) \subseteq N(B^*)$, $N(F) \subseteq N(B)$ and $N(F^*) \subseteq N(C^*)$.
2. $M^\dagger = gppt(Q, E)$ if and only if $N(D) \subseteq N(B)$, $N(D^*) \subseteq N(C^*)$, $N(E) \subseteq N(C)$ and $N(E^*) \subseteq N(B^*)$.

Proof By Theorem 11, $gppt(P, A^\dagger) = M$ if and only if $N(A) \subseteq N(C)$ and $N(A^*) \subseteq N(B^*)$. Thus $M^\dagger = gppt(P, A^\dagger)^\dagger$ if and only if $N(A) \subseteq N(C)$ and $N(A^*) \subseteq N(B^*)$. With the assumptions $N(A) \subseteq N(C)$ and $N(A^*) \subseteq N(B^*)$, by Theorem 10, we have $M^\dagger = gppt(P, A^\dagger)^\dagger = gppt(P, F)$ if and only if $CA^\dagger =$

$FF^\dagger CA^\dagger$ and $A^\dagger B = A^\dagger BF^\dagger F$. By applying the fact that $AA^\dagger B = B$ and $CA^\dagger A = C$, we will get that $M^\dagger = gppt(P, F)$ if and only if $C = FF^\dagger C$ and $B = BF^\dagger F$. It concludes that $M^\dagger = gppt(P, F)$ if and only if $N(A) \subseteq N(C)$, $N(A^*) \subseteq N(B^*)$, $N(F) \subseteq N(B)$ and $N(F^*) \subseteq N(C^*)$. The proof of other part is quite similar.

Lemma 1 *Let $P = gppt(M, A)$ and $Q = gppt(M, D)$. If $X = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix}$, $Y = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$, $Z = \begin{pmatrix} A^\dagger & -A^\dagger B \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix}$ and $\widehat{Z} = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ -D^\dagger C & D^\dagger \end{pmatrix}$, then $Z \in X\{1, 2, 4\}$ and $\widehat{Z} \in Y\{1, 2, 3\}$. Moreover, $YZ = P$ and $X\widehat{Z} = Q$. In particular, $Z = X^\dagger$ if and only if $N(A^*) \subseteq N(B^*)$ and $\widehat{Z} = Y^\dagger$ if and only if $N(A) \subseteq N(C)$.*

Proof It can be proved from straightforward computations.

The following theorem is a generalization of Theorem 4, which shows that the generalized principal pivot transform preserves the rank of symmetric part of the matrix.

Theorem 13 *Let $M = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$ be a partitioned square matrix with A and D are square matrices. If A is range-Hermitian and $R(B + C^*) \subseteq R(A)$, then $rank(S(M)) = rank(S(gppt(M, A)))$.*

Proof Let $X = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix}$ and $P = gppt(M, A) = \begin{pmatrix} A^\dagger & -A^\dagger B \\ CA^\dagger & D - CA^\dagger B \end{pmatrix}$. Then by easy computation, we can prove that

$$X^*PX = \begin{pmatrix} A^*A^\dagger A & 0 \\ B^*A^\dagger A + CA^\dagger A & D \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since A is range-Hermitian, $A^*A^\dagger A = A^*AA^\dagger = A^*$ and $R(B + C^*) \subseteq R(A^*)$ give that $A^\dagger A(B + C^*) = B + C^*$. Equivalently, $B^*A^\dagger A + CA^\dagger A = B^* + C$.

Thus $X^*PX = \begin{pmatrix} A^* & 0 \\ B^* + C & D \end{pmatrix}$. Also, $X^*(P + P^*)X = M + M^*$. This equality

shows that $rank(M + M^*) \leq rank(P + P^*)$. Now, set $Y = \begin{pmatrix} A^\dagger & -A^\dagger B \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix}$.

Again by simple calculation and using the fact that $AA^\dagger = A^\dagger A$, we get $Y^*MY = \begin{pmatrix} (A^\dagger)^* & 0 \\ CA^\dagger - B^*(A^\dagger)^* & D - CA^\dagger B \end{pmatrix}$. Thus $Y^*(M + M^*)Y = P + P^*$. It ensures the rank equality as $rank(P + P^*) = rank(M + M^*)$.

Remark 1 The assumptions given in Theorem 13 are weaker than the ones in Theorem 4. It is shown by the following example : Let $A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, $B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ and $C = (1 \ 0)$. Then $B + C^* = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$, thus $R(B + C^*) = R(A^*)$. But $N(A) \not\subseteq N(C)$ and $N(A^*) \not\subseteq N(B^*)$.

Corollary 1 Let $M = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$ be a square matrix with A as a range-Hermitian matrix. If $R(B + C^*) \subseteq R(A)$, then the following are equivalent :

- (i) M is almost skew-symmetric.
- (ii) M^\dagger is almost skew-symmetric.
- (iii) $gppt(M, A)$ is almost skew-symmetric.
- (iv) $gppt(M, A)^\dagger$ is almost skew-symmetric.

Proof (i) \Leftrightarrow (iii) follow from Theorem 13 and other implications follow from Theorem 5.

Theorem 14 Let $M = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$ be a partitioned square matrix with A and D are square matrices. If D is range-Hermitian and $R(C + B^*) \subseteq R(D)$, then $rank(S(M)) = rank(S(gppt(M, D)))$.

Proof The proof is similar to Theorem 13 by setting $X = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$ and $Y = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ -D^\dagger C & D^\dagger \end{pmatrix}$.

Corollary 2 Let $M = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$ be a square matrix with D as a range-Hermitian matrix. If $R(C + B^*) \subseteq R(D)$, then the following are equivalent :

- (i) M is almost skew-symmetric.
- (ii) M^\dagger is almost skew-symmetric.
- (iii) $gppt(M, D)$ is almost skew-symmetric.
- (iv) $gppt(M, D)^\dagger$ is almost skew-symmetric.

Proof (i) \Leftrightarrow (iii) follow from Theorem 14 and other implications follow from Theorem 5.

We now discuss domain-range exchange property which is well established for nonsingular matrices. Bishat et. al. [2] extended the domain range property for the singular matrices with some assumptions ([2], Lemma 4.2). But we have explored the same results for a larger class of matrices.

Theorem 15 Let $M = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$. If $CA^\dagger A = DD^\dagger C$ and $AA^\dagger B = BD^\dagger D$, then the following are equivalent :

- (i) $P = gppt(M, A)$ is range-Hermitian.
- (ii) $Q = gppt(M, D)$ is range-Hermitian.
- (iii) A and D are range-Hermitian.

Proof From the proof of Theorem 10, we observe that

$$PQ = \begin{pmatrix} A^\dagger A & 0 \\ CA^\dagger A - DD^\dagger C & DD^\dagger \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad QP = \begin{pmatrix} AA^\dagger & AA^\dagger B - BD^\dagger D \\ 0 & D^\dagger D \end{pmatrix}.$$

(iii) \Rightarrow (i) : By Theorem 10, we have $P^\dagger = Q$. Hence $PP^\dagger = PQ$. Since A and D are range-Hermitian, we have $PQ = QP$. Therefore $PP^\dagger = PQ = QP = P^\dagger P$. Hence P is range-Hermitian.

(i) \Leftrightarrow (ii) : By Theorem 10, we have $Q^\dagger = P$. Also observing the fact that A is range-Hermitian, then so is A^\dagger .

(i) \Rightarrow (iii) : Set $X = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ C & I \end{pmatrix}$, $Y = \begin{pmatrix} I & -B \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix}$ and $Z = \begin{pmatrix} A^\dagger & 0 \\ 0 & D \end{pmatrix}$. Then

$X^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ -C & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $Y^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} I & B \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix}$. Also it is easy to verify that $P =$

XZY and $Q = Y^{-1}Z^\dagger X^{-1}$. Moreover, $Q \in P\{1\}$ and $P \in Q\{1\}$. Suppose P is range-Hermitian. Then $R(P) = R(P^*)$. It concludes that $PP^{(1)}P^* = P^*$ for any $P^{(1)} \in P\{1\}$. Thus $PQP^* = P^*$. $PQP^* = XZZ^\dagger X^{-1}P^* =$

$$\begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ C & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A^\dagger A & 0 \\ 0 & DD^\dagger \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ -C & I \end{pmatrix} P^*$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} A^\dagger A(A^\dagger)^* & A^\dagger A(A^\dagger)^* C^* \\ CA^\dagger A(A^\dagger)^* - DD^\dagger C(A^\dagger)^* & CA^\dagger A(A^\dagger)^* C^* - DD^\dagger C(A^\dagger)^* C^* \\ -DD^\dagger B^*(A^\dagger)^* & DD^\dagger D^* - DD^\dagger B^*(A^\dagger)^* C^* \end{pmatrix} = P^* \quad (1)$$

$\Rightarrow A^\dagger A(A^\dagger)^* = (A^\dagger)^* \Rightarrow R((A^\dagger)^*) \subseteq R(A^\dagger A) = R(A^*)$. This shows that $R(A^*) = R(A)$, hence A is range-Hermitian. Also using the assumption $CA^\dagger A = DD^\dagger C$ and $AA^\dagger B = BD^\dagger D$, the equation (1) reduces to

$$\begin{pmatrix} (A^\dagger)^* & (A^\dagger)^* C^* \\ -DD^\dagger B^*(A^\dagger)^* & DD^\dagger D^* - DD^\dagger B^*(A^\dagger)^* C^* \end{pmatrix} = P^*$$

which implies that $-DD^\dagger B^*(A^\dagger)^* = -B^*(A^\dagger)^*$ and thus $DD^\dagger D^* = D^*$. This gives $R(D) = R(D^*)$, hence D is range-Hermitian. This completes the proof.

Example 3 Let $M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -2 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ with $A = 0, B = -2, C = 1, D = 0$. Then

$P = gppt(M, A) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Then $rank(M + M^*) = 1 \neq 0 = rank(P + P^*)$.

This shows that assumption $R(B + C^*) \subseteq R(A^*)$ given in Theorem 13 is indispensable.

Theorem 16 Let $M = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$ be a complex partitioned matrix.

1. If $M \begin{pmatrix} A^\dagger Ax_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{pmatrix}$, then $gppt(M, A) \begin{pmatrix} y_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A^\dagger Ax_1 \\ y_2 \end{pmatrix}$. Conversely, if $R(B) \subseteq R(A)$, then for any $y_1 \in R(A)$,

$$gppt(M, A) \begin{pmatrix} y_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A^\dagger Ax_1 \\ y_2 \end{pmatrix} \implies M \begin{pmatrix} A^\dagger Ax_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

2. If $M \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ D^\dagger D x_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{pmatrix}$, then $gppt(M, D) \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ y_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} y_1 \\ D^\dagger D x_2 \end{pmatrix}$. Conversely, if $R(C) \subseteq R(D)$, then for any $y_2 \in R(D)$,

$$gppt(M, D) \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ y_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} y_1 \\ D^\dagger D x_2 \end{pmatrix} \implies M \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ D^\dagger D x_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proof Suppose, $M \begin{pmatrix} A^\dagger A x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{pmatrix}$. Then $A x_1 = y_1 - B x_2$ and $CA^\dagger A x_1 + D x_2 = y_2$. Substitute the value of $A x_1$ in the second equation, we get

$$CA^\dagger y_1 + (D - CA^\dagger B)x_2 = y_2.$$

Pre-multiply the equation by A^\dagger , we get

$$A^\dagger y_1 - A^\dagger x_2 = A^\dagger A x_1.$$

Thus $gppt(M, A) \begin{pmatrix} y_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A^\dagger A x_1 \\ y_2 \end{pmatrix}$.

Conversely, suppose that $gppt(M, A) \begin{pmatrix} y_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A^\dagger A x_1 \\ y_2 \end{pmatrix}$. Then $A^\dagger y_1 = A^\dagger A x_1 + A^\dagger B x_2$ and $CA^\dagger y_1 + D x_2 - CA^\dagger B x_2 = y_2$. Substitute the value of $A^\dagger y_1$ in the second equation we get

$$CA^\dagger A x_1 + D x_2 = y_2.$$

Pre-multiply the first equation by A we get

$$AA^\dagger y_1 - AA^\dagger B x_2 = A x_1.$$

Then using the fact that $AA^\dagger B = B$ and $AA^\dagger y_1 = y_1$, we get

$$A x_1 + B x_2 = y_1.$$

Thus $M \begin{pmatrix} A^\dagger A x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{pmatrix}$. The second part can be proved in a similar way. This completes the proof.

The following result is Theorem 4.2 in [2] whose proof is not complete as illustrated here : Let $P = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ B^*(A^*)^\dagger & I \end{pmatrix}$, $Q = \begin{pmatrix} I & A^\dagger B \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix}$ and $N = \begin{pmatrix} A^* A & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. In [2], it is claimed that $Q^{-1}N^{(1)}P^{-1} = gppt(M^*M, A^*A)$ which is not true, where $N^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} (A^*A)^\dagger & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Here we have given the complete proof.

Theorem 17 ([2], Theorem 4.2) *Let $M = (A|B)$ be a partition matrix with $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n-r)}$. If $R(B) \subseteq R(A)$, then $gppt(M^*M, A^*A)$ is an $\{1\}$ -inverse of M^*M .*

Proof We have $M^*M = \begin{pmatrix} A^*A & A^*B \\ B^*A & B^*B \end{pmatrix}$. Let P, N, Q and $N^{(1)}$ be as given above. Since $R(B) \subseteq R(A)$, we have $M^*M = PNQ$. Now $Q^{-1}N^{(1)}P^{-1} = N^{(1)}$ is an $\{1\}$ -inverse of M^*M and by Theorem 1, $K = N^{(1)} + Z - N^{(1)}M^*MZM^*MN^{(1)}$ is also an $\{1\}$ -inverse of M^*M for any matrix Z of appropriate size. Taking $Z = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -A^\dagger B \\ B^*(A^*)^\dagger & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ we get

$$K = N^{(1)} + Z - \begin{pmatrix} -A^*A^\dagger A^*[-AA^\dagger BB^* + BB^*(A^\dagger)^*A^*]A(A^*A)^\dagger & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $R(B) \subseteq R(A)$ we have $AA^\dagger B = B$ and $B^*(A^\dagger)^*A^* = B^*$. Therefore $K = N^{(1)} + Z = \begin{pmatrix} (A^*A)^\dagger & -A^\dagger B \\ B^*(A^*)^\dagger & 0 \end{pmatrix} = gppt(M^*M, A^*A)$.

4 Some Inheritance Properties for Generalized Principal Pivot Transform

In this section, we consider inheritance properties of the generalized principal pivot transform with two classes of matrices, P_\dagger -matrices [8] and R_\dagger -matrices [9]. These classes of matrices are relevant and useful in the context of the linear complementarity problem.

Theorem 18 *Let $M = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$ be a real matrix with A and D are square matrices. Let $M_0 = \begin{pmatrix} A & AA^\dagger B \\ CA^\dagger A & D \end{pmatrix}$ and $F = D - CA^\dagger B$. Suppose $R(C) \subseteq R(F)$ and $R(B^*) \subseteq R(F^*)$. If M_0 is a P_\dagger -matrix, then $gppt(M, A)$, A, D are P_\dagger -matrices. On the other hand, suppose $R(C) \subseteq R(D)$ and $R(B^*) \subseteq R(D^*)$. If $gppt(M, A)$ is a P_\dagger -matrix, then M_0, A and F are P_\dagger -matrices.*

Proof Let $H = gppt(M, A)$. Consider $z = \begin{pmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \end{pmatrix} \in R(H^*)$. Then there exists $v = \begin{pmatrix} v_1 \\ v_2 \end{pmatrix}$ such that $H^*v = z$. Then $z_1 = (A^\dagger)^*v_1 + (CA^\dagger)^*v_2$ and $z_2 = (-A^\dagger B)^*v_1 + F^*v_2$. This gives that $z_1 \in R(A)$. So $z_1 = AA^\dagger z_1$. Also since $R(B^*) \subseteq R(F^*)$ we have $z_2 \in R(F^*)$ and so $z_2 = F^\dagger F z_2$. Let $w = \begin{pmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \end{pmatrix} = Hz$. Then $w_1 = A^\dagger z_1 - A^\dagger B z_2$ and $w_2 = CA^\dagger z_1 + F z_2$. This clearly gives that $w_1 \in R(A^\dagger)$ and so $w_1 = A^\dagger A w_1$. Therefore $H z = H \begin{pmatrix} AA^\dagger z_1 \\ z_2 \end{pmatrix} = w = \begin{pmatrix} A^\dagger A w_1 \\ w_2 \end{pmatrix}$. Observe that $gppt(H, A^\dagger) = M_0$. Now by 1 of Theorem 16 we have $M_0 \begin{pmatrix} A^\dagger A w_1 \\ z_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} AA^\dagger z_1 \\ w_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} z_1 \\ w_2 \end{pmatrix}$. Let $x = \begin{pmatrix} w_1 \\ z_2 \end{pmatrix}$. Now suppose

$(z)_i(Hz)_i \leq 0$ for all i . Then $(z_1)_i(w_1)_i \leq 0$ for all i and $(z_2)_j(w_2)_j \leq 0$ for all j . Now observe that $(w_1)_i = (x)_i$ for all i ; for some s , $w_1 \in \mathbb{C}^s$, hence $(z_2)_j = (x)_{j+s}$ for all j . Similarly, $(z_1)_i = (M_0x)_i$ for all i ; for some t , $z_1 \in \mathbb{C}^t$, hence $(w_2)_j = (M_0x)_{j+t}$ for all j . Therefore we have $(x)_i(M_0x)_i \leq 0$, for all i . By Theorem 6 we have $(M_0)^\dagger M_0 = \begin{pmatrix} A^\dagger A & 0 \\ 0 & F^\dagger F \end{pmatrix}$. Hence $(M_0)^\dagger M_0 x = \begin{pmatrix} A^\dagger A w_1 \\ F^\dagger F z_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} w_1 \\ z_2 \end{pmatrix} = x$. Therefore $x \in R((M_0)^*)$. Since M_0 is a P_\dagger -matrix we have $x = 0$. That is, $w_1 = 0$ and $z_2 = 0$. Since $M_0 \begin{pmatrix} w_1 \\ z_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} z_1 \\ w_2 \end{pmatrix}$, $z_1 = 0$ and therefore we have $z = 0$. Hence $gppt(M, A)$ is a P_\dagger -matrix.

Now we show that A is a P_\dagger -matrix. Let $x_1 \in R(A^*)$. Suppose $(x_1)_i(Ax_1)_i \leq 0$ for all i . Take $x = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Then $(M_0)^\dagger M_0 x = \begin{pmatrix} A^\dagger A x_1 \\ F^\dagger F 0 \end{pmatrix} = x$. Therefore $x \in R((M_0)^*)$. Also $(x)_j(M_0x)_j = \begin{pmatrix} (x_1)_j(Ax_1)_j \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \leq 0$, for all j . Since M_0 is a P_\dagger -matrix, we have $x = 0$, hence $x_1 = 0$. Therefore A is a P_\dagger -matrix. Finally we show that D is a P_\dagger -matrix. Let $x_2 \in R(D^*)$ so that $x_2 = D^\dagger D x_2$. Since $F = D - CA^\dagger B$ and $R(B^*) \subseteq R(F^*)$, we have $R(D^*) \subseteq R(F^*)$. Therefore $x_2 = F^\dagger F x_2$. Suppose $(x_2)_i(Dx_2)_i \leq 0$ for all i . Define $x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix}$. Then $(M_0)^\dagger M_0 x = \begin{pmatrix} A^\dagger A 0 \\ F^\dagger F x_2 \end{pmatrix} = x$. Therefore $x \in R(M_0)^*$. Also $(x)_j(M_0x)_j \leq 0$, for all j . Since M_0 is a P_\dagger -matrix, we have $x = 0$, hence $x_2 = 0$. Therefore D is a P_\dagger -matrix. The proof of other part follows by observing $gppt(M_0, A) = gppt(M, A) = H$, $gppt(H, A^\dagger) = M_0$ and applying the fact that a real matrix A is a P_\dagger -matrix if and only if A^\dagger is a P_\dagger -matrix.

Corollary 3 Let $M = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$ be a real matrix with A and D are square matrices. Let $M_0 = \begin{pmatrix} A & AA^\dagger B \\ CA^\dagger A & D \end{pmatrix}$ and $F = D - CA^\dagger B$. Suppose $R(C) \subseteq R(F)$, $R(B^*) \subseteq R(F^*)$, $R(C) \subseteq R(D)$ and $R(B^*) \subseteq R(D^*)$. Then M_0 is a P_\dagger -matrix if and only if $gppt(M, A)$ is a P_\dagger -matrix.

A similar result holds for complementary generalized principal pivot transform. We state these result below and the proof is omitted.

Theorem 19 Let $M = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$ be a real matrix with A and D are square matrices. Let $M_1 = \begin{pmatrix} A & BD^\dagger D \\ DD^\dagger C & D \end{pmatrix}$ and $G = A - BD^\dagger C$. Suppose $R(B) \subseteq R(G)$ and $R(C^*) \subseteq R(G^*)$. If M_1 is a P_\dagger -matrix, then $gppt(M, D)$, A , D are P_\dagger -matrices. On the other hand, suppose $R(B) \subseteq R(A)$ and $R(C^*) \subseteq R(A^*)$. If $gppt(M, D)$ is a P_\dagger -matrix, then M_1 , D and G are P_\dagger -matrices.

Corollary 4 Let $M = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$ be a real matrix with A and D are square matrices. Let $M_1 = \begin{pmatrix} A & BD^\dagger D \\ DD^\dagger C & D \end{pmatrix}$ and $G = A - BD^\dagger C$. Suppose $R(B) \subseteq R(G)$, $R(C^*) \subseteq R(G^*)$, $R(B) \subseteq R(A)$ and $R(C^*) \subseteq R(A^*)$. Then M_1 is a P_{\dagger} -matrix if and only if $gppt(M, D)$ is a P_{\dagger} -matrix.

If we drop the range space conditions in Theorem 18, then the result may not hold, as shown in the following example.

Example 4 Let $M = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & -2 & 1 \\ 2 & -2 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 & -0.5 \end{pmatrix}$ with $A = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & -2 \\ 2 & -2 \end{pmatrix}$, $B = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$, $C = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, $D = (-0.5)$. Now $A^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{8} & \frac{1}{8} \\ -\frac{1}{8} & -\frac{1}{8} \end{pmatrix}$, $M_0 = M$ and $F = 0$. Therefore

$R(C) \not\subseteq R(F)$ and $R(B^*) \not\subseteq R(F^*)$. Let $x \in R((M_0)^*)$. Then $x = \alpha(2, -2, 1)^*$, where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose $(x)_i(Mx)_i \leq 0$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Then $18(\alpha)^2 \leq 0$. This gives $\alpha = 0$. Therefore $x = 0$. So M_0 is a P_{\dagger} -matrix.

Now $H = gppt(M, A) = \begin{pmatrix} 0.125 & 0.125 & -0.25 \\ -0.125 & -0.125 & 0.25 \\ -0.25 & -0.25 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Let $y = (0, 0, -1)^*$. Then

$0 \neq y \in R(H^*)$ and $(y)_i(Hy)_i \leq 0$ for all $i = 1, 2, 3$ which show that H is not a P_{\dagger} -matrix. Also $0 \neq x_0 = (1, -1)^* \in R(A^*)$ and $(x_0)_i(Ax_0)_i = 0$. Therefore A is not a P_{\dagger} -matrix. Now take $x_1 = (1)$, clearly $x_1 \in R(D^*)$. $(x_1)(Dx_1) = -0.5 \leq 0$. Therefore D is not a P_{\dagger} -matrix. So conclusion of the first part of Theorem 18 does not hold.

Example 5 Consider $M = \begin{pmatrix} 0.125 & 0.125 & -0.25 \\ -0.125 & -0.125 & 0.25 \\ -0.25 & -0.25 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ with $A = \begin{pmatrix} 0.125 & 0.125 \\ -0.125 & -0.125 \end{pmatrix}$,

$B = \begin{pmatrix} -0.25 \\ 0.25 \end{pmatrix}$, $C = (-0.25 \ -0.25)$, $D = (0)$. Now $gppt(M, A) = H = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & -2 & 1 \\ 2 & -2 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 & -0.5 \end{pmatrix}$ and $M_0 = M$. Clearly $R(C) \not\subseteq R(D)$ and $R(B^*) \not\subseteq R(D^*)$.

By the previous example, H is a P_{\dagger} -matrix but M_0 is not a P_{\dagger} -matrix. So conclusion of the second part of Theorem 18 does not hold. This example also shows that converse of the first part Theorem 18 is not true in general.

In [2], for a R_{\dagger} -matrix M , some sufficient conditions are given for $gppt(M, A)$ to be a R_{\dagger} -matrix. We now prove generalized versions of them in the following results.

Theorem 20 Let $M = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$ be a real matrix with A and D are square matrices. Let $M_0 = \begin{pmatrix} A & AA^\dagger B \\ CA^\dagger A & D \end{pmatrix}$ and $F = D - CA^\dagger B$. Suppose $R(C) \subseteq$

$R(F)$ and $R(B^*) \subseteq R(F^*)$. If M_0 is a R_{\dagger} -matrix, then $gppt(M, A)$ is a R_{\dagger} -matrix. On the other hand, suppose $R(C) \subseteq R(D)$ and $R(B^*) \subseteq R(D^*)$. If $gppt(M, A)$ is a R_{\dagger} -matrix, then M_0 is a R_{\dagger} -matrix.

Proof Let $H = gppt(M, A)$. Let $z = \begin{pmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \end{pmatrix} \in R(H^*)$ such that $z \geq 0$, $H z = v = \begin{pmatrix} v_1 \\ v_2 \end{pmatrix} \geq 0$ and $\langle v, z \rangle = 0$. Then $v_1 = (A^{\dagger})z_1 - (A^{\dagger}B)z_2$ and $v_2 = (CA^{\dagger})z_1 + Fz_2$. This gives that $v_1 \in R(A^*)$. So $v_1 = A^{\dagger}Av_1$. As $z \in R(H^*)$, there exists $u = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{pmatrix}$ such that $H^*u = z$. Therefore $z_1 = (A^{\dagger})^*u_1 + (CA^{\dagger})^*u_2$ and $z_2 = (-A^{\dagger}B)^*u_1 + F^*u_2$. This implies $z_1 \in R(A)$ and so $z_1 = AA^{\dagger}z_1$. Since $R(B^*) \subseteq R(F^*)$, we obtain $z_2 \in R(F^*)$ and so $z_2 = F^{\dagger}Fz_2$. Therefore $H z = H \begin{pmatrix} AA^{\dagger}z_1 \\ z_2 \end{pmatrix} = v = \begin{pmatrix} A^{\dagger}Av_1 \\ v_2 \end{pmatrix}$. Observe that $gppt(H, A^{\dagger}) = M_0$. Now by 1 of Theorem 16 we have $M_0 \begin{pmatrix} A^{\dagger}Av_1 \\ z_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} AA^{\dagger}z_1 \\ v_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} z_1 \\ v_2 \end{pmatrix}$. Let $x = \begin{pmatrix} v_1 \\ z_2 \end{pmatrix}$ and $y = \begin{pmatrix} z_1 \\ v_2 \end{pmatrix}$. We have $x \geq 0$, $M_0x = y \geq 0$ and $\langle x, y \rangle = \sum x_i y_i = \sum z_i v_i = \langle z, v \rangle = 0$. Since $v_1 = A^{\dagger}Av_1$ and $z_2 = F^{\dagger}Fz_2$, by Theorem 6, we have $(M_0)^{\dagger}M_0 = \begin{pmatrix} A^{\dagger}A & 0 \\ 0 & F^{\dagger}F \end{pmatrix}$. Therefore $(M_0)^{\dagger}M_0x = \begin{pmatrix} A^{\dagger}Av_1 \\ F^{\dagger}Fz_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} v_1 \\ z_2 \end{pmatrix} = x$, hence $x \in R((M_0)^*)$. Since M_0 is a R_{\dagger} -matrix we have $x = 0$, so $v_1 = 0$ and $z_2 = 0$. As $M_0 \begin{pmatrix} v_1 \\ z_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} z_1 \\ v_2 \end{pmatrix}$, $z_1 = 0$ and hence $z = 0$. Thus $gppt(M, A)$ is a R_{\dagger} -matrix. Now the proof of other part follows by observing $gppt(M_0, A) = gppt(M, A) = H$ and $gppt(H, A^{\dagger}) = M_0$.

Theorem 21 Let $M = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$ be a real matrix with A and D are square matrices. Let $M_1 = \begin{pmatrix} A & BD^{\dagger}D \\ DD^{\dagger}C & D \end{pmatrix}$ and $G = A - BD^{\dagger}C$. Suppose $R(B) \subseteq R(G)$ and $R(C^*) \subseteq R(G^*)$. If M_1 is a R_{\dagger} -matrix, then $gppt(M, D)$ is a R_{\dagger} -matrix. On the other hand, suppose $R(B) \subseteq R(A)$ and $R(C^*) \subseteq R(A^*)$. If $gppt(M, D)$ is a R_{\dagger} -matrix, then M_1 is a R_{\dagger} -matrix.

Proof The proof is similar to Theorem 20.

Acknowledgements

The first author wishes to thank TNSCST, Government of Tamilnadu, India for the financial support through Young Scientist Fellowship and to carry out this work under collaborative Research Scheme. The third author thanks the National Institute of Technology Karnataka (NITK), Surathkal for giving financial support

References

1. Adi Ben-Israel and Thomas N. E. Greville. *Generalized inverses: theory and applications*. Robert E. Krieger Publishing Co., Inc., Huntington, N.Y., 1980. Corrected reprint of the 1974 original.
2. K. Bisht, G. Ravindran, and K. C. Sivakumar. Pseudo Schur complements, pseudo principal pivot transforms and their inheritance properties. *Electron. J. Linear Algebra*, 30:455–477, 2015.
3. Projesh Nath Choudhury and K. C. Sivakumar. Tucker’s theorem for almost skew-symmetric matrices and a proof of Farkas’ lemma. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 482:55–69, 2015.
4. J. J. McDonald, P. J. Psarrakos, and M. J. Tsatsomeros. Almost skew-symmetric matrices. *Rocky Mountain J. Math.*, 34(1):269–288, 2004.
5. Ar. Meenakshi. Principal pivot transforms of an *EP* matrix. *C. R. Math. Rep. Acad. Sci. Canada*, 8(2):121–126, 1986.
6. M. Rajesh Kannan and R. B. Bapat. Corrigendum to “Generalized principal pivot transform” [Linear Algebra Appl. 454 (2014) 49–56] [mr3208408]. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 459:620–621, 2014.
7. M. Rajesh Kannan and R. B. Bapat. Generalized principal pivot transform. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 454:49–56, 2014.
8. M. Rajesh Kannan and K. C. Sivakumar. P_{\dagger} -matrices: a generalization of P -matrices. *Linear Multilinear Algebra*, 62(1):1–12, 2014.
9. K. C. Sivakumar. A class of singular R_0 -matrices and extensions to semidefinite linear complementarity problems. *Yugosl. J. Oper. Res.*, 23(2):163–172, 2013.
10. Michael J. Tsatsomeros. Principal pivot transforms: properties and applications. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 307(1-3):151–165, 2000.