

Convergence Analysis and Parallel Computing Implementation for the Multiagent Coordination Optimization Algorithm

Qing Hui and Haopeng Zhang

Control Science and Engineering Laboratory

Department of Mechanical Engineering

Texas Tech University

Lubbock, TX 79409-1021

(qing.hui@ttu.edu; haopeng.zhang@ttu.edu)

Technical Report CSEL-06-13, June 2013

Abstract

In this report, a novel variation of Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO) algorithm, called Multiagent Coordination Optimization (MCO), is implemented in a parallel computing way for practical use by introducing MATLAB built-in function `parfor` into MCO. Then we rigorously analyze the global convergence of MCO by means of semistability theory. Besides sharing global optimal solutions with the PSO algorithm, the MCO algorithm integrates cooperative swarm behavior of multiple agents into the update formula by sharing velocity and position information between neighbors to improve its performance. Numerical evaluation of the parallel MCO algorithm is provided in the report by running the proposed algorithm on supercomputers in the High Performance Computing Center at Texas Tech University. In particular, the optimal value and consuming time are compared with PSO and serial MCO by solving several benchmark functions in the literature, respectively. Based on the simulation results, the performance of the parallel MCO is not only superb compared with PSO for solving many nonlinear, nonconvex optimization problems, but also is of high efficiency by saving the computational time.

I. INTRODUCTION

Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO) is a well developed swarm intelligence method that optimizes a nonlinear or linear objective function iteratively by trying to improve a candidate solution with regards to a given measure of quality. Motivated by a simplified social model, the algorithm is first introduced by Kennedy and Eberhart in [1], where some very primitive analysis of the convergence of PSO is also provided. Since the PSO algorithm requires only elementary mathematical operations and is computationally efficient in terms of both memory requirements and speed, it solves many optimization problems quite efficiently, particularly some nonlinear, nonconvex optimization problems. Consequently, the application of PSO has been widely seen from interdisciplinary subjects ranging from computer science, engineering, biology, to mathematics, economy [2], [3], etc. Several applications are reviewed in [4], which includes evolving neural networks, and reactive power and voltage control.

The mechanism of the PSO algorithm can be briefly explained as follows. The algorithm searches the solution space of an objective function by updating the individual solution vectors called particles. In the beginning, each particle is assigned to a position in the solution space and a velocity randomly. Each particle has a memory of

This work was supported by the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, Basic Research Award #HDTRA1-10-1-0090 and Fundamental Research Award #HDTRA1-13-1-0048, to Texas Tech University.

its previous best value and the corresponding previous best position. In addition, every particle in the swarm can know the global best value among all particles and the corresponding global best position. During every iteration, the velocity of each particle is updated so that the particle is guided by the previous best position of the particle and the global best position stochastically.

As the PSO algorithm is used more extensively, more research efforts are devoted to its refinement. To improve the efficiency of the PSO algorithm, the selection of the parameters becomes crucial. References [5], [6] study the relationship between convergence rate and parameter selection while [7] focuses on the impact of inertia weight and maximum velocity of PSO in which an adaptive inertia weight is equipped to guarantee the convergence rate near a minimum. On the other hand, some variations of PSO are proposed to improve the various aspects of the algorithm, not limited to efficiency. In particular, [8] presents a simple variation with the addition of a standard selection mechanism from evolutionary computation to improve performance. The authors in [9]–[11] expand PSO to multiobjective optimization by augmenting the objective functions. More recently, a new simple-structure variation of PSO is proposed [12] to improve convergence. Unlike the standard PSO, in this algorithm the particles can not only communicate with each other via the objective function but also via a new variable named “quantizer” which displays a better convergence than the standard PSO by evaluating some standard test functions in the literature.

All the above PSO variants focus either on some highly mathematical skills or on nature-inspired structures to improve their performance, lacking the fundamental understanding of how these algorithms work for *general* problems. Thus, to address this issue, we need to look at the swarm intelligence algorithm design from a new perspective since the traditional way of looking to *natural* network systems appearing in nature for inspiration does not provide a satisfactory answer. In particular, the new algorithms need to have *robustness* properties on the practical uncertainty of distributed network implementation with communication constraints. Furthermore, due to the real-time implementation requirement for many network optimization systems in harsh or even adversarial environments, these new algorithms need to have faster (or even finite-time) convergence properties compared with the existing algorithms. Last but not least, these new algorithms need to have a capability of dealing with dynamical systems and control problems instead of just static optimization problems. In particular, it is favorable to use these new algorithms to *modify* (control) the dynamic behavior of engineered network systems due to the inherent similarity between swarm optimization in computational intelligence [13] and cooperative networks in control theory [14]–[20].

Multiagent Coordination Optimization (MCO) algorithms are inspired by swarm intelligence and consensus protocols for multiagent coordination in [21]–[24]. Unlike the standard PSO, this new algorithm is a new

optimization technique based not only on swarm intelligence [13] which simulates the bio-inspired behavior, but also on cooperative control of autonomous agents. Similar to PSO, the MCO algorithm starts with a set of random solutions for agents which can communicate with each other. The agents then move through the solution space based on the evaluation of their cost functional and neighbor-to-neighbor rules like multiagent consensus protocols [21]–[26]. By adding a distributed control term and gradient-based adaptation, we hope that the convergence speed of MCO can be accelerated and the convergence time of MCO can be improved compared with the existing techniques. Moreover, this new algorithm will be more suitable to distributed and parallel computation for solving large-scale physical network optimization problems by means of high performance computing facilities.

In this report, we first implement MCO in a parallel computing way by introducing MATLAB[®] built-in function `parfor` into MCO. Then we rigorously analyze the global convergence of MCO by means of *semistability theory* [21], [27]. Besides sharing global optimal solutions with the PSO algorithm, the MCO algorithm incorporates cooperative swarm behavior of multiple agents into the update formula by sharing velocity and position information between neighbors to improve its performance. Numerical evaluation of the parallel MCO algorithm is provided by running the proposed algorithm on supercomputers in the High Performance Computing Center at Texas Tech University. In particular, the optimal solution and consuming time are compared with PSO and serial MCO by solving several benchmark functions in the literature, respectively. Based on the simulation results, the performance of the parallel MCO is not only superb compared with PSO by solving many nonlinear, nonconvex optimization problems, but also is of high efficiency by saving the computational time.

This report is organized as follows. In Section II, some notions and notation in graph theory are introduced. In Section III the realization of the parallel MCO algorithm in the MATLAB environment is described in details. The convergence results are developed in Section IV. The numerical evaluation of the parallel MCO algorithm is then presented in Section V. Finally, Section VI concludes the report.

II. MATHEMATICAL PRELIMINARIES

Graph theory is a powerful tool to investigate the topological change of large-scale network systems. In this report, we use graph-related notation to describe our network topology based MCO algorithm. More specifically, let $\mathcal{G}(t) = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}(t), \mathcal{A}(t))$ denote a *node-fixed dynamic directed graph* (or *node-fixed dynamic digraph*) with the set of vertices $\mathcal{V} = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ and $\mathcal{E}(t) \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ represent the set of edges, where $t \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+ = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. The time-varying matrix $\mathcal{A}(t)$ with nonnegative adjacency elements $a_{i,j}(t)$ serves as the weighted adjacency matrix. The node index of $\mathcal{G}(t)$ is denoted as a finite index set $\mathcal{N} = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. An edge of $\mathcal{G}(t)$

is denoted by $e_{i,j}(t) = (v_i, v_j)$ and the adjacency elements associated with the edges are positive. We assume $e_{i,j}(t) \in \mathcal{E}(t) \Leftrightarrow a_{i,j}(t) = 1$ and $a_{i,i}(t) = 0$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$. The set of neighbors of the node v_i is denoted by $\mathcal{N}^i(t) = \{v_j \in \mathcal{V} : (v_i, v_j) \in \mathcal{E}(t), j = 1, 2, \dots, |\mathcal{N}|, j \neq i\}$, where $|\mathcal{N}|$ denotes the cardinality of \mathcal{N} . The degree matrix of a node-fixed dynamic digraph $\mathcal{G}(t)$ is defined as

$$\Delta(t) = [\delta_{i,j}(t)]_{i,j=1,2,\dots,|\mathcal{N}|} \quad (1)$$

where

$$\delta_{i,j}(t) = \begin{cases} \sum_{j=1}^{|\mathcal{N}|} a_{i,j}(t), & \text{if } i = j, \\ 0, & \text{if } i \neq j. \end{cases}$$

The *Laplacian matrix* of the node-fixed dynamic digraph $\mathcal{G}(t)$ is defined by

$$L(t) = \Delta(t) - \mathcal{A}(t). \quad (2)$$

If $L(t) = L^T(t)$, then $\mathcal{G}(t)$ is called a *node-fixed dynamic undirected graph* (or simply *node-fixed dynamic graph*). If there is a path from any node to any other node in a node-fixed dynamic digraph, then we call the dynamic digraph *strongly connected*. Analogously, if there is a path from any node to any other node in a node-fixed dynamic graph, then we call the dynamic graph *connected*. From now on we use short notations $L_t, \mathcal{G}_t, \mathcal{N}_t^i$ to denote $L(t), \mathcal{G}(t), \mathcal{N}^i(t)$, respectively. The following result due to Proposition 1 of [28] is a property about the eigenvalue distribution of a Laplacian matrix.

Lemma 2.1 ([28]): Consider the Laplacian matrix L_t for a node-fixed dynamic digraph or graph \mathcal{G}_t with the index set \mathcal{N} , $|\mathcal{N}| \geq 2$. Let $\lambda_t \in \text{spec}(L_t)$, where $\text{spec}(A)$ denotes the spectrum of A . Then for every $t \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$,

$$-\left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \frac{\pi}{|\mathcal{N}|}\right) \leq \arg \lambda_t \leq \left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \frac{\pi}{|\mathcal{N}|}\right), \quad (3)$$

where $\arg \lambda$ denotes the argument of $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, where \mathbb{C} denotes the set of complex numbers.

A direct consequence from Lemma 2.1 is that $\text{Re } \lambda_t \geq 0$, where $\text{Re } \lambda$ denotes the real part of $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. Moreover, if \mathcal{G}_t is an undirected graph, then λ_t is real and $\lambda_t \geq 0$.

III. PARALLEL MULTIAGENT COORDINATION OPTIMIZATION ALGORITHM

A. Multiagent Coordination Optimization with Node-Fixed Dynamic Graph Topology

The MCO algorithm with static graph topology, proposed in [29] to solve a given optimization problem $\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(\mathbf{x})$, can be described in a vector form as follows:

$$\mathbf{v}_k(t+1) = \mathbf{v}_k(t) + \eta \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}^k} (\mathbf{v}_j(t) - \mathbf{v}_k(t)) + \mu \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}^k} (\mathbf{x}_j(t) - \mathbf{x}_k(t)) + \kappa(\mathbf{p}(t) - \mathbf{x}_k(t)), \quad (4)$$

$$\mathbf{x}_k(t+1) = \mathbf{x}_k(t) + \mathbf{v}_k(t+1), \quad (5)$$

$$\mathbf{p}(t+1) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{p}(t) + \kappa(\mathbf{x}_{\min}(t) - \mathbf{p}(t)), & \text{if } \mathbf{p}(t) \notin \mathcal{Z}, \\ \mathbf{x}_{\min}(t), & \text{if } \mathbf{p}(t) \in \mathcal{Z}, \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where $k = 1, \dots, q$, $t \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$, $\mathbf{v}_k(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbf{x}_k(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are the velocity and position of particle k at iteration t , respectively, $\mathbf{p}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the position of the global best value that the swarm of the particles can achieve so far, η , μ , and κ are three scalar random coefficients which are usually selected in uniform distribution in the range $[0, 1]$, $\mathcal{Z} = \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n : f(\mathbf{x}_{\min}) < f(\mathbf{y})\}$, and $\mathbf{x}_{\min} = \arg \min_{1 \leq k \leq q} f(\mathbf{x}_k)$. In this report, we allow node-fixed dynamic graph topology in MCO so that \mathcal{N}^k in (4) becomes $\mathcal{N}^k(t) = \mathcal{N}_t^k$. A natural question arising from (4)–(6) is the following: Can we always guarantee the convergence of (4)–(6) for a given optimization problem $\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(\mathbf{x})$? Here convergence means that all the limits $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{x}_k(t)$, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{v}_k(t)$, and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{p}(t)$ exist for every $k = 1, \dots, q$. This report tries to answer this question by giving some sufficient conditions to guarantee the convergence of (4)–(6).

B. Parallel Implementation of MCO

In this section, a parallel implementation of the MCO algorithm is introduced, which is described as Algorithm 1 in the MATLAB language format. The command `matlabpool` opens or closes a pool of MATLAB sessions for parallel computation, and enables the parallel language features within the MATLAB language (e.g., `parfor`) by starting a parallel job which connects this MATLAB client with a number of labs.

The command `parfor` executes code loop in parallel. Part of the `parfor` body is executed on the MATLAB client (where the `parfor` is issued) and part is executed in parallel on MATLAB workers. The necessary data on which `parfor` operates is sent from the client to workers, where most of the computation happens, and the results are sent back to the client and pieced together. In Algorithm 1, the command `parfor` is used for loop of the update formula of all particles. Since the update formula needs the neighbors' information, so two temporary variables C and D are introduced for storing the global information of position and velocity, respectively, and L is the Laplacian matrix for the communication topology \mathcal{G} for MCO.

IV. CONVERGENCE ANALYSIS

In this section, we present some theoretic results on global convergence of the iterative process in Algorithm 1. In particular, we view the randomized MCO algorithm as a discrete-time switched linear system and then use semistability theory to rigorously show its global convergence. To proceed with presentation, let \mathbb{R} denote the set of real numbers.

Lemma 4.1: Let n, q be positive integers and $q \geq 2$. For every $j = 1, \dots, q$, let $E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times nq}$ denote a block-matrix whose j th block-column is I_n and the rest block-elements are all zero matrices, i.e., $E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} = [\mathbf{0}_{n \times n}, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{n \times n}, I_n, \mathbf{0}_{n \times n}, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{n \times n}]$, $j = 1, \dots, q$, where $I_m \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ denotes the $m \times m$ identity matrix and $\mathbf{0}_{m \times n}$ denotes the $m \times n$ zero matrix. Define $W^{[j]} = (\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n) E_{n \times nq}^{[j]}$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$, where \otimes denotes

Algorithm 1 Parallel MCO Algorithm

```
for each agent  $i = 1, \dots, q$  do
  Initialize the agent's position with a uniformly distributed random vector:
   $x_i \sim U(\underline{x}, \bar{x}) \in \mathbf{R}^{n \times 1}$ , where  $\underline{x}$  and  $\bar{x}$  are the lower and upper boundaries of the search
  space;
  Initialize the agent's velocity:  $v_i \sim U(\underline{v}, \bar{v})$ , where  $\underline{v}$  and  $\bar{v} \in \mathbf{R}^{n \times 1}$  are the lower
  and upper boundaries of the search speed;
  Update the agent's best known position to its initial position:  $p_i \leftarrow x_i$ ;
  If  $f(p_i) < f(p)$  update the multiagent network's best known position:  $p \leftarrow p_i$ .
end for
repeat
   $k \leftarrow k + 1$ ;
  for each agent  $i = 1, \dots, q$  do
     $C = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_q]^T$ ,  $D = [v_1, v_2, \dots, v_q]^T$ ;
    parfor each agent  $i = 1, \dots, q$ 
      Choose random parameters:  $\eta \sim U(0, 1)$ ,  $\mu \sim U(0, 1)$ ,  $\kappa \sim U(0, 1)$ ;
      Update the agent's velocity:  $v_i \leftarrow v_i + \eta(L_k(i, :)D)^T + \mu(L_k(i, :)C)^T + \kappa(p - x_i)$ ;
      Update the agent's position:  $x_i \leftarrow x_i + v_i$ ;
    endparfor
    for  $f(x_i) < f(p_i)$  do
      Update the agent's best known position:  $p_i \leftarrow x_i$ ;
      Update the multiagent network's best known position:  $p \leftarrow p + \kappa(p_i - p)$ ;
      If  $f(p_i) < f(p)$  update the multiagent network's best known position:  $p \leftarrow p_i$ ;
    end for
  end for
until  $k$  is large enough or the value of  $f$  has small change
return  $p$ 
```

the Kronecker product and $\mathbf{1}_{m \times n}$ denotes the $m \times n$ matrix whose entries are all ones. Then the following statements hold:

- i) For every $j = 1, \dots, q$, $W^{[j]}$ is an idempotent matrix, i.e., $(W^{[j]})^2 = W^{[j]}$, and $\text{rank}(W^{[j]} - I_{nq}) = nq - n$, where $\text{rank}(A)$ denotes the rank of A .
- ii) For any $\mathbf{w} = [w_1, \dots, w_q]^T \in \mathbb{R}^q$, $W^{[j]}(\mathbf{w} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) = w_j \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$ and every $i = 1, \dots, n$. In particular, $W^{[j]}(\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) = \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i$ and $\ker(W^{[j]} - I_{nq}) = \text{span}\{\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_n\}$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$ and every $i = 1, \dots, n$, where $[\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n] = I_n$, $\ker(A)$ denotes the kernel of A , and $\text{span } S$ denotes the span of S .
- iii) $E_{n \times nq}^{[j]}(\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) = \mathbf{e}_i$, $E_{n \times nq}^{[j]}(\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n) = I_n$, and $(\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n)\mathbf{e}_i = \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$ and every $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Proof: i) First note that by Fact 7.4.3 of [30, p. 445], $W^{[j]} = (\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n)E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} = \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes E_{n \times nq}^{[j]}$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$. Now it follows from Fact 7.4.20 of [30, p. 446] that

$$\begin{aligned} (W^{[j]})^2 &= (\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes E_{n \times nq}^{[j]})(\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes E_{n \times nq}^{[j]}) = (\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes [\mathbf{0}_{n \times n}, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{n \times n}, I_n, \mathbf{0}_{n \times n}, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{n \times n}])^2 \\ &= [\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{0}_{n \times n}, \dots, \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{0}_{n \times n}, \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n, \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{0}_{n \times n}, \dots, \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{0}_{n \times n}]^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & \cdots & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & I_n & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & \cdots & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & \cdots & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & I_n & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & \cdots & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & \cdots & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & I_n & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & \cdots & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & \cdots & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & I_n & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & \cdots & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & \cdots & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & I_n & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & \cdots & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & \cdots & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & I_n & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & \cdots & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} \end{bmatrix} = W^{[j]}, \tag{7}
\end{aligned}$$

which shows that $W^{[j]}$ is idempotent.

Next, it follows from (7) that $\text{rank}(W^{[j]}) = n$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$. By Sylvester's inequality, we have $\text{rank}(W^{[j]} - I_{nq}) + \text{rank}(W^{[j]}) \leq \text{rank}((W^{[j]})^2 - W^{[j]}) + nq = nq$, and hence, $\text{rank}(W^{[j]} - I_{nq}) \leq nq - n$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$. On the other hand, since $I_{nq} - W^{[j]} + W^{[j]} = I_{nq}$, it follows from *iv*) of Fact 2.10.17 of [30, p. 127] that $\text{rank}(I_{nq} - W^{[j]}) + \text{rank}(W^{[j]}) \geq \text{rank}(I_{nq} - W^{[j]} + W^{[j]}) = \text{rank}(I_{nq}) = nq$, which implies that $\text{rank}(I_{nq} - W^{[j]}) \geq nq - n$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$. Thus, $\text{rank}(W^{[j]} - I_{nq}) = nq - n$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$.

ii) It follows from (7) that for every $j = 1, \dots, q$ and every $i = 1, \dots, n$,

$$W^{[j]}(\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & \cdots & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & I_n & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & \cdots & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & \cdots & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & I_n & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & \cdots & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{e}_i \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{e}_i \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{e}_i \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{e}_i \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i,$$

namely, $(W^{[j]} - I_{nq})(\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$. Since by *i*), $\text{rank}(W^{[j]} - I_{nq}) = nq - n$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$, it follows from Corollary 2.5.5 of [30, p. 105] that $\text{def}(W^{[j]} - I_{nq}) = nq - \text{rank}(W^{[j]} - I_{nq}) = n$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$, where $\text{def}(A) = \dim \ker(A)$ denotes the defect of A and $\dim S$ denotes the dimension of a subspace S . Note that $\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, are linearly independent, it follows that $\ker(W^{[j]} - I_{nq}) = \text{span}\{\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_n\}$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$.

Finally, for any $\mathbf{w} = [w_1, \dots, w_q]^T \in \mathbb{R}^q$, it follows from (7) that

$$W^{[j]}(\mathbf{w} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & \cdots & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & I_n & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & \cdots & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & \cdots & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & I_n & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & \cdots & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \mathbf{e}_i \\ \vdots \\ w_q \mathbf{e}_i \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} w_j \mathbf{e}_i \\ \vdots \\ w_j \mathbf{e}_i \end{bmatrix} = w_j \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i$$

for every $j = 1, \dots, q$ and every $i = 1, \dots, n$.

iii) For every $j = 1, \dots, q$ and every $i = 1, \dots, n$, $E_{n \times nq}^{[j]}(\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) = [\mathbf{0}_{n \times n}, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{n \times n}, I_n, \mathbf{0}_{n \times n}, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{n \times n}] [\mathbf{e}_i^T, \dots, \mathbf{e}_i^T]^T = \mathbf{e}_i$ and $E_{n \times nq}^{[j]}(\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n) = [\mathbf{0}_{n \times n}, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{n \times n}, I_n, \mathbf{0}_{n \times n}, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{n \times n}] [I_n, \dots, I_n]^T = I_n$. Finally, by Fact 7.4.3 of [30, p. 445], $(\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n)\mathbf{e}_i = \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$. \blacksquare

Next, we use some graph notions to state a result on the rank of certain matrices related to the matrix form of the iterative process in Algorithm 1.

Lemma 4.2: Define a (possibly infinite) series of matrices $A_k^{[j]}$, $j = 1, \dots, q$, $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, as follows:

$$A_k^{[j]} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{nq \times nq} & I_{nq} & \mathbf{0}_{nq \times n} \\ -\mu_k L_k \otimes I_n - \kappa_k I_{nq} & -\eta_k L_k \otimes I_n & \kappa_k \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n \\ \kappa_k E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} & \mathbf{0}_{n \times nq} & -\kappa_k I_n \end{bmatrix}, \tag{8}$$

where $\mu_k, \eta_k, \kappa_k \geq 0$, $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$, $L_k \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times q}$ denotes the Laplacian matrix of a node-fixed dynamic digraph \mathcal{G}_k , and $E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times nq}$ is defined in Lemma 4.1.

- i) If $\mu_k = 0$ and $\kappa_k = 0$, then $\text{rank}(A_k^{[j]}) = nq$ and $\ker(A_k^{[j]}) = \{[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \alpha_{il}(\mathbf{e}_i \otimes \mathbf{g}_l)]^\top, \mathbf{0}_{1 \times nq}, \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{e}_i^\top\}^\top : \forall \alpha_{il} \in \mathbb{R}, \forall \beta_i \in \mathbb{R}, i = 1, \dots, n, l = 1, \dots, q\}$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$, $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$, where $[\mathbf{g}_1, \dots, \mathbf{g}_q] = I_q$.
- ii) If $\kappa_k \neq 0$, then $\text{rank}(A_k^{[j]}) = 2nq$ and $\ker(A_k^{[j]}) = \{[\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i(\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)]^\top, \mathbf{0}_{1 \times nq}, \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \mathbf{e}_i^\top\}^\top : \forall \alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}, i = 1, \dots, n\}$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$, $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$.
- iii) If $\mu_k \neq 0$ and $\kappa_k = 0$, then $\text{rank}(A_k^{[j]}) = n(q + \text{rank}(L_k))$ and $\ker(A_k^{[j]}) = \{[\sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{li}(\mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)]^\top, \mathbf{0}_{1 \times nq}, \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{e}_i^\top\}^\top : \forall \alpha_{li} \in \mathbb{R}, \forall \beta_i \in \mathbb{R}, l = 0, 1, \dots, q-1-\text{rank}(L_k), i = 1, \dots, n\}$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$, $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$.

Proof: First, it follows from (8) that $\ker(A_k^{[j]}) = \{[\mathbf{z}_1^\top, \mathbf{z}_2^\top, \mathbf{z}_3^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{2nq+n} : \mathbf{z}_2 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}, -\mu_k(L_k \otimes I_n)\mathbf{z}_1 - \kappa_k \mathbf{z}_1 - \eta_k(L_k \otimes I_n)\mathbf{z}_2 + \kappa_k(\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n)\mathbf{z}_3 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}, \kappa_k E_{n \times nq}^{[j]}\mathbf{z}_1 - \kappa_k \mathbf{z}_3 = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}\}$, $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$, where $\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{nq}$ and $\mathbf{z}_3 \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

i) If $\mu_k = 0$ and $\kappa_k = 0$, then $\mathbf{z}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{nq}$ and $\mathbf{z}_3 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ in $\ker(A_k^{[j]})$ can be chosen arbitrarily in \mathbb{R}^{nq} and \mathbb{R}^n , respectively. Thus, \mathbf{z}_1 and \mathbf{z}_3 can be represented as $\mathbf{z}_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \alpha_{il}(\mathbf{e}_i \otimes \mathbf{g}_l)$ and $\mathbf{z}_3 = \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{e}_i$, where $\alpha_{il}, \beta_i \in \mathbb{R}$. In this case, $\ker(A_k^{[j]}) = \{[\mathbf{z}_1^\top, \mathbf{z}_2^\top, \mathbf{z}_3^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{2nq+n} : \mathbf{z}_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \alpha_{il}(\mathbf{e}_i \otimes \mathbf{g}_l), \mathbf{z}_2 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}, \mathbf{z}_3 = \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{e}_i, \forall \alpha_{il} \in \mathbb{R}, \forall \beta_i \in \mathbb{R}, i = 1, \dots, n, l = 1, \dots, q\}$ and $\text{def}(A_k^{[j]}) = nq + n$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$, $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$. By Corollary 2.5.5 of [30, p. 105], $\text{rank}(A_k^{[j]}) = 2nq + n - \text{def}(A_k^{[j]}) = nq$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$, $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$.

ii) We consider two cases on μ_k .

Case 1. If $\mu_k = 0$ and $\kappa_k \neq 0$, then substituting $\mathbf{z}_2 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$ and $\mathbf{z}_3 = E_{n \times nq}^{[j]}\mathbf{z}_1$ into $-\kappa_k \mathbf{z}_1 - \eta_k(L_k \otimes I_n)\mathbf{z}_2 + \kappa_k(\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n)\mathbf{z}_3 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$ yields

$$\kappa_k(W^{[j]} - I_{nq})\mathbf{z}_1 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}, \quad (9)$$

where $W^{[j]}$ is defined in Lemma 4.1. Since, by ii) of Lemma 4.1, $\ker(W^{[j]} - I_{nq}) = \text{span}\{\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_n\}$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$ and every $i = 1, \dots, n$, it follows from (9) that \mathbf{z}_1 can be represented as $\mathbf{z}_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i$, where $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}$. Furthermore, it follows from iii) of Lemma 4.1 that $\mathbf{z}_3 = E_{n \times nq}^{[j]}\mathbf{z}_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i E_{n \times nq}^{[j]}(\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \mathbf{e}_i$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$. Thus, $\ker(A_k^{[j]}) = \{[\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i(\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)]^\top, \mathbf{0}_{1 \times nq}, \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \mathbf{e}_i^\top\}^\top : \forall \alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}, i = 1, \dots, n\}$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$, $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$, which implies that $\text{def}(A_k^{[j]}) = n$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$, $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$. Therefore, in this case $\text{rank}(A_k^{[j]}) = 2nq + n - \text{def}(A_k^{[j]}) = 2nq$.

Case 2. If $\mu_k \neq 0$ and $\kappa_k \neq 0$, then we claim that $\kappa_k/\mu_k \notin \text{spec}(-L_k)$. To see this, it follows from Lemma 2.1 that for any $\lambda_k \in \text{spec}(-L_k)$, $\text{Re } \lambda_k \leq 0$. Furthermore, note that $L_k \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} = \mathbf{0}_{q \times 1}$. Thus, if $\kappa_k \neq 0$,

then $0 < \kappa_k/\mu_k \notin \text{spec}(-L_k)$. Now, substituting $\mathbf{z}_2 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$ and $\mathbf{z}_3 = E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} \mathbf{z}_1$ into $-\mu_k(L_k \otimes I_n) \mathbf{z}_1 - \kappa_k \mathbf{z}_1 - \eta_k(L_k \otimes I_n) \mathbf{z}_2 + \kappa_k(\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n) \mathbf{z}_3 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$ yields

$$(-\mu_k L_k \otimes I_n - \kappa_k I_{nq} + \kappa_k W^{[j]}) \mathbf{z}_1 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}, \quad k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+. \quad (10)$$

Note that $(L_k \otimes I_n)W^{[j]} = (L_k \otimes I_n)(\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes E_{n \times nq}^{[j]}) = L_k \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} = \mathbf{0}_{q \times 1} \otimes E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times nq}$, $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$. Pre-multiplying $-L_k \otimes I_n$ on both sides of (10) yields $(\mu_k(L_k \otimes I_n)^2 + \kappa_k L_k \otimes I_n) \mathbf{z}_1 = (\mu_k L_k \otimes I_n + \kappa_k I_{nq})(L_k \otimes I_n) \mathbf{z}_1 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$, $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$. Since $\kappa_k/\mu_k \notin \text{spec}(-L_k)$ for every $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$, it follows that $\det(\mu_k L_k \otimes I_n + \kappa_k I_{nq}) \neq 0$, $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$, where \det denotes the determinant. Hence, $(L_k \otimes I_n) \mathbf{z}_1 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$, $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$.

Let $\mathbf{w}_0 = \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1}$. Note that $L_k \mathbf{w}_0 = \mathbf{0}_{q \times 1}$, it follows from Fact 7.4.22 of [30, p. 446] that $(L_k \otimes I_n)(\mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) = \mathbf{0}_{q \times 1}$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$, and hence, $\text{span}\{\mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_n\} \subseteq \ker(L_k \otimes I_n)$. Next, let $\text{span}\{\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)}\} = \ker(L_k) \setminus \text{span}\{\mathbf{w}_0\}$, it follows that $\bigcup_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \text{span}\{\mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_n\} = \ker(L_k \otimes I_n)$, $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$. Hence, $\mathbf{z}_1 = \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{li} \mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i$, where $\alpha_{li} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha_{li} = 0$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$ if $\mathbf{w}_l = \mathbf{0}_{q \times 1}$ for some $l \in \{1, \dots, q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)\}$. Substituting this \mathbf{z}_1 into the left-hand side of (10) yields $(-\mu_k L_k \otimes I_n - \kappa_k I_{nq} + \kappa_k W^{[j]}) \mathbf{z}_1 = \kappa_k (W^{[j]} - I_{nq}) \mathbf{z}_1 = \kappa_k (W^{[j]} - I_{nq}) (\sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{li} \mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) = \kappa_k \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{li} W^{[j]} \mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i - \kappa_k \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{li} \mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i$. Note that it follows from *ii*) of Lemma 4.1 that $W^{[j]} \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i = \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$ and every $i = 1, \dots, n$. Let $\mathbf{w}_l = [w_{l1}, \dots, w_{lq}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^q$ for every $l = 1, \dots, q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)$, then it follows from *ii*) of Lemma 4.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} & \kappa_k \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{li} W^{[j]} \mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i - \kappa_k \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{li} \mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\ &= \kappa_k \sum_{l=1}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{li} (W^{[j]} \mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) \\ &= \kappa_k \sum_{l=1}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{li} (w_{lj} \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) \\ &= \kappa_k \sum_{l=1}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{li} (w_{lj} \mathbf{w}_0 - \mathbf{w}_l) \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\ &= \kappa_k \sum_{l=1}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{li} w_{lj} \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i + \kappa_k \sum_{l=1}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n (-\alpha_{li}) \mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i$, $l = 0, 1, \dots, q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, are linearly independent. Hence, \mathbf{z}_1 satisfies (10) if and only if $\alpha_{li} = 0$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$ and every $l = 1, \dots, q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)$. In this case, we have $\mathbf{z}_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{0i} \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i$.

Note that by *iii*) of Lemma 4.1, $\mathbf{z}_3 = E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} \mathbf{z}_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{0i} E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} (\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{0i} \mathbf{e}_i$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$. Thus, $\ker(A_k^{[j]}) = \{[\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i (\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)]^T, \mathbf{0}_{1 \times nq}, \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \mathbf{e}_i^T\}^T : \forall \alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}, i = 1, \dots, n\}$ for every

$j = 1, \dots, q, k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$. Clearly $\dim \ker(A_k^{[j]}) = n$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q, k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$. Therefore, it follows from Corollary 2.5.5 of [30, p. 105] that $\text{rank}(A_k^{[j]}) = 2nq + n - \text{def}(A_k^{[j]}) = 2nq$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q, k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$.

iii) If $\mu_k \neq 0$ and $\kappa_k = 0$, then $\mathbf{z}_2 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$, $-\mu_k(L_k \otimes I_n)\mathbf{z}_1 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$, and \mathbf{z}_3 in $\ker(A_k^{[j]})$ can be chosen arbitrarily in \mathbb{R}^n . Thus, \mathbf{z}_3 can be represented as $\mathbf{z}_3 = \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{e}_i$, where $\beta_i \in \mathbb{R}$. In this case, since $(L_k \otimes I_n)\mathbf{z}_1 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$, $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$, it follows from the similar arguments as in Case 2 of *ii)* that $\mathbf{z}_1 = \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{li} \mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i$. Therefore, $\ker(A_k^{[j]}) = \{[\sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{li} (\mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)^T, \mathbf{0}_{1 \times nq}, \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{e}_i^T]^T : \forall \alpha_{li} \in \mathbb{R}, \forall \beta_i \in \mathbb{R}, l = 0, 1, \dots, q-1 - \text{rank}(L_k), i = 1, \dots, n\}$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q, k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$. Clearly $\dim \ker(A_k^{[j]}) = n(q - \text{rank}(L_k)) + n$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q, k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$. Therefore, it follows from Corollary 2.5.5 of [30, p. 105] that $\text{rank}(A_k^{[j]}) = 2nq + n - \text{def}(A_k^{[j]}) = n(q + \text{rank}(L_k))$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q, k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$. \blacksquare

It follows from Lemma 4.2 that 0 is an eigenvalue of $A_k^{[j]}$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$ and every $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$. Next, we further investigate some relationships of the null spaces between a row-addition transformed matrix of $A_k^{[j]}$ and $A_k^{[j]}$ itself in order to unveil an important property of this eigenvalue 0 later.

Lemma 4.3: Consider the (possibly infinitely many) matrices $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$, $j = 1, \dots, q, k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, where $A_k^{[j]}$ is defined by (8) in Lemma 4.2,

$$A_{ck} = \begin{bmatrix} -\mu_k L_k \otimes I_n - \kappa_k I_{nq} & -\eta_k L_k \otimes I_n & \kappa_k \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n \\ \mathbf{0}_{nq \times nq} & \mathbf{0}_{nq \times nq} & \mathbf{0}_{nq \times n} \\ \mathbf{0}_{n \times nq} & \mathbf{0}_{n \times nq} & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (11)$$

and $\mu_k, \kappa_k, \eta_k, h_k \geq 0, k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$. Then $\ker(A_k^{[j]}) = \ker(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})$ and $\ker(A_k^{[j]}(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})) = \ker((A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})^2)$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$ and every $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$.

Proof: To show that $\ker(A_k^{[j]}) = \ker(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})$, note that for every $j = 1, \dots, q, \ker(A_k^{[j]}) = \{[\mathbf{z}_1^T, \mathbf{z}_2^T, \mathbf{z}_3^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{2nq+n} : \mathbf{z}_2 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}, -\mu_k(L_k \otimes I_n)\mathbf{z}_1 - \kappa_k \mathbf{z}_1 - \eta_k(L_k \otimes I_n)\mathbf{z}_2 + \kappa_k(\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n)\mathbf{z}_3 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}, \kappa_k E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} \mathbf{z}_1 - \kappa_k \mathbf{z}_3 = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}\}$, $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$. Alternatively, for every $j = 1, \dots, q$ and every $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$, let $\mathbf{y} = [\mathbf{y}_1^T, \mathbf{y}_2^T, \mathbf{y}_3^T]^T \in \ker(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})$, where $\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{nq}$ and $\mathbf{y}_3 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have

$$h_k(-\mu_k L_k \otimes I_n - \kappa_k I_{nq})\mathbf{y}_1 + h_k(-\eta_k L_k \otimes I_n)\mathbf{y}_2 + \mathbf{y}_2 + h_k(\kappa_k \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n)\mathbf{y}_3 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}, \quad (12)$$

$$(-\mu_k L_k \otimes I_n - \kappa_k I_{nq})\mathbf{y}_1 + (-\eta_k L_k \otimes I_n)\mathbf{y}_2 + (\kappa_k \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n)\mathbf{y}_3 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}, \quad (13)$$

$$\kappa_k E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} \mathbf{y}_1 - \kappa_k \mathbf{y}_3 = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}. \quad (14)$$

Substituting (13) into (12) yields $\mathbf{y}_2 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$. Together with (13) and (14), we have $\mathbf{y} \in \ker(A_k^{[j]})$, which implies that $\ker(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}) \subseteq \ker(A_k^{[j]})$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$ and every $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$. On the other hand, if $\mathbf{y} \in \ker(A_k^{[j]})$, then $\mathbf{y}_2 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$, $-\mu_k(L_k \otimes I_n)\mathbf{y}_1 - \kappa_k \mathbf{y}_1 - \eta_k(L_k \otimes I_n)\mathbf{y}_2 + \kappa_k(\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n)\mathbf{y}_3 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$, and $\kappa_k E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} \mathbf{y}_1 - \kappa_k \mathbf{y}_3 = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}$. Clearly in this case, (12)–(14) hold, i.e., $\mathbf{y} \in \ker(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})$, which implies that $\ker(A_k^{[j]}) \subseteq \ker(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$ and every $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$. Thus, $\ker(A_k^{[j]}) = \ker(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$ and every $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$.

Finally, to show that $\ker(A_k^{[j]}(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})) = \ker((A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})^2)$, note that $\ker((A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})^2) = \ker((A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}))$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$ and every $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$. Let $\mathbf{y} \in \ker((A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}))$, then $(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})\mathbf{y} \in \ker(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}) = \ker(A_k^{[j]})$, and hence, $\mathbf{y} \in \ker((A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})^2)$, which implies that $\ker(A_k^{[j]}(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})) \subseteq \ker((A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})^2)$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$ and every $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$. Alternatively, let $\mathbf{z} \in \ker((A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})^2)$, then $(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})\mathbf{z} \in \ker(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}) = \ker(A_k^{[j]})$, and hence, $\mathbf{z} \in \ker(A_k^{[j]}(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}))$, which implies that $\ker((A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})^2) \subseteq \ker(A_k^{[j]}(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}))$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$ and every $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$. Thus, $\ker(A_k^{[j]}(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})) = \ker((A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})^2)$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$ and every $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$. \blacksquare

Next, we assert that 0 is semisimple for $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$. Recall from Definition 5.5.4 of [30, p. 322] that 0 is semisimple if its geometric multiplicity and algebraic multiplicity are equal.

Lemma 4.4: Consider the (possibly infinitely many) matrices $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$, $j = 1, \dots, q$, $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, defined in Lemma 4.3, where $\mu_k, \kappa_k, \eta_k, h_k \geq 0$, $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$.

- i) If $\kappa_k = 0$ and $\mu_k = 0$, then $\text{rank}(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}) = nq$ and 0 is not a semisimple eigenvalue of $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$, $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$.
- ii) If $\kappa_k = 0$ and $\mu_k \neq 0$, then $\text{rank}(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}) = n(q + \text{rank}(L_k))$ and 0 is not a semisimple eigenvalue of $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$, $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$.
- iii) If $\kappa_k \neq 0$, then $\text{rank}(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}) = 2nq$ and 0 is a semisimple eigenvalue of $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$, $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$.

Proof: First, it follows from Lemma 4.3 that $\ker(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}) = \ker(A_k^{[j]})$, and hence $\text{def}(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}) = \text{def}(A_k^{[j]})$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$ and every $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$. Thus, $\text{rank}(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}) = 2nq + n - \text{def}(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}) = 2nq + n - \text{def}(A_k^{[j]}) = \text{rank}(A_k^{[j]})$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$ and every $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$. Therefore, all the rank conclusions on $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$ in i)–iii) directly follow from Lemma 4.2.

Next, it follows from these rank conclusions on $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$ that $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$ has an eigenvalue 0 for every $j = 1, \dots, q$ and every $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$. Now we want to further investigate whether 0 is a semisimple eigenvalue of $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$ or not for every $j = 1, \dots, q$, $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$. To this end, we need to study the relationship between $\ker(A_k^{[j]})$ and $\ker(A_k^{[j]}(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}))$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$, $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$.

Noting that $(L_k \otimes I_n)(\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n) = (L_k \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1}) \otimes I_n = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times n}$ and by iii) of Lemma 4.1, $E_{n \times nq}^{[j]}(\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n) = I_n$, we have

$$(A_k^{[j]})^2 = \begin{bmatrix} -\mu_k L_k \otimes I_n - \kappa_k I_{nq} & -\eta_k L_k \otimes I_n & \kappa_k \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n \\ \eta_k \mu_k (L_k \otimes I_n)^2 + \eta_k \kappa_k L_k \otimes I_n + \kappa_k^2 W^{[j]} & \eta_k^2 (L_k \otimes I_n)^2 - \mu_k L_k \otimes I_n - \kappa_k I_{nq} & -\kappa_k^2 \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n \\ -\kappa_k^2 E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} & \kappa_k E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} & \kappa_k^2 I_n \end{bmatrix},$$

$$A_k^{[j]} A_{ck} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{nq \times nq} & \mathbf{0}_{nq \times nq} & \mathbf{0}_{nq \times n} \\ \mu_k^2 (L_k \otimes I_n)^2 + 2\mu_k \kappa_k (L_k \otimes I_n) + \kappa_k^2 I_{nq} & \mu_k \eta_k (L_k \otimes I_n)^2 + \kappa_k \eta_k L_k \otimes I_n & -\kappa_k^2 \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n \\ -\kappa_k \mu_k E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} (L_k \otimes I_n) - \kappa_k^2 E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} & -\kappa_k \eta_k E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} (L_k \otimes I_n) & \kappa_k^2 I_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

Thus, for every $j = 1, \dots, q$ and every $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$, let $\mathbf{y} = [\mathbf{y}_1^T, \mathbf{y}_2^T, \mathbf{y}_3^T]^T \in \ker(A_k^{[j]}(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}))$, where $\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{nq}$ and $\mathbf{y}_3 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have

$$(-\mu_k L_k \otimes I_n - \kappa_k I_{nq}) \mathbf{y}_1 - (\eta_k L_k \otimes I_n) \mathbf{y}_2 + (\kappa_k \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n) \mathbf{y}_3 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}, \quad (15)$$

$$(\eta_k \mu_k (L_k \otimes I_n)^2 + \eta_k \kappa_k L_k \otimes I_n + \kappa_k^2 W^{[j]}) \mathbf{y}_1 + (\eta_k^2 (L_k \otimes I_n)^2 - \mu_k L_k \otimes I_n - \kappa_k I_{nq}) \mathbf{y}_2 + (-\kappa_k^2 \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n) \mathbf{y}_3$$

$$+ h_k (\mu_k^2 (L_k \otimes I_n)^2 + 2\mu_k \kappa_k (L_k \otimes I_n) + \kappa_k^2 I_{nq}) \mathbf{y}_1 + h_k (\mu_k \eta_k (L_k \otimes I_n)^2 + \kappa_k \eta_k L_k \otimes I_n) \mathbf{y}_2$$

$$+ h_k (-\kappa_k^2 \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n) \mathbf{y}_3 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}, \quad (16)$$

$$-\kappa_k^2 E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} \mathbf{y}_1 + \kappa_k E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} \mathbf{y}_2 + \kappa_k^2 \mathbf{y}_3$$

$$+ h_k (-\kappa_k \mu_k E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} (L_k \otimes I_n) - \kappa_k^2 E_{n \times nq}^{[j]}) \mathbf{y}_1 + h_k (-\kappa_k \eta_k E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} (L_k \otimes I_n)) \mathbf{y}_2 + h_k \kappa_k^2 \mathbf{y}_3 = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}. \quad (17)$$

Now we consider two cases on κ_k .

Case 1. $\kappa_k = 0$. In this case, (17) becomes trivial and (15) and (16) become

$$(-\mu_k L_k \otimes I_n) \mathbf{y}_1 - (\eta_k L_k \otimes I_n) \mathbf{y}_2 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}, \quad (18)$$

$$\eta_k \mu_k (L_k \otimes I_n)^2 \mathbf{y}_1 + (\eta_k^2 (L_k \otimes I_n)^2 - \mu_k L_k \otimes I_n) \mathbf{y}_2$$

$$+ h_k \mu_k^2 (L_k \otimes I_n)^2 \mathbf{y}_1 + h_k \mu_k \eta_k (L_k \otimes I_n)^2 \mathbf{y}_2 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}. \quad (19)$$

If $\mu_k = 0$, then it follows from (18) and (19) that $-(\eta_k L_k \otimes I_n) \mathbf{y}_2 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$ and $\eta_k^2 (L_k \otimes I_n)^2 \mathbf{y}_2 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$. Hence, either $\eta_k = 0$ or $(L_k \otimes I_n) \mathbf{y}_2 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$. If $\eta_k = 0$, then $\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{nq}$ and $\mathbf{y}_3 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ can be chosen arbitrarily. Thus, $\ker(A_k^{[j]}(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})) = \mathbb{R}^{2nq+n}$, and it follows from *i*) of Lemma 4.2 that $\ker(A_k^{[j]}(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})) \neq \ker(A_k^{[j]})$. By Lemma 4.3, we have $\ker((A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})^2) \neq \ker(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})$. Now, by Proposition 5.5.8 of [30, p. 323], 0 is not semisimple. Alternatively, if $\eta_k \neq 0$, then $(L_k \otimes I_n) \mathbf{y}_2 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$ and $\mathbf{y}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{nq}$ and $\mathbf{y}_3 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ can be chosen arbitrarily. Using the similar arguments as in the proof of Case 2 in *ii*) of Lemma 4.2, it follows that $\mathbf{y}_2 = \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{li} \mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i$, where $\alpha_{li} \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence, $\ker(A_k^{[j]}(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})) = \{[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{r=1}^q \beta_{ir} (\mathbf{e}_i \otimes \mathbf{e}_r)^T, \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{li} (\mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)^T, \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i \mathbf{e}_i^T]^T : \forall \alpha_{li} \in \mathbb{R}, \forall \beta_{ir} \in \mathbb{R}, \forall \gamma_i \in \mathbb{R}, i = 1, \dots, n, r = 1, \dots, q, l = 0, \dots, q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)\}$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q, k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$. Clearly it follows from *i*) of Lemma 4.2 that $\ker(A_k^{[j]}(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})) \neq \ker(A_k^{[j]})$. By Lemma 4.3, we have $\ker((A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})^2) \neq \ker(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})$. Now, by Proposition 5.5.8 of [30, p. 323], 0 is not semisimple.

If $\mu_k \neq 0$, then substituting (18) into (19) yields $-\mu_k (L_k \otimes I_n) \mathbf{y}_2 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$. Substituting this equation into (18) yields $-\mu_k (L_k \otimes I_n) \mathbf{y}_1 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$. Using the similar arguments as in the proof of Case 2 in *ii*) of Lemma 4.2, it fol-

lows that $\mathbf{y}_1 = \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{li} \mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i$ and $\mathbf{y}_2 = \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_{li} \mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i$, where $\alpha_{li}, \beta_{li} \in \mathbb{R}$. Note that $\mathbf{y}_3 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ can be chosen arbitrarily, and hence, $\ker(A_k^{[j]}(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})) = \{[\sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{li} (\mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)^T, \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_{li} (\mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)^T, \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i \mathbf{e}_i^T]^T : \forall \alpha_{li} \in \mathbb{R}, \forall \beta_{li} \in \mathbb{R}, \forall \gamma_i \in \mathbb{R}, i = 1, \dots, n, l = 0, \dots, q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)\}$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q, k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$. Clearly it follows from *iii*) of Lemma 4.2 that $\ker(A_k^{[j]}(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})) \neq \ker(A_k^{[j]})$. By Lemma 4.3, we have $\ker((A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})^2) \neq \ker(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})$. Now, by Proposition 5.5.8 of [30, p. 323], 0 is not semisimple.

Case 2. $\kappa_k \neq 0$. In this case, substituting (15) into (16) and (17) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & (\eta_k \mu_k (L_k \otimes I_n)^2 + \eta_k \kappa_k L_k \otimes I_n + \kappa_k^2 W^{[j]}) \mathbf{y}_1 + (\eta_k^2 (L_k \otimes I_n)^2 - \mu_k L_k \otimes I_n - \kappa_k I_{nq}) \mathbf{y}_2 \\ & \quad + (-\kappa_k^2 \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n) \mathbf{y}_3 \\ & \quad + h_k (\mu_k^2 (L_k \otimes I_n)^2 + \mu_k \kappa_k (L_k \otimes I_n)) \mathbf{y}_1 + h_k \mu_k \eta_k (L_k \otimes I_n)^2 \mathbf{y}_2 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

$$-\kappa_k^2 E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} \mathbf{y}_1 + \kappa_k E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} \mathbf{y}_2 + \kappa_k^2 \mathbf{y}_3 = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}. \quad (21)$$

Note that $(L_k \otimes I_n) W^{[j]} = (L_k \otimes I_n) (\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes E_{n \times nq}^{[j]}) = L_k \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} = \mathbf{0}_{q \times 1} \otimes E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times nq}$. Pre-multiplying $-L_k \otimes I_n$ on both sides of (15) yields $(\mu_k (L_k \otimes I_n)^2 + \kappa_k L_k \otimes I_n) \mathbf{y}_1 + \eta_k (L_k \otimes I_n)^2 \mathbf{y}_2 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$. Substituting this equation into (20) yields

$$\kappa_k^2 W^{[j]} \mathbf{y}_1 + (-\mu_k L_k \otimes I_n - \kappa_k I_{nq}) \mathbf{y}_2 + (-\kappa_k^2 \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n) \mathbf{y}_3 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}. \quad (22)$$

Finally, substituting (21) into (15) and (22) by eliminating \mathbf{y}_3 yields

$$(-\mu_k L_k \otimes I_n - \kappa_k I_{nq} + \kappa_k W^{[j]}) \mathbf{y}_1 - (\eta_k L_k \otimes I_n + W^{[j]}) \mathbf{y}_2 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}, \quad (23)$$

$$(-\mu_k L_k \otimes I_n - \kappa_k I_{nq} + \kappa_k W^{[j]}) \mathbf{y}_2 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}. \quad (24)$$

Note that (24) is identical to (10). Then it follows from the similar arguments as in the proof of Case 2 of *ii*) of Lemma 4.2 that $\mathbf{y}_2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i$, where $\beta_i \in \mathbb{R}$. Clearly $\mathbf{y}_2 \in \ker(L_k \otimes I_n)$. Next, substituting this \mathbf{y}_2 into $(\mu_k (L_k \otimes I_n)^2 + \kappa_k L_k \otimes I_n) \mathbf{y}_1 + \eta_k (L_k \otimes I_n)^2 \mathbf{y}_2 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$ yields $(\mu_k (L_k \otimes I_n)^2 + \kappa_k L_k \otimes I_n) \mathbf{y}_1 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$. If $\mu_k = 0$, then $\kappa_k (L_k \otimes I_n) \mathbf{y}_1 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$. Otherwise, if $\mu_k \neq 0$, then $\det(\mu_k (L_k \otimes I_n) + \kappa_k I_{nq}) \neq 0$, which implies that $(L_k \otimes I_n) \mathbf{y}_1 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$. Again, it follows from the similar arguments as in the proof of *ii*) of Lemma 4.2 that $\mathbf{y}_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i$, where $\gamma_i \in \mathbb{R}$. Clearly it follows from *ii*) of Lemma 4.1 that $W^{[j]} \mathbf{y}_1 = \mathbf{y}_1$ and $W^{[j]} \mathbf{y}_2 = \mathbf{y}_2$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$. Now substituting \mathbf{y}_1 and \mathbf{y}_2 into the left-hand side of (23) yields $(-\mu_k L_k \otimes I_n - \kappa_k I_{nq} + \kappa_k W^{[j]}) \mathbf{y}_1 - (\eta_k L_k \otimes I_n + W^{[j]}) \mathbf{y}_2 = -\mathbf{y}_2 = -\sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i (\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)$. Thus, (23) holds if and only if $\sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i (\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$, which implies that $\beta_i = 0$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$, that is, $\mathbf{y}_2 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$. Then it follows from (21) and *iii*) of Lemma 4.1 that $\mathbf{y}_3 = E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} \mathbf{y}_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} (\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i \mathbf{e}_i$. Clearly such $\mathbf{y}_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i$, $\mathbf{y}_2 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$, and $\mathbf{y}_3 = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i \mathbf{e}_i$ satisfy (15)–(17). Thus, $\ker(A_k^{[j]}(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})) =$

$\{[\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i (\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)]^\top, \mathbf{0}_{1 \times nq}, \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i \mathbf{e}_i^\top\}^\top : \forall \gamma_i \in \mathbb{R}, i = 1, \dots, n\} = \ker(A_k^{[j]})$, where the last step follows from *ii*) of Lemma 4.2. By Lemma 4.3, we have $\ker((A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})^2) = \ker(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})$. Now, by Proposition 5.5.8 of [30, p. 323], 0 is semisimple. \blacksquare

It follows from Lemma 4.4 that for every $j = 1, \dots, q$, 0 is a semisimple eigenvalue of $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$ defined in Lemma 4.3, where $\mu_k, \kappa_k, \eta_k, h_k \geq 0$, if and only if $\kappa_k \neq 0, k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$. To proceed, let \mathbb{C}^n (respectively $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$) denote the set of complex vectors (respectively matrices). Using Lemmas 4.1–4.4, one can show the following complete result about the nonzero eigenvalue and eigenspace structures of $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$.

Lemma 4.5: Consider the (possibly infinitely many) matrices $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$, $j = 1, \dots, q, k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, defined by (8) in Lemma 4.2 and (11) in Lemma 4.4, where $\mu_k, \kappa_k, \eta_k \geq 0$ and $h_k > 0, k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$.

- i)* Then for every $j = 1, \dots, q$, $\text{spec}(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}) \subseteq \{0, -\kappa_k, -\frac{\kappa_k(1+h_k)}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k)^2 - 4\kappa_k}, \lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \forall \frac{\lambda^2 + \kappa_k h_k \lambda + \kappa_k}{\eta_k \lambda + \mu_k h_k \lambda + \mu_k} \in \text{spec}(-L_k)\} = \{0, -\kappa_k, -\frac{\kappa_k(1+h_k)}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k)^2 - 4\kappa_k}, -\frac{\kappa_k h_k}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\kappa_k^2 h_k^2 - 4\kappa_k}, \lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \forall \frac{\lambda^2 + \kappa_k h_k \lambda + \kappa_k}{\eta_k \lambda + \mu_k h_k \lambda + \mu_k} \in \text{spec}(-L_k) \setminus \{0\}\}$.
- ii)* If $1 \notin \text{spec}((\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda_{1,2} \kappa_k} + \frac{\mu_k h_k}{\kappa_k} + \frac{\eta_k}{\kappa_k})L_k)$, then $\lambda_{1,2} = -\frac{\kappa_k(1+h_k)}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k)^2 - 4\kappa_k}$ are the eigenvalues of $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$. The corresponding eigenspace is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \ker \left(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck} - \lambda_{1,2} I_{2nq+n} \right) \\ &= \left\{ \left[\frac{1 + h_k \lambda_{1,2}^*}{\lambda_{1,2}^*} \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_{li} (\mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)^\top, \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_{li} (\mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)^\top, \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. - \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_{li} \omega_{lj} \mathbf{e}_i^\top \right]^* : \forall \omega_{li} \in \mathbb{C}, i = 1, \dots, n, l = 0, 1, \dots, q-1-\text{rank}(L_k) \right\}, \quad (25) \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbf{x}^* denotes the complex conjugate transpose of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^n$.

- iii)* If $1 \in \text{spec}((\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda_{1,2} \kappa_k} + \frac{\mu_k h_k}{\kappa_k} + \frac{\eta_k}{\kappa_k})L_k)$, and $h_k \kappa_k \neq 1$, then $\lambda_{1,2} = -\frac{\kappa_k(1+h_k)}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k)^2 - 4\kappa_k}$ are the eigenvalues of $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$. The corresponding eigenspace is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \ker \left(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck} - \lambda_{1,2} I_{2nq+n} \right) \\ &= \left\{ \left[\frac{1 + h_k \lambda_{1,2}^*}{\lambda_{1,2}^*} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} ((\mathbf{g}_l - G_k^+ G_k \mathbf{g}_l) \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)^\top - \frac{1 + h_k \lambda_{1,2}^*}{\kappa_k \lambda_{1,2}^*} \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_{0i} (\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)^\top, \right. \right. \\ & \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} ((\mathbf{g}_l - G_k^+ G_k \mathbf{g}_l) \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)^\top - \frac{1}{\kappa_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_{0i} (\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)^\top, \\ & \quad \left. \frac{\kappa_k + \kappa_k h_k \lambda_{1,2}^*}{\lambda_{1,2}^* (\lambda_{1,2}^* + \kappa_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} (\mathbf{g}_l^\top \mathbf{g}_l - \mathbf{g}_l^\top G_k^+ G_k \mathbf{g}_l) \mathbf{e}_i^\top - \frac{1 + h_k \lambda_{1,2}^*}{\lambda_{1,2}^* (\lambda_{1,2}^* + \kappa_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_{0i} \mathbf{e}_i^\top \right]^* : \\ & \quad \forall \omega_{0i} \in \mathbb{C}, \forall \varpi_{li} \in \mathbb{C}, i = 1, \dots, n, l = 1, \dots, q \}, \quad (26) \end{aligned}$$

where $G_k = (\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda_{1,2}} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k) L_k - \kappa_k I_q$ and A^+ denotes the Moore-Penrose generalized inverse of A .

iv) If $\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda_4} + \lambda_4 + \kappa_k h_k \neq 0$, $\lambda_4 \neq -\kappa_k$, $\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda_4} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k \neq 0$, and $\frac{\lambda_4^2 + \kappa_k h_k \lambda_4 + \kappa_k}{\eta_k \lambda_4 + \mu_k h_k \lambda_4 + \mu_k} \in \text{spec}(-L_k)$, then λ_4 are the eigenvalues of $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$. The corresponding eigenspace is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \ker \left(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck} - \lambda_4 I_{2nq+n} \right) \\ &= \left\{ \left[\frac{1 + h_k \lambda_4^*}{\lambda_4^*} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} \left(\mathbf{g}_l - F_k^+ F_k \mathbf{g}_l + \frac{\kappa_k^2 (1 + h_k \lambda_4)}{\lambda_4 (\lambda_4 + \kappa_k)} (\mathbf{g}_j^T F_k \mathbf{g}_l) F_k^+ \psi_k - \frac{\kappa_k^2 (1 + h_k \lambda_4)}{\lambda_4 (\lambda_4 + \kappa_k)} (\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l) \psi_k \right)^* \otimes \mathbf{e}_i^T, \right. \right. \\ & \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} \left(\mathbf{g}_l - F_k^+ F_k \mathbf{g}_l + \frac{\kappa_k^2 (1 + h_k \lambda_4)}{\lambda_4 (\lambda_4 + \kappa_k)} (\mathbf{g}_j^T F_k \mathbf{g}_l) F_k^+ \psi_k - \frac{\kappa_k^2 (1 + h_k \lambda_4)}{\lambda_4 (\lambda_4 + \kappa_k)} (\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l) \psi_k \right)^* \otimes \mathbf{e}_i^T, \\ & \frac{\kappa_k + \kappa_k h_k \lambda_4^*}{\lambda_4^* (\lambda_4^* + \kappa_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} \left(\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l - \mathbf{g}_j^T F_k^+ F_k \mathbf{g}_l + \frac{\kappa_k^2 (1 + h_k \lambda_4)}{\lambda_4 (\lambda_4 + \kappa_k)} (\mathbf{g}_j^T F_k \mathbf{g}_l) \mathbf{g}_j^T F_k^+ \psi_k \right. \\ & \left. \left. - \frac{\kappa_k^2 (1 + h_k \lambda_4)}{\lambda_4 (\lambda_4 + \kappa_k)} (\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l) \mathbf{g}_j^T \psi_k \right)^* \otimes \mathbf{e}_i^T \right]^* : \varpi_{li} \in \mathbb{C}, i = 1, \dots, n, l = 1, \dots, q \}, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where $F_k = \left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda_4} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k \right) L_k + \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda_4} + \lambda_4 + \kappa_k h_k \right) I_q$ and

$$\psi_k = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{\kappa_k^2 (1 + h_k \lambda_4)}{\lambda_4 (\lambda_4 + \kappa_k)} \mathbf{g}_j^T - \frac{\kappa_k^2 (1 + h_k \lambda_4)}{\lambda_4 (\lambda_4 + \kappa_k)} \mathbf{g}_j^T F_k^+ F_k \right)^+, & \frac{\kappa_k^2 (1 + h_k \lambda_4^*)}{\lambda_4^* (\lambda_4^* + \kappa_k)} \mathbf{g}_j \neq \frac{\kappa_k^2 (1 + h_k \lambda_4^*)}{\lambda_4^* (\lambda_4^* + \kappa_k)} F_k^+ F_k \mathbf{g}_j, \\ \frac{\kappa_k^2 (1 + h_k \lambda_4)}{\lambda_4 (\lambda_4 + \kappa_k)} (1 + |\frac{\kappa_k^2 (1 + h_k \lambda_4)}{\lambda_4 (\lambda_4 + \kappa_k)}|^2 \mathbf{g}_j^T (F_k^T F_k)^+ \mathbf{g}_j)^{-1} (F_k^T F_k)^+ \mathbf{g}_j, & \frac{\kappa_k^2 (1 + h_k \lambda_4^*)}{\lambda_4^* (\lambda_4^* + \kappa_k)} \mathbf{g}_j = \frac{\kappa_k^2 (1 + h_k \lambda_4^*)}{\lambda_4^* (\lambda_4^* + \kappa_k)} F_k^+ F_k \mathbf{g}_j. \end{cases} \quad (28)$$

v) If $\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda_{5,6}} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k \neq 0$, $\lambda_{5,6} \neq -\kappa_k$, and $\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda_{5,6}} + \lambda_{5,6} + \kappa_k h_k = 0$, then $\lambda_{5,6} = -\frac{\kappa_k h_k}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\kappa_k^2 h_k^2 - 4\kappa_k}$ are the eigenvalues of $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$. The corresponding eigenspace is given by the form (27) with λ_4 being replaced by $\lambda_{5,6}$.

vi) If $\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda_{5,6}} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k = 0$, $\lambda_{5,6} \neq -\kappa_k$, $\mu_k = 0$, and $\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda_{5,6}} + \lambda_{5,6} + \kappa_k h_k = 0$, then $\lambda_{5,6}$ are the eigenvalues of $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$. The corresponding eigenspace is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \ker \left(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck} - \lambda_{5,6} I_{2nq+n} \right) \\ &= \left\{ \left[\frac{1 + h_k \lambda_{5,6}^*}{\lambda_{5,6}^*} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} (\mathbf{g}_l - (\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l) \mathbf{g}_j)^T \otimes \mathbf{e}_i^T, \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} (\mathbf{g}_l - (\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l) \mathbf{g}_j)^T \otimes \mathbf{e}_i^T, \mathbf{0}_{1 \times n} \right]^* : \right. \\ & \left. \varpi_{li} \in \mathbb{C}, i = 1, \dots, n, l = 1, \dots, q \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

vii) If $1 \in \text{spec}(\frac{\eta_k}{\kappa_k} L_k)$ and $\kappa_k h_k = 1$, then $\lambda_3 = -\kappa_k$ is an eigenvalue of $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$. The corresponding eigenspace is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \ker \left(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck} - \lambda_3 I_{2nq+n} \right) \\ &= \left\{ \left[\mathbf{0}_{1 \times nq}, \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \alpha_{li} (\mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)^T, \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \frac{\eta_k}{\kappa_k} \alpha_{li} (L_k \mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)^T - \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \alpha_{li} (\mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)^T \right]^* : \right. \\ & \left. \forall \alpha_{li} \in \mathbb{C}, i = 1, \dots, n, l = 1, \dots, q \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

viii) If $\frac{\mu_k}{\kappa_k} (\kappa_k h_k - 1) + \eta_k = 0$ and $h_k = 1 + \frac{1}{\kappa_k}$, then $\lambda_3 = -\kappa_k$ is an eigenvalue of $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$. The corresponding eigenspace is given by

$$\ker \left(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck} - \lambda_3 I_{2nq+n} \right) = \left\{ \left[\mathbf{0}_{1 \times nq}, \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \alpha_{li} (\mathbf{g}_l - (\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l) \mathbf{g}_j)^T \otimes \mathbf{e}_i^T, \mathbf{0}_{1 \times n} \right]^* : \right.$$

$$\forall \alpha_{li} \in \mathbb{C}, i = 1, \dots, n, l = 1, \dots, q \}. \quad (31)$$

ix) If $1 \in \text{spec}(\frac{\mu_k + \eta_k}{\kappa_k} L_k)$ and $h_k = 1 + \frac{1}{\kappa_k}$, then $\lambda_3 = -\kappa_k$ is an eigenvalue of $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$. The corresponding eigenspace is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \ker \left(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck} - \lambda_3 I_{2nq+n} \right) \\ &= \left\{ \left[\mathbf{0}_{1 \times nq}, \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i (L_k^+ \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)^\top - \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i (L_k^+ \varphi_k \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)^\top \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \sum_{l=1}^q \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{li} (\mathbf{g}_l - L_k^+ L_k \mathbf{g}_l + (\mathbf{g}_j^\top L_k \mathbf{g}_l) L_k^+ \varphi_k - (\mathbf{g}_j^\top \mathbf{g}_l) \varphi_k)^\top \otimes \mathbf{e}_i^\top, \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{e}_i^\top \right]^* : \right. \\ & \quad \left. \beta_i \in \mathbb{C}, \gamma_{li} \in \mathbb{C}, i = 1, \dots, n, l = 1, \dots, q \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where

$$\varphi_k = \begin{cases} (\mathbf{g}_j^\top - \mathbf{g}_j^\top L_k^+ L_k)^+, & \mathbf{g}_j \neq L_k^+ L_k \mathbf{g}_j, \\ (1 + \mathbf{g}_j^\top (L_k^+ L_k)^+ \mathbf{g}_j)^{-1} (L_k^+ L_k)^+ \mathbf{g}_j, & \mathbf{g}_j = L_k^+ L_k \mathbf{g}_j. \end{cases} \quad (33)$$

x) If $1 \in \text{spec}(\frac{\mu_k(\kappa_k h_k - 1) + \eta_k \kappa_k}{\kappa_k(-\kappa_k h_k + 1 + \kappa_k)} L_k)$ and $\kappa_k h_k \neq 1$, then $\lambda_3 = -\kappa_k$ is an eigenvalue of $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$. The corresponding eigenspace is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \ker \left(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck} - \lambda_3 I_{2nq+n} \right) \\ &= \left\{ \left[\mathbf{0}_{1 \times nq}, \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} \left(\mathbf{g}_l - M_k^+ M_k \mathbf{g}_l + (\mathbf{g}_j^\top M_k \mathbf{g}_l) M_k^+ \phi_k - (\mathbf{g}_j^\top \mathbf{g}_l) \phi_k \right)^\top \otimes \mathbf{e}_i^\top, \mathbf{0}_{1 \times n} \right]^* : \right. \\ & \quad \left. \varpi_{li} \in \mathbb{C}, i = 1, \dots, n, l = 1, \dots, q \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where $M_k = (\frac{\mu_k}{\kappa_k}(\kappa_k h_k - 1) + \eta_k) L_k + (\kappa_k h_k - 1 - \kappa_k) I_q$ and

$$\phi_k = \begin{cases} (\mathbf{g}_j^\top - \mathbf{g}_j^\top M_k^+ M_k)^+, & \mathbf{g}_j \neq M_k^+ M_k \mathbf{g}_j, \\ (1 + \mathbf{g}_j^\top (M_k^+ M_k)^+ \mathbf{g}_j)^{-1} (M_k^+ M_k)^+ \mathbf{g}_j, & \mathbf{g}_j = M_k^+ M_k \mathbf{g}_j. \end{cases} \quad (35)$$

Proof: For a fixed $j \in \{1, \dots, q\}$ and a fixed $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$, let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^{2nq+n}$ be an eigenvector of the corresponding eigenvalue $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ for $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$. We partition \mathbf{x} into $\mathbf{x} = [\mathbf{x}_1^*, \mathbf{x}_2^*, \mathbf{x}_3^*]^* \neq \mathbf{0}_{(2nq+n) \times 1}$, where $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathbb{C}^{nq}$, and $\mathbf{x}_3 \in \mathbb{C}^n$. It follows from $(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}) \mathbf{x} = \lambda \mathbf{x}$ that

$$h_k (-\mu_k L_k \otimes I_n - \kappa_k I_{nq}) \mathbf{x}_1 + h_k (-\eta_k L_k \otimes I_n) \mathbf{x}_2 + \mathbf{x}_2 + h_k (\kappa_k \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n) \mathbf{x}_3 = \lambda \mathbf{x}_1, \quad (36)$$

$$(-\mu_k L_k \otimes I_n - \kappa_k I_{nq}) \mathbf{x}_1 + (-\eta_k L_k \otimes I_n) \mathbf{x}_2 + (\kappa_k \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n) \mathbf{x}_3 = \lambda \mathbf{x}_2, \quad (37)$$

$$\kappa_k E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} \mathbf{x}_1 - \kappa_k \mathbf{x}_3 = \lambda \mathbf{x}_3. \quad (38)$$

Note that it follows from Lemma 4.4 that $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$ has an eigenvalue 0. Now we assume that $\lambda \neq 0$.

Substituting (37) into (36) yields $\mathbf{x}_1 = \frac{1+h_k \lambda}{\lambda} \mathbf{x}_2$. Replacing \mathbf{x}_1 in (37) and (38) with $\mathbf{x}_1 = \frac{1+h_k \lambda}{\lambda} \mathbf{x}_2$ yields

$$- \left[\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + \kappa_k h_k \right) I_{nq} \right] \mathbf{x}_2 + \kappa_k (\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n) \mathbf{x}_3 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}, \quad (39)$$

$$\left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \kappa_k h_k\right) E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} \mathbf{x}_2 - (\lambda + \kappa_k) \mathbf{x}_3 = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}. \quad (40)$$

Clearly $\mathbf{x}_2 \neq \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$. Thus, (39) and (40) have nontrivial solutions if and only if

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} \left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k\right)(L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + \kappa_k h_k\right) I_{nq} & -\kappa_k (\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n) \\ \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \kappa_k h_k\right) E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} & -(\lambda + \kappa_k) I_n \end{bmatrix} = 0. \quad (41)$$

If $\det \left[\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k\right)(L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + \kappa_k h_k\right) I_{nq} \right] \neq 0$, then pre-multiplying $-L_k \otimes I_n$ on both sides of (39) yields

$$\left[\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k\right)(L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + \kappa_k h_k\right) I_{nq} \right] (L_k \otimes I_n) \mathbf{x}_2 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1},$$

which implies that $(L_k \otimes I_n) \mathbf{x}_2 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$. Now following the similar arguments as in the proof of Case 2 of *ii*) in Lemma 4.2, we have $\mathbf{x}_2 = \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \varpi_{li} (\mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)$, where $\varpi_{li} \in \mathbb{C}$ and not all ϖ_{li} are zero.

Substituting this expression of \mathbf{x}_2 into (39) and (40) by using *iii*) of Lemma 4.1 yields

$$\kappa_k \mathbf{x}_3 = \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + \kappa_k h_k\right) \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \varpi_{li} w_{lj} \mathbf{e}_i. \quad (42)$$

$$(\lambda + \kappa_k) \mathbf{x}_3 = \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \kappa_k h_k\right) \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \varpi_{li} w_{lj} \mathbf{e}_i. \quad (43)$$

Furthermore, substituting (42) into (43) yields

$$\lambda \mathbf{x}_3 = -\lambda \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \varpi_{li} w_{lj} \mathbf{e}_i,$$

which implies that $\mathbf{x}_3 = -\sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \varpi_{li} w_{lj} \mathbf{e}_i$ since $\lambda \neq 0$. Finally, substituting the obtained expressions for \mathbf{x}_2 and \mathbf{x}_3 into (40), or substituting the obtained expression for \mathbf{x}_3 into either (42) or (43) yields

$$\left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \kappa_k h_k + \lambda + \kappa_k\right) \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \varpi_{li} w_{lj} \mathbf{e}_i = -\left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \kappa_k h_k + \lambda + \kappa_k\right) \mathbf{x}_3 = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}. \quad (44)$$

In this case, (39) and (40) have nontrivial solutions if and only if (44) holds, which implies that $\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \kappa_k h_k + \lambda + \kappa_k = 0$ since $\mathbf{x}_3 \neq \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}$, and hence, $\kappa_k \neq 0$. Let $\lambda_{1,2}$ denote the two solutions to $\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \kappa_k h_k + \lambda + \kappa_k = 0$.

Then

$$\lambda_{1,2} = -\frac{\kappa_k(1+h_k)}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k)^2 - 4\kappa_k}. \quad (45)$$

In this case, note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \det \left[\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda_{1,2}} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k\right)(L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda_{1,2}} + \lambda_{1,2} + \kappa_k h_k\right) I_{nq} \right] \\ &= \det \left[\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda_{1,2}} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k\right)(L_k \otimes I_n) - \kappa_k I_{nq} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$= \kappa_k^{nq} \det \left[\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda_{1,2} \kappa_k} + \frac{\mu_k h_k}{\kappa_k} + \frac{\eta_k}{\kappa_k} \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) - I_{nq} \right]. \quad (46)$$

Hence, $\det \left[\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda_{1,2}} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda_{1,2}} + \lambda_{1,2} + \kappa_k h_k \right) I_{nq} \right] \neq 0$ if and only if $1 \notin \text{spec} \left(\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda_{1,2} \kappa_k} + \frac{\mu_k h_k}{\kappa_k} + \frac{\eta_k}{\kappa_k} \right) L_k \right)$. Thus, if $1 \notin \text{spec} \left(\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda_{1,2} \kappa_k} + \frac{\mu_k h_k}{\kappa_k} + \frac{\eta_k}{\kappa_k} \right) L_k \right)$, then $\lambda_{1,2}$ given by (45) are indeed the eigenvalues of $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$ and the corresponding eigenvectors for $\lambda_{1,2}$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x} &= \left[\frac{1 + h_k \lambda_{1,2}^*}{\lambda_{1,2}^*} \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \varpi_{li} (\mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)^T, \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \varpi_{li} (\mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)^T, \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \varpi_{li} w_{lj} \mathbf{e}_i^T \right]^*, \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

where $\varpi_{li} \in \mathbb{C}$ and not all of ϖ_{li} are zero. Therefore, $\ker \left(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck} - \lambda_{1,2} I_{2nq+n} \right)$ is given by (25).

Alternatively, if $\det \left[\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + \kappa_k h_k \right) I_{nq} \right] = 0$, then in this case, we consider two additional cases for (41):

Case 1. If $\lambda \neq -\kappa_k$, then it follows from Proposition 2.8.4 of [30, p. 116] that (41) is equivalent to $\det \left(\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + \kappa_k h_k \right) I_{nq} - \frac{\kappa_k^2 (1 + h_k \lambda)}{\lambda(\lambda + \kappa_k)} W^{[j]} \right) = 0$, which implies that for $\lambda \neq -\kappa_k$, the equation

$$\left(\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + \kappa_k h_k \right) I_{nq} - \frac{\kappa_k^2 (1 + h_k \lambda)}{\lambda(\lambda + \kappa_k)} W^{[j]} \right) \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1} \quad (48)$$

has nontrivial solutions for $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{C}^{nq}$. It follows from (39) and (40) that solving this \mathbf{v} is equivalent to solving \mathbf{x}_2 .

Again, note that for every $j = 1, \dots, q$, $(L_k \otimes I_n) W^{[j]} = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times nq}$. Pre-multiplying $L_k \otimes I_n$ on both sides of (48) yields $\left(\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n)^2 + \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + \kappa_k h_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) \right) \mathbf{v} = (L_k \otimes I_n) \left(\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + \kappa_k h_k \right) I_{nq} \right) \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$, which implies that $\left(\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + \kappa_k h_k \right) I_{nq} \right) \mathbf{v} \in \ker(L_k \otimes I_n)$. Since $\ker(L_k \otimes I_n) = \bigcup_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \text{span}\{\mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_n\}$, it follows that

$$\left(\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + \kappa_k h_k \right) I_{nq} \right) \mathbf{v} = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \omega_{li} \mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i, \quad (49)$$

where $\omega_{li} \in \mathbb{C}$. Now it follows from (48) and (49) that

$$\frac{\kappa_k^2 (1 + h_k \lambda)}{\lambda(\lambda + \kappa_k)} W^{[j]} \mathbf{v} = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \omega_{li} \mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i. \quad (50)$$

If $\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + \kappa_k h_k \neq 0$, then (49) has a particular solution $\mathbf{v} = \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + \kappa_k h_k \right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \omega_{li} \mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i$.

Let $\mathbf{w}_l = [w_{l1}^*, \dots, w_{lq}^*]^*$. Substituting this particular solution into (50), together with *ii*) of Lemma 4.1, yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \omega_{li} \mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i - \frac{\kappa_k^2 (1 + h_k \lambda)}{\lambda(\lambda + \kappa_k)} W^{[j]} \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + \kappa_k h_k \right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \omega_{li} \mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \omega_{li} \mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i - \frac{\kappa_k^2 (1 + h_k \lambda)}{(\lambda + \kappa_k)(\lambda^2 + \kappa_k h_k \lambda + \kappa_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \omega_{li} w_{lj} \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\omega_{0i} - \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda)}{(\lambda+\kappa_k)(\lambda^2+\kappa_k h_k \lambda + \kappa_k)} \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \omega_{li} \omega_{lj} \right] \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \omega_{li} \mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\
&= \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1},
\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

which implies that

$$\omega_{0i} - \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda)}{(\lambda+\kappa_k)(\lambda^2+\kappa_k h_k \lambda + \kappa_k)} \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \omega_{li} \omega_{lj} = 0 \tag{52}$$

and $\omega_{\ell i} = 0$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$ and every $\ell = 1, \dots, q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)$. Note that $w_{0j} = 1$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$. Substituting $\omega_{\ell i} = 0$ into (52) yields

$$\omega_{0i} - \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda)}{(\lambda+\kappa_k)(\lambda^2+\kappa_k h_k \lambda + \kappa_k)} \omega_{0i} = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \tag{53}$$

Then either $1 - \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda)}{(\lambda+\kappa_k)(\lambda^2+\kappa_k h_k \lambda + \kappa_k)} = 0$ or $\omega_{0i} = 0$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$.

If $\frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda)}{(\lambda+\kappa_k)(\lambda^2+\kappa_k h_k \lambda + \kappa_k)} = 1$, then $\lambda^2 + \kappa_k(1+h_k)\lambda + \kappa_k = 0$. Hence, $\lambda = \lambda_{1,2}$ where $\lambda_{1,2}$ are given by (45). In this case, note that $\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda_{1,2}} + \lambda_{1,2} + \kappa_k h_k = -\kappa_k \neq 0$. Then it follows that (46) holds. Hence, $\det \left[\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda_{1,2}} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda_{1,2}} + \lambda_{1,2} + \kappa_k h_k \right) I_{nq} \right] = 0$ if and only if $1 \in \text{spec} \left(\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda_{1,2} \kappa_k} + \frac{\mu_k h_k}{\kappa_k} + \frac{\eta_k}{\kappa_k} \right) L_k \right)$. Furthermore, $\lambda_{1,2} \neq -\kappa_k$ if and only if $h_k \kappa_k \neq 1$. Thus, if $1 \in \text{spec} \left(\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda_{1,2} \kappa_k} + \frac{\mu_k h_k}{\kappa_k} + \frac{\eta_k}{\kappa_k} \right) L_k \right)$ and $h_k \kappa_k \neq 1$, then $\lambda_{1,2}$ given by (45) are indeed the eigenvalues of $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$. In this case, (49) becomes

$$\left(\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda_{1,2}} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) - \kappa_k I_{nq} \right) \mathbf{v} = \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_{0i} \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \tag{54}$$

and a specific solution is given by $\mathbf{v} = -\frac{1}{\kappa_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_{0i} \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i$. To find the general solution to (54), let $G_k = \left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda_{1,2}} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k \right) L_k - \kappa_k I_q$ and consider

$$(G_k \otimes I_n) \hat{\mathbf{v}} = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}. \tag{55}$$

It follows from *vi*) of Proposition 6.1.7 of [30, p. 400] and *viii*) of Proposition 6.1.6 of [30, p. 399] that the general solution $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ to (55) is given by the form

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\mathbf{v}} &= \left[I_{nq} - (G_k \otimes I_n)^+ (G_k \otimes I_n) \right] \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} \mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\
&= \left[I_{nq} - (G_k^+ \otimes I_n) (G_k \otimes I_n) \right] \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} \mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\
&= \left[I_q \otimes I_n - ((G_k^+ G_k) \otimes I_n) \right] \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} \mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\
&= \left[(I_q - G_k^+ G_k) \otimes I_n \right] \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} \mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} (\mathbf{g}_l - G_k^+ G_k \mathbf{g}_l) \otimes \mathbf{e}_i,
\end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

where $\varpi_{li} \in \mathbb{C}$, $j = 1, \dots, q$, and we used the facts that $(A \otimes B)^+ = A^+ \otimes B^+$, $A \otimes B - C \otimes B = (A - C) \otimes B$, and $(A \otimes B)(C \otimes D) = AC \otimes BD$ for compatible matrices A, B, C, D . Then the general solution to (54) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v} &= \hat{\mathbf{v}} - \frac{1}{\kappa_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_{0i} \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} (\mathbf{g}_l - G_k^+ G_k \mathbf{g}_l) \otimes \mathbf{e}_i - \frac{1}{\kappa_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_{0i} \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i, \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

and hence, $\mathbf{x}_2 = \mathbf{v} \neq \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$ and $\mathbf{x}_1 = \frac{1+h_k \lambda_{1,2}}{\lambda_{1,2}} \mathbf{v}$. Furthermore, note that $\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{w}_0 = 1$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_3 &= \frac{\kappa_k + \kappa_k h_k \lambda_{1,2}}{\lambda_{1,2}(\lambda_{1,2} + \kappa_k)} E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} \mathbf{v} \\ &= \frac{\kappa_k + \kappa_k h_k \lambda_{1,2}}{\lambda_{1,2}(\lambda_{1,2} + \kappa_k)} (\mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n) \mathbf{v} \\ &= \frac{\kappa_k + \kappa_k h_k \lambda_{1,2}}{\lambda_{1,2}(\lambda_{1,2} + \kappa_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} (\mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n) ((\mathbf{g}_l - G_k^+ G_k \mathbf{g}_l) \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) \\ &\quad - \frac{1 + h_k \lambda_{1,2}}{\lambda_{1,2}(\lambda_{1,2} + \kappa_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_{0i} (\mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n) (\mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) \\ &= \frac{\kappa_k + \kappa_k h_k \lambda_{1,2}}{\lambda_{1,2}(\lambda_{1,2} + \kappa_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} (\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l - \mathbf{g}_j^T G_k^+ G_k \mathbf{g}_l) \mathbf{e}_i - \frac{1 + h_k \lambda_{1,2}}{\lambda_{1,2}(\lambda_{1,2} + \kappa_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_{0i} \mathbf{e}_i. \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

Hence, the corresponding eigenvectors for $\lambda_{1,2}$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x} &= \left[\frac{1 + h_k \lambda_{1,2}^*}{\lambda_{1,2}^*} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} ((\mathbf{g}_l - G_k^+ G_k \mathbf{g}_l) \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)^T - \frac{1 + h_k \lambda_{1,2}^*}{\kappa_k \lambda_{1,2}^*} \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_{0i} (\mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)^T, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} ((\mathbf{g}_l - G_k^+ G_k \mathbf{g}_l) \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)^T - \frac{1}{\kappa_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_{0i} (\mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)^T, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \frac{\kappa_k + \kappa_k h_k \lambda_{1,2}^*}{\lambda_{1,2}^* (\lambda_{1,2}^* + \kappa_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} (\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l - \mathbf{g}_j^T G_k^+ G_k \mathbf{g}_l) \mathbf{e}_i^T - \frac{1 + h_k \lambda_{1,2}^*}{\lambda_{1,2}^* (\lambda_{1,2}^* + \kappa_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_{0i} \mathbf{e}_i^T \right]^*, \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

where $\varpi_{li} \in \mathbb{C}$, $\omega_{0i} \in \mathbb{C}$, and not all of them are zero. Therefore, $\ker \left(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck} - \lambda_{1,2} I_{2nq+n} \right)$ is given by (26).

If $\omega_{0i} = 0$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$, then it follows from (48) and (49) that

$$\frac{\kappa_k^2 (1 + h_k \lambda)}{\lambda (\lambda + \kappa_k)} W^{[j]} \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}, \quad (60)$$

$$\left(\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + \kappa_k h_k \right) I_{nq} \right) \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}. \quad (61)$$

In this case, since $\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + \kappa_k h_k \neq 0$ and $\lambda \neq -\kappa_k$, $\det \left[\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + \kappa_k h_k \right) I_{nq} \right] = 0$ if and only if $\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k \neq 0$ and $\frac{\lambda^2 + \kappa_k h_k \lambda + \kappa_k}{\eta_k \lambda + \mu_k h_k \lambda + \mu_k} \in \text{spec}(-L_k)$. Thus, if $\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + \kappa_k h_k \neq 0$, $\lambda \neq -\kappa_k$,

$\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k \neq 0$, and $\frac{\lambda^2 + \kappa_k h_k \lambda + \kappa_k}{\eta_k \lambda + \mu_k h_k \lambda + \mu_k} \in \text{spec}(-L_k)$, then $\lambda = \lambda_4$, where

$$\frac{\lambda_4^2 + \kappa_k h_k \lambda_4 + \kappa_k}{\eta_k \lambda_4 + \mu_k h_k \lambda_4 + \mu_k} \in \text{spec}(-L_k), \quad (62)$$

are the eigenvalues of $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$. To find their corresponding eigenvectors, let $F_k = \left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda_4} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k\right) L_k + \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda_4} + \lambda_4 + \kappa_k h_k\right) I_q$. We first show that (60) is equivalent to

$$\frac{\kappa_k^2(1 + h_k \lambda)}{\lambda(\lambda + \kappa_k)} E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1} \quad (63)$$

for every $j = 1, \dots, q$. To see this, let $\mathbf{v} = [\mathbf{v}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{v}_q^*]^*$. Then it follows from (7) that $W^{[j]} \mathbf{v} = [\mathbf{v}_j^*, \dots, \mathbf{v}_j^*]^*$.

Hence (60) holds if and only if $\frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda)}{\lambda(\lambda+\kappa_k)} \mathbf{v}_j = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}$. On the other hand, note that $E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_j$. Hence, (60) is equivalent to (63). Then by noting that $E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} = \mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$, it follows from (61) and (63) that

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} F_k \otimes I_n \\ \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)} (\mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n) \end{array} \right] \mathbf{v} = \left(\left[\begin{array}{c} F_k \\ \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)} \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{array} \right] \otimes I_n \right) \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}_{(nq+n) \times 1}. \quad (64)$$

Next, it follows from *vi*) of Proposition 6.1.7 of [30, p. 400] and *viii*) of Proposition 6.1.6 of [30, p. 399] that the general solution \mathbf{v} to (64) is given by the form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v} &= \left[I_{nq} - \left(\left[\begin{array}{c} F_k \\ \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)} \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{array} \right] \otimes I_n \right)^+ \left(\left[\begin{array}{c} F_k \\ \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)} \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{array} \right] \otimes I_n \right) \right] \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} \mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\ &= \left[I_{nq} - \left(\left[\begin{array}{c} F_k \\ \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)} \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{array} \right] \otimes I_n \right)^+ \left(\left[\begin{array}{c} F_k \\ \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)} \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{array} \right] \otimes I_n \right) \right] \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} \mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\ &= \left[I_q \otimes I_n - \left(\left[\begin{array}{c} F_k \\ \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)} \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{array} \right] \right)^+ \left[\begin{array}{c} F_k \\ \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)} \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{array} \right] \otimes I_n \right] \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} \mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\ &= \left[\left(I_q - \left[\begin{array}{c} F_k \\ \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)} \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{array} \right] \right)^+ \left[\begin{array}{c} F_k \\ \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)} \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{array} \right] \right) \otimes I_n \right] \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} \mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} \left(\mathbf{g}_l - \left[\begin{array}{c} F_k \\ \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)} \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{array} \right]^+ \left[\begin{array}{c} F_k \\ \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)} \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{array} \right] \mathbf{g}_l \right) \otimes \mathbf{e}_i, \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

where $\varpi_{li} \in \mathbb{C}$ and $j = 1, \dots, q$. Note that by Proposition 6.1.6 of [30, p. 399], $F_k^T (F_k^T)^+ = F_k^T (F_k^+)^T = (F_k^+ F_k)^T = F_k^+ F_k$. It follows from Fact 6.5.17 of [30, p. 427] that

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} F_k \\ \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)} \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{array} \right]^+ = \left[F_k^+ \left(I_q - \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)} \psi_k \mathbf{g}_j^T \right) \quad \psi_k \right], \quad (66)$$

where ψ_k is given by (28). Hence, it follows that for every $j, l = 1, \dots, q$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{g}_l - \left[\begin{array}{c} F_k \\ \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)} \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{array} \right]^+ \left[\begin{array}{c} F_k \\ \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)} \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{array} \right] \mathbf{g}_l &= \mathbf{g}_l - \left[F_k^+ \left(I_q - \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)} \psi_k \mathbf{g}_j^T \right) \quad \psi_k \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} F_k \\ \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)} \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{array} \right] \mathbf{g}_l \\ &= \mathbf{g}_l - \left[F_k^+ \left(I_q - \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)} \psi_k \mathbf{g}_j^T \right) \quad \psi_k \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} F_k \mathbf{g}_l \\ \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)} \mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l \end{array} \right] \\ &= \mathbf{g}_l - F_k^+ \left(I_q - \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)} \psi_k \mathbf{g}_j^T \right) F_k \mathbf{g}_l \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)}(\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l)\psi_k \\
& = \mathbf{g}_l - F_k^+ F_k \mathbf{g}_l + \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)}(\mathbf{g}_j^T F_k \mathbf{g}_l)F_k^+ \psi_k \\
& -\frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)}(\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l)\psi_k. \tag{67}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, (65) becomes

$$\mathbf{v} = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} \left(\mathbf{g}_l - F_k^+ F_k \mathbf{g}_l + \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)}(\mathbf{g}_j^T F_k \mathbf{g}_l)F_k^+ \psi_k - \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)}(\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l)\psi_k \right) \otimes \mathbf{e}_i. \tag{68}$$

Hence, $\mathbf{x}_1 = \frac{1+h_k\lambda_4}{\lambda_4} \mathbf{v}$, $\mathbf{x}_2 = \mathbf{v} \neq \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$ given by (68), and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{x}_3 & = \frac{\kappa_k + \kappa_k h_k \lambda_4}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4 + \kappa_k)} E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} \mathbf{v} \\
& = \frac{\kappa_k + \kappa_k h_k \lambda_4}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4 + \kappa_k)} (\mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n) \mathbf{v} \\
& = \frac{\kappa_k + \kappa_k h_k \lambda_4}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4 + \kappa_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} (\mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n) \left(\left(\mathbf{g}_l - F_k^+ F_k \mathbf{g}_l + \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)}(\mathbf{g}_j^T F_k \mathbf{g}_l)F_k^+ \psi_k \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)}(\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l)\psi_k \right) \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \right) \\
& = \frac{\kappa_k + \kappa_k h_k \lambda_4}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4 + \kappa_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} \left(\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l - \mathbf{g}_j^T F_k^+ F_k \mathbf{g}_l + \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)}(\mathbf{g}_j^T F_k \mathbf{g}_l) \mathbf{g}_j^T F_k^+ \psi_k \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)}(\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l) \mathbf{g}_j^T \psi_k \right) \otimes \mathbf{e}_i, \tag{69}
\end{aligned}$$

where not all of ω_{li} and ϖ_{li} are zero. The corresponding eigenvectors for λ_4 are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{x} & = \\
& \left[\frac{1+h_k\lambda_4^*}{\lambda_4^*} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} \left(\mathbf{g}_l - F_k^+ F_k \mathbf{g}_l + \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)}(\mathbf{g}_j^T F_k \mathbf{g}_l)F_k^+ \psi_k - \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)}(\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l)\psi_k \right)^* \otimes \mathbf{e}_i^T, \right. \\
& \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} \left(\mathbf{g}_l - F_k^+ F_k \mathbf{g}_l + \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)}(\mathbf{g}_j^T F_k \mathbf{g}_l)F_k^+ \psi_k - \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)}(\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l)\psi_k \right)^* \otimes \mathbf{e}_i^T, \\
& \frac{\kappa_k + \kappa_k h_k \lambda_4^*}{\lambda_4^*(\lambda_4^* + \kappa_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} \left(\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l - \mathbf{g}_j^T F_k^+ F_k \mathbf{g}_l + \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)}(\mathbf{g}_j^T F_k \mathbf{g}_l) \mathbf{g}_j^T F_k^+ \psi_k \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda_4)}{\lambda_4(\lambda_4+\kappa_k)}(\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l) \mathbf{g}_j^T \psi_k \right)^* \otimes \mathbf{e}_i^T \Big]^*, \tag{70}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\varpi_{li} \in \mathbb{C}$ and not all of them are zero. Therefore, $\ker \left(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck} - \lambda_4 I_{2nq+n} \right)$ is given by (27).

If $\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + \kappa_k h_k = 0$, then $\frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda)}{\lambda(\lambda+\kappa_k)} = -\frac{\kappa_k \lambda}{\lambda+\kappa_k} \neq 0$ since $\lambda \neq 0$ and $\kappa_k \neq 0$. In this case, it follows from (48) and (49) that

$$\frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda)}{\lambda(\lambda+\kappa_k)} W^{[j]} \mathbf{v} = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \omega_{li} \mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i, \tag{71}$$

$$\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k\right)(L_k \otimes I_n)\mathbf{v} = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \omega_{li} \mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i. \quad (72)$$

Since $W^{[j]}$ is idempotent by *i*) of Lemma 4.1, it follows from (71) and *ii*) of Lemma 4.1 that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \omega_{li} \mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \omega_{li} \omega_{lj} \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i, \quad (73)$$

and hence,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\omega_{0i} - \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \omega_{li} \omega_{lj} \right) \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \omega_{li} \mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}, \quad (74)$$

which implies that $\omega_{0i} - \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \omega_{li} \omega_{lj} = 0$ and $\omega_{\ell i} = 0$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$, $j = 1, \dots, q$, and $\ell = 1, \dots, q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)$. Consequently, (71) and (72) can be simplified as

$$\frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda)}{\lambda(\lambda+\kappa_k)} W^{[j]}\mathbf{v} = \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_{0i} \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i, \quad (75)$$

$$\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k\right)(L_k \otimes I_n)\mathbf{v} = \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_{0i} \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i. \quad (76)$$

It follows from *ii*) of Lemma 4.1 that (75) has a specific solution

$$\mathbf{v} = \left(\frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda)}{\lambda(\lambda+\kappa_k)}\right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_{0i} \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i. \quad (77)$$

Substituting (77) into (76) yields $\sum_{i=1}^n \omega_{0i} \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$, which implies that $\omega_{0i} = 0$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Hence, (75) and (76) can be further simplified as

$$\frac{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k\lambda)}{\lambda(\lambda+\kappa_k)} W^{[j]}\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}, \quad (78)$$

$$\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k\right)(L_k \otimes I_n)\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}. \quad (79)$$

If $\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k \neq 0$, note that for $\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + \kappa_k h_k = 0$, $\det \left[\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k\right)(L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + \kappa_k h_k\right) I_{nq} \right] = \det \left[\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k\right)(L_k \otimes I_n) \right] = 0$. Hence, the general solution \mathbf{v} to (78) and (79) is given by the form of (68) in which λ_4 is replaced by $\lambda_{5,6}$ satisfying $\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda_{5,6}} + \lambda_{5,6} + \kappa_k h_k = 0$. Thus, this case is similar to the previous case where (62) still holds for λ_4 being replaced by $\lambda_{5,6}$, where

$$\lambda_{5,6} = -\frac{\kappa_k h_k}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\kappa_k^2 h_k^2 - 4\kappa_k}. \quad (80)$$

Thus, $\lambda = \lambda_{5,6}$ are indeed the eigenvalues of $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$ and the corresponding eigenvectors are given by the form (70) with λ_4 being replaced by $\lambda_{5,6}$.

Otherwise, if $\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k = 0$ and $\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + \kappa_k h_k = 0$, then $\mu_k(\frac{1}{\lambda} + h_k) = -\eta_k$ and $\kappa_k(\frac{1}{\lambda} + h_k) = -\lambda$. Again, since $\lambda \neq 0$, it follows from $\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + \kappa_k h_k = 0$ that $\kappa_k \neq 0$. If $\mu_k = 0$, then it follows from $\mu_k(\frac{1}{\lambda} + h_k) = -\eta_k$ that $\eta_k = 0$. In this case, $\lambda = \lambda_{5,6}$ are the eigenvalues of $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$. Furthermore, (79) becomes trivial and

(78) is equivalent to $E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}$, that is, $(\mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n) \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}$. It follows from *vi*) of Proposition 6.1.7 of [30, p. 400] and *viii*) of Proposition 6.1.6 of [30, p. 399] that the general solution \mathbf{v} to $(\mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n) \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}$ is given by the form

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{v} &= \left[I_{nq} - (\mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n)^+ (\mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n) \right] \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} \mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\
&= \left[I_{nq} - ((\mathbf{g}_j^T)^+ \otimes I_n) (\mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n) \right] \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} \mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\
&= \left[I_q \otimes I_n - ((\mathbf{g}_j^T)^+ \mathbf{g}_j^T) \otimes I_n \right] \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} \mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\
&= \left[(I_q - ((\mathbf{g}_j^T)^+ \mathbf{g}_j^T)) \otimes I_n \right] \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} \mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} (\mathbf{g}_l - ((\mathbf{g}_j^T)^+ \mathbf{g}_j^T) \mathbf{g}_l) \otimes \mathbf{e}_i, \tag{81}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\varpi_{li} \in \mathbb{C}$ and $j = 1, \dots, q$. Note that it follows from Fact 6.3.2 of [30, p. 404] that $\mathbf{g}_j^+ = \mathbf{g}_j^T$, and hence, $(\mathbf{g}_j^T)^+ = \mathbf{g}_j$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{v} &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} (\mathbf{g}_l - (\mathbf{g}_j \mathbf{g}_j^T) \mathbf{g}_l) \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} (\mathbf{g}_l - (\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l) \mathbf{g}_j) \otimes \mathbf{e}_i. \tag{82}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\mathbf{x}_1 = \frac{1+h_k \lambda_{5,6}}{\lambda_{5,6}} \mathbf{v}$, $\mathbf{x}_2 = \mathbf{v} \neq \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$ where \mathbf{v} is given by (82), and $\mathbf{x}_3 = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}$. The corresponding eigenvectors for $\lambda_{5,6}$ in this case are given by

$$\mathbf{x} = \left[\frac{1+h_k \lambda_{5,6}^*}{\lambda_{5,6}^*} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} (\mathbf{g}_l - (\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l) \mathbf{g}_j)^T \otimes \mathbf{e}_i^T, \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} (\mathbf{g}_l - (\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l) \mathbf{g}_j)^T \otimes \mathbf{e}_i^T, \mathbf{0}_{1 \times n} \right]^*, \tag{83}$$

where $\varpi_{li} \in \mathbb{C}$ and not all of them are zero. Consequently, in this case $\ker \left(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck} - \lambda_{5,6} I_{2nq+n} \right)$ is given by (29).

Finally, if $\mu_k \neq 0$, then it follows from $\mu_k \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} + h_k \right) = -\eta_k$ that $\frac{1}{\lambda} + h_k = -\frac{\eta_k}{\mu_k}$. Together with $\kappa_k \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} + h_k \right) = -\lambda$, we have $\lambda = \frac{\kappa_k \eta_k}{\mu_k}$. Since $\lambda \neq 0$, it follows that $\eta_k \neq 0$. Substituting this λ into $\frac{1}{\lambda} + h_k = -\frac{\eta_k}{\mu_k}$ yields $h_k = -\frac{\eta_k}{\mu_k} - \frac{\mu_k}{\kappa_k \eta_k} < 0$, which is a contradiction since $h_k > 0$. Hence, this case is impossible.

Case 2. If $\lambda = -\kappa_k$, then $\kappa_k \neq 0$ and (41) becomes

$$\det \left[\begin{array}{cc} \left(\frac{\mu_k}{\kappa_k} (\kappa_k h_k - 1) + \eta_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + (\kappa_k h_k - 1 - \kappa_k) I_{nq} & -\kappa_k (\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n) \\ (\kappa_k h_k - 1) E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} \end{array} \right] = 0. \tag{84}$$

If $\kappa_k h_k = 1$, then clearly (84) holds. In this case,

$$\det \left[\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + \kappa_k h_k \right) I_{nq} \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \det \left[\left(-\frac{\mu_k}{\kappa_k} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) - \kappa_k I_{nq} \right] \\
&= \kappa_k^{nq} \det \left[\left(-\frac{\mu_k}{\kappa_k^2} + \frac{\mu_k h_k}{\kappa_k} + \frac{\eta_k}{\kappa_k} \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) - I_{nq} \right] \\
&= \kappa_k^{nq} \det \left[\frac{\eta_k}{\kappa_k} (L_k \otimes I_n) - I_{nq} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\det \left[\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + \kappa_k h_k \right) I_{nq} \right] = 0$ if and only if $1 \in \text{spec} \left(\frac{\eta_k}{\kappa_k} L_k \right)$. Thus, if $1 \in \text{spec} \left(\frac{\eta_k}{\kappa_k} L_k \right)$ and $\kappa_k h_k = 1$, then $\lambda = -\kappa_k$ is indeed an eigenvalue of $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$. Clearly when $\kappa_k h_k = 1$ and $\lambda = -\kappa_k$, $\mathbf{x}_1 = \frac{1+h_k\lambda}{\lambda} \mathbf{x}_2 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$, (40) becomes trivial, and (39) becomes

$$(\eta_k (L_k \otimes I_n) - \kappa_k I_{nq}) \mathbf{x}_2 - \kappa_k (\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n) \mathbf{x}_3 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}. \quad (85)$$

Pre-multiplying $E_{n \times nq}^{[j]}$ on both sides of (85) yields

$$\mathbf{x}_3 = \left[\frac{\eta_k}{\kappa_k} (L_k \otimes I_n) - I_{nq} \right] \mathbf{x}_2. \quad (86)$$

Note that \mathbf{x}_2 can be chosen arbitrarily in \mathbb{C}^{nq} other than $\mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$. Then \mathbf{x}_2 can be represented as $\mathbf{x}_2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \alpha_{li} (\mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)$, where $\alpha_{li} \in \mathbb{C}$, not all of α_{li} are zero, and $[\mathbf{g}_1, \dots, \mathbf{g}_q] = I_q$. Then it follows from (86) that $\mathbf{x}_3 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \frac{\eta_k}{\kappa_k} \alpha_{li} (L_k \otimes I_n) (\mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) - \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \alpha_{li} (\mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \frac{\eta_k}{\kappa_k} \alpha_{li} (L_k \mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) - \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \alpha_{li} (\mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)$, where $\alpha_{li} \in \mathbb{C}$ and not all of α_{li} are zero. Clearly such \mathbf{x}_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$, satisfy (36)–(38).

Thus, the corresponding eigenvectors for the eigenvalue $\lambda = \lambda_3$ are given by

$$\mathbf{x} = \left[\mathbf{0}_{1 \times nq}, \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \alpha_{li} (\mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)^\top, \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \frac{\eta_k}{\kappa_k} \alpha_{li} (L_k \mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)^\top - \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \alpha_{li} (\mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)^\top \right]^*, \quad (87)$$

where $\alpha_{li} \in \mathbb{C}$, not all of α_{li} are zero, and

$$\lambda_3 = -\kappa_k. \quad (88)$$

Therefore, $\ker \left(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck} - \lambda_3 I_{2nq+n} \right)$ is given by (30).

Now we consider the case where $\kappa_k h_k \neq 1$. Then in this case (84) holds if and only if the equation

$$\begin{bmatrix} \left(\frac{\mu_k}{\kappa_k} (\kappa_k h_k - 1) + \eta_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + (\kappa_k h_k - 1 - \kappa_k) I_{nq} & -\kappa_k (\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n) \\ (\kappa_k h_k - 1) E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}_{(nq+n) \times 1} \quad (89)$$

has a nontrivial solution $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{C}^{nq+n}$. Let $\mathbf{u} = [\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*, \mathbf{u}_0^*]^*$, where $\mathbf{u}_i \in \mathbb{C}^n$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, q$. Then it follows from (89) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\kappa_k} (\kappa_k h_k - 1) + \eta_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) [\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*]^* + (\kappa_k h_k - 1 - \kappa_k) [\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*]^* \\
&\quad - \kappa_k (\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n) \mathbf{u}_0 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}, \quad (90)
\end{aligned}$$

$$(\kappa_k h_k - 1) E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} [\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*]^* = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}. \quad (91)$$

If $\frac{\mu_k}{\kappa_k} (\kappa_k h_k - 1) + \eta_k = 0$, in this case, since $\lambda = -\kappa_k$, then it follows that

$$\det \left[\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + \kappa_k h_k \right) I_{nq} \right] = \det \left[(\kappa_k h_k - 1 - \kappa_k) I_{nq} \right]$$

$$= (\kappa_k h_k - 1 - \kappa_k)^{nq}.$$

Hence, $\det \left[\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + \kappa_k h_k \right) I_{nq} \right] = 0$ if and only if $\kappa_k h_k - 1 - \kappa_k = 0$. If $\kappa_k h_k - 1 - \kappa_k = 0$, eliminating h_k in $\frac{\mu_k}{\kappa_k} (\kappa_k h_k - 1) + \eta_k = 0$ by using $\kappa_k h_k - 1 - \kappa_k = 0$ yields $\mu_k + \eta_k = 0$, and hence, $\mu_k = \eta_k = 0$ since $\mu_k, \eta_k \geq 0$. Furthermore, $h_k \kappa_k = 1 + \kappa_k \neq 1$ due to $\kappa_k \neq 0$. Next, since $\frac{\mu_k}{\kappa_k} (\kappa_k h_k - 1) + \eta_k = 0$ and $\kappa_k h_k - 1 - \kappa_k = 0$, it follows from (90) that $\mathbf{u}_0 = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}$. Thus in this case, (91) becomes $E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} [\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*]^* = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}$, that is, $(\mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n) [\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*]^* = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}$. Now it follows from (82) that $[\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*]^* = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \alpha_{li} (\mathbf{g}_l - (\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l) \mathbf{g}_j) \otimes \mathbf{e}_i$, where $\alpha_{li} \in \mathbb{C}$ and not all of them are zero. Clearly $\mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$, $\mathbf{x}_2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \alpha_{li} (\mathbf{g}_l - (\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l) \mathbf{g}_j) \otimes \mathbf{e}_i$, and $\mathbf{x}_3 = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}$ satisfy (36)–(38). Thus, if $\frac{\mu_k}{\kappa_k} (\kappa_k h_k - 1) + \eta_k = 0$ and $h_k = 1 + \frac{1}{\kappa_k}$, then $\lambda = -\kappa_k$ is indeed an eigenvalue of $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$ and the corresponding eigenvectors for the eigenvalue λ_3 of the form (88) are given by

$$\mathbf{x} = \left[\mathbf{0}_{1 \times nq}, \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \alpha_{li} (\mathbf{g}_l - (\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l) \mathbf{g}_j)^T \otimes \mathbf{e}_i^T, \mathbf{0}_{1 \times n} \right]^*, \quad (92)$$

where $\alpha_{li} \in \mathbb{C}$ and not all α_{li} are zero. Therefore, $\ker \left(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck} - \lambda_3 I_{2nq+n} \right)$ is given by (31).

If $\frac{\mu_k}{\kappa_k} (\kappa_k h_k - 1) + \eta_k \neq 0$ and $\kappa_k h_k - 1 - \kappa_k = 0$, then $h_k = 1 + \frac{1}{\kappa_k}$. Clearly $h_k \kappa_k \neq 1$. In this case, since $\lambda = -\kappa_k$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \det \left[\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + \kappa_k h_k \right) I_{nq} \right] \\ &= \det \left[\left(-\frac{\mu_k}{\kappa_k} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) - \kappa_k I_{nq} \right] \\ &= \kappa_k^{nq} \det \left[\frac{\mu_k + \eta_k}{\kappa_k} (L_k \otimes I_n) - I_{nq} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\det \left[\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + \kappa_k h_k \right) I_{nq} \right] = 0$ if and only if $1 \in \text{spec} \left(\frac{\mu_k + \eta_k}{\kappa_k} L_k \right)$. Note that $1 \in \text{spec} \left(\frac{\mu_k + \eta_k}{\kappa_k} L_k \right)$ implies that $\mu_k + \eta_k \neq 0$ and hence, by using $\kappa_k h_k - 1 - \kappa_k = 0$, $\frac{\mu_k}{\kappa_k} (\kappa_k h_k - 1) + \eta_k = \mu_k + \eta_k \neq 0$. Now we assume that $1 \in \text{spec} \left(\frac{\mu_k + \eta_k}{\kappa_k} L_k \right)$ and $h_k = 1 + \frac{1}{\kappa_k}$. Next, since $\kappa_k h_k - 1 - \kappa_k = 0$ and $\mu_k + \eta_k \neq 0$, it follows from (90) that

$$(L_k \otimes I_n) [\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*]^* = \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} (\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n) \mathbf{u}_0. \quad (93)$$

Note that $(L_k \otimes I_n) (\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n) = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times n}$. Pre-multiplying $L_k \otimes I_n$ on both sides of (93) yields $(L_k \otimes I_n) (L_k \otimes I_n) [\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*]^* = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$, which implies that $(L_k \otimes I_n) [\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*]^* \in \ker(L_k \otimes I_n)$. Using the similar arguments as in the proof of Case 2 of *ii*) in Lemma 4.2, it follows that

$$(L_k \otimes I_n) [\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*]^* = \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{li} \mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i, \quad (94)$$

where $\alpha_{li} \in \mathbb{C}$. Let $\mathbf{u}_0 = \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{e}_i$, where $\beta_i \in \mathbb{C}$. Then it follows from *iii*) of Lemma 4.1 that $(\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n) \mathbf{u}_0 = \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i (\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n) \mathbf{e}_i = \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i (\mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)$. Now it follows from (93) and (94) that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\alpha_{0i} - \beta_i \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \right) \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i + \sum_{l=1}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{li} \mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1},$$

which implies that $\alpha_{0i} - \beta_i \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} = 0$ and $\alpha_{li} = 0$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$ and every $l = 1, \dots, q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)$.

Hence,

$$(L_k \otimes I_n) [\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*]^* = \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i. \quad (95)$$

Together with $E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} [\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*]^* = (\mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n) [\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*]^* = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}$, we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} L_k \otimes I_n \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n \end{bmatrix} [\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*]^* = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\ \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (96)$$

Now it follows from *ii*) of Theorem 2.6.4 of [30, p. 108] that (96) has a solution $[\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*]^*$ if and only if

$$\text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} L_k \otimes I_n \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n \end{bmatrix} = \text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} L_k \otimes I_n & \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n & \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (97)$$

We claim that (97) is indeed true. First, if $\beta_i = 0$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$, then it is clear that $\text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} L_k \otimes I_n \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n \end{bmatrix} = \text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} L_k \otimes I_n & \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1} \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n & \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1} \end{bmatrix}$. Alternatively, assume that $\beta_i \neq 0$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Note that it follows from Fact 2.11.8 of [30, p. 132] that $\text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} L_k \otimes I_n \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n \end{bmatrix} \leq \text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} L_k \otimes I_n & \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n & \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1} \end{bmatrix}$. To show (97), it suffices to show that

$$\text{def} \begin{bmatrix} L_k \otimes I_n \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n \end{bmatrix} \leq \text{def} \begin{bmatrix} L_k \otimes I_n & \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n & \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1} \end{bmatrix},$$

or, equivalently,

$$\dim \ker \begin{bmatrix} L_k \otimes I_n \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n \end{bmatrix} \leq \dim \ker \begin{bmatrix} L_k \otimes I_n & \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n & \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let $s \in \mathbb{C}$ be such that $s \in \ker \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\ \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1} \end{bmatrix}$. Then $s \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \beta_i = 0$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, which implies that $s = 0$. Thus, $\dim \ker \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\ \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1} \end{bmatrix} = 0$. Consequently, it follows from Fact 2.11.8 of [30, p. 132] that

$$\begin{aligned} \dim \ker \begin{bmatrix} L_k \otimes I_n \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n \end{bmatrix} &= \dim \ker \begin{bmatrix} L_k \otimes I_n \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n \end{bmatrix} + \dim \ker \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\ \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1} \end{bmatrix} \\ &\leq \dim \ker \begin{bmatrix} L_k \otimes I_n & \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n & \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1} \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} L_k \otimes I_n \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n \end{bmatrix} \geq \text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} L_k \otimes I_n & \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n & \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1} \end{bmatrix}$. Hence, (97) holds. Next, it follows from *vi*) of Proposition 6.1.7 of [30, p. 400] and *viii*) of Proposition 6.1.6 of [30, p. 399] that the

general solution to (96) is given by the form

$$\begin{aligned}
[\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*]^* &= \begin{bmatrix} L_k \otimes I_n \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n \end{bmatrix}^+ \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\ \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1} \end{bmatrix} + \sum_{l=1}^q \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{li} \left(I_{nq} - \begin{bmatrix} L_k \otimes I_n \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n \end{bmatrix}^+ \begin{bmatrix} L_k \otimes I_n \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n \end{bmatrix} \right) \\
&\quad (\mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) \\
&= \left(\begin{bmatrix} L_k \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{bmatrix} \otimes I_n \right)^+ \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\ \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{0} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \end{bmatrix} + \sum_{l=1}^q \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{li} \left(I_{nq} - \left(\begin{bmatrix} L_k \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{bmatrix} \otimes I_n \right)^+ \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left(\begin{bmatrix} L_k \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{bmatrix} \otimes I_n \right) \right) (\mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) \\
&= \left(\begin{bmatrix} L_k \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{bmatrix}^+ \otimes I_n \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \beta_i \mathbf{w}_0 \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \right) + \sum_{l=1}^q \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{li} \left(I_q \otimes I_n - \left(\begin{bmatrix} L_k \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{bmatrix}^+ \otimes I_n \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left(\begin{bmatrix} L_k \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{bmatrix} \otimes I_n \right) \right) (\mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\begin{bmatrix} L_k \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{bmatrix}^+ \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \beta_i \mathbf{w}_0 \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes \mathbf{e}_i + \sum_{l=1}^q \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{li} \left(I_q \otimes I_n - \left(\begin{bmatrix} L_k \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{bmatrix}^+ \begin{bmatrix} L_k \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{bmatrix} \otimes I_n \right) \right) \\
&\quad (\mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\begin{bmatrix} L_k \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{bmatrix}^+ \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \beta_i \mathbf{w}_0 \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes \mathbf{e}_i + \sum_{l=1}^q \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{li} \left(\mathbf{g}_l - \begin{bmatrix} L_k \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{bmatrix}^+ \begin{bmatrix} L_k \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{g}_l \right) \otimes \mathbf{e}_i, \quad (98)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma_{li} \in \mathbb{C}$. Note that by Proposition 6.1.6 of [30, p. 399], $L_k^T (L_k^T)^+ = L_k^T (L_k^+)^T = (L_k^+ L_k)^T = L_k^+ L_k$. It follows from Fact 6.5.17 of [30, p. 427] that

$$\begin{bmatrix} L_k \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{bmatrix}^+ = \begin{bmatrix} L_k^+ (I_q - \varphi_k \mathbf{g}_j^T) & \varphi_k \end{bmatrix}, \quad (99)$$

where φ_k is given by (33). Note that $\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{w}_0 = 1$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$. Hence, it follows that for every $i = 1, \dots, n$ and every $j, l = 1, \dots, q$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\begin{bmatrix} L_k^+ (I_q - \varphi_k \mathbf{g}_j^T) & \varphi_k \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \beta_i \mathbf{w}_0 \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} &= \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \beta_i L_k^+ \mathbf{w}_0 - \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \beta_i L_k^+ \varphi_k, \quad (100) \\
\mathbf{g}_l - \begin{bmatrix} L_k \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{bmatrix}^+ \begin{bmatrix} L_k \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{g}_l &= \mathbf{g}_l - \begin{bmatrix} L_k^+ (I_q - \varphi_k \mathbf{g}_j^T) & \varphi_k \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} L_k \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{g}_l \\
&= \mathbf{g}_l - \begin{bmatrix} L_k^+ (I_q - \varphi_k \mathbf{g}_j^T) & \varphi_k \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} L_k \mathbf{g}_l \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \mathbf{g}_l - L_k^+ (I_q - \varphi_k \mathbf{g}_j^T) L_k \mathbf{g}_l - (\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l) \varphi_k \\
&= \mathbf{g}_l - L_k^+ L_k \mathbf{g}_l + (\mathbf{g}_j^T L_k \mathbf{g}_l) L_k^+ \varphi_k - (\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l) \varphi_k. \quad (101)
\end{aligned}$$

Then (98) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
[\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*]^* &= \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i L_k^+ \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i - \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i L_k^+ \varphi_k \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\
&\quad + \sum_{l=1}^q \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{li} (\mathbf{g}_l - L_k^+ L_k \mathbf{g}_l + (\mathbf{g}_j^T L_k \mathbf{g}_l) L_k^+ \varphi_k - (\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l) \varphi_k) \otimes \mathbf{e}_i. \quad (102)
\end{aligned}$$

In summary, if $1 \in \text{spec}(\frac{\mu_k + \eta_k}{\kappa_k} L_k)$ and $h_k = 1 + \frac{1}{\kappa_k}$, then $\lambda = -\kappa_k$ is indeed an eigenvalue of $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$. In this case, $\mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$, $\mathbf{x}_2 = [\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*]^*$ given by (102), and $\mathbf{x}_3 = \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{e}_i$, where not all of β_i and γ_{li} are zero. The corresponding eigenvectors for λ_3 are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x} = & \left[\mathbf{0}_{1 \times nq}, \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i (L_k^+ \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)^T - \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i (L_k^+ \varphi_k \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)^T \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{l=1}^q \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{li} (\mathbf{g}_l - L_k^+ L_k \mathbf{g}_l + (\mathbf{g}_j^T L_k \mathbf{g}_l) L_k^+ \varphi_k - (\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l) \varphi_k)^T \otimes \mathbf{e}_i^T, \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{e}_i^T \right]^*, \end{aligned} \quad (103)$$

where $\beta_i \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\gamma_{li} \in \mathbb{C}$ and not all of them are zero. Therefore, $\ker \left(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck} - \lambda_3 I_{2nq+n} \right)$ is given by (32).

If $\frac{\mu_k}{\kappa_k} (\kappa_k h_k - 1) + \eta_k \neq 0$, $\kappa_k h_k - 1 - \kappa_k \neq 0$, and $\kappa_k h_k - 1 \neq 0$, in this case, since $\lambda = -\kappa_k$, then it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \det \left[\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + \kappa_k h_k \right) I_{nq} \right] \\ & = \det \left[\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\kappa_k} (\kappa_k h_k - 1) + \eta_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + (\kappa_k h_k - 1 - \kappa_k) I_{nq} \right] \\ & = (-\kappa_k h_k + 1 + \kappa_k)^{nq} \det \left[\frac{\mu_k (\kappa_k h_k - 1) + \eta_k \kappa_k}{\kappa_k (-\kappa_k h_k + 1 + \kappa_k)} (L_k \otimes I_n) - I_{nq} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\det \left[\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k + \eta_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + \kappa_k h_k \right) I_{nq} \right] = 0$ if and only if $1 \in \text{spec}(\frac{\mu_k (\kappa_k h_k - 1) + \eta_k \kappa_k}{\kappa_k (-\kappa_k h_k + 1 + \kappa_k)} L_k)$. Again, note that $1 \in \text{spec}(\frac{\mu_k (\kappa_k h_k - 1) + \eta_k \kappa_k}{\kappa_k (-\kappa_k h_k + 1 + \kappa_k)} L_k)$ implies that $\frac{\mu_k}{\kappa_k} (\kappa_k h_k - 1) + \eta_k \neq 0$ and $\kappa_k h_k - 1 - \kappa_k \neq 0$. Now we assume that $1 \in \text{spec}(\frac{\mu_k (\kappa_k h_k - 1) + \eta_k \kappa_k}{\kappa_k (-\kappa_k h_k + 1 + \kappa_k)} L_k)$ and $\kappa_k h_k \neq 1$. Next, let $\mathbf{u}_0 = \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{e}_i$, where $\beta_i \in \mathbb{C}$ and it follows from (90) that

$$\left(\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\kappa_k} (\kappa_k h_k - 1) + \eta_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + (\kappa_k h_k - 1 - \kappa_k) I_{nq} \right) [\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*]^* = \kappa_k \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i. \quad (104)$$

Note that a specific solution $[\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*]^*$ to (104) is given by the form

$$[\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*]^* = \frac{\kappa_k}{\kappa_k h_k - 1 - \kappa_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i. \quad (105)$$

Substituting (105) into (91) by using *iii*) of Lemma 4.1 yields $\frac{\kappa_k (\kappa_k h_k - 1)}{\kappa_k h_k - 1 - \kappa_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} (\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) = \frac{\kappa_k (\kappa_k h_k - 1)}{\kappa_k h_k - 1 - \kappa_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{e}_i = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}$, which implies that $\beta_i = 0$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$, and hence, $\mathbf{u}_0 = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}$. Thus, (104) becomes

$$\left(\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\kappa_k} (\kappa_k h_k - 1) + \eta_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + (\kappa_k h_k - 1 - \kappa_k) I_{nq} \right) [\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*]^* = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}. \quad (106)$$

Let $M_k = (\frac{\mu_k}{\kappa_k} (\kappa_k h_k - 1) + \eta_k) L_k + (\kappa_k h_k - 1 - \kappa_k) I_q$. Again, note that $E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} = \mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$. Then it follows from (106) and (91) that

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} M_k \otimes I_n \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n \end{array} \right] [\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*]^* = \left(\left[\begin{array}{c} M_k \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{array} \right] \otimes I_n \right) [\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*]^* = \mathbf{0}_{(nq+n) \times 1}. \quad (107)$$

Next, it follows from *vi*) of Proposition 6.1.7 of [30, p. 400] and *viii*) of Proposition 6.1.6 of [30, p. 399] that the general solution $[\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*]^*$ to (107) is given by the form

$$\begin{aligned}
[\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*]^* &= \left[I_{nq} - \left(\begin{bmatrix} M_k \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{bmatrix} \otimes I_n \right)^+ \left(\begin{bmatrix} M_k \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{bmatrix} \otimes I_n \right) \right] \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} \mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\
&= \left[I_{nq} - \left(\begin{bmatrix} M_k \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{bmatrix}^+ \otimes I_n \right) \left(\begin{bmatrix} M_k \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{bmatrix} \otimes I_n \right) \right] \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} \mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\
&= \left[I_q \otimes I_n - \left(\begin{bmatrix} M_k \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{bmatrix}^+ \begin{bmatrix} M_k \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{bmatrix} \otimes I_n \right) \right] \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} \mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\
&= \left[\left(I_q - \begin{bmatrix} M_k \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{bmatrix}^+ \begin{bmatrix} M_k \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes I_n \right] \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} \mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} \left(\mathbf{g}_l - \begin{bmatrix} M_k \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{bmatrix}^+ \begin{bmatrix} M_k \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{g}_l \right) \otimes \mathbf{e}_i, \tag{108}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\varpi_{li} \in \mathbb{C}$ and $j = 1, \dots, q$. Note that by Proposition 6.1.6 of [30, p. 399], $M_k^T (M_k^T)^+ = M_k^T (M_k^+)^T = (M_k^+ M_k)^T = M_k^+ M_k$. It follows from Fact 6.5.17 of [30, p. 427] that

$$\begin{bmatrix} M_k \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{bmatrix}^+ = \begin{bmatrix} M_k^+ (I_q - \phi_k \mathbf{g}_j^T) & \phi_k \end{bmatrix}, \tag{109}$$

where ϕ_k is given by (35). Hence, it follows that for every $j, l = 1, \dots, q$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{g}_l - \begin{bmatrix} M_k \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{bmatrix}^+ \begin{bmatrix} M_k \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{g}_l &= \mathbf{g}_l - \begin{bmatrix} M_k^+ (I_q - \phi_k \mathbf{g}_j^T) & \phi_k \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} M_k \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{g}_l \\
&= \mathbf{g}_l - \begin{bmatrix} M_k^+ (I_q - \phi_k \mathbf{g}_j^T) & \phi_k \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} M_k \mathbf{g}_l \\ \mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \mathbf{g}_l - M_k^+ (I_q - \phi_k \mathbf{g}_j^T) M_k \mathbf{g}_l - (\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l) \phi_k \\
&= \mathbf{g}_l - M_k^+ M_k \mathbf{g}_l + (\mathbf{g}_j^T M_k \mathbf{g}_l) M_k^+ \phi_k - (\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l) \phi_k. \tag{110}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, (108) becomes

$$[\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*]^* = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} \left(\mathbf{g}_l - M_k^+ M_k \mathbf{g}_l + (\mathbf{g}_j^T M_k \mathbf{g}_l) M_k^+ \phi_k - (\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l) \phi_k \right) \otimes \mathbf{e}_i. \tag{111}$$

In summary, if $1 \in \text{spec} \left(\frac{\mu_k (\kappa_k h_k - 1) + \eta_k \kappa_k}{\kappa_k (-\kappa_k h_k + 1 + \kappa_k)} L_k \right)$ and $\kappa_k h_k \neq 1$, then $\lambda = -\kappa_k$ is indeed an eigenvalue of $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$. In this case, $\mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$, $\mathbf{x}_2 = [\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*]^*$ given by (111), and $\mathbf{x}_3 = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}$, where not all of ϖ_{li} are zero. The corresponding eigenvectors for λ_3 are given by

$$\mathbf{x} = \left[\mathbf{0}_{1 \times nq}, \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \varpi_{li} \left(\mathbf{g}_l - M_k^+ M_k \mathbf{g}_l + (\mathbf{g}_j^T M_k \mathbf{g}_l) M_k^+ \phi_k - (\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l) \phi_k \right)^T \otimes \mathbf{e}_i^T, \mathbf{0}_{1 \times n} \right]^*, \tag{112}$$

where $\varpi_{li} \in \mathbb{C}$ and not all of them are zero. Therefore, $\ker \left(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck} - \lambda_3 I_{2nq+n} \right)$ is given by (34). \blacksquare

Remark 4.1: One can obtain an alternative expression of (34) by using the following method. First, it follows from *ii*) of Theorem 2.6.4 of [30, p. 108] that (95) has a solution $[\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*]^*$ if and only if

$$\text{rank}(L_k \otimes I_n) = \text{rank} \left[L_k \otimes I_n \quad \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \right]. \tag{113}$$

We claim that (113) is indeed true. First, if $\beta_i = 0$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$, then it is clear that $\text{rank}(L_k \otimes I_n) = \text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} L_k \otimes I_n & \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1} \end{bmatrix}$. Alternatively, assume that $\beta_i \neq 0$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Note that it follows from Fact 2.11.8 of [30, p. 132] that $\text{rank}(L_k \otimes I_n) \leq \text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} L_k \otimes I_n & \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \end{bmatrix}$. To show (113), it suffices to show that

$$\text{def}(L_k \otimes I_n) \leq \text{def} \begin{bmatrix} L_k \otimes I_n & \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \end{bmatrix},$$

or, equivalently,

$$\dim \ker(L_k \otimes I_n) \leq \dim \ker \begin{bmatrix} L_k \otimes I_n & \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let $s \in \mathbb{C}$ be such that $s \in \ker \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \right)$. Then $s \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \beta_i = 0$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, which implies that $s = 0$. Thus, $\dim \ker \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \right) = 0$. Consequently, it follows from Fact 2.11.8 of [30, p. 132] that

$$\begin{aligned} \dim \ker(L_k \otimes I_n) &= \dim \ker(L_k \otimes I_n) + \dim \ker \left(\frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \right) \\ &\leq \dim \ker \begin{bmatrix} L_k \otimes I_n & \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\text{rank}(L_k \otimes I_n) \geq \text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} L_k \otimes I_n & \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i \end{bmatrix}$. Hence, (113) holds. Next, it follows from *vi*) of Proposition 6.1.7 of [30, p. 400] and *viii*) of Proposition 6.1.6 of [30, p. 399] that the general solution to (95) is given by the form

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*]^* &= \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i (L_k \otimes I_n)^+ (\mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) + \sum_{l=1}^q \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{li} (I_{nq} - (L_k \otimes I_n)^+ (L_k \otimes I_n)) (\mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) \\ &= \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i (L_k^+ \otimes I_n) (\mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) + \sum_{l=1}^q \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{li} (I_{nq} - (L_k^+ \otimes I_n) (L_k \otimes I_n)) (\mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) \\ &= \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i L_k^+ \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i + \sum_{l=1}^q \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{li} (I_q \otimes I_n - (L_k^+ L_k \otimes I_n)) (\mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) \\ &= \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i L_k^+ \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i + \sum_{l=1}^q \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{li} ((I_q - L_k^+ L_k) \otimes I_n) (\mathbf{g}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) \\ &= \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i L_k^+ \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i + \sum_{l=1}^q \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{li} (\mathbf{g}_l - L_k^+ L_k \mathbf{g}_l) \otimes \mathbf{e}_i, \end{aligned} \tag{114}$$

where $\gamma_{li} \in \mathbb{C}$. Hence, the general solution to (95) is given by the form

$$[\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*]^* = \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i L_k^+ \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i + \sum_{l=1}^q \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{li} (\mathbf{g}_l - L_k^+ L_k \mathbf{g}_l) \otimes \mathbf{e}_i. \tag{115}$$

Note that it follows from (91) that $E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} [\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*]^* = \mathbf{u}_j = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}$. Then both the general solution (115) should satisfy this constraint. It now follows from (115) that $\beta_i \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\gamma_{li} \in \mathbb{C}$ in (115) should satisfy

$$\frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} (L_k^+ \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) + \sum_{l=1}^q \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{li} E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} ((\mathbf{g}_l - L_k^+ L_k \mathbf{g}_l) \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}. \tag{116}$$

Note that $E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} = \mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n$ for every $j = 1, \dots, q$. Then for every $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, \dots, q$,

$$E_{n \times nq}^{[j]}(L_k^+ \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) = (\mathbf{g}_j^T \otimes I_n)(L_k^+ \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) = \mathbf{g}_j^T L_k^+ \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i = (\mathbf{g}_j^T L_k^+ \mathbf{w}_0) \mathbf{e}_i.$$

Similarly, one can obtain that $E_{n \times nq}^{[j]}((\mathbf{g}_l - L_k^+ L_k \mathbf{g}_l) \otimes \mathbf{e}_i) = (\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l - \mathbf{g}_j^T L_k^+ L_k \mathbf{g}_l) \mathbf{e}_i$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$, every $j = 1, \dots, q$, and every $l = 1, \dots, q$. Now using these relationships, (116) can be simplified as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1} &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \beta_i (\mathbf{g}_j^T L_k^+ \mathbf{w}_0) \mathbf{e}_i + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^q \gamma_{li} (\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l - \mathbf{g}_j^T L_k^+ L_k \mathbf{g}_l) \mathbf{e}_i \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \beta_i (\mathbf{g}_j^T L_k^+ \mathbf{w}_0) + \sum_{l=1}^q \gamma_{li} (\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l - \mathbf{g}_j^T L_k^+ L_k \mathbf{g}_l) \right] \mathbf{e}_i, \end{aligned}$$

which imply that $\beta_i \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\gamma_{li} \in \mathbb{C}$ in (115) satisfy

$$\frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \beta_i (\mathbf{g}_j^T L_k^+ \mathbf{w}_0) + \sum_{l=1}^q \gamma_{li} (\mathbf{g}_j^T \mathbf{g}_l - \mathbf{g}_j^T L_k^+ L_k \mathbf{g}_l) = 0, \quad (117)$$

for every $i = 1, \dots, n$ and every $j = 1, \dots, q$. Finally, since (96) has infinitely many solutions due to (97), it follows that there exist infinitely many $\beta_i \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\gamma_{li} \in \mathbb{C}$ satisfying (117).

In summary, if $1 \in \text{spec}(\frac{\mu_k + \eta_k}{\kappa_k} L_k)$ and $h_k = 1 + \frac{1}{\kappa_k}$, then $\lambda = -\kappa_k$ is indeed an eigenvalue of $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$. In this case, $\mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$, $\mathbf{x}_2 = [\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_q^*]^*$ given by (115) with $\mathbf{u}_j = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}$, and $\mathbf{x}_3 = \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{e}_i$, where not all of β_i and γ_{li} are zero. The corresponding eigenvectors for λ_3 are given by

$$\mathbf{x} = \left[\mathbf{0}_{1 \times nq}, \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i (L_k^+ \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)^T + \sum_{l=1}^q \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{li} ((\mathbf{g}_l - L_k^+ L_k \mathbf{g}_l) \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)^T, \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{e}_i^T \right]^*, \quad (118)$$

where $\beta_i \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\gamma_{li} \in \mathbb{C}$ satisfy (117) and not all of them are zero. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\ker \left(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck} - \lambda_3 I_{2nq+n} \right) \\ &= \left\{ \left[\mathbf{0}_{1 \times nq}, \frac{\kappa_k}{\mu_k + \eta_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i (L_k^+ \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)^T + \sum_{l=1}^q \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{li} ((\mathbf{g}_l - L_k^+ L_k \mathbf{g}_l) \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)^T, \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{e}_i^T \right]^* : (117) \text{ holds}, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \beta_i \in \mathbb{C}, \gamma_{li} \in \mathbb{C}, i = 1, \dots, n, l = 1, \dots, q \right\}. \quad (119) \end{aligned}$$

This expression of $\ker \left(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck} - \lambda_3 I_{2nq+n} \right)$ is slightly different from the one in (34) since it involves the constraint (117) for $\beta_i \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\gamma_{li} \in \mathbb{C}$. Nevertheless, they are equivalent to each other since both expressions are the general solution to the same form of linear equations. \blacklozenge

Remark 4.2: If $\text{rank}(L_k) = q - 1$, then it follows that $\ker(L_k) = \text{span}\{\mathbf{w}_0\}$. In graph theory, this rank condition is implied by the strong connectivity condition on \mathcal{G}_k . In this case, if $\eta_k \lambda_{5,6} + \mu_k h_k \lambda_{5,6} + \mu_k \neq 0$, where $\lambda_{5,6}$ are given by (80), then $\lambda_{5,6}$ are not the eigenvalues of $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$ and $\{0\} \subseteq \text{spec}(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}) \subseteq \{0, -\kappa_k, -\frac{\kappa_k(1+h_k)}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k)^2 - 4\kappa_k}, \lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \forall \frac{\lambda^2 + \kappa_k h_k \lambda + \kappa_k}{\eta_k \lambda + \mu_k h_k \lambda + \mu_k} \in \text{spec}(-L_k) \setminus \{0\}\}$. This is because $\ker(L_k \otimes I_n) = \text{span}\{\mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_0 \otimes \mathbf{e}_n\}$, (78) and (79) only have the trivial solution $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$, which

contradicts the definition of eigenvectors for $\lambda = \lambda_{5,6}$. Hence, $\lambda \neq \lambda_{5,6}$. Furthermore, note that it follows from Lemma 2.1 that if \mathcal{G}_k is undirected, then $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ in $\text{spec}(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})$ is such that $\frac{\lambda^2 + \kappa_k h_k \lambda + \kappa_k}{\eta_k \lambda + \mu_k h_k \lambda + \mu_k} < 0$. \blacklozenge

Lemma 4.6: Define a (possibly infinite) series of matrices $B_k^{[j]}$, $j = 1, \dots, q$, $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, as follows:

$$B_k^{[j]} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{nq \times nq} & h_k I_{nq} & \mathbf{0}_{nq \times n} \\ -h_k \mu_k L_k \otimes I_n - h_k \kappa I_{nq} & -h_k \eta_k L_k \otimes I_n & h_k \kappa_k \mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n \\ E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} & \mathbf{0}_{n \times nq} & -I_n \end{bmatrix}, \quad (120)$$

where $\mu_k, \eta_k, \kappa_k \geq 0$, $h_k > 0$, $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$, $L_k \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times q}$ denotes the Laplacian matrix of a node-fixed dynamic digraph \mathcal{G}_k , and $E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times nq}$ is defined in Lemma 4.1. Then for every $j = 1, \dots, q$, $\{0\} \subseteq \text{spec}(B_k^{[j]} + h_k^2 A_{ck}) \subseteq \{0, -1, -\frac{h_k^2 \kappa_k}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{(h_k^2 \kappa_k)^2 - 4h_k^2 \kappa_k}, \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{C} : \forall \frac{\lambda_1^2 + \kappa_k h_k^2 \lambda_1 + \kappa_k h_k^2}{\eta_k h_k \lambda_1 + \mu_k h_k^2 \lambda_1 + \mu_k h_k^2} \in \text{spec}(-L_k) \setminus \{0\}, \lambda_2^3 + (1 + h_k^2 \kappa_k) \lambda_2^2 + (2h_k^2 \kappa_k - h_k \kappa_k) \lambda_2 + h_k^2 \kappa_k = 0\}$, where A_{ck} is defined by (11) in Lemma 4.4. Furthermore, if $h_k \kappa_k \neq 0$, then 0 is semisimple.

Proof: For a fixed $j \in \{1, \dots, q\}$, let $\lambda \in \text{spec}(B_k^{[j]} + h_k^2 A_{ck})$ and $\mathbf{x} = [\mathbf{x}_1^*, \mathbf{x}_2^*, \mathbf{x}_3^*]^* \in \mathbb{C}^{2nq+n}$ be the corresponding eigenvector for λ , where $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathbb{C}^{nq}$ and $\mathbf{x}_3 \in \mathbb{C}^n$. Then it follows from $(B_k^{[j]} + h_k^2 A_{ck})\mathbf{x} = \lambda \mathbf{x}$ that

$$h_k \mathbf{x}_2 + h_k^2 [-\mu_k (L_k \otimes I_n) \mathbf{x}_1 - \kappa_k \mathbf{x}_1 - \eta_k (L_k \otimes I_n) \mathbf{x}_2 + \kappa_k (\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n) \mathbf{x}_3] = \lambda \mathbf{x}_1, \quad (121)$$

$$h_k [-\mu_k (L_k \otimes I_n) \mathbf{x}_1 - \kappa_k \mathbf{x}_1 - \eta_k (L_k \otimes I_n) \mathbf{x}_2 + \kappa_k (\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n) \mathbf{x}_3] = \lambda \mathbf{x}_2, \quad (122)$$

$$E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} \mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_3 = \lambda \mathbf{x}_3. \quad (123)$$

Let $\mathbf{x}_3 \neq \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}$ be arbitrary, $\mathbf{x}_1 = (\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n) \mathbf{x}_3$, and $\mathbf{x}_2 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$. Clearly such \mathbf{x}_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$, satisfy (121)–(123) with $\lambda = 0$. Hence, $\lambda = 0$ is always an eigenvalue of $B_k^{[j]} + h_k^2 A_{ck}$. Next, we assume that $\lambda \neq 0$.

Substituting (122) into (121) yields $\mathbf{x}_1 = \frac{h_k(1+\lambda)}{\lambda} \mathbf{x}_2$. Replacing \mathbf{x}_1 in (122) and (123) with $\mathbf{x}_1 = \frac{h_k(1+\lambda)}{\lambda} \mathbf{x}_2$ yields

$$\left[\left(\frac{h_k^2 \mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k^2 + \eta_k h_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{h_k^2 \kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + h_k^2 \kappa_k \right) I_{nq} \right] \mathbf{x}_2 - h_k \kappa_k (\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n) \mathbf{x}_3 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}, \quad (124)$$

$$E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} \mathbf{x}_2 - (1 + \lambda) \mathbf{x}_3 = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}. \quad (125)$$

Thus, (124) and (125) have nontrivial solutions if and only if

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} \left(\frac{h_k^2 \mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k^2 + \eta_k h_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{h_k^2 \kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + h_k^2 \kappa_k \right) I_{nq} & -h_k \kappa_k (\mathbf{1}_{q \times 1} \otimes I_n) \\ E_{n \times nq}^{[j]} & -(1 + \lambda) I_n \end{bmatrix} = 0. \quad (126)$$

If $\det \left[\left(\frac{h_k^2 \mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k^2 + \eta_k h_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{h_k^2 \kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + h_k^2 \kappa_k \right) I_{nq} \right] \neq 0$, then pre-multiplying $-L_k \otimes I_n$ on both sides of (124) and following the similar arguments as in the proof of *ii*) of Lemma 4.5, we have $\mathbf{x}_2 = \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \varpi_{li} (\mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i)$, where $\varpi_{li} \in \mathbb{C}$. Substituting this expression of \mathbf{x}_2 into (124) and (125) by using *iii*) of Lemma 4.1 yields

$$\left(\frac{h_k^2 \kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + h_k^2 \kappa_k \right) \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \varpi_{li} w_{lj} \mathbf{e}_i - h_k \kappa_k \mathbf{x}_3 = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}, \quad (127)$$

$$\sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \sum_{i=1}^n \varpi_{li} w_{lj} \mathbf{e}_i - (1 + \lambda) \mathbf{x}_3 = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}. \quad (128)$$

Substituting (128) into (127) yields

$$\left[\left(\frac{h_k^2 \kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + h_k^2 \kappa_k \right) (1 + \lambda) - h_k \kappa_k \right] \mathbf{x}_3 = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}. \quad (129)$$

If $\mathbf{x}_3 = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}$, then it follows from (124) that $\mathbf{x}_2 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$, and hence, $\mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$, which is a contradiction since \mathbf{x} is an eigenvector. Thus, $\mathbf{x}_3 \neq \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}$ and consequently, $\left(\frac{h_k^2 \kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + h_k^2 \kappa_k \right) (1 + \lambda) - h_k \kappa_k = 0$, i.e.,

$$\lambda^3 + (1 + h_k^2 \kappa_k) \lambda^2 + (2h_k^2 \kappa_k - h_k \kappa_k) \lambda + h_k^2 \kappa_k = 0. \quad (130)$$

Solving this cubic equation in terms of λ gives the possible eigenvalues of $B_k^{[j]} + h_k^2 A_{ck}$. This can be done via Cardano's formula. If $h_k \kappa_k = 0$, then $\lambda = -1$. Otherwise, if $h_k \kappa_k \neq 0$, then it follows from Routh's Stability Criterion that $\text{Re } \lambda < 0$ if and only if $2h_k^2 \kappa_k - h_k \kappa_k > 0$ and $(1 + h_k^2 \kappa_k)(2h_k^2 \kappa_k - h_k \kappa_k) > h_k^2 \kappa_k$, that is, $h_k > 1/2$ and $h_k + 2h_k^3 \kappa_k > 1 + h_k^2 \kappa_k$.

Alternatively, if $\det \left[\left(\frac{h_k^2 \mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k^2 + \eta_k h_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{h_k^2 \kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + h_k^2 \kappa_k \right) I_{nq} \right] = 0$, then in this case, (126) holds if $\lambda = -1$, or $\lambda \neq -1$ and by Proposition 2.8.4 of [30, p. 116], $\det \left(\left(\frac{h_k^2 \mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k^2 + \eta_k h_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{h_k^2 \kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + h_k^2 \kappa_k \right) I_{nq} - \frac{\kappa_k h_k}{1 + \lambda} W^{[j]} \right) = 0$, which implies that for $\lambda \neq -1$, the equation

$$\left(\left(\frac{h_k^2 \mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k^2 + \eta_k h_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{h_k^2 \kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + h_k^2 \kappa_k \right) I_{nq} - \frac{\kappa_k h_k}{1 + \lambda} W^{[j]} \right) \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1} \quad (131)$$

has nontrivial solutions for $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{C}^{nq}$. Again, note that for every $j = 1, \dots, q$, $(L_k \otimes I_n) W^{[j]} = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times nq}$. Pre-multiplying $L_k \otimes I_n$ on both sides of (131) yields $\left(\left(\frac{h_k^2 \mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k^2 + \eta_k h_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n)^2 + \left(\frac{h_k^2 \kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + h_k^2 \kappa_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) \right) \mathbf{v} = (L_k \otimes I_n) \left(\left(\frac{h_k^2 \mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k^2 + \eta_k h_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{h_k^2 \kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + h_k^2 \kappa_k \right) I_{nq} \right) \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$, which implies that $\left(\left(\frac{h_k^2 \mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k^2 + \eta_k h_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{h_k^2 \kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + h_k^2 \kappa_k \right) I_{nq} \right) \mathbf{v} \in \ker(L_k \otimes I_n)$. Since $\ker(L_k \otimes I_n) = \bigcup_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \text{span}\{\mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_n\}$, it follows that

$$\left(\left(\frac{h_k^2 \mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k^2 + \eta_k h_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{h_k^2 \kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + h_k^2 \kappa_k \right) I_{nq} \right) \mathbf{v} = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \omega_{li} \mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i, \quad (132)$$

where $\omega_{li} \in \mathbb{C}$, which is similar to (49). Now it follows from (131) and (132) that

$$\frac{\kappa_k h_k}{1 + \lambda} W^{[j]} \mathbf{v} = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=0}^{q-1-\text{rank}(L_k)} \omega_{li} \mathbf{w}_l \otimes \mathbf{e}_i. \quad (133)$$

If $\frac{h_k^2 \kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + h_k^2 \kappa_k \neq 0$, then it follows from the similar arguments after (50) that $\omega_{\ell i} = 0$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$ and every $\ell = 1, \dots, q - 1 - \text{rank}(L_k)$. Furthermore,

$$\omega_{0i} - \frac{\lambda \kappa_k h_k}{(1 + \lambda)(\lambda^2 + h_k^2 \kappa_k \lambda + h_k^2 \kappa_k)} \omega_{0i} = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (134)$$

Then either $1 - \frac{\lambda \kappa_k h_k}{(1+\lambda)(\lambda^2 + h_k^2 \kappa_k \lambda + h_k^2 \kappa_k)} = 0$ or $\omega_{0i} = 0$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$. If $\frac{\lambda \kappa_k h_k}{(1+\lambda)(\lambda^2 + h_k^2 \kappa_k \lambda + h_k^2 \kappa_k)} = 1$, then

$$\lambda^3 + (1 + h_k^2 \kappa_k) \lambda^2 + (2h_k^2 \kappa_k - h_k \kappa_k) \lambda + h_k^2 \kappa_k = 0, \quad (135)$$

which is the same as (130). Since $\lambda \neq -1$, in this case $\kappa_k h_k \neq 0$. Then it follows from Routh's Stability Criterion that $\text{Re } \lambda < 0$ if and only if $h_k > 1/2$ and $h_k + 2h_k^3 \kappa_k > 1 + h_k^2 \kappa_k$. If $\omega_{0i} = 0$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$, then it follows from (131) and (132) that $\frac{\kappa_k h_k}{1+\lambda} W^{[j]} \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$ and $\left(\left(\frac{h_k^2 \mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k^2 + \eta_k h_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{h_k^2 \kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + h_k^2 \kappa_k \right) I_{nq} \right) \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}_{nq \times 1}$, which implies that $\mathbf{v} \in \ker \left(\left(\frac{h_k^2 \mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k^2 + \eta_k h_k \right) (L_k \otimes I_n) + \left(\frac{h_k^2 \kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + h_k^2 \kappa_k \right) I_{nq} \right) \cap \ker \left(\frac{\kappa_k h_k}{1+\lambda} W^{[j]} \right)$. Clearly $\frac{h_k^2 \mu_k}{\lambda} + \mu_k h_k^2 + \eta_k h_k \neq 0$. In this case, $\lambda \in \{ \lambda_1 \in \mathbb{C} : \forall \frac{\lambda_1^2 + \kappa_k h_k^2 \lambda_1 + \kappa_k h_k^2}{\eta_k h_k \lambda_1 + \mu_k h_k^2 \lambda_1 + \mu_k h_k^2} \in \text{spec}(-L_k) \setminus \{0\} \}$.

Alternatively, if $\frac{h_k^2 \kappa_k}{\lambda} + \lambda + h_k^2 \kappa_k = 0$, then it follows from the similar arguments after (70) in Lemma 4.5 that

$$\lambda = -\frac{h_k^2 \kappa_k}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{(h_k^2 \kappa_k)^2 - 4h_k^2 \kappa_k} \quad (136)$$

are the possible eigenvalues of $B_k^{[j]} + h_k^2 A_{ck}$.

In summary,

$$\begin{aligned} \{0\} \subseteq \text{spec}(B_k^{[j]} + h_k^2 A_{ck}) \subseteq \\ \left\{ 0, -1, -\frac{h_k^2 \kappa_k}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{(h_k^2 \kappa_k)^2 - 4h_k^2 \kappa_k}, \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{C} : \forall \frac{\lambda_1^2 + \kappa_k h_k^2 \lambda_1 + \kappa_k h_k^2}{\eta_k h_k \lambda_1 + \mu_k h_k^2 \lambda_1 + \mu_k h_k^2} \in \text{spec}(-L_k) \setminus \{0\}, \right. \\ \left. \lambda_2^3 + (1 + h_k^2 \kappa_k) \lambda_2^2 + (2h_k^2 \kappa_k - h_k \kappa_k) \lambda_2 + h_k^2 \kappa_k = 0 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (137)$$

Finally, the semisimplicity property of 0 can be proved by using the similar arguments as in the proof of Lemma 4.4. ■

Remark 4.3: Similar to Remark 4.2, if $\text{rank}(L_k) = q - 1$, then $-\frac{h_k^2 \kappa_k}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{(h_k^2 \kappa_k)^2 - 4h_k^2 \kappa_k}$ are not the eigenvalues of $B_k^{[j]} + h_k^2 A_{ck}$ and $\{0\} \subseteq \text{spec}(B_k^{[j]} + h_k^2 A_{ck}) \subseteq \{0, -1, \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{C} : \forall \frac{\lambda_1^2 + \kappa_k h_k^2 \lambda_1 + \kappa_k h_k^2}{\eta_k h_k \lambda_1 + \mu_k h_k^2 \lambda_1 + \mu_k h_k^2} \in \text{spec}(-L_k) \setminus \{0\}, \lambda_2^3 + (1 + h_k^2 \kappa_k) \lambda_2^2 + (2h_k^2 \kappa_k - h_k \kappa_k) \lambda_2 + h_k^2 \kappa_k = 0\}$. Furthermore, note that it follows from Lemma 2.1 that if \mathcal{G}_k is undirected, then $\lambda_1 \in \mathbb{C}$ in $\text{spec}(B_k^{[j]} + h_k^2 A_{ck})$ is such that $\frac{\lambda_1^2 + \kappa_k h_k^2 \lambda_1 + \kappa_k h_k^2}{\eta_k h_k \lambda_1 + \mu_k h_k^2 \lambda_1 + \mu_k h_k^2} < 0$. Finally, one can also discuss the detailed eigenspace for each possible eigenvalue in (137) by using the similar arguments in Lemmas 4.2–4.5. ◆

The following definition is due to [31].

Definition 4.1: Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. The matrix pair (A, C) is *discrete-time semiobservable* if

$$\bigcap_{k=0}^{n-1} \ker(C(I_n - A)^k) = \ker(I_n - A). \quad (138)$$

Next, we present an extended version of Definition 4.1 in [32].

Definition 4.2: Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. The matrix pair (A, C) is *discrete-time k -semiobservable* if there exists a nonnegative integer k such that

$$k = \min \left\{ l \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+ : \bigcap_{i=0}^{n-1} \ker \left(C(I_n - A)^{l+i} \right) = \ker(I_n - A) \right\}. \quad (139)$$

An alternative extended version of Definition 4.1 to operator pairs can be found in [33]. Define ℓ_2 to be the collection of all sequences $\{x_i\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$ for which $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \|x_i\|^2 < \infty$, where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the 2-norm.

Definition 4.3: Consider a Hilbert space ℓ_2 and a linear system \mathcal{G}_a with a given infinitesimal generator \mathcal{A} of the form $\frac{d}{dt}\psi(t) = (\mathcal{A}\psi)(t)$ over ℓ_2 . Let C be a bounded operator on ℓ_2 . The operator pair (\mathcal{A}, C) is *discretely approximate semiobservable* if

$$\bigcap_{k=0}^{\infty} \ker(C\mathcal{A}^k) = \ker(\mathcal{A}). \quad (140)$$

Motivated by Definitions 4.1 and 4.3, we propose a new notion of discrete-time approximate semiobservable for a (possibly infinite) set of matrix pairs.

Definition 4.4: Let $A_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, and $C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. The set of pairs $\{(A_k, C)\}_{k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+}$ is called *discrete-time approximate semiobservable with respect to some matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$* if

$$\bigcap_{k=0}^{\infty} \ker(C(I_n - A_k)) = \ker(I_n - A). \quad (141)$$

The following definition of paracontracting matrices is due to [34].

Definition 4.5: Let $W \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. W is called *paracontracting* if for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $Wx \neq x$ is equivalent to $\|Wx\| < \|x\|$.

Recall from [27], [30], [35] that a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is called *discrete-time semistable* if $\text{spec}(A) \subseteq \{s \in \mathbb{C} : |s| < 1\} \cup \{1\}$, and if $1 \in \text{spec}(A)$, then 1 is semisimple. $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is called *nontrivially discrete-time semistable* [27] if A is discrete-time semistable and $A \neq I_n$. Finally, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is called *normal* [30, p. 179] if $AA^T = A^T A$.

Lemma 4.7: Let $W \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times q}$. If W is normal and nontrivially discrete-time semistable, then W is paracontracting. Conversely, if W is paracontracting, then W is nontrivially discrete-time semistable.

Proof: Assume that W is normal and nontrivially discrete-time semistable. Since W is normal, it follows from Corollary 5.4.8 of [30, p. 321] that W has q mutually orthogonal eigenvectors. In this case, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^q$, we write x as $x = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i y_i$ where $\alpha_i, i = 1, \dots, n$, are either real or complex numbers, and $\{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$ is an orthonormal set of eigenvectors of W associated with the eigenvalues $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{C}$, $|\lambda_i| < 1$ or $\lambda_i = 1, i = 1, \dots, n$.

Next, since $Wx = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \lambda_i y_i$, it follows that $\|Wx\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \|\alpha_i \lambda_i y_i\|^2$. Hence, $Wx = x$ if and only if $\alpha_i = \alpha_i \lambda_i$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$, or, equivalently, $Wx \neq x$ if and only if $\alpha_j \neq \alpha_j \lambda_j$ for some $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Clearly if $Wx \neq x$, then $\|\alpha_j \lambda_j y_j\| < \|\alpha_j y_j\|$ for some $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Thus, $\|Wx\|^2 < \|\alpha_1 \lambda_1 y_1\|^2 + \dots + \|\alpha_j y_j\|^2 + \dots + \|\alpha_n \lambda_n y_n\|^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \|\alpha_i y_i\|^2 = \|x\|^2$, which imply that $\|Wx\|^2 < \|x\|^2$. Hence, $\|Wx\| < \|x\|$. On the other hand, if $\|Wx\| < \|x\|$ for any nonzero $x \in \mathbb{R}^q$, then it follows from the above expressions for $\|Wx\|^2$ and $\|x\|^2$ that there exists at least one integer $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $\|\alpha_j \lambda_j y_j\| < \|\alpha_j y_j\|$, which implies that $|\alpha_j \lambda_j| \neq |\alpha_j|$. Suppose there exists some nonzero $x \in \mathbb{R}^q$ such that $Wx = x$. Then it follows that $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \lambda_i y_i = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i y_i$, which implies that $\alpha_i \lambda_i = \alpha_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. However, this contradicts $|\alpha_j \lambda_j| \neq |\alpha_j|$. Hence, $Wx \neq x$.

Conversely, it follows from Proposition 3.2 of [36] that if W is paracontracting, then $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} W^k$ exists, and hence, W is discrete-time semistable by [30, p. 735]. Clearly $W \neq I_q$. ■

A direct consequence from Lemma 4.7 is that if $W \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times q}$ is symmetric and nontrivially discrete-time semistable, then W is paracontracting. Next we generalize Lemma 4.7 to have a necessary and sufficient condition to guarantee paracontraction of W .

Lemma 4.8: Let $W \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times q}$ and $\text{spec}(W) = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r\}$, where r denotes the number of distinct eigenvalues for W . Then W is nontrivially discrete-time semistable, $\|Wx\| \leq \|x\|$ for any $Wx \neq \lambda_i x$ and every $i = 1, \dots, r$, and $\ker(W^T W - I_q) = \ker((W - I_q)^T (W - I_q) + (W - I_q)^2)$ if and only if W is paracontracting.

Proof: First, note that $\|Wx\|^2 - \|x\|^2 = x^T (W^T W - I_q)x = x^T [(W - I_q)^T (W - I_q) + W^T - I_q + W - I_q]x$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^q$. Hence, W is paracontracting if and only if $x^T [(W - I_q)^T (W - I_q) + W^T - I_q + W - I_q]x < 0$ is equivalent to $(W - I_q)x \neq 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^q$, or, equivalently speaking, $x^T [(W - I_q)^T (W - I_q) + W^T - I_q + W - I_q]x \leq 0$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^q$, and $x^T [(W - I_q)^T (W - I_q) + W^T - I_q + W - I_q]x = 0$ is equivalent to $(W - I_q)x = 0$. Furthermore, since $x^T [(W - I_q)^T (W - I_q) + W^T - I_q + W - I_q]x \leq 0$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^q$ is equivalent to $(W - I_q)^T (W - I_q) + W^T - I_q + W - I_q \leq 0$, it follows that W is paracontracting if and only if $(W - I_q)^T (W - I_q) + W^T - I_q + W - I_q \leq 0$, and $x^T [(W - I_q)^T (W - I_q) + W^T - I_q + W - I_q]x = 0$ is equivalent to $(W - I_q)x = 0$. Next, it follows from Fact 8.15.2 of [30, p. 550] that the condition, $(W - I_q)^T (W - I_q) + W^T - I_q + W - I_q \leq 0$ and $x^T [(W - I_q)^T (W - I_q) + W^T - I_q + W - I_q]x = 0$ if and only if $(W - I_q)x = 0$, is equivalent to a new condition, $(W - I_q)^T (W - I_q) + W^T - I_q + W - I_q \leq 0$ and $\ker((W - I_q)^T (W - I_q) + W^T - I_q + W - I_q) = \ker(W - I_q)$. Consequently, W is paracontracting if and only if $(W - I_q)^T (W - I_q) + W^T - I_q + W - I_q \leq 0$ and $\ker((W - I_q)^T (W - I_q) + W^T - I_q + W - I_q) = \ker(W - I_q)$.

Assume that W is nontrivially discrete-time semistable and $\ker(W^T W - I_q) = \ker((W - I_q)^T (W - I_q) + (W - I_q)^2)$. We first claim that if W is discrete-time semistable, then $\ker(W - I_q) = \ker((W - I_q)^2)$. Since W is discrete-time semistable, it follows from Proposition 11.10.2 of [30, p. 735] that $W - I_q$ is group invertible. Now it follows from Fact 3.6.1 of [30, p. 191] that $\ker(W - I_q) = \ker((W - I_q)^2)$. Since $\ker(W - I_q) =$

$\ker((W - I_q)^T(W - I_q))$, it follows that $\ker(W - I_q) = \ker((W - I_q)^2) = \ker((W - I_q)^T(W - I_q))$.

We now claim that $(W - I_q)^T(W - I_q) + W^T - I_q + W - I_q \leq 0$, or equivalently, $W^T W \leq I_q$. Clearly by discrete-time semistability of W , $|\lambda_i| \leq 1$ for every $i = 1, \dots, r$. Next by definition $Wx_i = \lambda_i x_i$ for $x_i \in \ker(\lambda_i I_q - W) \setminus \{0\}$, $i = 1, \dots, r$. Hence, $x_i^* W^T W x_i = |\lambda_i|^2 x_i^* x_i$, $i = 1, \dots, r$. By Proposition 4.5.4 of [30, p. 268], x_1, \dots, x_r are linearly independent, and hence, $\ker(\lambda_i I_q - W) \cap \ker(\lambda_j I_q - W) = \{0\}$ for every $i, j = 1, \dots, r$, $i \neq j$. Then it follows from $|\lambda_i| \leq 1$, $i = 1, \dots, r$, that $x^* W^T W x \leq x^* x$ for every $x \in \bigcup_{i=1}^r \ker(\lambda_i I_q - W)$.

Suppose that there exists $y \in \overline{\bigcup_{i=1}^r \ker(\lambda_i I_q - W)}$ such that $y^* W^T W y > y^* y$, where \overline{S} denotes the complement of the set S . First note that $\overline{\bigcup_{i=1}^r \ker(\lambda_i I_q - W)} = \bigcap_{i=1}^r \overline{\ker(\lambda_i I_q - W)}$. Hence, $y \in \overline{\ker(\lambda_i I_q - W)}$ for every $i = 1, \dots, r$, or equivalently, $W y \neq \lambda_i y$ for every $i = 1, \dots, r$. However, this contradicts the condition that $\|Wx\| \leq \|x\|$ for any $Wx \neq \lambda_i x$ and every $i = 1, \dots, r$. In summary, $x^* W^T W x \leq x^* x$ for every $x \in \mathbb{C}^q$. Thus, $W^T W \leq I_q$.

Next, we show that $\ker((W - I_q)^T(W - I_q) + W^T - I_q + W - I_q) = \ker(W - I_q)$. If $x \in \ker(W - I_q)$, then it follows from $\ker(W - I_q) = \ker((W - I_q)^2) = \ker((W - I_q)^T(W - I_q))$ that $((W - I_q)^T(W - I_q) + (W - I_q)^2)x = 0$, which implies that $x \in \ker((W - I_q)^T(W - I_q) + (W - I_q)^2)$. Hence, $\ker(W - I_q) \subseteq \ker((W - I_q)^T(W - I_q) + (W - I_q)^2)$. On the other hand, if $x \in \ker((W - I_q)^T(W - I_q) + (W - I_q)^2)$, then it follows from $(W - I_q)^T(W - I_q) + W^T - I_q + W - I_q \leq 0$ that $0 = x^T(W - I_q)^T((W - I_q)^T(W - I_q) + (W - I_q)^2)x = x^T(W - I_q)^T(W^T - I_q + W - I_q)(W - I_q)x \leq -x^T((W - I_q)^2)^T(W - I_q)^2 x \leq 0$, which implies that $x^T((W - I_q)^2)^T(W - I_q)^2 x = 0$, and hence, $x \in \ker((W - I_q)^2) = \ker(W - I_q)$. Thus, $\ker((W - I_q)^T(W - I_q) + (W - I_q)^2) \subseteq \ker(W - I_q)$. Therefore, $\ker((W - I_q)^T(W - I_q) + (W - I_q)^2) = \ker(W - I_q)$. Now it follows from $\ker(W^T W - I_q) = \ker((W - I_q)^T(W - I_q) + (W - I_q)^2)$ that $\ker((W - I_q)^T(W - I_q) + W^T - I_q + W - I_q) = \ker(W - I_q)$. Combining this kernel condition with $W^T W \leq I_q$ yields paracontraction of W .

Alternatively, assume that W is paracontracting. Then it follows from Lemma 4.7 that W is nontrivially discrete-time semistable. Hence, $W - I_q$ is group invertible. Moreover, it follows from Fact 3.6.1 of [30, p. 191] that $\ker(W - I_q) = \ker((W - I_q)^2) = \ker((W - I_q)^T(W - I_q))$. Next, since for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^q$, $Wx \neq x$ is equivalent to $\|Wx\| < \|x\|$, it follows that $\|Wx\| \leq \|x\|$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^q$, or equivalently, $W^T W \leq I_q$. In particular, $\|Wx\| \leq \|x\|$ for any $Wx \neq \lambda_i x$ and every $i = 1, \dots, r$. Finally, to show that $\ker(W^T W - I_q) = \ker((W - I_q)^T(W - I_q) + (W - I_q)^2)$, it suffices to show that $\ker((W - I_q)^T(W - I_q) + (W - I_q)^2) = \ker(W - I_q)$ since $\ker(W^T W - I_q) = \ker(W - I_q)$ by paracontraction of W . This has actually been done in the above paragraph. ■

Next, we replace $\|Wx\| \leq \|x\|$ for any $Wx \neq \lambda_i x$ and every $i = 1, \dots, r$, and $\ker(W^T W - I_q) = \ker((W - I_q)^T(W - I_q) + (W - I_q)^2)$ in Lemma 4.8 by new conditions which are easier to check practically. Recall from [30, p. 608] that the Hölder-induced norm $\|\cdot\|$ for W is defined by $\|W\| = \max_{x \in \mathbb{R}^q \setminus \{0\}} \|Ax\|/\|x\|$.

Lemma 4.9: Let $W \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times q}$. Then W is nontrivially discrete-time semistable, $\|W\| \leq 1$, and $\text{rank}(W^T W - I_q) = \text{rank}((W - I_q)^T(W - I_q) + (W - I_q)^2) = \text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} W^T W - I_q & (W - I_q)^T(W - I_q) + (W^T - I_q)^2 \end{bmatrix}$ if and only if W is paracontracting.

Proof: First, it follows from Proposition 9.4.9 of [30, p. 609] that $\sigma_{\max}(W) = \|W\| \leq 1$, where $\sigma_{\max}(W)$ denotes the maximum singular value of W . Next, it follows from Fact 5.11.35 of [30, p. 358] that $\sigma_{\max}(W) \leq 1$ if and only if $W^T W \leq I_q$. Thus, $\|W\| \leq 1$ if and only if $W^T W \leq I_q$.

Second, it follows from Equation (2.4.13) of [30, p. 103] that $\ker(W^T W - I_q) = \ker((W - I_q)^T(W - I_q) + (W - I_q)^2)$ if and only if $\text{ran}(W^T W - I_q)^\perp = \text{ran}((W - I_q)^T(W - I_q) + (W^T - I_q)^2)^\perp$, where $\text{ran}(A)$ denotes the range of A and S^\perp denotes the orthogonal complement of S . Note that both $\text{ran}(W^T W - I_q)$ and $\text{ran}((W - I_q)^T(W - I_q) + (W^T - I_q)^2)$ are subspaces. Then it follows from Fact 2.9.14 of [30, p. 121] that $\text{ran}(W^T W - I_q)^\perp = \text{ran}((W - I_q)^T(W - I_q) + (W^T - I_q)^2)^\perp$ if and only if $\text{ran}(W^T W - I_q) = \text{ran}((W - I_q)^T(W - I_q) + (W^T - I_q)^2)$. Now it follows from Fact 2.11.5 of [30, p. 131] that $\text{ran}(W^T W - I_q) = \text{ran}((W - I_q)^T(W - I_q) + (W^T - I_q)^2)$ if and only if $\text{rank}(W^T W - I_q) = \text{rank}((W - I_q)^T(W - I_q) + (W^T - I_q)^2) = \text{rank}((W - I_q)^T(W - I_q) + (W - I_q)^2) = \text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} W^T W - I_q & (W - I_q)^T(W - I_q) + (W^T - I_q)^2 \end{bmatrix}$.

Now the rest of the proof directly follows from the proof of Lemma 4.8. ■

The following corollary is immediate based on Lemmas 4.8 and 4.9.

Corollary 4.1: Let $W \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times q}$. Then W is nontrivially discrete-time semistable, $\|W\| \leq 1$, and $\ker((W - I_q)^T(W - I_q) + W^T - I_q + W - I_q) = \ker((W - I_q)^T(W - I_q) + (W - I_q)^2)$ if and only if W is paracontracting.

Motivated by Theorem 1 of [34] and Corollary 3.2 of [37], we have the following convergence results for a sequence of (possibly infinite) discrete-time semistable matrices.

Lemma 4.10: Let J be a (possibly infinite) countable index set and $P_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $k \in J$, be discrete-time semistable, $\|P_k\| \leq 1$, and $\ker(P_k^T P_k - I_n) = \ker((P_k - I_n)^T(P_k - I_n) + (P_k - I_n)^2)$. Consider the sequence $\{x_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$ defined by the iterative process $x_{i+1} = Q_i x_i$, $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, where $Q_i \in \{P_k : \forall k \in J\}$.

i) If $|J| < \infty$, then $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} x_i$ exists. If in addition, $P_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is nontrivially discrete-time semistable for every $k \in J$, then $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} x_i$ is in $\bigcap_{k \in \mathcal{I}} \ker(I_n - P_k)$, where \mathcal{I} is the set of all indexes k for which P_k appears infinitely often in $\{Q_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$.

ii) If there exists $s \in J$ such that P_s is nontrivially discrete-time semistable, $\{(Q_k, I_n)\}_{k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+}$ is discrete-time approximate semiobservable with respect to some nontrivially discrete-time semistable matrix Q_r , $r \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$,

and for every positive integer N , there always exists $j \geq N$ such that $Q_j = Q_r$, then $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} x_i$ exists and the limit is in $\ker(I_n - Q_r)$.

Proof: *i)* Since $P_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is discrete-time semistable for every $k \in J$, it follows that either $P_k = I_n$ or P_k is nontrivially discrete-time semistable. If there exists $N \geq 1$ such that $Q_i = I_n$ for all $i \geq N$, then $x_i = x_N$ for all $i \geq N$, which implies that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} x_i$ exists. Otherwise, we select all the nontrivially discrete-time semistable matrices in $\{Q_i\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$ to form an infinite subsequence $\{Q_{i_n}\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ of $\{Q_i\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$. Define $y_{n+1} = Q_{i_n} y_n$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. Then it follows from Corollary 4.1 that Q_{i_n} is paracontracting for every $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. Now by Theorem 1 of [34], $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n$ exists. Consequently, $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} x_i = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n$ exists. The second assertion is a direct consequence of Corollary 4.1 above and Theorem 1 of [34].

ii) Again, it follows from Corollary 4.1 that Q_i is paracontracting for every $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. Then the assertion follows directly from Corollary 3.2 of [37]. ■

Now we have the main result for the global convergence of the iterative process in Algorithm 1.

Theorem 4.1: Consider the following discrete-time switched linear model to describe the iterative process for MCO:

$$x_i[k+1] = x_i[k] + h_k v_i[k+1], \quad x_i[0] = x_{i0}, \quad (142)$$

$$\begin{aligned} v_i[k+1] &= v_i[k] + h_k \eta_k \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} (v_j[k] - v_i[k]) + h_k \mu_k \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} (x_j[k] - x_i[k]) \\ &\quad + h_k \kappa_k (p[k] - x_i[k]), \quad v_i[0] = v_{i0}, \end{aligned} \quad (143)$$

$$p[k+1] = p[k] + h_k \kappa_k (x_j[k] - p[k]), \quad p[k] \notin \mathcal{Z}_p, \quad p[0] = p_0, \quad (144)$$

$$p[k+1] = x_j[k], \quad p[k] \in \mathcal{Z}_p, \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \quad i = 1, \dots, q, \quad (145)$$

where $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\mu_k, \eta_k, \kappa_k, h_k$ are randomly selected in $\Omega \subseteq [0, \infty)$, $\mathcal{Z}_p = \{p \in \mathbb{R}^n : f(x_j) < f(p)\}$, and $x_j = \arg \min_{1 \leq i \leq q} f(x_i)$. Assume that for every $k \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$ and every $j = 1, \dots, q$:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{H1)} \quad &0 < h_k < -\frac{\lambda + \bar{\lambda}}{|\lambda|^2} \text{ for every } \lambda \in \{-\kappa_k, -\frac{\kappa_k(1+h_k)}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k)^2 - 4\kappa_k}, -\frac{\kappa_k h_k}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\kappa_k^2 h_k^2 - 4\kappa_k}, \lambda \in \\ &\mathbb{C} : \forall \frac{\lambda^2 + \kappa_k h_k \lambda + \kappa_k}{\eta_k \lambda + \mu_k h_k \lambda + \mu_k} \in \text{spec}(-L_k) \setminus \{0\}\}; \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{H2)} \quad &0 < h_k < -\frac{\lambda + \bar{\lambda}}{|\lambda|^2} \text{ for every } \lambda \in \{-1, -\frac{h_k^2 \kappa_k}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{(h_k^2 \kappa_k)^2 - 4h_k^2 \kappa_k}, \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{C} : \forall \frac{\lambda_1^2 + \kappa_k h_k^2 \lambda_1 + \kappa_k h_k^2}{\eta_k h_k \lambda_1 + \mu_k h_k^2 \lambda_1 + \mu_k h_k^2} \in \\ &\text{spec}(-L_k) \setminus \{0\}, \lambda_2^3 + (1 + h_k^2 \kappa_k) \lambda_2^2 + (2h_k^2 \kappa_k - h_k \kappa_k) \lambda_2 + h_k^2 \kappa_k = 0\}; \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{H3)} \quad \|I_{2nq+n} + h_k A_k^{[j]} + h_k^2 A_{ck}\| \leq 1 \text{ and } \|I_{2nq+n} + B_k^{[j]} + h_k^2 A_{ck}\| \leq 1.$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{H4)} \quad &\ker((h_k A_k^{[j]} + h_k^2 A_{ck})^T (h_k A_k^{[j]} + h_k^2 A_{ck}) + (h_k A_k^{[j]} + h_k^2 A_{ck})^T + h_k A_k^{[j]} + h_k^2 A_{ck}) = \ker((h_k A_k^{[j]} + h_k^2 A_{ck})^T \\ &(h_k A_k^{[j]} + h_k^2 A_{ck}) + (h_k A_k^{[j]} + h_k^2 A_{ck})^2) \text{ and } \ker((B_k^{[j]} + h_k^2 A_{ck})^T (B_k^{[j]} + h_k^2 A_{ck}) + (B_k^{[j]} + h_k^2 A_{ck})^T + B_k^{[j]} + \\ &h_k^2 A_{ck}) = \ker((B_k^{[j]} + h_k^2 A_{ck})^T (B_k^{[j]} + h_k^2 A_{ck}) + (B_k^{[j]} + h_k^2 A_{ck})^2). \end{aligned}$$

Then the following conclusions hold:

C1) If Ω is a finite discrete set, then $x_i[k] \rightarrow p^\dagger$, $v_i[k] \rightarrow \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}$, and $p[k] \rightarrow p^\dagger$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ for every $x_{i0} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $v_{i0} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and every $i = 1, \dots, q$, where $p^\dagger \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is some constant vector.

C2) If for every positive integer N , there always exists $s \geq N$ such that $h_s(A_s^{[j_s]} + h_s A_{cs}) = B_s^{[j_s]} + h_s^2 A_{cs} = h_T(A_T^{[j_T]} + h_T A_{cT}) = B_T^{[j_T]} + h_T^2 A_{cT}$ for some fixed $T \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$, where $j_s, j_T \in \{1, \dots, q\}$, then $x_i[k] \rightarrow p^\dagger$, $v_i[k] \rightarrow \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}$, and $p[k] \rightarrow p^\dagger$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ for every $x_{i0} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $v_{i0} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and every $i = 1, \dots, q$, where $p^\dagger \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is some constant vector.

Proof: Let $Z = [x_1^T, \dots, x_q^T, v_1^T, \dots, v_q^T, p^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{2nq+n}$. Note that (142)–(145) can be rewritten as the compact form $Z[k+1] = (I_{2nq+n} + h_k(A_k^{[j_k]} + h_k A_{ck}))Z[k]$, $Z[k] \notin \mathcal{S}$, and $Z[k+1] = (I_{2nq+n} + B_k^{[j_k]} + h_k^2 A_{ck})Z[k]$, $Z[k] \in \mathcal{S}$, $j_k \in \{1, \dots, q\}$ is selected based on \mathcal{Z}_p . Let $h_k^\dagger = \min \left\{ -\frac{\lambda + \bar{\lambda}}{|\lambda|^2} : \lambda \in \{-\kappa_k, -\frac{\kappa_k(1+h_k)}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\kappa_k^2(1+h_k)^2 - 4\kappa_k}, -\frac{\kappa_k h_k}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\kappa_k^2 h_k^2 - 4\kappa_k}, \lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \forall \frac{\lambda^2 + \kappa_k h_k \lambda + \kappa_k}{\eta_k \lambda + \mu_k h_k \lambda + \mu_k} \in \text{spec}(-L_k) \setminus \{0\} \right\}$. First, we show that if $h < h_k^\dagger$, then $I_{2nq+n} + h_k(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})$ becomes discrete-time semistable for every $j = 1, \dots, q$ and every $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. Note that $\text{spec}(I_{2nq+n} + h_k(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})) = \{1 + h\lambda : \forall \lambda \in \text{spec}(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})\}$. Since by Lemma 4.5 and Assumption H1, $A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}$ is semistable for every $j = 1, \dots, q$ and every $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, it follows that $\text{spec}(I_{2nq+n} + h_k(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})) = \{1\} \cup \{1 + h\lambda : \forall \lambda \in \text{spec}(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}), \text{Re } \lambda < 0\}$. Hence, $I_{2nq+n} + h_k(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})$ is discrete-time semistable for every $j = 1, \dots, q$ and every $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ if $|1 + h_k \lambda| < 1$ for every $\lambda \in \text{spec}(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})$ and $\text{Re } \lambda < 0$. Note that $|1 + h_k \lambda| < 1$ is equivalent to $(1 + h_k \lambda)(1 + h_k \bar{\lambda}) = |1 + h_k \lambda|^2 < 1$, i.e., $h_k < -(\lambda + \bar{\lambda})/|\lambda|^2$. By Lemma 4.5, for any $h_k < h_k^\dagger$, $I_{2nq+n} + h_k(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck})$ is discrete-time semistable for every $j = 1, \dots, q$ and every $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. Similarly, it follows from Lemma 4.6 and Assumption H2 that $I_{2nq+n} + B_k^{[j]} + h_k^2 A_{ck}$ is discrete-time semistable for every $j = 1, \dots, q$ and every $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. And (142)–(145) can further be rewritten as an iteration $Z[k+1] = P_k Z[k]$, $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, where $P_k \in \{I_{2nq+n} + h_k(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}), I_{2nq+n} + B_k^{[j]} + h_k^2 A_{ck} : j = 1, \dots, q, k = 0, 1, 2, \dots\} = \{I_{2nq+n} + h_k(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}), I_{2nq+n} + B_k^{[j]} + h_k^2 A_{ck} : j = 1, \dots, q, \mu_k, \eta_k, \kappa_k, h_k \in \Omega\}$.

C1) By assumption, Ω is a finite discrete set. Hence, $\{I_{2nq+n} + h_k(A_k^{[j]} + h_k A_{ck}), I_{2nq+n} + B_k^{[j]} + h_k^2 A_{ck} : j = 1, \dots, q, \mu_k, \eta_k, \kappa_k, h_k \in \Omega\}$ is a finite discrete set. Now it follows from Assumptions H3 and H4 as well as *i*) of Lemma 4.10 that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} Z[k]$ exists. The rest of the conclusion follows directly from (142)–(145).

C2) By assumption, either $h_T(A_T^{[j_T]} + h_T A_{cT})$ or $B_T^{[j_T]} + h_T^2 A_{cT}$ appears infinitely many times in the sequence $\{P_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$. Next, it follows from Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3 as well as the assumption $h_k > 0$ that $\ker(h_k(A_k^{[j_k]} + h_k A_{ck})) = \ker(A_k^{[j_k]}) = \ker(A_s^{[j_s]}) = \ker(h_s(A_s^{[j_s]} + h_s A_{cs}))$ for every $k, s \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$. Using the similar arguments, one can prove that $\ker(B_k^{[j_k]} + h_k^2 A_{ck}) = \ker(B_k^{[j_k]}) = \ker(B_s^{[j_s]}) = \ker(B_s^{[j_s]} + h_s^2 A_{cs})$ for every $k, s \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_+$. Hence, it follows from Assumptions H3 and H4 as well as *ii*) of Lemma 4.10 that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} Z[k]$ exists. The rest of the conclusion follows directly from (142)–(145). Note that in this case, Ω may be an infinite set. \blacksquare

Remark 4.4: Since $\rho(A) \leq \|A\|$, where $\rho(A)$ denotes the spectrum abscissa of A , it follows from Lemmas 4.5 and 4.6 that $\|I_{2nq+n} + h_k A_k^{[j]} + h_k^2 A_{ck}\| \geq 1$ and $\|I_{2nq+n} + B_k^{[j]} + h_k^2 A_{ck}\| \geq 1$. Hence, to guarantee H3, one only needs to assume that $\|I_{2nq+n} + h_k A_k^{[j]} + h_k^2 A_{ck}\| = 1$ and $\|I_{2nq+n} + B_k^{[j]} + h_k^2 A_{ck}\| = 1$. \blacklozenge

V. NUMERICAL EVALUATION

A. Test Function Review

In order to show the performance of the parallel MCO, we conduct a comparison evaluation between the standard PSO, serial MCO, and parallel MCO. In particular, we use the following eight test functions chosen from [5], [12] to evaluate the proposed algorithm.



- Sphere function: $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2$. The test area is usually restricted to the hypercube $-30 \leq x_i \leq 30$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. The global minimum of $f(x)$ is 0 at $x_i = 0$.
- Rosenbrock's valley: $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} [100(x_{i+1} - x_i^2)^2 + (1 - x_i)^2]$. The test area is usually restricted to the hypercube $-30 \leq x_i \leq 30$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. The global minimum of $f(x)$ is 0 at $x_i = 1$.
- Rastrigin function: $f(x) = 10n + \sum_{i=1}^n [x_i^2 - 10 \cos(2\pi x_i)]$. The test area is usually restricted to the hypercube $-30 \leq x_i \leq 30$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. The global minimum of $f(x)$ is 0.
- Griewank function: $f(x) = \frac{1}{4000} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 - \prod_{i=1}^n \cos(\frac{x_i}{\sqrt{i}}) + 1$. The test area is usually restricted to the hypercube $-600 \leq x_i \leq 600$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. The global minimum of $f(x)$ is 0 at $x_i = 0$.
- Ackley function: $f(x) = -20 \exp(-0.2 \times \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}) - \exp(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \cos 2\pi x_i) + 20 + e$. The test area is usually restricted to the hypercube $-32.768 \leq x_i \leq 32.768$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. The global minimum of $f(x)$ is 0 at $x_i = 0$.
- De Jong's f4 function: $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n (ix_i^4)$. The test area is usually restricted to the hypercube $-20 \leq x_i \leq 20$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. The global minimum of $f(x)$ is 0 at $x_i = 0$.
- Zakharov function: $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 + (0.5ix_i)^2 + (0.5ix_i)^4$. The test area is usually restricted to the hypercube $-10 \leq x_i \leq 10$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. The global minimum of $f(x)$ is 0 at $x_i = 0$.
- Levy function: $f(x) = \sin^2(\pi x_1) + (x_n - 1)^2(1 + \sin^2(2\pi x_n)) - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (x_i - 1)^2(1 + 10 \sin^2(\pi x_i + 1))$. The test area is usually restricted to the hypercube $-10 \leq x_i \leq 10$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. The global minimum of $f(x)$ is 0 at $x_i = 1$.

B. Evaluation of Computational Time for the Parallel MCO

We first evaluate the computational time of the parallel MCO for different test functions. Specifically, eight 2.8 GHz cores equipped supercomputers in the High Performance Computing Center at Texas Tech University are used to run the parallel MCO algorithm for all the eight benchmark functions in which the search areas and dimensions of objective functions are listed in Subsection V-A with $n = 30$. We choose the communication

TABLE I
NUMERICAL COMPARISON BETWEEN PSO, SERIAL MCO, AND PARALLEL MCO FOR THE EIGHT TEST FUNCTIONS

Function	Min			Max			Median			Average		
	PSO	Serial MCO	Parallel MCO	PSO	Serial MCO	Parallel MCO	PSO	Serial MCO	Parallel MCO	PSO	Serial MCO	Parallel MCO
Sphere	9.525E1	3.3E-3	3.0E-3	2.716E2	1.51E-2	1.11E-2	4.278E2	1.85E-2	1.73E-2	1.785E2	8.3E-3	7.2E-3
Rosenbrock	1.981E5	1.708E1	1.840E2	1.139E6	7.649E1	1.561E2	1.425E6	1.262E2	1.429E2	5.415E5	4.471E1	5.973E1
Rastrigin	2.802E2	1.027E2	1.252E2	7.639E2	2.585E2	2.916E2	1.125E3	4.050E2	4.030E2	4.773E3	1.687E2	1.773E2
Griewank	1.268E1	6.735E-1	4.674E-1	3.953E1	5.165	4.084	5.961E1	1.710	1.883	2.294E1	8.003E-1	7.894E-1
Ackley	8.551	1.541	2.355	1.292E1	3.792	5.744	2.414E1	6.987	7.955	1.110E1	2.889	3.477
De Jong's f4	3.206E2	1.565E-6	7.156E-7	1.328E3	1.905E-5	1.793E-5	1.428E3	2.097E-5	1.553E-5	6.048E2	7.7106E-6	6.346E-6
Zakharov	6.288E4	1.394	1.101	2.938E5	5.746	4.084	1.689E+5	5.165	7.310	7.307E4	2.484	2.476
Levy	1.041E2	2.053E1	2.483E1	4.029E2	1.813E2	9.079E2	5.867E2	7.545E1	1.300E2	2.286E2	4.690E1	5.545E1



(a) Computational time comparison between serial MCO and parallel MCO.



(b) Time saving for parallel MCO.

Fig. 1. Test function: Sphere.

graph \mathcal{G}_k for MCO to be a complete graph. The simulation results are shown in Fig. 1–8. The saving time t_{saved} is calculated as $t_{saved} = (t_{seri} - t_{para})/t_{seri} \times 100\%$, where t_{seri} and t_{para} are the computational time for the serial MCO and parallel MCO to solve the optimization problem, respectively. From the simulation results, the parallel MCO algorithm can shorten the computational time about 5% to 30% compared with the serial MCO.

C. Evaluation of Numerical Accuracy for the Parallel MCO



To evaluate numerical accuracy for the parallel MCO, the statistical results of the optimal values obtained from the standard PSO, serial MCO and parallel MCO algorithms are compared numerically. Similarly, the search areas and dimensions of objective functions are listed in Subsection V-A with $n = 30$. The maximum of the objective values, the minimum of the objective values, the average of objective value, and the median objective values are compared in Table I. Based on these results, it follows that the serial MCO and parallel MCO algorithms are more accurate for obtaining optimal values than the PSO algorithm.



(a) Computational time comparison between serial MCO and parallel MCO.

(b) Time saving for parallel MCO.

Fig. 2. Test function: Rosenbrock.





(a) Computational time comparison between serial MCO and parallel MCO.

(b) Time saving for parallel MCO.

Fig. 3. Test function: Rastrigin.

VI. CONCLUSION



In this report, a parallel MCO algorithm is developed by introducing the MATLAB built-in parallel function `parfor` into the inner loop of the MCO algorithm. The numerical evaluation concludes that the parallel MCO algorithm can achieve similar accuracy compared with the serial MCO algorithm, but in a shorter computational time. A detailed convergence analysis of the MCO algorithm is presented. Future work will focus on the large-scale, real-time engineering applications of this parallel MCO algorithm, such as power grid network vulnerability problems.



(a) Computational time comparison between serial MCO and parallel MCO.

(b) Time saving for parallel MCO.

Fig. 4. Test function: Griewank.





(a) Computational time comparison between serial MCO and parallel MCO.

(b) Time saving for parallel MCO.

Fig. 5. Test function: Ackley.

REFERENCES



- [1] J. Kennedy and R. Eberhart, "Particle swarm optimization," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Neural Netw.*, Perth, Australia, 1995, pp. 1942–1948.
- [2] J.-B. Park, K.-S. Lee, J.-R. Shin, and K. Y. Lee, "A particle swarm optimization for economic dispatch with nonsmooth cost functions," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 34–42, 2005.
- [3] J. Robinson and Y. Rahmat-Sammi, "Particle swarm optimization in electromagnetics," *IEEE Trans. Anten. Propag.*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 397–407, 2004.
- [4] R. Eberhart and Y. Shi, "Particle swarm optimization: Developments, applications and resources," in *Proc. 2001 IEEE Congr. Evolut. Comput.*, Seoul, South Korea, 2001, pp. 81–86.
- [5] I. C. Trelea, "The particle swarm optimization algorithm: Convergence analysis and parameter selection," *Info. Process. Lett.*, vol. 85, no. 6, pp. 317–325, 2003.
- [6] Y. Shi and R. C. Eberhart, "Parameter selection in particle swarm optimization," in *Evolutionary Programming VII*, V. Porto, N. Saravanan, D. Waagen, and A. Eiben, Eds. Berlin, Germany: Springer-Verlag, 1998, vol. 1447, pp. 591–600.



(a) Computational time comparison between serial MCO and parallel MCO.

(b) Time saving for parallel MCO.

Fig. 6. Test function: De Jong's f4.



(a) Computational time comparison between serial MCO and parallel MCO.

(b) Time saving for parallel MCO.

Fig. 7. Test function: Zakharov.

[7] R. C. Eberhart and Y. Shi, "Comparing inertia weights and constriction factors in particle swarm optimization," in *Proc. 2000 IEEE Congr. Evolut. Comput.*, San Diego, CA, 2000, pp. 84–88.

[8] M. Clerc, "The swarm and the queen: Towards a deterministic and adaptive particle swarm optimization," in *Proc. 1999 IEEE Congr. Evolut. Comput.*, Washington, DC, 1999, pp. 1951–1957.

[9] C. A. Coello Coello and M. S. Lechuga, "MOPSO: A proposal for multiple objective particle swarm optimization," in *Proc. 2002 IEEE Congr. Evolut. Comput.*, Honolulu, HI, 2002, pp. 1051–1056.



[10] X. Hu and R. C. Eberhart, "Multiobjective optimization using dynamic neighborhood particle swarm optimization," in *Proc. 2002 IEEE Congr. Evolut. Comput.*, Honolulu, HI, 2002, pp. 1677–1681.

[11] C. A. Coello Coello, G. T. Pulido, and M. S. Lechuga, "Handling multiple objectives with particle swarm optimization," *IEEE Trans. Evolut. Comput.*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 256–279, 2004.

[12] Z. Liu, S. Deshpande, and Q. Hui, "Quantized particle swarm optimization: An improved algorithm based on group effect and its convergence analysis," in *Proc. 2011 ASME Dyna. Syst. Control Conf.*, Arlington, VA, 2011.

[13] E. Bonabeau, M. Dorigo, and G. Théraulaz, *Swarm Intelligence: From Natural to Artificial Systems*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford Univ. Press, 1999.

[14] N. E. Leonard and E. Fiorelli, "Virtual leaders, artificial potentials, and coordinated control of groups," in *Proc. IEEE Conf. Decision*



(a) Computational time comparison between serial MCO and parallel MCO.

(b) Time saving for parallel MCO.

Fig. 8. Test function: Levy.

Control, Orlando, FL, 2001, pp. 2968–2873.

- [15] K. M. Passino, “Biomimicry of bacterial foraging for distributed optimization and control,” *IEEE Contr. Syst. Mag.*, vol. 22, pp. 52–67, 2002.
- [16] V. Gazi and K. M. Passino, “Stability analysis of swarms,” *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 48, pp. 692–697, 2003.
- [17] V. Gazi, “Swarm aggregations using artificial potentials and sliding-mode control,” *IEEE Trans. Robotics*, vol. 21, pp. 1208–1214, 2005.
- [18] Y. Liu, K. M. Passino, and M. M. Polycarpou, “Stability analysis of m -dimensional asynchronous swarms with a fixed communication topology,” *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 48, pp. 76–95, 2003.
- [19] W. Xi, X. Tan, and J. S. Baras, “Gibbs sampler-based coordination of autonomous swarms,” *Automatica*, vol. 42, pp. 1107–1119, 2006.
- [20] W. M. Haddad and Q. Hui, “Complexity, robustness, self-organization, swarms, and system thermodynamics,” *Nonlinear Analysis: Real World Applications*, vol. 10, pp. 531–543, 2009.
- [21] Q. Hui, W. M. Haddad, and S. P. Bhat, “Finite-time semistability and consensus for nonlinear dynamical networks,” *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 53, pp. 1887–1900, 2008.
- [22] —, “Semistability, finite-time stability, differential inclusions, and discontinuous dynamical systems having a continuum of equilibria,” *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 54, no. 10, pp. 2465–2470, 2009.
- [23] Q. Hui, “Hybrid consensus protocols: An impulsive dynamical system approach,” *Int. J. Control*, vol. 83, pp. 1107–1116, 2010.
- [24] Q. Hui and W. M. Haddad, “Distributed nonlinear control algorithms for network consensus,” *Automatica*, vol. 44, pp. 2375–2381, 2008.
- [25] Q. Hui, “Finite-time rendezvous algorithms for mobile autonomous agents,” *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 207–211, 2011.
- [26] —, “Optimal distributed linear averaging,” *Automatica*, vol. 47, no. 12, pp. 2713–2719, 2011.
- [27] —, “Optimal semistable control in *ad hoc* network systems: A sequential two-stage approach,” *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 58, no. 3, pp. 779–784, 2013.
- [28] R. Agaev and P. Chebotarev, “On the spectra of nonsymmetric Laplacian matrices,” *Linear Alg. Appl.*, vol. 399, pp. 157–168, 2005.
- [29] H. Zhang and Q. Hui, “Multiagent coordination optimization: A control-theoretic perspective of swarm intelligence algorithms,” in *2013 IEEE Congr. Evolut. Comput.*, Cancun, Mexico, 2013, pp. 3339–3346.
- [30] D. S. Bernstein, *Matrix Mathematics*, 2nd ed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press, 2009.
- [31] Q. Hui and W. M. Haddad, “ \mathcal{H}_2 optimal semistable stabilization for linear discrete-time dynamical systems with applications to network consensus,” *Int. J. Control*, vol. 82, pp. 456–469, 2009.
- [32] Q. Hui and H. Zhang, “Optimal balanced coordinated network resource allocation using swarm optimization,” in *Proc. IEEE Conf. Decision Control*, Maui, HI, 2012, pp. 3936–3941.
- [33] Q. Hui and J. M. Berg, “Semistability theory for spatially distributed systems,” *Syst. Control Lett.*, vol. 62, no. 10, pp. 862–870, 2013.
- [34] L. Elsner, I. Koltracht, and M. Neumann, “On the convergence of asynchronous paracontractions with applications to tomographic reconstruction from incomplete data,” *Linear Alg. Appl.*, vol. 130, pp. 65–82, 1990.
- [35] W. M. Haddad, V. Chellaboina, and Q. Hui, *Nonnegative and Compartmental Dynamical Systems*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press, 2010.

- [36] S. Nelson and M. Neumann, "Generalizations of the projection method with applications to SOR theory for Hermitian positive semidefinite linear systems," *Numerische Mathematik*, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 123–141, 1987.
- [37] R. Bru, L. Elsner, and M. Neumann, "Convergence of infinite products of matrices and inner-outer iteration schemes," *Electronic Transactions on Numerical Analysis*, vol. 2, pp. 183–193, 1994.