

# Matrix monotonicity and concavity of the principal pivot transform

Kenneth Beard\*

Louisiana State University  
Department of Mathematics  
Baton Rouge, LA, USA 70803

Aaron Welters†

Florida Institute of Technology  
Department of Mathematical Sciences  
Melbourne, FL, USA 32901

February 13, 2023

## Abstract

We prove the (generalized) principal pivot transform is matrix monotone, in the sense of the Löwner ordering, under minimal hypotheses. This improves on the recent results of J. E. Pascoe and R. Tully-Doyle, *Monotonicity of the principal pivot transform*, Linear Algebra Appl. 662 (2022) in two ways. First, we use the “generalized” principal pivot transform, where matrix inverses in the classical definition of the principal pivot transform are replaced with Moore-Penrose pseudoinverses. Second, the hypotheses on matrices for which monotonicity holds is relaxed and, in particular, we find the weakest hypotheses possible for which it can be true. We also prove the principal pivot transform is a matrix convex function on positive semi-definite matrices that have the same kernel (and, in particular, on positive definite matrices). Our proof is a corollary of a minimization variational principle for the principal pivot transform.

*Keywords:* Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse, generalized principal pivot transform, matrix inequalities, Löwner order, matrix monotone, matrix concave, variational principles, Schur complement, convex sets of Hermitian matrices, constant rank, matrix-valued Herglotz-Nevalinna functions, sweep operator, exchange operator, gyration operator, partial inverse, Potapov-Ginzburg transform, Redheffer transform, chain-scattering transform

*2020 MSC:* 15A09, 47A56, 15A39, 15A10, 15B57, 15B48, 47B44, 47L07, 15A15, 90C33

---

\*Email: klathr2@lsu.edu

†Email: awelters@fit.edu

# 1 Introduction

Suppose that  $A \in M_n(\mathbb{F})$ , where  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$  or  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$ , is partitioned into a  $2 \times 2$  block matrix

$$A = [A_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2} = \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

and  $A_{ij} \in M_{n_i \times n_j}(\mathbb{F})$  for each  $i, j = 1, 2$ . Then the (generalized) principal pivot transform [57, 89, 72, 73, 83, 47] of  $A$  with respect to the  $(2, 2)$ -block  $A_{22}$  is the matrix  $\text{ppt}(A) \in M_n(\mathbb{F})$  defined by

$$\text{ppt}(A) = \begin{bmatrix} A/A_{22} & A_{12}A_{22}^+ \\ -A_{22}^+A_{21} & A_{22}^+ \end{bmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

where  $A/A_{22} \in M_{n_1}(\mathbb{F})$  is the (generalized) Schur complement [21, 19, 93] of  $A$  with respect to the  $(2, 2)$ -block  $A_{22}$  defined by

$$A/A_{22} = A_{11} - A_{12}A_{22}^+A_{21}, \quad (3)$$

and  $A_{22}^+$  denotes the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse [17, 20] of  $A_{22}$  (in particular, if  $A_{22}$  is invertible then  $A_{22}^+ = A_{22}^{-1}$ ). Note one could consider instead the generalized principal pivot transform and Schur complement of  $A$  with respect to the  $(1, 1)$ -block  $A_{11}$ , and our results will still hold under trivial modifications (cf. [84, Sec. 4.4, Lemmas 38 and 40] and [93, pp. 20-21, Sec. 1.1]).

Alternatively, we can define as in [69], the map  $\text{PPT}(A) \in M_n(\mathbb{F})$  as the “principal pivot transformation” of  $A$  (or following the terminology in [70], it would be appropriate to refer to  $\text{PPT}(A)$  as the “symmetric principal pivot transform” although we do not do so in this paper), where

$$\text{PPT}(A) = J \text{ppt}(A) = \begin{bmatrix} A/A_{22} & A_{12}A_{22}^+ \\ A_{22}^+A_{21} & -A_{22}^+ \end{bmatrix} \quad (4)$$

and the signature matrix  $J \in M_n(\mathbb{F})$  is defined to be the block matrix, partitioned conformally to the block structure of  $A = [A_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2}$ , by

$$J = \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} & 0 \\ 0 & -I_{n_2} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5)$$

In this paper, we study the matrix monotonicity and convexity of the map  $\text{PPT}(\cdot) = J \text{ppt}(\cdot)$  in the sense of the Löwner ordering  $\leq$ , i.e., for two self-adjoint matrices  $A^* = A, B^* = B \in M_n(\mathbb{F})$  we write  $A \leq B$  if  $B - A$  is a positive semi-definite matrix, i.e.,  $0 \leq B - A$ . Section 2 contains our statement of main results on this monotonicity (namely, Theorem 1) and convexity (namely, Theorem 10) of  $\text{PPT}(\cdot) = J \text{ppt}(\cdot)$ . In that same section, we will provide a proof of the convexity result using a minimization variational principle (namely, Theorem 9) for this map, but delay the proof of the monotonicity until Sec. 3.

## 2 Main results

We begin by stating one of our main results of this paper, Theorem 1, on the matrix monotonicity of the map  $\text{PPT}(\cdot) = J \text{ppt}(\cdot)$  in the sense of the Löwner ordering  $\leq$ , but postpone the proof of this theorem until Sec. 3.

The following will clarify some of the hypotheses (and notation) that we use. First, if  $A^* = A = [A_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2} \in M_n(\mathbb{F})$ , then  $A_{ij}^* = A_{ji}$  for  $i, j = 1, 2$  and  $[J \text{ppt}(A)]^* = J \text{ppt}(A)$ . If, in addition,  $B^* = B = [B_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2} \in M_n(\mathbb{F})$ , i.e.,  $B$  is partitioned conformal to  $A = [A_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2}$  in (1) [so that  $A_{ij}, B_{ij} \in M_{n_i \times n_j}(\mathbb{F})$  for each  $i, j = 1, 2$ ], and  $A \leq B$  then  $A_{22} \leq B_{22}$ . Given these hypotheses, the next theorem gives us necessary and sufficient conditions to have  $J \text{ppt}(A) \leq J \text{ppt}(B)$  in terms of the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverses  $(A_{22})^+, (B_{22})^+$  of  $A_{22}, B_{22}$ , respectively, and the rank of the convex combination of the matrices  $A_{22}$  and  $B_{22}$ , i.e., the function  $\text{rank}[(1-t)A_{22} + tB_{22}]$  for  $t \in [0, 1]$  (see also Lemmas 17 and 21).

**Theorem 1** *If  $A^* = A = [A_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2}, B^* = B = [B_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2} \in M_n(\mathbb{F})$ , and*

$$A \leq B \tag{6}$$

*then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (a)  $J \text{ppt}(A) \leq J \text{ppt}(B)$ ,
- (b)  $(B_{22})^+ \leq (A_{22})^+$ ,
- (c)  $\text{rank}[(1-t)A_{22} + tB_{22}]$  is constant for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ .

*Moreover, if any of these statements is true then*

$$A/A_{22} \leq B/B_{22}. \tag{7}$$

This theorem is new at least in regard to the characterization of the monotonicity of the map  $\text{PPT}(\cdot) = J \text{ppt}(\cdot)$  in the Löwner ordering  $\leq$ . The statement (c)  $\Rightarrow$  (a) can be seen as a generalization of [69, Theorem 1.1.(2)], where they prove this statement (using our notation) in the special case  $\text{rank}[(1-t)A_{22} + tB_{22}] = n_2$ , i.e.,  $(1-t)A_{22} + tB_{22}$  is invertible, for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ . Another comparable result is that the conclusion of our theorem in regard to the monotonicity of the Schur complement following from our hypotheses and statement (b) is a generalization of [25, Lemma 2.3], since our result implies theirs, but our hypotheses are much weaker. As such, our theorem may be useful in their setting in which they considered monotonicity and comparison results for discrete-time algebraic Riccati equations [52, 1] and associated Riccati operators (see, for instance, Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 and Lemma 3.1 in [25]) based on the known connection between Riccati equations and Schur complements [88, 6, 4, 25]. It should also be noted that monotonicity of the Schur complement for *positive semi-definite* matrices, i.e.,  $0 \leq A \leq B$  implies  $0 \leq A/A_{22} \leq B/B_{22}$ , is well-known [41, 3, 21, 54].

The following example illustrate our theorem (cf. Sec. 1, last para. in [69]).

**Example 2** Let  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$  or  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$ . Consider the function  $J \text{ppt}(\cdot)$  on the following  $2 \times 2$  block matrices  $A^* = A = [A_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2}$ ,  $B^* = B = [B_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2} \in M_2(\mathbb{F})$ ,

$$A = \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ \hline A_{21} & A_{22} \end{array} \right] = \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & -1 \end{array} \right], B = \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ \hline A_{21} & A_{22} \end{array} \right] = \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 1 \end{array} \right], \quad (8)$$

$$J \text{ppt}(A) = \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} A/A_{22} & A_{12}A_{22}^+ \\ \hline A_{22}^+A_{21} & -A_{22}^+ \end{array} \right] = \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 1 \end{array} \right], \quad (9)$$

$$J \text{ppt}(B) = \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} B/B_{22} & B_{12}B_{22}^+ \\ \hline B_{22}^+B_{21} & -B_{22}^+ \end{array} \right] = \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & -1 \end{array} \right]. \quad (10)$$

Then  $A \leq B$  so that the hypotheses of Theorem 1 are satisfied and, in particular, we have  $J \text{ppt}(A) \not\leq J \text{ppt}(B)$ ,  $B_{22}^+ = B_{22}^{-1} = [1] \not\leq [-1] = A_{22}^{-1} = A_{22}^+$ , and  $\text{rank}[(1-t)A_{22} + tB_{22}]$  is not constant on  $[0, 1]$  since at  $t = 0$  we have  $\text{rank} A_{22} = 1$ , whereas at  $t = 1/2$  we have  $\text{rank}[(1/2)A_{22} + (1/2)B_{22}] = 0$ .

We next establish the following result that  $\text{PPT}(A) = J \text{ppt}(A)$  is itself a Schur complement. Although the result is easily proved as we will show, and is based on Proposition 42 in [84] and Lemma 74 in [14], it is useful as it allows us to apply the theory of Schur complements [21, 93] to prove many important results on the principal pivot transform as we shall see.

**Proposition 3** If  $A = [A_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2} \in M_n(\mathbb{F})$  then  $J \text{ppt}(A)$  is the Schur complement

$$J \text{ppt}(A) = \hat{A}/\hat{A}_{22}, \quad (11)$$

where  $\hat{A} = [\hat{A}_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2} \in M_{n+n_2}(\mathbb{F})$  is the block matrix

$$\hat{A} = \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} \hat{A}_{11} & \hat{A}_{12} \\ \hline \hat{A}_{21} & \hat{A}_{22} \end{array} \right] = \left[ \begin{array}{cc|c} A_{11} & 0 & A_{12} \\ 0 & 0 & -A_{22}^+A_{22} \\ \hline A_{21} & -A_{22}A_{22}^+ & A_{22} \end{array} \right] \quad (12)$$

and  $A_{22}A_{22}^+$  and  $A_{22}^+A_{22}$  are the orthogonal projections of  $\mathbb{F}^{n_2}$  onto  $\text{ran}(A_{22})$  and  $\text{ran}(A_{22}^*)$ , respectively.

**Proof.** By a direct calculation using block multiplication, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{A}/\hat{A}_{22} &= \hat{A}_{11} - \hat{A}_{12}\hat{A}_{22}^+\hat{A}_{21} = \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} A_{12} \\ -A_{22}^+A_{22} \end{bmatrix} A_{22}^+ \begin{bmatrix} A_{21} & -A_{22}A_{22}^+ \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} - A_{12}A_{22}^+A_{21} & A_{12}A_{22}^+A_{22}A_{22}^+ \\ A_{22}^+A_{22}A_{22}^+A_{21} & -A_{22}^+A_{22}A_{22}^+A_{22}A_{22}^+ \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A/A_{22} & A_{12}A_{22}^+ \\ A_{22}^+A_{21} & -A_{22}^+ \end{bmatrix} \\ &= J \text{ppt}(A). \end{aligned}$$

■

For instance, from this proposition we can easily derive, using the theory of Schur complements, the following corollary that  $\text{PPT}(\cdot) = J \text{ppt}(\cdot)$  maps matrices with positive semi-definite imaginary part to matrices with positive

semi-definite imaginary part, which is a generalization of Theorem 1.1.(1) in [69]. Recall, that if  $A \in M_n(\mathbb{F})$  then its imaginary part  $\text{Im}(A) \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  is defined as the self-adjoint matrix  $\text{Im}(A) = \frac{1}{2i}(A - A^*)$ . We begin with a lemma.

**Lemma 4** *If  $A = [A_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2} \in M_n(\mathbb{F})$  and  $A_{22}$  is an EP matrix, i.e.,  $A_{22}A_{22}^+ = A_{22}^+A_{22}$ , then*

$$A/A_{22} = \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} \\ -A_{22}^+A_{21} \end{bmatrix}^* A \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} \\ -A_{22}^+A_{21} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (13)$$

$$\text{Im}(A/A_{22}) = \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} \\ -A_{22}^+A_{21} \end{bmatrix}^* \text{Im}(A) \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} \\ -A_{22}^+A_{21} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (14)$$

*In particular, if  $0 \leq \text{Im} A$  then  $A_{22}$  is an EP matrix and*

$$0 \leq \text{Im}(A/A_{22}). \quad (15)$$

**Proof.** Assume the hypotheses. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} \\ -A_{22}^+A_{21} \end{bmatrix}^* A \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} \\ -A_{22}^+A_{21} \end{bmatrix} &= [I_{n_1} \quad (-A_{22}^+A_{21})^*] \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} \\ -A_{22}^+A_{21} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= A/A_{22} - A_{21}^*[(I_{n_2} - A_{22}^+A_{22})A_{22}^+]^*A_{21} = A/A_{22}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of the lemma now follows immediately from this and the fact that if  $0 \leq \text{Im} A$  then  $0 \leq \text{Im}(A_{22})$  implying  $A_{22}$  is an EP matrix. ■

**Corollary 5** *If  $A = [A_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2} \in M_n(\mathbb{F})$  and  $A_{22}$  is an EP matrix then*

$$J \text{ppt}(A) = \begin{bmatrix} I_n \\ -\hat{A}_{22}^+\hat{A}_{21} \end{bmatrix}^* \hat{A} \begin{bmatrix} I_n \\ -\hat{A}_{22}^+\hat{A}_{21} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (16)$$

$$\text{Im}[J \text{ppt}(A)] = \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} & 0 \\ -A_{22}^+A_{21} & A_{22}^+ \end{bmatrix}^* \text{Im}(A) \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} & 0 \\ -A_{22}^+A_{21} & A_{22}^+ \end{bmatrix}. \quad (17)$$

*In particular, if  $0 \leq \text{Im}(A)$  then*

$$0 \leq \text{Im}[J \text{ppt}(A)]. \quad (18)$$

**Proof.** The proof follows immediately from Proposition 3 and Lemma 4 by observing that

$$\text{Im}(\hat{A}) = C^* \text{Im}(A)C, \quad C \begin{bmatrix} I_n \\ -\hat{A}_{22}^+\hat{A}_{21} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} & 0 \\ -A_{22}^+A_{21} & A_{22}^+ \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $C \in M_{n \times (n+n_2)}(\mathbb{F})$  is the block matrix defined by

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I_{n_2} \end{bmatrix}.$$

■

Another instance of the usefulness of Proposition 3 begins with recalling the following well-known variational principle for the Schur complement [54, 93, 15] with a short proof of it.

**Lemma 6** *If  $A^* = A = [A_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2} \in M_n(\mathbb{F})$ ,  $0 \leq A_{22}$ , and  $\ker A_{22} \subseteq \ker A_{12}$  then  $A/A_{22}$  is the unique self-adjoint matrix satisfying the minimization principle:*

$$(x_1, A/A_{22}x_1) = \min_{x_2 \in \mathbb{F}^{n_2}} \left( \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix}, A \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} \right), \quad (19)$$

for all  $x_1 \in \mathbb{F}^{n_1}$ . Furthermore, for each  $x_1 \in \mathbb{F}^{n_1}$ , the set of minimizers is

$$\{-A_{22}^+ A_{21} x_1\} + \ker A_{22}. \quad (20)$$

**Proof.** Assume the hypotheses. Then by Lemma 18 it follows that, for any  $(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{F}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{F}^{n_2}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix}, A \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} \right) &= \left( \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} & 0 \\ A_{22}^+ A_{21} & I_{n_2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} A/A_{22} & 0 \\ 0 & A_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} & 0 \\ A_{22}^+ A_{21} & I_{n_2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &= (x_1, A/A_{22}x_1) + ((A_{22}^+ A_{21} x_1 + x_2), A_{22}(A_{22}^+ A_{21} x_1 + x_2)) \geq (x_1, A/A_{22}x_1) \end{aligned}$$

with equality if and only if  $A_{22}^+ A_{21} x_1 + x_2 \in \ker A_{22}$  if and only if  $x_2 \in \{-A_{22}^+ A_{21} x_1\} + \ker A_{22}$ . ■

Using this we get immediately the next theorem on a minimization variational principle for  $\text{PPT}(\cdot) = J \text{ppt}(\cdot)$ , whose minimizers solve the following problem based on the next proposition.

**Problem 7** *Let  $A = [A_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2} \in M_n(\mathbb{F})$ . Given  $(x_1, y_2) \in \mathbb{F}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{F}^{n_2}$ , find all  $(y_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{F}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{F}^{n_2}$  such that*

$$A \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (21)$$

**Proposition 8 (Solution of Problem 7)** *If  $A = [A_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2} \in M_n(\mathbb{F})$ ,  $\text{ran } A_{21} \subseteq \text{ran } A_{22}$ , and  $\ker A_{22} \subseteq \ker A_{12}$  then for each  $(x_1, y_2) \in \mathbb{F}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{F}^{n_2}$  and for  $(y_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{F}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{F}^{n_2}$ ,*

$$A \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix} \iff \begin{cases} x_2 \in \{-A_{22}^+ A_{21} x_1 + A_{22}^+ y_2\} + \ker A_{22}, \\ y_1 = A/A_{22} x_1 + A_{12} A_{22}^+ y_2 \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

with a particular solution  $(y_1, x_2^0) \in \mathbb{F}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{F}^{n_2}$  given by

$$J \text{ppt}(A) \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ -x_2^0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad x_2^0 = -A_{22}^+ A_{21} x_1 + A_{22}^+ y_2. \quad (23)$$

**Proof.** Assume the hypotheses. Let  $(x_1, y_2) \in \mathbb{F}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{F}^{n_2}$ . Then by Lemma 18 and since  $A_{22} A_{22}^+ A_{21} = A_{21}$  (by the hypothesis  $\text{ran } A_{21} \subseteq \text{ran } A_{22}$ ), it follows that for  $(y_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{F}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{F}^{n_2}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} A \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix} &\iff \begin{bmatrix} A/A_{22} & 0 \\ 0 & A_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ A_{22}^+ A_{21} x_1 + x_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} y_1 - A_{12} A_{22}^+ y_2 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix} \\ &\iff \begin{bmatrix} A/A_{22} x_1 \\ A_{21} x_1 + A_{22} x_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} y_1 - A_{12} A_{22}^+ y_2 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix} \\ &\iff \begin{bmatrix} A/A_{22} x_1 \\ A_{22}^+ A_{21} x_1 + A_{22}^+ A_{22} x_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} y_1 - A_{12} A_{22}^+ y_2 \\ A_{22}^+ y_2 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of the proposition now follows immediately from this using the fact that  $A_{22}^+ A_{22}$  is the orthogonal projection of  $\mathbb{F}^{n_2}$  onto  $\text{ran}(A_{22}^*)$  and as such its kernel is  $\ker A_{22}$  so that in particular,

$$\begin{aligned} J \text{ppt}(A) \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} A/A_{22} & A_{12}A_{22}^+ \\ A_{22}^+ A_{21} & -A_{22}^+ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A/A_{22}x_1 + A_{12}A_{22}^+ y_2 \\ A_{22}^+ A_{21}x_1 - A_{22}^+ y_2 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ -A_{22}^+ A_{22}x_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ -A_{22}^+ A_{22}(-A_{22}^+ A_{21}x_1 + A_{22}^+ y_2) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ -(-A_{22}^+ A_{21}x_1 + A_{22}^+ y_2) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ -x_2^0 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

■

**Theorem 9** *If  $A^* = A = [A_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2} \in M_n(\mathbb{F})$ ,  $0 \leq A_{22}$ , and  $\ker A_{22} \subseteq \ker A_{12}$  then  $J \text{ppt}(A)$  is the unique self-adjoint matrix satisfying the minimization principle:*

$$\frac{1}{2} \left( \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix}, J \text{ppt}(A) \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix} \right) = \min_{x_2 \in \mathbb{F}^{n_2}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left( \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix}, A \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} \right) - \text{Re} \left( y_2, (A_{22}A_{22}^+)x_2 \right) \right\}, \quad (24)$$

for all  $(x_1, y_2) \in \mathbb{F}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{F}^{n_2}$ . Furthermore, for each  $(x_1, y_2) \in \mathbb{F}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{F}^{n_2}$ , the set of minimizers is

$$\{-A_{22}^+ A_{21}x_1 + A_{22}^+ y_2\} + \ker A_{22}. \quad (25)$$

**Proof.** Assume the hypotheses. Then by Proposition 3 we have  $[J \text{ppt}(A)]^* = J \text{ppt}(A) = \hat{A}/\hat{A}_{22}$  with  $\hat{A}_{22} = A_{22}^+ \geq 0$  and  $\ker \hat{A}_{22} = \ker A_{22} = \ker A_{22} \cap \ker A_{12} = \ker \begin{bmatrix} A_{12} \\ -A_{22}^+ A_{22} \end{bmatrix} = \ker \hat{A}_{12}$ . Thus, it follows immediately by Lemma 6 that  $J \text{ppt}(A)$  is the unique self-adjoint matrix satisfying the minimization principle:

$$\left( \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix}, J \text{ppt}(A) \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix} \right) = \min_{x_2 \in \mathbb{F}^{n_2}} \left( \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ y_2 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix}, \hat{A} \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ y_2 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} \right),$$

for all  $(x_1, y_2) \in \mathbb{F}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{F}^{n_2}$  with the set of minimizers

$$\left\{ -\hat{A}_{22}^+ \hat{A}_{21} \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix} \right\} + \ker \hat{A}_{22}.$$

The proof of the theorem now follows immediately from this since, for any  $(x_1, y_2, x_2) \in \mathbb{F}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{F}^{n_2} \times \mathbb{F}^{n_2}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} -\hat{A}_{22}^+ \hat{A}_{21} \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix} &= -A_{22}^+ \begin{bmatrix} A_{21} & -A_{22}A_{22}^+ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix} = -A_{22}^+ A_{21}x_1 + A_{22}^+ y_2, \\ \left( \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ y_2 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix}, \hat{A} \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ y_2 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} \right) &= \left( \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix}, A \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} \right) - 2 \text{Re} \left( y_2, A_{22}A_{22}^+ x_2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

■

This theorem, which appears to be new in this context, is insightful as it indicates possible applications of the theory of the principal pivot transform (and our main theorem, i.e., Theorem 1) to linear systems of saddle point type [18] such as those occurring in classical analytic mechanics when the Legendre transform is used to derive the Hamiltonian formulation from the Lagrangian formulation, and conversely (see, for instance, [30, Sec. II.A and cf. Eqs. (1), (12), (13)] for a brief summary of the relevant theory for Lagrangians that are quadratic forms and [37, 7] for the general theory). This is one of our motivations for this paper.

Another motivation for this paper in connection to Theorem 9 is its potential application in the theory of composites, where the principal pivot transform and such variational principles appear in the Cherkhev-Gibiansky-Milton (CGM) method (see [58, 24, 23, 59, 62, 61, 80, 79, 60]) which is used, for instance, in obtaining upper and lower bounds on effective tensors of multiphased composites with lossy inclusions.

One immediate application of Theorem 9 is another of our main results, which appears to be new, that  $\text{PPT}(\cdot) = J \text{ppt}(\cdot)$  is a concave function on positive semidefinite matrices with the same kernel and, in particular, on the set of all positive definite matrices.

**Theorem 10** *If  $A^* = A = [A_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2}, B^* = B = [B_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2} \in M_n(\mathbb{F}), 0 \leq A, 0 \leq B$ , and  $\ker A_{22} = \ker B_{22}$  then*

$$(1-t)J \text{ppt} A + tJ \text{ppt} B \leq J \text{ppt}[(1-t)A + tB], \forall t \in [0, 1]. \quad (26)$$

**Proof.** Assume the hypotheses. Then  $A_{22}^* = A_{22} \geq 0, B_{22}^* = B_{22} \geq 0$ , and  $\ker A_{22} = \ker B_{22}$  implies

$$\ker[(1-t)A_{22} + tB_{22}] = \ker A_{22} = \ker B_{22}, \forall t \in [0, 1]$$

from which it follows that

$$[(1-t)A_{22} + tB_{22}][(1-t)A_{22} + tB_{22}]^+ = A_{22}A_{22}^+ = B_{22}B_{22}^+, \forall t \in [0, 1]$$

and hence

$$A_{22}A_{22}^+ = B_{22}B_{22}^+ = (1-t)A_{22}A_{22}^+ + tB_{22}B_{22}^+, \forall t \in [0, 1].$$

Next, the hypotheses of Theorem 9 are true of  $(1-t)A + tB$  for each  $t \in [0, 1]$



implying for all  $t \in [0, 1]$  and all  $(x_1, y_2) \in \mathbb{F}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{F}^{n_2}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \left( \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix}, J \text{ppt}[(1-t)A + tB] \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix} \right) \\
&= \min_{x_2 \in \mathbb{F}^{n_2}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left( \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix}, [(1-t)A + tB] \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \text{Re} \left( y_2, [(1-t)A_{22} + tB_{22}] [(1-t)A_{22} + tB_{22}]^+ x_2 \right) \right\} \\
&= \min_{x_2 \in \mathbb{F}^{n_2}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left( \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix}, [(1-t)A + tB] \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \text{Re} \left( y_2, [(1-t)A_{22}A_{22}^+ + tB_{22}B_{22}^+] x_2 \right) \right\} \\
&\geq (1-t) \min_{x_2 \in \mathbb{F}^{n_2}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left( \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix}, A \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} \right) - \text{Re} \left( y_2, (A_{22}A_{22}^+) x_2 \right) \right\} \\
&\quad + t \min_{x_2 \in \mathbb{F}^{n_2}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left( \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix}, B \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} \right) - \text{Re} \left( y_2, (B_{22}B_{22}^+) x_2 \right) \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \left( \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix}, [(1-t)J \text{ppt} A + tJ \text{ppt} B] \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The proof follows now immediately from this. ■

As an application of this theorem, we can immediately prove the following corollaries on the well-known results on the concavity of the Schur complement (see, for instance, [54]) and of the convexity of the Moore–Penrose pseudoinverse on positive semidefinite matrices with the same kernel [45, 36, 46, 65, 67, 68] (and, in particular, on the set of all positive definite matrices [66, 5, 82]).

**Corollary 11** *If  $A^* = A = [A_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2}$ ,  $B^* = B = [B_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2} \in M_n(\mathbb{F})$ ,  $0 \leq A$ ,  $0 \leq B$ , and  $\ker A_{22} = \ker B_{22}$  then*

$$(1-t)A/A_{22} + tB/B_{22} \leq [(1-t)A + tB]/[(1-t)A + tB]_{22}, \quad \forall t \in [0, 1]. \quad (27)$$

**Proof.** Assume the hypotheses. Then it follows from Theorem 10 that

$$\begin{aligned}
(1-t)A/A_{22} + tB/B_{22} &= [(1-t)J \text{ppt} A + tJ \text{ppt} B]_{11} \\
&\leq \{J \text{ppt}[(1-t)A + tB]\}_{11} \\
&= [(1-t)A + tB]/[(1-t)A + tB]_{22}, \quad \forall t \in [0, 1].
\end{aligned}$$

■

**Corollary 12** *If  $C^* = C, D^* = D \in M_m(\mathbb{F})$ ,  $0 \leq C$ ,  $0 \leq D$ , and  $\ker C = \ker D$  then*

$$[(1-t)C + tD]^+ \leq (1-t)C^+ + tD^+, \quad \forall t \in [0, 1]. \quad (28)$$

**Proof.** Assume the hypotheses. Then it follows from Theorem 10 with  $A^* = A = [A_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2}$ ,  $B^* = B = [B_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2} \in M_n(\mathbb{F})$ ,  $n = m + 1$  defined by  $A_{22} =$

$C, B_{22} = D$  and  $A_{ij} = B_{ij} = 0$  otherwise, (so that  $0 \leq A, 0 \leq B$ , and  $\ker A_{22} = \ker B_{22}$ ) that we have

$$\begin{aligned} (1-t)C^+ + tD^+ &= -[(1-t)J \text{ppt } A + tJ \text{ppt } B]_{22} \\ &\geq -\{J \text{ppt}[(1-t)A + tB]\}_{22} = [(1-t)C + tD]^+, \quad \forall t \in [0, 1]. \end{aligned}$$

■

**Remark 13** *It should be pointed out that one could also use Theorem 10 to give a simple proof on the matrix monotonicity of  $\text{PPT}(\cdot) = J \text{ppt}(\cdot)$  on positive semi-definite matrices with the same kernel, but such a result is already contained in our more general result, Theorem 1 (cf. Lemma 17).*

Our results may have further applications, but, of course, this requires recognizing the occurrence of the principal pivot transform in specific problems, which may not always be clear. As such, we want to briefly mention below some additional contexts where the principal pivot transform arises under various guises.

First, as discussed in [89, 69], the principal pivot(al) transform was introduced around 1960 by A. W. Tucker [90, 91] in the context of mathematical programming to understand the linear algebraic structure underlying the simplex method of G. B. Dantzig, but it is also known as the sweep operator [38, 53], exchange operator [85], partial inverse [92], and gyration operator [28, 29, 27, 64] with the latter a term coined by R. J. Duffin, D. Hazony, and N. Morrison in the context of network synthesis problems involving nonreciprocal circuit elements called gyrators [87, 42] (see also Sec. 4.4 in [84]).

Second, the principal pivot transform is essentially the Potapov-Ginzburg transform [8, see Sec. 2.2 and cf. p. 21, Eq. (2.13)]. This transform was introduced and studied by V. P. Potapov [71] in 1955 and Y. P. Ginzburg [35] in 1957, in the context of the theory  $J$ -contractive (nonexpanding) matrix- and operator-valued functions. It has also been called the Redheffer transform [13, see Sec. 17.4 and cf. p. 328, Eqs. (17.17), (17.18)] after R. Redheffer who introduced the transformation in 1959 in the context of matrix Riccati equations and related it to the Redheffer star product [74, 75, 78], all which play an important role in transmission-line theory [8, Sec. 2.16], [76, 77], the electrodynamics of layered media [55], and Schrodinger equations on graphs [50] whenever the scattering matrix plays a prominent role. In these context, the Redheffer transform converts a chain-scattering or transfer matrix into the scattering matrix and as such it is also sometimes called the chain scattering transform [10] (see also [8, 49, 48, 86]).

Finally, the principal pivot transform also occurs in other contexts, for instance, in connection to solving inverse problems for canonical differential equations [51, 9], in the study of the analytic properties of the electromagnetic Dirichlet-to-Neumann (DtN) map in layered media [22], and in the solvability of elliptic PDEs in terms of their boundary data [11].

### 3 Proof of the monotonicity of principal pivot transform

Our goal in this section is to prove Theorem 1 on the monotonicity of the map  $\text{PPT}(\cdot) = J \text{ppt}(\cdot)$  in the sense of the Löwner ordering  $\leq$ .

We begin by considering a matrix  $B \in M_n(\mathbb{F})$  partitioned conformally to the matrix  $A = [A_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2} \in M_n(\mathbb{F})$  in (1), i.e.,

$$B = [B_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2} = \begin{bmatrix} B_{11} & B_{12} \\ B_{21} & B_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (29)$$

and  $B_{ij} \in M_{n_i \times n_j}(\mathbb{F})$  for each  $i, j = 1, 2$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} J \text{ppt}(B) - J \text{ppt}(A) &= \begin{bmatrix} B/B_{22} - A/A_{22} & B_{12}B_{22}^+ - A_{12}A_{22}^+ \\ B_{22}^+B_{21} - A_{22}^+A_{21} & A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+ \end{bmatrix}, \quad (30) \\ [J \text{ppt}(B) - J \text{ppt}(A)]/[J \text{ppt}(B) - J \text{ppt}(A)]_{22} \\ &= B/B_{22} - A/A_{22} - (B_{12}B_{22}^+ - A_{12}A_{22}^+)(A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+)^+(B_{22}^+B_{21} - A_{22}^+A_{21}). \quad (31) \end{aligned}$$

Now, recall the well-known lemma {originally due to A. Albert [2], see Eqs. (2.6) and (2.7) in [21] as well as Theorem 1.20 and Sec. 6.0.4 in [93] on the ‘‘Albert nonnegative definiteness conditions’’} which characterizes self-adjoint matrices that are positive semi-definite in terms of their Schur complement.

**Lemma 14** *If  $A^* = A = [A_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2} \in M_n(\mathbb{F})$  then  $0 \leq A$  if and only if*

$$0 \leq A_{22}, \ker A_{22} \subseteq \ker A_{12}, \text{ and } 0 \leq A/A_{22}. \quad (32)$$

**Remark 15** *It should be noted that in some statements of our results, kernel inclusions can be replaced by equivalent range inclusions. This is a consequence of the facts that if  $A = [A_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2} \in M_n(\mathbb{F})$  then  $\ker A_{22} \subseteq \ker A_{12}$  iff  $\text{ran}(A^*)_{21} \subseteq \text{ran}(A^*)_{22}$ ; (ii)  $\text{ran} A_{21} \subseteq \text{ran} A_{22}$  iff  $\ker(A^*)_{22} \subseteq \ker(A^*)_{12}$ . This follows immediately using the facts that if  $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$  then  $(A_{ij})^* = (A^*)_{ji}$ , for any  $B \in M_{n_i \times n_j}(\mathbb{F})$  we have  $(\ker B)^\perp = \text{ran}(B^*)$  and  $(\text{ran} B)^\perp = \ker(B^*)$ , and if  $S_1, S_2$  are subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}^j$  with  $S_1 \subseteq S_2$  then  $S_1^\perp \subseteq S_2^\perp$ .*

From this lemma we get immediately the following result which is a key observation that helps give insight into statements (a) and (b) in Theorem 1 and the proof they are equivalent.

**Corollary 16** *If  $A^* = A = [A_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2}, B^* = B = [B_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2} \in M_n(\mathbb{F})$  then*

$$J \text{ppt}(A) \leq J \text{ppt}(B) \quad (33)$$

*if and only if*

$$\begin{aligned} B_{22}^+ \leq A_{22}^+, \ker(A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+) \subseteq \ker(B_{12}B_{22}^+ - A_{12}A_{22}^+), \quad (34) \\ 0 \leq B/B_{22} - A/A_{22} - (B_{12}B_{22}^+ - A_{12}A_{22}^+)(A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+)^+(B_{22}^+B_{21} - A_{22}^+A_{21}). \quad (35) \end{aligned}$$

**Proof.** Assume the hypotheses. Then  $[J \text{ppt}(A)]^* = J \text{ppt}(A)$ ,  $[J \text{ppt}(B)]^* = J \text{ppt}(B)$  so that  $[J \text{ppt}(B) - J \text{ppt}(A)]^* = J \text{ppt}(B) - J \text{ppt}(A)$ , and the proof now follows from this immediately by Lemma 14 using (30) and (31). ■

Now we explore some necessary and sufficient conditions for (34) and (35) to be true. To do this we need some auxiliary results. First, it is clear from Corollary 16 and the statement of Theorem 1 that it is important to know under what additional conditions, besides  $A_{22}^* = A_{22} \leq B_{22} = B_{22}^*$ , do we need in order to guarantee that  $B_{22}^+ \leq A_{22}^+$  is true? The following well-known statement on the monotonicity of the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse (see, for instance, [12, Lemma 4, Theorem 2], [16, Theorem 3.8], [56, 39], [63, Chap. 8]) is a satisfactory answer for our purposes.

**Lemma 17** *If  $C^* = C, D^* = D \in M_m(\mathbb{F})$  and  $C \leq D$  then*

$$D^+ \leq C^+ \iff \ker C = \ker D, i_-(C) = i_-(D), \quad (36)$$

where  $i_-(\cdot)$  denotes the number of negative eigenvalues (counting multiplicities) of a self-adjoint matrix. In particular, if  $0 \leq C \leq D$  then  $D^+ \leq C^+$  if and only if  $\ker C = \ker D$ .

Next, we need the following extension of [25, Lemma 6.1]. In our lemma, formula (37) with (39) may appropriately be called a generalized Aitken block-diagonalization formula {cf. Eqs. (0.9.1) and (6.0.20) in Secs. 0.9 and 6.0.4, respectively, in [93]}.

**Lemma 18** *If  $A = [A_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2} \in M_n(\mathbb{F})$  then*

$$\begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} & -X \\ 0 & I_{n_2} \end{bmatrix} A \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} & 0 \\ -Y & I_{n_2} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} W & 0 \\ 0 & Z \end{bmatrix} \quad (37)$$

for some  $X \in M_{n_1 \times n_2}(\mathbb{F}), Y \in M_{n_2 \times n_1}(\mathbb{F}), Z \in M_{n_2}(\mathbb{F}), W \in M_{n_1}(\mathbb{F})$  if and only if

$$\ker A_{22} \subseteq \ker A_{12} \text{ and } \text{ran } A_{21} \subseteq \text{ran } A_{22}, \quad (38)$$

in which case

$$Z = A_{22}, W = A/A_{22}. \quad (39)$$

**Proof.** Assume the hypotheses, where  $A_{ij} \in M_{n_i \times n_j}(\mathbb{F})$  for  $i, j = 1, 2$ . First, using the fact that

$$A_{22}^+ A_{22} A_{22}^+ = A_{22}^+,$$

it follows by block multiplication that

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} & -A_{12}A_{22}^+ \\ 0 & I_{n_2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} & 0 \\ -A_{22}^+A_{21} & I_{n_2} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} A/A_{11} & A_{12} - A_{12}A_{22}^+A_{22} \\ A_{21} - A_{22}A_{22}^+A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Second, we have

$$\ker A_{22} \subseteq \ker A_{12} \iff A_{12} - A_{12}A_{22}^+A_{22} = 0.$$

Third, we have

$$\operatorname{ran} A_{21} \subseteq \operatorname{ran} A_{22} \iff A_{21} - A_{22}A_{22}^+A_{21} = 0.$$

This proves that

$$\begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} & -A_{12}A_{22}^+ \\ 0 & I_{n_2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} & 0 \\ -A_{22}^+A_{21} & I_{n_2} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A/A_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & A_{22} \end{bmatrix}.$$

( $\Leftarrow$ ): Suppose the inclusions (38) hold. Then it follows from these facts that 37 is true, where we can take  $X = A_{12}A_{22}^+$ ,  $Y = A_{22}^+A_{21}$ ,  $Z = A_{22}$ ,  $W = A/A_{22}$ . ( $\Rightarrow$ ): Conversely, suppose (37) holds for some  $X \in M_{n_1 \times n_2}(\mathbb{F})$ ,  $Y \in M_{n_2 \times n_1}(\mathbb{F})$ ,  $Z \in M_{n_2}(\mathbb{F})$ ,  $W \in M_{n_1}(\mathbb{F})$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} & X \\ 0 & I_{n_2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} W & 0 \\ 0 & Z \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} & 0 \\ Y & I_{n_2} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} W & XZ \\ 0 & Z \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} & 0 \\ Y & I_{n_2} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} W + XZY & XZ \\ ZY & Z \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

implying

$$\begin{aligned} A_{22} &= Z, A_{12} = XZ, A_{21} = ZY, \\ W &= A_{11} - XZY = A_{11} - XZZ^+ZY = A_{11} - A_{12}A_{22}^+A_{21} = A/A_{22}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that

$$A_{22}A_{22}^+A_{22} = A_{22}.$$

From these equalities it follows immediately that (38) and (39) are true.  $\blacksquare$

The next proposition is the key result we need to prove that (a)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (b) in Theorem 1.

**Proposition 19** *If  $A = [A_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2}$ ,  $B = [B_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2} \in M_n(\mathbb{F})$  with  $\ker A_{22} = \ker B_{22}$ ,  $\operatorname{ran} A_{22} = \operatorname{ran} B_{22}$ ,  $\ker(B_{22} - A_{22}) \subseteq \ker(B_{12} - A_{12})$ , and  $\operatorname{ran}(B_{21} - A_{21}) \subseteq \operatorname{ran}(B_{22} - A_{22})$  then*

$$\ker(A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+) \subseteq \ker(B_{12}B_{22}^+ - A_{12}A_{22}^+), \quad (40)$$

$$\operatorname{ran}(B_{22}^+B_{21} - A_{22}^+A_{21}) \subseteq \operatorname{ran}(A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+). \quad (41)$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} &(A_{12}A_{22}^+ - B_{12}B_{22}^+)(A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+)^+(A_{22}^+A_{21} - B_{22}^+B_{21}) \\ &= (A_{12}A_{22}^+ - B_{12}B_{22}^+)[A_{22} + A_{22}(B_{22} - A_{22})^+A_{22}](A_{22}^+A_{21} - B_{22}^+B_{21}). \quad (42) \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$(B - A)/(B - A)_{22} = B/B_{22} - A/A_{22} - (B_{12}B_{22}^+ - A_{12}A_{22}^+)(A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+)^+(B_{22}^+B_{21} - A_{22}^+A_{21}). \quad (43)$$

**Proof.** Assume the hypotheses. Then as  $\ker(B_{22} - A_{22}) \subseteq \ker(B_{12} - A_{12})$ , it follows that

$$\ker(B_{22} - A_{22}) \subseteq \ker[(B_{12}B_{22}^+A_{22} - A_{12}) + B_{12}(I_{n_2} - B_{22}^+B_{22})]. \quad (44)$$

Next, as  $\ker A_{22} = \ker B_{22}$ ,  $\text{ran } A_{22} = \text{ran } B_{22}$ , then  $A_{22}A_{22}^+ = B_{22}B_{22}^+$ , and  $A_{22}^+A_{22} = B_{22}^+B_{22}$  from which it follows, using also the identity  $A_{22}^+A_{22}A_{22}^+ = A_{22}^+$ , that

$$\begin{aligned} [(B_{12}B_{22}^+A_{22} - A_{12}) + B_{12}(I_{n_2} - B_{22}^+B_{22})]A_{22}^+ &= B_{12}B_{22}^+ - A_{12}A_{22}^+, \\ B_{22}A_{22}^+ - A_{22}A_{22}^+ &= B_{22}A_{22}^+ - B_{22}B_{22}^+ = B_{22}(A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+). \end{aligned}$$

It now follows immediately from these facts that

$$\begin{aligned} \ker(B_{22}A_{22}^+ - A_{22}A_{22}^+) &\subseteq \ker(B_{12}B_{22}^+ - A_{12}A_{22}^+), \\ \ker(A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+) &\subseteq \ker(B_{22}(A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+)) = \ker(B_{22}A_{22}^+ - A_{22}A_{22}^+), \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\ker(A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+) \subseteq \ker(B_{22}A_{22}^+ - A_{22}A_{22}^+) \subseteq \ker(B_{12}B_{22}^+ - A_{12}A_{22}^+).$$

Now since  $\text{ran}(B_{21} - A_{21}) \subseteq \text{ran}(B_{22} - A_{22})$  implies  $\ker((B^*)_{22} - (A^*)_{22}) \subseteq \ker((B^*)_{12} - (A^*)_{12})$ , then by interchanging the role of  $A, B$  with  $A^*, B^*$  in the proof we just gave and taking orthogonal complements, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ran}[(A_{22}B_{22}^+B_{21} - A_{21}) + (I_{n_2} - B_{22}B_{22}^+)B_{21}] &\subseteq \text{ran}(B_{22} - A_{22}), \\ \text{ran}(B_{22}^+B_{21} - A_{22}^+A_{21}) &\subseteq \text{ran}(A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have proven the inclusions (40) and (41) hold. Next, it follows from these inclusions that

$$\begin{aligned} A_{12}A_{22}^+ - B_{12}B_{22}^+ &= (A_{12}A_{22}^+ - B_{12}B_{22}^+)(A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+)^+(A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+), \\ A_{22}^+A_{21} - B_{22}^+B_{21} &= (A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+)(A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+)^+(A_{22}^+A_{21} - B_{22}^+B_{21}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, in order to prove the identity (42), we need only prove the claim that

$$\begin{aligned} (A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+)^+(A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+)[A_{22} + A_{22}(B_{22} - A_{22})^+A_{22}](A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+)(A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+)^+ \\ = (A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+)^+. \end{aligned}$$

First,

$$\begin{aligned}
& (A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+)[A_{22} + A_{22}(B_{22} - A_{22})^+ A_{22}](A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+) \\
= & (A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+)A_{22}(A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+) + (A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+)A_{22}(B_{22} - A_{22})^+ A_{22}(A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+) \\
& = (A_{22}^+ A_{22} - B_{22}^+ A_{22})(A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+) \\
& \quad + (A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+)A_{22}(B_{22} - A_{22})^+ A_{22}(A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+) \\
= & (A_{22}^+ A_{22} - B_{22}^+ A_{22})A_{22}^+ - (A_{22}^+ A_{22} - B_{22}^+ A_{22})B_{22}^+ \\
& \quad + (A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+)A_{22}(B_{22} - A_{22})^+ A_{22}(A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+) \\
= & (A_{22}^+ A_{22} A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+ A_{22} A_{22}^+) - (A_{22}^+ A_{22} B_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+ A_{22} B_{22}^+) \\
& \quad + (A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+)A_{22}(B_{22} - A_{22})^+ A_{22}(A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+) \\
= & (A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+ B_{22} B_{22}^+) - (B_{22}^+ B_{22} B_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+ A_{22} B_{22}^+) \\
& \quad + (A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+)A_{22}(B_{22} - A_{22})^+ A_{22}(A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+) \\
& = A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+ \\
& \quad + B_{22}^+ A_{22} B_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+ + (A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+)A_{22}(B_{22} - A_{22})^+ A_{22}(A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+) \\
& = A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+ \\
& \quad + B_{22}^+ A_{22} B_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+ + (A_{22}^+ A_{22} - B_{22}^+ A_{22})(B_{22} - A_{22})^+ (A_{22} A_{22}^+ - A_{22} B_{22}^+) \\
& = A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+ \\
& \quad + B_{22}^+ A_{22} B_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+ + (B_{22}^+ B_{22} - B_{22}^+ A_{22})(B_{22} - A_{22})^+ (B_{22} B_{22}^+ - A_{22} B_{22}^+) \\
& = A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+ \\
& \quad + B_{22}^+ A_{22} B_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+ + B_{22}^+ (B_{22} - A_{22})(B_{22} - A_{22})^+ (B_{22} - A_{22}) B_{22}^+ \\
& = A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+ + B_{22}^+ A_{22} B_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+ + B_{22}^+ (B_{22} - A_{22}) B_{22}^+ \\
= & A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+ + B_{22}^+ A_{22} B_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+ + (B_{22}^+ B_{22} B_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+ A_{22} B_{22}^+) \\
& = A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+.
\end{aligned}$$

Second,

$$(A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+)^+ (A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+) (A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+)^+ = (A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+)^+.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
& (A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+)^+ (A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+) [A_{22} + A_{22}(B_{22} - A_{22})^+ A_{22}] (A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+) (A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+)^+ \\
& = (A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+)^+ (A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+) (A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+)^+ \\
& = (A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+)^+.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim, which proves the identity (42).

We are now ready to prove the equality (43). First, since  $A_{22}^+ A_{22} = B_{22}^+ B_{22}$

and  $A_{22}A_{22}^+ = B_{22}B_{22}^+$ , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} & -B_{12}B_{22}^+ \\ 0 & I_{n_2} \end{bmatrix} A \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} & 0 \\ -B_{22}^+B_{21} & I_{n_2} \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} & -B_{12}B_{22}^+ \\ 0 & I_{n_2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} & 0 \\ -B_{22}^+B_{21} & I_{n_2} \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} A/A_{22} + A_{12}(A_{22}^+A_{21} - B_{22}^+B_{21}) \\ +B_{12}B_{22}^+(-A_{21} + A_{22}B_{22}^+B_{21}) & A_{12} - B_{12}B_{22}^+A_{22} \\ A_{21} - A_{22}B_{22}^+B_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} A/A_{22} + A_{12}A_{22}^+A_{22}(A_{22}^+A_{21} - B_{22}^+B_{21}) \\ -B_{12}B_{22}^+A_{22}(A_{22}^+A_{21} - B_{22}^+B_{21}) & A_{12} - B_{12}B_{22}^+A_{22} \\ A_{21} - A_{22}B_{22}^+B_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} A/A_{22} + (A_{12}A_{22}^+ - B_{12}B_{22}^+)A_{22}(A_{22}^+A_{21} - B_{22}^+B_{21}) & A_{12} - B_{12}B_{22}^+A_{22} \\ A_{21} - A_{22}B_{22}^+B_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, by block multiplication [cf. (3)] we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} & -B_{12}B_{22}^+ \\ 0 & I_{n_2} \end{bmatrix} B \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} & 0 \\ -B_{22}^+B_{21} & I_{n_2} \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} B/B_{22} & B_{12}(I_{n_2} - B_{22}^+B_{22}) \\ (I_{n_2} - B_{22}B_{22}^+)B_{21} & B_{22} \end{bmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} & -B_{12}B_{22}^+ \\ 0 & I_{n_2} \end{bmatrix} (B - A) \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} & 0 \\ -B_{22}^+B_{21} & I_{n_2} \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} B/B_{22} & B_{12}(I_{n_2} - B_{22}^+B_{22}) \\ (I_{n_2} - B_{22}B_{22}^+)B_{21} & B_{22} \end{bmatrix} \\
&\quad - \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} & -B_{12}B_{22}^+ \\ 0 & I_{n_2} \end{bmatrix} A \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} & 0 \\ -B_{22}^+B_{21} & I_{n_2} \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} B/B_{22} & B_{12}(I_{n_2} - B_{22}^+B_{22}) \\ (I_{n_2} - B_{22}B_{22}^+)B_{21} & B_{22} \end{bmatrix} \\
&\quad - \begin{bmatrix} A/A_{22} + (A_{12}A_{22}^+ - B_{12}B_{22}^+)A_{22}(A_{22}^+A_{21} - B_{22}^+B_{21}) & A_{12} - B_{12}B_{22}^+A_{22} \\ A_{21} - A_{22}B_{22}^+B_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} [B/B_{22} - A/A_{22}] & [(B_{12}B_{22}^+A_{22} - A_{12})] \\ -(A_{12}A_{22}^+ - B_{12}B_{22}^+)A_{22}(A_{22}^+A_{21} - B_{22}^+B_{21}) & +B_{12}(I_{n_2} - B_{22}^+B_{22}) \\ (A_{22}B_{22}^+B_{21} - A_{21}) + (I_{n_2} - B_{22}B_{22}^+)B_{21} & B_{22} - A_{22} \end{bmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, the inclusions (44) and (3) together with this block form implies, by the generalized Aitken block diagonal formula (3) in the proof of Lemma 18, that

$$\begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} & M \\ 0 & I_{n_2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} & -B_{12}B_{22}^+ \\ 0 & I_{n_2} \end{bmatrix} (B - A) \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} & 0 \\ -B_{22}^+B_{21} & I_{n_2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} & 0 \\ N & I_{n_2} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} S & 0 \\ 0 & B_{22} - A_{22} \end{bmatrix},$$



where

$$\begin{aligned}
M &= -[(B_{12}B_{22}^+A_{22} - A_{12}) + B_{12}(I_{n_2} - B_{22}^+B_{22})](B_{22} - A_{22})^+, \\
N &= -(B_{22} - A_{22})^+[(A_{22}B_{22}^+B_{21} - A_{21}) + (I_{n_2} - B_{22}B_{22}^+)B_{21}], \\
S &= B/B_{22} - A/A_{22} - (A_{12}A_{22}^+ - B_{12}B_{22}^+)A_{22}(A_{22}^+A_{21} - B_{22}^+B_{21}) - S_1S_2, \\
S_1 &= [(B_{12}B_{22}^+A_{22} - A_{12}) + B_{12}(I_{n_2} - B_{22}^+B_{22})], \\
S_2 &= (B_{22} - A_{22})^+[(A_{22}B_{22}^+B_{21} - A_{21}) + (I_{n_2} - B_{22}B_{22}^+)B_{21}].
\end{aligned}$$

It also follows from this and Lemma 18 that

$$S = (B - A)/(B - A)_{22}.$$

Next, we claim that

$$(I_{n_2} - B_{22}^+B_{22})(B_{22} - A_{22})^+ = 0, (B_{22} - A_{22})^+(I_{n_2} - B_{22}B_{22}^+) = 0. \quad (45)$$

First, we know that  $I_{n_2} - B_{22}^+B_{22}$  is the orthogonal projection of  $\mathbb{F}^{n_2}$  onto  $\ker B_{22}$ . Second, we know by fundamental properties of the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse that

$$\ker[(B_{22} - A_{22})^+]^* = \ker[(B_{22} - A_{22})^*]^+ = \ker[(B_{22} - A_{22})^*]^* = \ker(B_{22} - A_{22}).$$

Next, we know that  $\text{ran}(I_{n_2} - B_{22}^+B_{22}) = \ker B_{22}$  and from our assumption that  $\ker A_{22} = \ker B_{22}$ , it follows that  $\ker A_{22} = \ker B_{22} \subseteq \ker(B_{22} - A_{22})$ . Putting all this together, we have

$$(I_{n_2} - B_{22}^+B_{22})(B_{22} - A_{22})^+ = \{[(B_{22} - A_{22})^+]^*(I_{n_2} - B_{22}^+B_{22})\}^* = 0^* = 0.$$

Now, by interchanging the roll of  $A_{22}, B_{22}$  with  $(A^*)_{22}, (B^*)_{22}$  in the proof we just gave and using the hypothesis that  $\text{ran}(A_{22}) = \text{ran}(B_{22})$  [which is equivalent to  $\ker(A^*)_{22} = \ker(B^*)_{22}$ ], it follows that

$$(I_{n_2} - (B^*)_{22}^+(B^*)_{22}^*)((B^*)_{22} - (A^*)_{22})^+ = 0,$$

and then taking adjoints of this proves our claim. Thus, it follows now from the identities (45), the equalities  $A_{22}^+A_{22} = B_{22}^+B_{22}$  and  $A_{22}A_{22}^+ = B_{22}B_{22}^+$ , and

(42) that

$$\begin{aligned}
M &= -(B_{12}B_{22}^+A_{22} - A_{12})(B_{22} - A_{22})^+, \\
N &= -(B_{22} - A_{22})^+(A_{22}B_{22}^+B_{21} - A_{21}), \\
S &= B/B_{22} - A/A_{22} - (A_{12}A_{22}^+ - B_{12}B_{22}^+)A_{22}(A_{22}^+A_{21} - B_{22}^+B_{21}) \\
&\quad - (B_{12}B_{22}^+A_{22} - A_{12})(B_{22} - A_{22})^+(A_{22}B_{22}^+B_{21} - A_{21}) \\
&= B/B_{22} - A/A_{22} - (A_{12}A_{22}^+ - B_{12}B_{22}^+)A_{22}(A_{22}^+A_{21} - B_{22}^+B_{21}) \\
&\quad - (B_{12}B_{22}^+A_{22} - A_{12})A_{22}^+A_{22}(B_{22} - A_{22})^+A_{22}A_{22}^+(A_{22}B_{22}^+B_{21} - A_{21}) \\
&= B/B_{22} - A/A_{22} - (A_{12}A_{22}^+ - B_{12}B_{22}^+)A_{22}(A_{22}^+A_{21} - B_{22}^+B_{21}) \\
&\quad - (B_{12}B_{22}^+ - A_{12}A_{22}^+)A_{22}(B_{22} - A_{22})^+A_{22}(B_{22}^+B_{21} - A_{22}^+A_{21}) \\
&\quad = B/B_{22} - A/A_{22} \\
&\quad - (A_{12}A_{22}^+ - B_{12}B_{22}^+)[A_{22} + A_{22}(B_{22} - A_{22})^+A_{22}](A_{22}^+A_{21} - B_{22}^+B_{21}) \\
&= B/B_{22} - A/A_{22} - (B_{12}B_{22}^+ - A_{12}A_{22}^+)(A_{22}^+ - B_{22}^+)^+(B_{22}^+B_{21} - A_{22}^+A_{21}).
\end{aligned}$$

This proves (43) and completes the proof of the proposition. ■

We are now ready to prove  $(a) \Leftrightarrow (b)$  in Theorem 1.

**Proof of  $(a) \Leftrightarrow (b)$  in Theorem 1.** Assume the hypotheses in Theorem 1.  $[(a) \Rightarrow (b)]$ : Suppose  $J \text{ppt}(A) \leq J \text{ppt}(B)$ . Then  $(B_{22})^+ \leq (A_{22})^+$  by Corollary 16 and

$$A/A_{22} = [J \text{ppt}(A)]_{11} \leq [J \text{ppt}(B)]_{11} = B/B_{22}.$$

$[(b) \Rightarrow (a)]$ : Conversely, suppose  $(B_{22})^+ \leq (A_{22})^+$ . We begin by showing that the hypotheses of Proposition 19 are satisfied. First, Lemma 17 implies that  $\ker(A_{22}) = \ker(B_{22})$  and hence  $\text{ran}(A_{22}) = \text{ran}(B_{22})$ . Second, since  $(B - A)^* = B - A, 0 \leq B - A$  then it follows by Lemma 14 that  $0 \leq (B - A)/(B - A)_{22}, \ker(B_{22} - A_{22}) \subseteq \ker(B_{12} - A_{12})$  and the latter implies that  $\text{ran}(B_{21} - A_{21}) \subseteq \text{ran}(B_{22} - A_{22})$ . Thus, we have proved the hypotheses of Proposition 19 are satisfied. The proof of the theorem now follows immediately from this proposition and Corollary 16. ■

Before we move on, let us now compare our Proposition 19, the statement that  $(b) \Rightarrow (a)$  in Theorem 1, and their proof in the self-adjoint case  $A^* = A, B^* = B$  to Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.3, respectively, of Clement and Wimmer in [25]. First, our Proposition 19 is a stronger result than [25, Lemma 2.2] since, although we both require that  $\ker A_{22} = \ker B_{22}, \ker(B_{22} - A_{22}) \subseteq \ker(B_{12} - A_{12})$  {cf. (2.8) and (2.9) in [25]}, we don't require the hypotheses  $\ker A_{22} \subseteq \ker A_{12}, \ker B_{22} \subseteq \ker B_{12}$  {cf. (2.8) in [25]} in order to get the same conclusion (43) {cf. (2.10) in [25]}. Second, our Theorem 1 that  $(b) \Rightarrow (a)$ , is a stronger result than [25, Lemma 2.3] since we do not need to assume that  $\ker B_{22} \subseteq \ker B_{12}$  in order to get the same conclusion (7) {cf. (2.14) in [25]}. Moreover, in essence, the main difference in our proof of Proposition 19 and that  $(b) \Rightarrow (a)$  in Theorem 1 vs. the proof of Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.3 in [25] is that we found a way to avoid using their hypothesis  $\ker B_{22} \subseteq \ker B_{12}$  to achieve the

same conclusions. The following example is useful to consider in regard to this discussion.

**Example 20** Let  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$  or  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$ . Consider the function  $J \text{ppt}(\cdot)$  on the following the following  $2 \times 2$  block matrices  $A^* = A = [A_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2}$ ,  $B^* = B = [B_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2} \in M_4(\mathbb{F})$ ,

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & -\frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \\ -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 1 & -\frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (46)$$

$$J \text{ppt}(A) = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{1}{8} & 0 & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline \frac{1}{4} & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{4} & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad J \text{ppt}(B) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{7}{16} & 0 & \frac{1}{8} & \frac{1}{8} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline \frac{1}{8} & 0 & -\frac{1}{4} & -\frac{1}{4} \\ \frac{1}{8} & 0 & -\frac{1}{4} & -\frac{1}{4} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (47)$$

Then  $A \leq B$  so that the hypotheses of Theorem 1 are satisfied and, in particular, we know by this theorem that  $A/A_{22} \leq B/B_{22}$  and  $J \text{ppt}(A) \leq J \text{ppt}(B)$  since

$$B_{22}^+ = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}^+ = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} \\ \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} \end{bmatrix} \leq \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \end{bmatrix}^+ = A_{22}^+. \quad (48)$$

On the other hand, we cannot use Lemma 2.3 in [25] to prove that  $A/A_{22} \leq B/B_{22}$  since

$$\ker(B_{22}) = \text{span} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} -1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\} \not\subseteq \text{span} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix} \right\} = \ker(B_{12}). \quad (49)$$

We now complete the proof of Theorem 1 by proving that statements (b) and (c) are equivalent. Before we do this we need the following results from [43, Observation (7)] (cf. [44, Observation 3.1]) and [40, Theorem 2.1] (cf. [81, Theorem 5]) which is complementary to Lemma 17 above.

**Lemma 21** If  $C^* = C, D^* = D \in M_m(\mathbb{F})$ , and  $D$  is invertible then

$$\det[(1-t)C + tD] \neq 0, \forall t \in [0, 1] \iff \sigma(D^{-1}C) \cap (-\infty, 0] = \emptyset, \quad (50)$$

where  $\sigma(D^{-1}C)$  denotes the set of all eigenvalues of  $D^{-1}C$ . Furthermore, if  $C \leq D$  then  $\sigma(D^{-1}C) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  and

$$\sigma(D^{-1}C) \cap (-\infty, 0] = \emptyset \iff D^{-1} \leq C^{-1}. \quad (51)$$

**Proof of (b)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (c) in Theorem 1.** Assume the hypotheses in Theorem 1. We begin by proving (c)  $\Rightarrow$  (b) in Theorem 1. To do this we can assume without loss of generality that  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$ . Observe that, since  $A_{22}^* = A_{22}, B_{22}^* = B_{22}, 0 \leq B_{22} - A_{22}$ , then it follows that the holomorphic  $n_2 \times n_2$ -matrix-valued function  $H : \mathbb{C}^+ \rightarrow M_{n_2}(\mathbb{C})$  defined by

$$H(t) = (1-t)A_{22} + tB_{22} = A_{22} + t(B_{22} - A_{22}), \quad t \in \mathbb{C}$$

is a matrix-valued Herglotz-Nevanlinna function on the open upper half of the complex plane  $\mathbb{C}^+ = \{t \in \mathbb{C} : \text{Im } z > 0\}$ . Let

$$r = \text{rank } H(i).$$

In the case  $r = 0$ , it follows that  $H(i) = 0$  and hence  $A_{22} = B_{22} = 0$  so that (b)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (c) in Theorem 1 is true in this case. Now assume that  $r \neq 0$ . Then by well-known theorems on matrix-valued Herglotz-Nevanlinna functions (see [34, 32, 31, 33]), it follows that there exists a unitary matrix  $U \in M_{n_2}(\mathbb{C})$  and matrices  $H_0^* = H_0, H_1^* = H_1 \in M_r(\mathbb{C})$  with  $0 \leq H_1$  such that

$$H(t) = U^* \begin{bmatrix} h(t) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} U, \quad h(t) = H_0 + tH_1, \quad t \in \mathbb{C},$$

the set

$$Z = \{t \in \mathbb{C} : \text{rank } H(t) \neq r\} = \{t \in \mathbb{C} : \det h(t) = 0\}$$

contains a finite number of elements with  $Z \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ , and the function  $H^+ : \mathbb{C} \setminus Z \rightarrow M_{n_2}(\mathbb{C})$  defined by

$$H^+(t) = H(t)^+ = U^* \begin{bmatrix} h(t)^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} U, \quad t \in \mathbb{C} \setminus Z$$

is a holomorphic  $n_2 \times n_2$ -matrix-valued function (in which  $-H^+$  is a matrix-valued Herglotz-Nevanlinna function on  $\mathbb{C}^+$ ). Moreover, it follows that  $H^+$  is continuously differentiable on  $\mathbb{R} \setminus Z$  with  $H^+(t)^* = H^+(t)$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R} \setminus Z$  and

$$\begin{aligned} (H^+)'(t) &= \frac{d}{dt} H(t)^+ = U^* \begin{bmatrix} \frac{d}{dt} h(t)^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} U = U^* \begin{bmatrix} -h(t)^{-1} h'(t) h(t)^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} U \\ &= -H^+(t) H'(t) H^+(t) = -H^+(t) (B_{22} - A_{22}) H^+(t) \leq 0, \quad t \in \mathbb{R} \setminus Z. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, it follows immediately from this that  $\text{rank } H(t)$  is constant on an interval  $[a, b] \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  if and only if  $[a, b] \subseteq \mathbb{R} \setminus Z$ , in which case

$$H(b)^+ = H(a)^+ + \int_a^b (H^+)'(t) dt \leq H(a)^+.$$

This proves the statement (c)  $\Rightarrow$  (b) in Theorem 1.

We will now prove the statement (b)  $\Rightarrow$  (c) in Theorem 1. Suppose that  $(B_{22})^+ \leq (A_{22})^+$ . If  $A_{22} = B_{22} = 0$  then (b)  $\Rightarrow$  (c) in Theorem 1 in this case. Hence, suppose  $A_{22}$  and  $B_{22}$  are not both the zero matrix. Then by Lemma 17 it follows that  $0 \neq r_0 = \text{rank } A_{22} = \text{rank } B_{22}$  and there exists a matrix  $V \in M_{n_2}(\mathbb{F})$  with  $V^* = V^{-1}$  and invertible self-adjoint matrices  $C, D \in M_{r_0}(\mathbb{F})$  with  $0 \leq D - C$  such that

$$A_{22} = V^* \begin{bmatrix} C & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} V, \quad B_{22} = V^* \begin{bmatrix} D & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} V.$$

It follows from this that

$$H(t) = (1-t)A_{22} + tB_{22} = V^* \begin{bmatrix} (1-t)C + tD & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} V.$$

Thus, to prove the statement (c) in Theorem 1, we need only show that  $\det[(1-t)C + tD] \neq 0$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ . But this follows immediately from Lemma 21 since by the hypothesis that  $(B_{22})^+ \leq (A_{22})^+$  we must have  $D^{-1} \leq C^{-1}$ . ■

## Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Joseph A. Ball for bring to our attention the Potapov-Ginzburg transform in relation to the principal pivot transform. The second author would also like to thank Graeme W. Milton and Maxence Cassier for all the helpful discussions that motivated this paper and which lead him to find the reference [26].

## Funding:

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

## Declarations of interest:

None.

## References

- [1] H. Abou-Kandil, G. Freiling, V. Ionescu, and G. Jank. *Matrix Riccati Equations in Control Systems Theory*. Birkhäuser, 2003. doi:10.1007/978-3-0348-8081-7.
- [2] A. Albert. Conditions for positive and nonnegative definiteness in terms of pseudoinverses. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 17(2):434–440, 1969. doi:10.1137/0117041.
- [3] W. N. Anderson, Jr. Shorted operators. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 20(3):520–525, 1971. doi:10.1137/0120053.
- [4] W. N. Anderson, Jr., T. D. Morley, and G. E. Trapp. Sets of positive operators with suprema. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 11(2):207–212, 1990. doi:10.1137/0611014.
- [5] T. Ando. Concavity of certain maps on positive definite matrices and applications to Hadamard products. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 26:203–241, 1979. doi:10.1016/0024-3795(79)90179-4.

- [6] T. Ando, J. Bunce, and G. Trapp. An alternate variational characterization of matrix Riccati equation solutions. *Circuits, Systems and Signal Processing*, 9(2):223–228, 1990. doi:10.1007/BF01236454.
- [7] V. I. Arnold. *Mathematical Methods of Classical Mechanics*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer, 2013. doi:10.1007/978-1-4757-1693-1.
- [8] D. Z. Arov and H. Dym. *J-Contractive Matrix Valued Functions and Related Topics*. Cambridge University Press, 2008. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511721427.
- [9] D. Z. Arov and H. Dym. *Bitangential Direct and Inverse Problems for Systems of Integral and Differential Equations*. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge University Press, 2012. doi:10.1017/CBO9781139093514.
- [10] D. Z. Arov and O. J. Staffans. *Linear State/Signal Systems*. Cambridge University Press, 2022. doi:10.1017/9781009024921.
- [11] P. Auscher, A. Axelsson, and A. McIntosh. Solvability of elliptic systems with square integrable boundary data. *Arkiv för Matematik*, 48(2):253–287, 2010. doi:10.1007/s11512-009-0108-2.
- [12] J. K. Baksalary, K. Nordström, and G. P. Styan. Löwner-ordering antitonicity of generalized inverse of Hermitian matrices. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 127:171–182, 1990. doi:10.1016/0024-3795(90)90342-A.
- [13] H. Bart, I. Gohberg, M. Kaashoek, and A. Ran. *A State Space Approach to Canonical Factorization with Applications*. Birkhäuser, 2010. doi:10.1007/978-3-7643-8753-2.
- [14] K. Beard. Relaxation of Variational Principles for Z-problems in Effective Media Theory. Master’s thesis, Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, FL, 2022.
- [15] K. Beard, A. Stefan, R. Viator, and A. Welters. Effective operators and their variational principles for discrete electrical network problems. *arXiv:2210.05761 [math-ph]*, preprint, 2022. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2210.05761.
- [16] J. Behrndt, S. Hassi, H. Wietsma, and H. de Snoo. Antitonicity of the inverse for selfadjoint matrices, operators, and relations. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 142(8):2783–2796, 2014. doi:10.1090/S0002-9939-2014-12115-0.
- [17] A. Ben-Israel and T. Greville. *Generalized Inverses: Theory and Applications*. Springer, 2nd edition, 2003. doi:10.2307/2344395.
- [18] M. Benzi, G. H. Golub, and J. Liesen. Numerical solution of saddle point problems. *Acta Numerica*, 14:1–137, 2005. doi:10.1017/S0962492904000212.

- [19] C. A. Butler and T. D. Morley. Six generalized Schur complements. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 106:259–269, 1988. doi:10.1016/0024-3795(88)90033-X.
- [20] S. L. Campbell and C. D. Meyer. *Generalized Inverses of Linear Transformations*. SIAM, 2009. doi:10.1137/1.9780898719048.
- [21] D. Carlson, E. Haynsworth, and T. Markham. A generalization of the Schur complement by means of the Moore–Penrose inverse. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 26(1):169–175, 1974. doi:10.1137/0126013.
- [22] M. Cassier, A. Welters, and G. W. Milton. Analyticity of the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map for the time-harmonic Maxwell’s equations. In G. W. Milton, editor, *Extending the Theory of Composites to Other Areas of Science*, chapter 4. Milton-Patton Publishers, 2016.
- [23] A. Cherkhaev. *Variational Methods for Structural Optimization*. Springer, 2002. doi:10.1007/978-1-4612-1188-4.
- [24] A. V. Cherkhaev and L. V. Gibiansky. Variational principles for complex conductivity, viscoelasticity, and similar problems in media with complex moduli. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 35(1):127–145, 1994. doi:10.1063/1.530782.
- [25] D. J. Clements and H. K. Wimmer. Monotonicity of the optimal cost in the discrete-time regulator problem and Schur complements. *Automatica*, 37(11):1779–1786, 2001. doi:10.1016/S0005-1098(01)00147-9.
- [26] N. Cohen and I. Lewkowicz. A characterization of convex cones of matrices with constant regular inertia. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 318(1):23–33, 2000. doi:10.1016/S0024-3795(00)00126-9.
- [27] R. J. Duffin and G. E. Trapp. Hybrid addition of matrices—network theory concept. *Applicable Analysis*, 2(3):241–254, 1972. doi:10.1080/00036817208839042.
- [28] R. J. Duffin, D. Hazony, and N. Morrison. The gyration operator in network theory. Scientific Report 7, AF 19 (628) 1699, Case Institute of Technology, Jan. 1965.
- [29] R. J. Duffin, D. Hazony, and N. Morrison. Network synthesis through hybrid matrices. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 14(2):390–413, 1966. doi:10.1137/0114032.
- [30] A. Figotin and A. Welters. Lagrangian framework for systems composed of high-loss and lossless components. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 55(6):062902, 2014. doi:10.1063/1.4884298.

- [31] B. Fritzsche, B. Kirstein, A. Lasarow, and A. Rahn. On reciprocal sequences of matricial Carathéodory sequences and associated matrix functions. In D. Alpay and B. Kirstein, editors, *Interpolation, Schur Functions and Moment Problems II*, pages 57–115. Springer Basel, 2012. doi:10.1007/978-3-0348-0428-8\_2.
- [32] B. Fritzsche, B. Kirstein, and C. Mädler. On matrix-valued Herglotz-Nevanlinna functions with an emphasis on particular subclasses. *Mathematische Nachrichten*, 285(14-15):1770–1790, 2012. doi:10.1002/mana.201100247.
- [33] B. Fritzsche, B. Kirstein, and C. Mädler. On matrix-valued Stieltjes functions with an emphasis on particular subclasses. In D. A. Bini, T. Ehrhardt, A. Y. Karlovich, and I. Spitkovsky, editors, *Large Truncated Toeplitz Matrices, Toeplitz Operators, and Related Topics: The Albrecht Böttcher Anniversary Volume*, pages 301–352. Springer, Cham, 2017. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-49182-0\_15.
- [34] F. Gesztesy and E. Tsekanovskii. On matrix-valued Herglotz functions. *Mathematische Nachrichten*, 218(1):61–138, 2000. doi:10.1002/1522-2616(200010)218:1<61::AID-MANA61>3.0.CO;2-D.
- [35] Y. P. Ginzburg. On J-nonexpanding operator functions. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 117:171–173, 1957.
- [36] A. Giovagnoli and H. Wynn. G-majorization with applications to matrix orderings. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 67:111–135, 1985. doi:10.1016/0024-3795(85)90190-9.
- [37] H. Goldstein, C. Poole, and J. Safko. *Classical Mechanics*. Addison Wesley, 2002.
- [38] J. H. Goodnight. A tutorial on the SWEEP operator. *The American Statistician*, 33(3):149–158, 1979. doi:10.1080/00031305.1979.10482685.
- [39] J. Groß. Some remarks on partial orderings of Hermitian matrices. *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, 42(1):53–60, 1997. doi:10.1080/03081089708818490.
- [40] S. Hassi and K. Nordstroem. Antitonicity of the inverse and J-contractivity. In A. Gheondea, D. Timotin, and F.-H. Vasilescu, editors, *Operator Extensions, Interpolation of Functions and Related Topics: 14th International Conference on Operator Theory, Timișoara (Romania), June 1–5, 1992*, pages 149–161. Birkhäuser Basel, 1993. doi:10.1007/978-3-0348-8575-1\_8.
- [41] E. V. Haynsworth. Applications of an inequality for the Schur complement. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 24(3):512–516, 1970. doi:10.2307/2037398.
- [42] D. Hazony. *Elements of Network Synthesis*. Reinhold, 1963.



- [43] C. R. Johnson and L. Rodman. Convex sets of Hermitian matrices with constant inertia. *SIAM Journal on Algebraic Discrete Methods*, 6(3):351–359, 1985. doi:10.1137/0606036.
- [44] C. R. Johnson and M. J. Tsatsomeros. Convex sets of nonsingular and P–matrices. *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, 38(3):233–239, 1995. doi:10.1080/03081089508818359.
- [45] D. G. Kaffes. An inequality for matrices. *Bulletin of the Greek Mathematical Society*, 22:143–159, 1981. <https://hdml.di.ionio.gr/pdfs/journals/300.pdf>.
- [46] D. G. Kaffes, T. Mathew, M. B. Rao, and K. Subramanyam. On the matrix convexity of the Moore—Penrose inverse and some applications. *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, 24(4):265–271, 1989. doi:10.1080/03081088908817920.
- [47] K. Kamaraj, P. S. Johnson, and S. M. Naik. Generalized principal pivot transform and its inheritance properties. *The Journal of Analysis*, 30(3):1241–1256, 2022. doi:10.1007/s41478-022-00399-w.
- [48] H. Kimura. *Chain-Scattering Approach to  $H^\infty$  Control*. Birkhäuser, 1997. doi:10.1007/978-0-8176-8331-3.
- [49] H. Kimura and F. Okunishi. Chain-scattering approach to control system design. In A. Isidori, editor, *Trends in Control*, pages 151–171, London, 1995. Springer. doi:10.1007/978-1-4471-3061-1\_7.
- [50] V. Kostykin and R. Schrader. The generalized star product and the factorization of scattering matrices on graphs. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 42(4):1563–1598, 2001. doi:10.1063/1.1354641.
- [51] M. G. Krein and I. E. Ovcharenko. On the theory of inverse problems for the canonical differential equation. In I. Gohberg and L. A. Sakhnovich, editors, *Matrix and Operator Valued Functions: The Vladimir Petrovich Potapov Memorial Volume*, pages 162–170. Birkhäuser, Basel, 1994. doi:10.1007/978-3-0348-8532-4\_7.
- [52] P. Lancaster and L. Rodman. *Algebraic Riccati Equations*. Oxford science publications. Clarendon Press, 1995.
- [53] K. Lange. *Numerical analysis for statisticians*, volume 2. Springer, 2010. doi:10.1007/978-1-4419-5945-4.
- [54] C.-K. Li and R. Mathias. Extremal characterizations of the Schur complement and resulting inequalities. *SIAM Review*, 42(2):233–246, 2000. doi:10.1137/S0036144599337290.
- [55] L. Li. Formulation and comparison of two recursive matrix algorithms for modeling layered diffraction gratings. *J. Opt. Soc. Am. A*, 13(5):1024–1035, May 1996. doi:10.1364/JOSAA.13.001024.

- [56] E. P. Liski. On Löwner-ordering antitonicity of matrix inversion. *Acta Mathematicae Applicatae Sinica*, 12(4):435–442, 1996. doi:10.1007/BF02029073.
- [57] A. R. Meenakshi. Principal pivot transforms of an EP matrix. *C. R. Math. Rep. Acad. Sci. Canada*, 8(2):121–126, 1986.
- [58] G. W. Milton. On characterizing the set of possible effective tensors of composites: The variational method and the translation method. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 43(1):63–125, 1990. doi:10.1002/cpa.3160430104.
- [59] G. W. Milton. *The Theory of Composites*. Cambridge University Press, 2002. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511613357.
- [60] G. W. Milton, editor. *Extending the Theory of Composites to Other Areas of Science*. Milton-Patton Publishers, 2016. ISBN 978-1483569192.
- [61] G. W. Milton and J. R. Willis. Minimum variational principles for time-harmonic waves in a dissipative medium and associated variational principles of Hashin–Shtrikman type. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 466(2122):3013–3032, 2010. doi:10.1098/rspa.2010.0006.
- [62] G. W. Milton, P. Seppecher, and G. Bouchitté. Minimization variational principles for acoustics, elastodynamics and electromagnetism in lossy inhomogeneous bodies at fixed frequency. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 465(2102):367–396, 2009. doi:10.1098/rspa.2008.0195.
- [63] S. Mitra, P. Bhimasankaram, and S. Malik. *Matrix Partial Orders, Shorted Operators and Applications*. World Scientific, 2010. doi:10.1142/7170.
- [64] S. K. Mitra and G. E. Trapp. On hybrid addition of matrices. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 10(1):19–35, 1975. doi:10.1016/0024-3795(75)90091-9.
- [65] B. Mond and J. E. Pecaric. On matrix convexity of the Moore–Penrose inverse. *International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences*, 19:1–4, 1996. doi:10.1155/S0161171296000968.
- [66] M. H. Moore. A convex matrix function. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 80(4):408–409, 1973. doi:10.1080/00029890.1973.11993296.
- [67] K. Nordström. Convexity of the inverse and Moore–Penrose inverse. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 434(6):1489–1512, 2011. doi:10.1016/j.laa.2010.11.023.
- [68] K. Nordström. A note on the convexity of the Moore–Penrose inverse. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 538:143–148, 2018. doi:10.1016/j.laa.2017.10.016.

- [69] J. Pascoe and R. Tully-Doyle. Monotonicity of the principal pivot transform. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 643:161–165, 2022. doi:10.1016/j.laa.2022.02.016.
- [70] F. Poloni and N. Strabić. Principal pivot transforms of quasidefinite matrices and semidefinite Lagrangian subspaces. *The Electronic Journal of Linear Algebra*, 31:200–231, 2016. doi:10.13001/1081-3810.3132.
- [71] V. P. Potapov. The multiplicative structure of J-contractive matrix functions. *Tr. Mosk. Mat. Obs.*, 4:125–236, 1955. English transl.: Amer. Math. Soc. Transl., Series 2, Volume 15 (1960), 131–243.
- [72] M. Rajesh Kannan and R. Bapat. Generalized principal pivot transform. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 454:49–56, 2014. doi:10.1016/j.laa.2014.04.015.
- [73] M. Rajesh Kannan and R. Bapat. Corrigendum to “Generalized principal pivot transform” [Linear Algebra Appl. 454 (2014) 49–56]. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 459:620–621, 2014. doi:10.1016/j.laa.2014.07.028.
- [74] R. Redheffer. Inequalities for a matrix Riccati equation. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 8:349–367, 1959. doi:10.1512/iumj.1959.8.58024.
- [75] R. Redheffer. Supplementary note on matrix Riccati equations. *Journal of Mathematics and Mechanics*, 9(5):745–748, 1960. doi:10.1512/iumj.1960.9.59046.
- [76] R. Redheffer. On the relation of transmission-line theory to scattering and transfer. *Journal of Mathematics and Physics*, 41(1-4):1–41, 1962. doi:10.1002/sapm19624111.
- [77] R. Redheffer. Difference equations and functional equations in transmissionline theory. In E. Beckenbach, editor, *Modern mathematics for the engineer: Second Series*, chapter 12. Dover, 2013.
- [78] W. T. Reid. *Riccati Differential Equations*. Academic Press, 1972. doi:10.1016/S0076-5392(08)61162-5.
- [79] R. B. Richins. A saddle point numerical method for Helmholtz equations. *Journal of Computational Mathematics*, 35(1):19–36, 2017. doi:10.4208/jcm.1604-m2014-0136.
- [80] Richins, Russell B. and Dobson, David C. A numerical minimization scheme for the complex Helmholtz equation. *ESAIM: M2AN*, 46(1):39–57, 2012. doi:10.1051/m2an/2011017.
- [81] Y. L. Shmul’yan. A question regarding inequalities between Hermitian operators. *Mathematical notes of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR*, 49(4):423–425, 1991. doi:10.1007/BF01158223.

- [82] B. Simon. *Loewner's Theorem on Monotone Matrix Functions*. Springer, 2019. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-22422-6.
- [83] K. C. Sivakumar, G. Ravindran, and K. Bisht. Pseudo Schur complements, pseudo principal pivot transforms and their inheritance properties. *The Electronic Journal of Linear Algebra*, 30:455–477, 2015. doi:10.13001/1081-3810.2825.
- [84] A. Stefan and A. Welters. Extension of the Bessmertnyĭ realization theorem for rational functions of several complex variables. *Complex Analysis and Operator Theory*, 15:1–74, 2021. doi:10.1007/s11785-021-01150-2.
- [85] M. Stewart and G. W. Stewart. On hyperbolic triangularization: Stability and pivoting. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 19(4):847–860, 1998. doi:10.1137/S0895479897319581.
- [86] L. Tan and A. C. Pugh. Non-standard  $H_\infty$  control problem: A generalized chain-scattering representation approach. *International Journal of Control*, 75(11):775–783, 2002. doi:10.1080/00207170210141833.
- [87] B. D. Tellegen. The gyrator, a new electric network element. *Philips Res. Rep*, 3(2):81–101, 1948.
- [88] G. E. Trapp. The Riccati equation and the geometric mean. *Contemp. Math*, 47:437–445, 1985.
- [89] M. J. Tsatsomeros. Principal pivot transforms: properties and applications. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 307(1):151–165, 2000. doi:10.1016/S0024-3795(99)00281-5.
- [90] A. W. Tucker. A combinatorial equivalence of matrices. In R. Bellman and M. Hall, editors, *Combinatorial Analysis*, volume 10 of *Proceedings of symposia in applied mathematics*, pages 129–140. American Mathematical Society, 1960. doi:10.1090/psapm/010.
- [91] A. W. Tucker. Principal pivotal transforms of square matrices. *SIAM Review*, 5(3):305, 1963.
- [92] N. Wermuth, M. Wiedenbeck, and D. R. Cox. Partial inversion for linear systems and partial closure of independence graphs. *BIT Numerical Mathematics*, 46(4):883–901, 2006. doi:10.1007/s10543-006-0093-9.
- [93] F. Zhang, editor. *The Schur Complement and its Applications*. Springer-Verlag, 2005. doi:10.1007/b105056.