

A simplification of the C -realizability criterion for the Nonnegative Inverse Eigenvalue Problem for integers

Alberto Borobia* and Roberto Canogar†

January 17, 2024

Abstract

A multiset $\Lambda = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ of complex numbers is said to be realizable whenever there exists a nonnegative matrix of order n with spectrum Λ . One of the broadest criterion that guarantees realizability is the C -realizability. It says that Λ , with real numbers, is C -realizable if it can be obtained starting from n basic multisets $\{0\}, \dots, \{0\}$ by successively applying any finite number of times any of the following rules: (a) join two of the multisets; (b) increase by $\epsilon > 0$ the Perron root of one of the multisets; (c) increase by $\epsilon > 0$ the Perron root of one of the multisets and simultaneously increase or decrease by ϵ any other value of the same multiset.

If in the above rules we restrict ϵ to be an integer number, then we will always obtain multisets of integers. And for integers, this work proves that the collection of original rules (a)–(c) is equivalent to a simplified collection: (a) join two of the multisets; (b') increase by 1 the Perron root of one of the multisets ; and (c') increase by 1 the Perron root of one of the multisets and simultaneously decrease by 1 a non-positive value of the same multiset. This simplification is useful if we want to decide if a given multiset of integers is C -realizable or not.

Keywords: Nonnegative matrices; Nonnegative inverse eigenvalue problem; realizable spectra; realizability criteria; C -realizability.

AMS Subject Classification: 15A18, 15A29.

1 Introduction

A matrix is nonnegative if all its entries are nonnegative numbers. A multiset $\Lambda = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ of complex numbers is said to be realizable if there exists a nonnegative matrix with spectrum Λ . In 1949 Suleimanova posed the nonnegative inverse eigenvalue problem (NIEP), which is the problem of determining which multisets of complex numbers are realizable. A thorough survey for the NIEP was provided by Johnson et al. [7].

The version for reals of the NIEP, the RNIEP, asks for realizable multisets of real numbers. The RNIEP has a broad literature, where special attention has been focused on obtaining criteria of realizability. Here we are interested in one of such criteria, namely the C -realizability (see Borobia, Moro and Soto [2, 3]). First, we give three classical results (the first and second are well known, and the third is due to Guo).

Theorem 1. *Let Λ and Γ be two realizable multisets of \mathbb{C} , then $\Lambda \cup \Gamma$ is realizable.*

Theorem 2. *Let $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ be a realizable multiset of \mathbb{C} whose Perron root is λ_1 . Then for any $\epsilon > 0$ the multiset $\{\lambda_1 + \epsilon, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ is realizable .*

Theorem 3. [6] *Let $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ be a realizable multiset of \mathbb{C} whose Perron root is λ_1 and let λ_2 be real. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$, the multiset $\{\lambda_1 + \epsilon, \lambda_2 \pm \epsilon, \lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ is realizable.*

Based on these theorems, a new criterion for the RNIEP was introduced in [3]. Theorems 1, 2, and 3 can be applied to realizable multisets Λ and Γ of \mathbb{C} . But note that whenever Λ and Γ are multisets of \mathbb{R} , then the result of the rules is a multiset of \mathbb{R} as well. In the next definition we start with the collection of realizable real multisets $\{0\}, \dots, \{0\}$, so we will always obtain real multisets.

Definition 4. A multiset $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ of \mathbb{R} is **C -realizable** if it can be reached starting from the n realizable sets $\{0\}, \dots, \{0\}$ and successively applying any finite number of times any of the Theorems 1, 2, and 3.

And the main result in [3] reads as follows.

*Departamento de Matemáticas, Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia (UNED), email: aborobia@mat.uned.es

†Departamento de Matemáticas, Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia (UNED), email: rcanogar@mat.uned.es

Theorem 5. *If a multiset of \mathbb{R} is C -realizable, then it is realizable.*

Marijuán, Pisonero and Soto [11] (see also [10]) showed that the C -realizability was one of the broadest criteria for the RNIEP. Ellard and Šmigoc [4] proved the equivalence of the C -realizability criterion to other three criteria due to Soto [12], Soules [13] (refined by Elsner, Nabben and Neumann [5]), and their own Ellard-Šmigoc method. As a consequence of this equivalence they concluded that the C -realizability is also a criterion of nonnegative symmetric realizability. The advantage of C -realizability with respect to other criteria is the simplicity of its approach. The main objective of this work is to go further, that is, simplify the basic rules (given by Theorems 1, 2, and 3) that guarantee C -realizability.

Recently, Marijuán and Moro [8] obtained a combinatorial characterization of C -realizable multisets with zero sum (see [9] for the general case), together with explicit formulas for C -realizable multisets having at most four positive entries. It should be noted that the definition of C -realizability that they consider follows from an incomplete version of Theorem 3, more precisely, they omit the realizability of $\{\lambda_1 + \epsilon, \lambda_2 + \epsilon, \lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_n\}$. Intuitively this makes sense because it was thought that its inclusion would not augment the set of realizable lists. For integers that intuition was correct, although it is quite hard to prove as we will see. On the other hand, for rationals and for reals we have not been able to prove it. These difficulties seem to tell us that something deeper than expected is at work here.

In Section 2 we will dedicate special attention to the rule given by Theorem 3, indeed we will partition this rule into four parts. So the three original rules (corresponding to Theorems 1 to 3) become six rules after the partition. Consequently, we will introduce the C_6 and the C_3 -realizability for a multiset, depending on whether we consider the six rules or if we consider only three of them: the one corresponding to Theorem 1, the one corresponding to Theorem 2, and one of the four corresponding to Theorem 3. If the rules only involve integers then we will speak of $C_{\mathbb{Z},6}$ and $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}$ -realizability. These types of realizability can also be extended to rationals or to reals. In Section 3 we introduce states of integer numbers as tuples of tuples of integer numbers: for example, $((5, -5), (2, -1, -1))$ is a state. We provide six transformations or moves that can be applied to states. The six moves for states will correspond to the six rules for multisets. We finish this section providing a collection of laws that any sequence of moves should verify.

It is important to note that when we work with multisets the order of its elements is irrelevant, but when we work with states the order is relevant. In Section 4 we introduce the $C_{\mathbb{Z},6}^*$ and the $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}^*$ -realizability for tuples of integers. This concepts are analogous to $C_{\mathbb{Z},6}$ and $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}$ -realizability, considering the 6 moves instead of the 6 rules, and starting from $((0), \dots, (0))$ instead of $\{0\}, \dots, \{0\}$. And we will finish this section by establishing the relation between $C_{\mathbb{Z},k}$ and $C_{\mathbb{Z},k}^*$ -realizability for $k = 6$ and for $k = 3$.

In Section 5 we study the swap of two consecutive moves: let M_1 and M_2 be two consecutive moves applied to a state Λ , then these moves can be swapped whenever $M_2(\Lambda)$ and $M_1(M_2(\Lambda))$ make sense, and $M_1(M_2(\Lambda)) = M_2(M_1(\Lambda))$. An adequate understanding of swaps in a sequence of moves is a necessary tool for the proof of the main result.

Section 6 contains technical results. In Section 7 we present the proof of the main result, Theorem 28, that says that a multiset of integer numbers is $C_{\mathbb{Z},6}$ -realizable if and only if it is $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}$ -realizable. Finally, in Section 8 we discuss the extension of the main theorem to rationals and to reals. We also discuss the decision problem of deciding when a given a multiset is C -realizable. In this sense, Borobia and Canogar [1] proved that the decision problem of determining if Λ is C -realizable is NP-hard. This result should not discourage the search for more efficient algorithms.

2 An alternative approach to C -realizability

As we said in the introduction, it will be convenient to restate Theorem 3 by partitioning it into four items.

Theorem 6. *Let $\Lambda = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ be a realizable multiset of \mathbb{C} whose Perron root is λ_1 and let λ_2 be real. For any $\epsilon > 0$ we have that:*

1. *If $\lambda_2 \leq 0$, then the multiset $\{\lambda_1 + \epsilon, \lambda_2 - \epsilon, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ is realizable.*
2. *If $\lambda_2 \geq \epsilon$, then the multiset $\{\lambda_1 + \epsilon, \lambda_2 - \epsilon, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ is realizable.*
3. *If $\lambda_2 < 0$ with $|\lambda_2| \geq \epsilon$, then the multiset $\{\lambda_1 + \epsilon, \lambda_2 + \epsilon, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ is realizable.*
4. *If $\lambda_2 \geq 0$, then the multiset $\{\lambda_1 + \epsilon, \lambda_2 + \epsilon, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ is realizable.*

Let us see the equivalence of Theorem 3 and Theorem 6. That Theorem 3 implies Theorem 6 is obvious. On the other hand, the cases of Theorem 3 that are not covered by Theorem 6 are:

- $\{\lambda_1 + \epsilon, \lambda_2 - \epsilon, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ when $\epsilon > \lambda_2 > 0$. It can be obtained in two steps:

$$\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n\} \longrightarrow \{\lambda_1 + \epsilon_1, \lambda_2 - \epsilon_1, \dots, \lambda_n\} \longrightarrow \{\lambda_1 + \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2, \lambda_2 - \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2, \dots, \lambda_n\}$$

with $\epsilon_1 = \lambda_2$ as in item 2 of Theorem 6, and $\epsilon_2 = \epsilon - \lambda_2$ as in item 1 of Theorem 6.

- $\{\lambda_1 + \epsilon, \lambda_2 + \epsilon, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ when $\lambda_2 < 0$ and $\epsilon > |\lambda_2|$. It can be obtained in two steps:

$$\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n\} \longrightarrow \{\lambda_1 + \epsilon_1, \lambda_2 + \epsilon_1, \dots, \lambda_n\} \longrightarrow \{\lambda_1 + \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2, \lambda_2 + \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2, \dots, \lambda_n\}$$

with $\epsilon_1 = |\lambda_2|$ as in item 3 of Theorem 6, and $\epsilon_2 = \epsilon - |\lambda_2|$ as in item 4 of Theorem 6.

Now we group together Theorem 1, Theorem 2 and Theorem 6 particularizing them in the reals, the rationals or the integers.

Theorem 7. Let $\Lambda = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ and Γ be two realizable multisets of \mathbb{S} where \mathbb{S} is \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{Q} or \mathbb{Z} . Let λ_1 be the Perron root of Λ and let $\epsilon > 0$ with $\epsilon \in \mathbb{S}$. Then

(i) The multiset $\Lambda \cup \Gamma$ is realizable.

(ii) If $\epsilon > 0$, then the set $\{\lambda_1 + \epsilon, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ is realizable.

(iii) If $\lambda_2 \leq 0$, then the multiset $\{\lambda_1 + \epsilon, \lambda_2 - \epsilon, \lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ is realizable.

(iv) If $\lambda_2 \geq \epsilon$, then the multiset $\{\lambda_1 + \epsilon, \lambda_2 - \epsilon, \lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ is realizable.

(v) If $\lambda_2 < 0$ with $|\lambda_2| \geq \epsilon$, then the multiset $\{\lambda_1 + \epsilon, \lambda_2 + \epsilon, \lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ is realizable.

(vi) If $\lambda_2 \geq 0$, then the multiset $\{\lambda_1 + \epsilon, \lambda_2 + \epsilon, \lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ is realizable.

Now we return to the concept of C -realizability by employing Theorem 7, and expanding the definition to reals, rationals and integers.

Definition 8. Let $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ be a multiset of \mathbb{S} where \mathbb{S} is \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{Q} or \mathbb{Z} . We say that Λ is $C_{\mathbb{S},6}$ -**realizable** if it can be reached starting from the n realizable basic multisets $\{0\}, \dots, \{0\}$ and successively applying any finite number of times any of the six rules (i)–(vi) of Theorem 7.

Of course, the C -realizable multisets of Definition 4 are the $C_{\mathbb{R},6}$ -realizable multisets of Definition 8.

The partition of Theorem 3 into the four items of Theorem 6 is closely related with the simplification that we pursue. Indeed we will see that when $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{Z}$, rules (iv)–(vi) of Theorem 7 are redundant and can be omitted. For the cases when \mathbb{S} is \mathbb{Q} or \mathbb{R} we were unable to prove the same. In Section 8.1 we will be more specific about the obstacle that we encounter with $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{Q}$, while the case $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{R}$ is much more elusive. That said, it is convenient to also have the following definition where the 6 rules are replaced by the 3 rules (i)–(iii).

Definition 9. Let \mathbb{S} be \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{Q} or \mathbb{Z} . A multiset $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ of \mathbb{S} is $C_{\mathbb{S},3}$ -**realizable** if it can be reached starting from the n realizable multisets $\{0\}, \{0\}, \dots, \{0\}$ and successively applying any finite number of times any of the three rules (i)–(iii) of Theorem 7.

2.1 C -realizability for integers

In this work we will work mainly with integer numbers. Note that rules (ii)–(vi) of Theorem 7 with an integer $\epsilon > 1$, can be split into ϵ repetitions of the same rule in which we replace ϵ by 1. So, when $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{Z}$, Theorem 7 can be restated in a simplified way as follows.

Theorem 10. Let $\Lambda = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ and Γ be two realizable multisets of \mathbb{Z} , and let λ_1 be the Perron root of Λ . Then

(i) The set $\Lambda \cup \Gamma$ is realizable.

(ii) The set $\{\lambda_1 + 1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ is realizable.

(iii) If $\lambda_2 \leq 0$, then the set $\{\lambda_1 + 1, \lambda_2 - 1, \lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ is realizable.

(iv) If $\lambda_2 > 0$, then the set $\{\lambda_1 + 1, \lambda_2 - 1, \lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ is realizable.

(v) If $\lambda_2 < 0$, then the set $\{\lambda_1 + 1, \lambda_2 + 1, \lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ is realizable.

(vi) If $\lambda_2 \geq 0$, then the set $\{\lambda_1 + 1, \lambda_2 + 1, \lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ is realizable.

Now, using Theorem 10 instead of Theorem 7 we can redefine $C_{\mathbb{Z},6}$ and $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}$ -realizable multisets given in Definition 8 and 9 respectively.

Definition 11. A multiset $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ of integer numbers is said to be $C_{\mathbb{Z},6}$ -**realizable** if it can be reached starting from the n realizable sets $\{0\}, \dots, \{0\}$ and successively applying any finite number of times any of the six rules (i)–(vi) of Theorem 10. And is $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}$ -**realizable** if we only apply the three rules (i)–(iii)

A consequence of Theorem 5 is the following.

Corollary 12. *If a multiset $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ of \mathbb{Z} is $C_{\mathbb{Z},6}$ or $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}$ -realizable, then it is realizable.*

3 States and types of moves for states

In the previous section we used multisets. The elements of multisets do not have an order and, consequently, analyzing a long sequence of rules with multisets would be challenging. On the other hand, having an order on the elements and preserving that order after any rule, would permit us to easily track the changes that the rules perform. In this sense we will replace the use of multisets by tuples. Actually, we will need to manage a collection of tuples of different sizes, or a tuple of tuples and we will call them states. We introduce all the terminology referring to states in the following definition.

Definition 13. We consider the following sets:

- For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $p \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ we will consider the set given by

$$\mathbb{Z}^{n,p} := \{(\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_p) : \Lambda_i \in \mathbb{Z}^{n_i}; n = n_1 + \dots + n_p\}.$$

Each element of $\mathbb{Z}^{n,p}$ will be called a **state**. So, a state of $\mathbb{Z}^{n,p}$ is a tuple of p tuples which might be of different sizes and with n integers overall. For $((\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n,1}$ we will also use the notation $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$.

- To the state

$$\Phi = \left((\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{n_1}), (\lambda_{n_1+1}, \dots, \lambda_{n_1+n_2}), \dots, (\lambda_{n_1+\dots+n_{p-1}+1}, \dots, \lambda_n) \right) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n,p}$$

we associate the n -tuple

$$\Phi^* = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n.$$

The k^{th} **position** of state Φ denotes the specific coordinate and tuple where λ_k is located inside Φ . So it makes sense to talk about the tuple to which the k^{th} position belongs. And the value at the k^{th} **position** of Φ will be $\Phi[k] = \Phi^*[k] = \lambda_k$.

- Let $\Lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. We will say that λ_i is **dominant** in Λ if $\lambda_i \geq |\lambda_j|$ for all $j = 1, \dots, n$.
- Let $\Phi \in \mathbb{Z}^{n,p}$. We will say that **the i^{th} position is dominant** in Φ if the value at the i^{th} position of Φ is dominant in the tuple where it is located. For instance, in the state

$$\Phi = ((8, -2, 8, 1, -4), (-1, 5, -6), (2, -3, 5, -5)) \in \mathbb{Z}^{12,3}$$

the first tuple of Φ has two dominant positions in the 1st and 3rd positions; the second tuple of Φ has no dominant position; and the third tuple of Φ has one dominant position in the 11th position.

The following definition translates the six rules of Theorem 10 applied to multisets into six moves applied to states. And these will be the terms we will use throughout this work, that is, rules for multisets and moves for states.

Definition 14. A **move** is a function that transforms a state into another state. The first move that we consider transforms a state of $\mathbb{Z}^{n,p}$ into another state of $\mathbb{Z}^{n,p-1}$:

- For $1 \leq d < p$, the **type 1 move** $T_1^{(d) \frown (d+1)}$ acts on Φ so that $T_1^{(d) \frown (d+1)}(\Phi)$ is obtained from Φ by joining or concatenating the d^{th} and $(d+1)^{\text{th}}$ tuples of Φ . We can only join two consecutive tuples, and there is no reordering of the values in the new bigger tuple, in other words $T_1^{(d) \frown (d+1)}(\Phi)[j] = \Phi[j]$ for all $j = 1, \dots, n$.

We will say that $T_1^{(d) \frown (d+1)}$ is a **valid move for Φ** .

And the rest of the moves transform a state Φ of $\mathbb{Z}^{n,p}$ into another state of $\mathbb{Z}^{n,p}$:

- For $1 \leq i \leq n$, the **type 2 move** T_2^i acts on Φ by only modifying the i^{th} position, namely, $T_2^i(\Phi)[i] = \Phi[i] + 1$.

We will say that T_2^i is a **valid move for Φ** if its i^{th} position is dominant, otherwise we will say that T_2^i is an **invalid move for Φ** .

- For $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ with $i \neq j$, the **type 3 move** T_3^{ij} acts by only modifying the i^{th} and j^{th} positions, namely, $T_3^{ij}(\Phi)[i] = \Phi[i] + 1$ and $T_3^{ij}(\Phi)[j] = \Phi[j] - 1$.

We will say that T_3^{ij} is a **valid move for Φ** if the i^{th} and j^{th} position in Φ are in the same tuple, the i^{th} position is dominant in Φ , and $\Phi[j] \leq 0$, otherwise we will say that $T_3^{ij}(\Phi)$ is an **invalid move for Φ** .

- For $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ with $i \neq j$, the **type 4 move** T_4^{ij} acts by only modifying the i^{th} and j^{th} positions, namely, $T_4^{ij}(\Phi)[i] = \Phi[i] + 1$ and $T_4^{ij}(\Phi)[j] = \Phi[j] - 1$.

Note that T_4^{ij} is equal to T_3^{ij} as transformation, the difference lies on the validity or invalidity. We will say that T_4^{ij} is a **valid move for Φ** if the i^{th} and j^{th} position in Φ are in the same tuple, the i^{th} position is dominant in Φ , and $\Phi[j] > 0$, otherwise we will say that T_4^{ij} is an **invalid move for Φ** .

- For $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ with $i \neq j$, the **type 5 move** T_5^{ij} acts by only modifying the i^{th} and j^{th} positions, namely, $T_5^{ij}(\Phi)[i] = \Phi[i] + 1$ and $T_5^{ij}(\Phi)[j] = \Phi[j] + 1$.

We will say that T_5^{ij} is a **valid move for Φ** if the i^{th} and j^{th} position in Φ are in the same tuple, the i^{th} position is dominant in Φ , and $\Phi[j] < 0$, otherwise we will say that T_5^{ij} is an **invalid move for Φ** .

- For $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ with $i \neq j$, the **type 6 move** T_6^{ij} acts by only modifying the i^{th} and j^{th} positions, namely, $T_6^{ij}(\Phi)[i] = \Phi[i] + 1$ and $T_6^{ij}(\Phi)[j] = \Phi[j] + 1$.

Note, again, that T_6^{ij} is equal to T_5^{ij} as transformation, the difference lies on the validity or invalidity. We will say that T_6^{ij} is a **valid move for Φ** if the i^{th} and j^{th} position in Φ are in the same tuple, the i^{th} position is dominant in Φ , and $\Phi[j] \geq 0$, otherwise we will sat that T_6^{ij} is an **invalid move for Φ** .

All these moves, valid or invalid, will be said to be **admissible moves**. With this we want to emphasize that they can be performed, independently of its validity. Moves that are not admissible are moves that can not be performed, we will give examples of them bellow.

To clarify the idea of valid and invalid moves, we provide examples for each of the six types of moves when they are applied to state

$$\Phi = ((8, -2, -3, 1, -4), (5, -1, -2)) \in \mathbb{Z}^{8,2}.$$

We consider the following admissible moves:

- $T_1^{(1) \sim (2)}(\Phi) = ((8, -2, -3, 1, -4, 5, -1, -2));$
- $T_2^6(\Phi) = ((8, -2, -3, 1, -4), (6, -1, -2));$
- $T_2^8(\Phi) = ((8, -2, -3, 1, -4), (5, -1, -1));$
- $T_3^{6,8}(\Phi) = T_4^{6,8}(\Phi) = ((8, -2, -3, 1, -4), (6, -1, -3));$
- $T_3^{1,4}(\Phi) = T_4^{1,4}(\Phi) = ((9, -2, -3, 0, -4), (5, -1, -2));$
- $T_3^{1,8}(\Phi) = T_4^{1,8}(\Phi) = ((9, -2, -3, 1, -4), (5, -1, -3));$
- $T_5^{6,8}(\Phi) = T_6^{6,8}(\Phi) = ((8, -2, -3, 1, -4), (6, -1, -1));$
- $T_5^{1,4}(\Phi) = T_6^{1,4}(\Phi) = ((9, -2, -3, 2, -4), (5, -1, -2));$
- $T_5^{1,8}(\Phi) = T_6^{1,8}(\Phi) = ((9, -2, -3, 1, -4), (5, -1, -1)).$

Note that for state Φ the move $T_1^{(1) \sim (2)}$ is valid, T_2^6 is valid, T_2^8 is invalid, $T_3^{6,8}$ is valid while $T_4^{6,8}$ is invalid, $T_3^{1,4}$ is invalid while $T_4^{1,4}$ is valid, $T_3^{1,8}$ and $T_4^{1,8}$ are invalid, $T_5^{6,8}$ is valid while $T_6^{6,8}$ is invalid, $T_5^{1,4}$ is invalid while $T_6^{1,4}$ is valid, and finally $T_5^{1,8}$ and $T_6^{1,8}$ are invalid.

Finally we provide some moves that are not admissible for Φ : $T_1^{(2) \sim (3)}$, T_2^{10} , $T_3^{1,9}$, $T_4^{11,12}$, $T_5^{12,1}$, and $T_6^{1,13}$. In all of them, at least one of the super-indexes is out of bounds and nothing can be done with Φ .

3.1 Laws for moves

Consider the sequence

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{M_1} \Phi_2 \xrightarrow{M_2} \dots \rightarrow \Phi_{k-1} \xrightarrow{M_{k-1}} \Phi_k \xrightarrow{M_k} \Phi_{k+1}$$

where $\Phi_1, \dots, \Phi_{k+1}$ are states and M_1, \dots, M_k are valid moves that verify $M_i(\Phi_i) = \Phi_{i+1}$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$. Now we provide, with respect to this sequence and any state Φ_t in that sequence, the following list of laws that will be assumed throughout the whole work. The proof of each law is easy to deduce:

1. **Permanence law:** If the i^{th} and j^{th} positions are in the same tuple of Φ_t , then both positions remain on the same tuple in any subsequent states. This law also works when the moves are admissible, valid or invalid.
2. **Dominance law:** When only valid moves are applied, if a position is dominant in Φ_t then it was dominant in all previous states and, equivalently, if a position is not dominant in a state then it will never be dominant in subsequent states.
3. **Increasing-decreasing law:** When only valid moves of types 1, 2, 3 and 6 are applied, the positive values can only increase, and the negative values can only decrease.

4 $C_{\mathbb{Z},6}^*$ and $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}^*$ -realizability for states

Note that the order in which the elements are allocated on the multiset $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ is not important when we determine its $C_{\mathbb{Z},6}$ or $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}$ -realizability. On the other hand, on the next definition applied to the tuple $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$, the order is essential.

Definition 15. The state $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ is $C_{\mathbb{Z},6}^*$ -**realizable** if can be obtained from state $((0), \dots, (0)) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n,n}$ by applying a sequence of valid moves of types 1 to 6. And is $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}^*$ -**realizable** if we only apply valid moves of types 1 to 3.

Now we will see how $C_{\mathbb{Z},6}$ -realizability is closely related to $C_{\mathbb{Z},6}^*$ -realizability.

Lemma 16. A multiset $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ is $C_{\mathbb{Z},6}$ -realizable if and only if there is at least one permutation σ of n elements such that the state $(\lambda_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, \lambda_{\sigma(n)}) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ is $C_{\mathbb{Z},6}^*$ -realizable.

Proof. The sufficiency is quite straightforward. Suppose that we start with $((0), \dots, (0))$ and, for some permutation σ , we arrive to $(\lambda_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, \lambda_{\sigma(n)})$ by applying a sequence of valid moves of types 1 to 6. If we change tuples by multisets and moves by rules, then we start with $\{0\}, \dots, \{0\}$ and apply the corresponding sequence of rules (i)–(vi) of Theorem 10 to obtain the multiset $\{\lambda_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, \lambda_{\sigma(n)}\}$. And, of course, this multiset is equal to the multiset $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\}$.

It will be easier to prove the necessity by showing the behaviour of one example, which we will analyze to understand how to find the permutation of the statement of this lemma. In the example we only consider rules of types (i) and (iii), and at the end of the example we will explain why.

Let us see that $\{5, 4, 3, 2, 1, -1, -2, -3, -4, -5\}$ is $C_{\mathbb{Z},6}$ -realizable. Consider the sequence of moves given on the left of Figure 1 where the step from A to B is by applying five times rule (i) of Theorem 10, and the second step from B to C is by applying fifteen times rule (iii) of Theorem 10. These two steps can be performed without the interchange of the position of the values. From C to G we have interchanges of the position of some values as indicated by the arrows. In each multiset the values are ordered in non-decreasing order. The first insight after following all the threads, is that sorting at every step adds complexity. So on the right of Figure 1 we leave the multisets unsorted which minimizes the number of crossings.

Once we have unsorted multisets, the structure of applying rule (i) repeatedly is that of a tangled tree, in which the root of the tree, G' , is the only multisets at the bottom (see left of Figure 2). As we have a tree, it is possible to untangle the threads so that there are no crossings (see right of Figure 2).

On the right of Figure 2 we observe that the position of the entries does not change across the different




Figure 1: (left) ordering the entries on each multiset, (right) without ordering the entries on each multiset




Figure 2: (left) tangled tree, (right) untangled tree.

steps. This allow us to change the multisets to ordered list directly as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_A &= ((0), (0), (0), (0), (0), (0), (0), (0), (0), (0)) \\
\Phi_B &= ((0, 0), (0, 0), (0, 0), (0, 0), (0, 0)) \\
\Phi_{C''} &= ((5, -5), (3, -3), (2, -2), (4, -4), (1, -1)) \\
\Phi_{D''} &= ((5, -5, 3, -3), (2, -2), (4, -4), (1, -1)) \\
\Phi_{E''} &= ((5, -5, 3, -3), (2, -2), (4, -4, 1, -1)) \\
\Phi_{F'} &= ((5, -5, 3, -3, 2, -2), (4, -4, 1, -1)) \\
\Phi_{G'} &= (5, -5, 3, -3, 2, -2, 4, -4, 1, -1)
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

In summary, the aim of this process is to go from something without order (multisets) to something ordered (states). While everything regarding multisets (the collection of multisets and the values on each multiset) has no imposed order, everything regarding states (the collection of tuples and the values on each tuple) have an imposed order.

In this proof, the transition between multisets and states is done in several stages. The first stage is to realize that presenting the values in non-decreasing order adds complexity, so we stop doing it (this has been done in Figure 1). The second stage is to find a correct way to order the multisets so that whenever a rule (i) is applied then it joins two contiguous tuples (this reordering is possible and has been done in Figure 2). On the third stage we pass from multisets (as on the right of Figure 2) to states (as in (1)). Observe that in the sequence of states each entry remains in the same position from the initial state to the final state.

A final remark, rules (ii)–(vi) of Theorem 10 give no problems in the overall process because they only

modify some specific entries which do not require a change of positions. \square

Note that the state $\Lambda = (1, -1, 1, -1)$ is $C_{\mathbb{Z},6}^*$ -realizable since $(1, -1)$ and $(1, -1)$ are both $C_{\mathbb{Z},6}^*$ -realizable and can be joined by a type 1 move. But let us show that changing the order of the entries we can obtain the state $\Lambda' = (1, 1, -1, -1)$ which is not $C_{\mathbb{Z},6}^*$ -realizable. Suppose that we could achieve Λ' starting from $((0), (0), (0), (0))$ by a sequence of moves of type 1 to 6. First note that all the elements of Λ' add to 0 so there are no moves of type 2, 5 or 6. And since Λ' has two dominant entries equal to 1 then the last move is not of type 3 or 4. So the last move is necessarily of type 1: (a) joining (1) with $(1, -1, -1)$; (b) joining $(1, 1)$ with $(-1, -1)$; or (c) joining $(1, 1, -1)$ with (-1) . In all cases the second tuple is not $C_{\mathbb{Z},6}^*$ -realizable because the sum of its elements is negative.

So this is a case of two states with the same numbers, where one can be reached by a sequence of moves of types 1 to 6, while the other one can not be reached. This happens because none of the moves of type 1 to 6 perform a reordering of the elements of the tuples.

As in Lemma 16, it is possible to see how $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}$ -realizability is closely related to $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}^*$ -realizability.

Lemma 17. *A multiset $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ is $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}$ -realizable if and only if there is at least one permutation σ of n elements such that the state $(\lambda_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, \lambda_{\sigma(n)}) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ is $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}^*$ -realizable.*

Lemmas 16 and 17 permit us to translate the language of $C_{\mathbb{Z},6}$ and $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}$ -realizable multisets into the language of $C_{\mathbb{Z},6}^*$ and $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}^*$ -realizable states. They will be useful in the proof of Theorem 28.

5 Swapping moves

From now on, in all sequences of admissible moves we will employ the following notation:

- If the move is inside a circle

$$\Phi \xrightarrow{\textcircled{M}} M(\Phi)$$

then M is admissible and invalid for Φ . For instance $(1, 2, 7) \xrightarrow{\textcircled{T_2^2}} (1, 3, 7)$.

- If the move has no circle around it

$$\Phi \xrightarrow{M} M(\Phi)$$

then M is admissible and valid for Φ . For instance $(1, 2, 7) \xrightarrow{T_2^3} (1, 2, 8)$.

- If the move is inside a dashed circle

$$\Phi \xrightarrow{\textcircled{\text{---}}M} M(\Phi)$$

then M is admissible for Φ , although we do not know yet if it is valid or invalid. This notation will be useful for some proofs in which the validity or invalidity of M has to be determined.

Let Φ be a state and let M_1 and M_2 be two moves of types 1 to 6 such that M_1 is admissible (valid or invalid) for Φ and M_2 is admissible (valid or invalid) for $M_1(\Phi)$. In order to prove the main result of this work, Theorem 28, we are interested in understanding the effect on admissibility and validity when we swap the order in which M_1 and M_2 act on Φ .

The first result that we will see is that if in a sequence of two admissible moves, valid or invalid, we perform a swap then in most cases we obtain again a sequence of two admissible moves.

Lemma 18. *Let $\Phi \in \mathbb{Z}^{n,p}$ and consider a sequence of admissible (valid or invalid) moves*

$$\Phi \xrightarrow{\textcircled{\text{---}}M_1} M_1(\Phi) \xrightarrow{\textcircled{\text{---}}M_2} M_2(M_1(\Phi)). \quad (2)$$

If we swap M_1 and M_2 then we will obtain, except when $M_1 = T_1^{(p-1) \wedge (p)}$ and M_2 is of type 1, a sequence

$$\Phi \xrightarrow{\textcircled{\text{---}}M_2} M_2(\Phi) \xrightarrow{\textcircled{\text{---}}M_1} M_1(M_2(\Phi)) \quad (3)$$

of admissible (valid or invalid) moves. Moreover, if M_1 and M_2 are not both of type 1 then

$$M_1(M_2(\Phi)) = M_2(M_1(\Phi)).$$

Proof. Note that a move M of type 2 to 6 applied to a state of n positions is admissible if and only if $M = T_2^i$ for some $1 \leq i \leq n$ or $M = T_h^{jk}$ for some $3 \leq h \leq 6$ and some $j \neq k$ with $1 \leq j, k \leq n$. As the state Φ has n positions, then all the states of sequences (2) and (3) will have also n positions. Therefore, an admissible move of type 2 to 6 in sequence (2) will remain admissible in sequence (3) after a swap.

Let us see what happens to M_1 and to M_2 when at least one of them is of type 1:

- M_1 is a move of type 2 to 6 and $M_2 = T_1^{(d)\wedge(d+1)}$ with $1 \leq d < p$. After the swap M_2 is admissible for Φ since Φ has p tuples.
- $M_1 = T_1^{(d)\wedge(d+1)}$ with $1 \leq d < p$ and M_2 is a move of type 2 to 6. After the swap M_1 is admissible for $M_2(\Phi)$ since $M_2(\Phi)$ has p tuples.
- $M_1 = T_1^{(d)\wedge(d+1)}$ with $1 \leq d < p - 1$ and $M_2 = T_1^{(g)\wedge(g+1)}$ with $1 \leq g < p - 1$. After the swap M_2 is admissible for Φ since Φ has p tuples, and M_1 is admissible for $M_2(\Phi)$ since $M_2(\Phi)$ has $p - 1$ tuples.
- $M_1 = T_1^{(p-1)\wedge(p)}$ and $M_2 = T_1^{(d)\wedge(d+1)}$ with $1 \leq d < p - 1$. After the swap M_2 is admissible for Φ since Φ has p tuples, but M_1 becomes not admissible for $M_2(\Phi)$ since $M_2(\Phi)$ has $p - 1$ tuples.

Finally, let us see that if M_1 and M_2 are not both of type 1 then $M_1(M_2(\Phi)) = M_2(M_1(\Phi))$. Consider two possibilities:

- If one of the moves is of type 1, then both moves do not interfere with each other since one of them will modify one or two positions and the other one will join two tuples. So the order in which they are applied does not matter.
- If none of the moves is of type 1, then each move will modify one or two positions of the state. And the the order in which the modifications are performed does not vary the final result.

□

We provide one example of swapping two admissible moves M_1 and M_2 of type 1:

$$\begin{aligned} ((0), (1), (2), (3)) &\xrightarrow{T_1^{(1)\wedge(2)}} ((0, 1), (2), (3)) \xrightarrow{T_1^{(2)\wedge(3)}} ((0, 1), (2, 3)) \\ ((0), (1), (2), (3)) &\xrightarrow{T_1^{(2)\wedge(3)}} ((0), (1, 2), (3)) \xrightarrow{T_1^{(1)\wedge(2)}} ((0, 1, 2), (3)), \end{aligned}$$

and note that $M_1(M_2(\Phi)) \neq M_2(M_1(\Phi))$. In the proof of the main theorem, we will never swap two admissible moves of Type 1, so we will never encounter this *non-commutativity*.

5.1 Swapping a valid move of type 2

Let us see how in a sequence of valid moves of types 1 to 3, we can swap each type 2 move to bring it closer to the beginning of the sequence.

Lemma 19. *Let $\Phi_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^{n,p}$ and let us have a sequence of valid moves*

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{M} \Phi_2 \xrightarrow{T_2^i} \Phi_3, \quad (4)$$

where M is of type 1, 2 or 3. If we swap M and T_2^i we obtain the sequence of two valid moves

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{T_2^i} \Phi'_2 \xrightarrow{M} \Phi'_3 \quad (5)$$

with $\Phi'_3 = \Phi_3$.

Proof. As $\Phi_2 \xrightarrow{T_2^i} \Phi_3$ is valid, then the i^{th} position is dominant in Φ_2 . By the dominance law the i^{th} position is also dominant in Φ_1 , and therefore $\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{T_2^i} \Phi'_2$ is valid. It remains to prove that $\Phi'_2 \xrightarrow{M} \Phi'_3$ is also valid:

1. Let M be a move of type 1. Then $\Phi'_2 \xrightarrow{M} \Phi'_3$ is admissible by Lemma 18. So it is valid automatically.
2. Let M be a move T_2^j of type 2.

- (a) If $i = j$, then both moves are equal, so they can be swapped and remain valid.
- (b) If $i \neq j$ and the i^{th} and j^{th} positions belong to different tuples in Φ_1 , then the two moves of sequence (4) are independent. So they can be swapped and remain valid.
- (c) Let us see that it is not possible for $i \neq j$ that the i^{th} and the j^{th} position belong to the same tuple in Φ_1 . Since $\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{T_2^j} \Phi_2$ is valid, then the j^{th} position is strictly greater than any other value in its tuple of Φ_2 . This makes T_2^i invalid for Φ_2 , which contradicts (4).

3. Let M be a move T_3^{jk} of type 3.

- (a) Let $i = j$. As $\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{T_2^i} \Phi_2$ is valid, then the i^{th} position is dominant in Φ_2 and so $\Phi_2 \xrightarrow{T_3^{ik}} \Phi_3$ is valid.
- (b) If $i \neq j$ and the i^{th} and j^{th} positions belong to different tuples in Φ_1 , then the two moves of sequence (4) are independent. So they can be swapped and remain valid.
- (c) Let us see that it is not possible for $i \neq j$ that the i^{th} and the j^{th} position belong to the same tuple in Φ_1 . Since $\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{T_3^{jk}} \Phi_2$ is valid, then the j^{th} position is strictly greater than any other value in its tuple of Φ_2 . This makes T_2^i invalid for Φ_2 , which contradicts (4).

□

The counterpart of Lemma 19 is false as we will see in the following example. We begin with the following sequence of valid moves:

$$((1, 2), (7)) \xrightarrow{T_2^2} ((1, 3), (7)) \xrightarrow{T_1^{(1) \wedge (2)}} (1, 3, 7).$$

After the swap, the move of type 2 becomes invalid:

$$((1, 2), (7)) \xrightarrow{T_1^{(1) \wedge (2)}} (1, 2, 7) \xrightarrow{\textcircled{T_2^2}} (1, 3, 7).$$

An interesting consequence of Lemma 19 is that for a $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}^*$ -realizable state all type 2 moves can be performed at the beginning of the sequence.

Corollary 20. *If Φ is a $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}^*$ -realizable state, then Φ can be obtained by a sequence of moves of type 1 to 3, where all type 2 moves are performed at the beginning of the sequence.*

Proof. If Φ is a $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}^*$ -realizable state, then Φ can be obtained by a sequence of moves of types 1 to 3. Applying repeatedly Lemma 19 we can take all type 2 moves to the beginning of the sequence. □

We will talk more about the implications of Corollary 20 in the final remarks.

5.2 Swapping an invalid move of type 2

The most frequent swaps that we will perform in the proof of the main result (Theorem 28) involve first a valid move of type 1, 2 or 3 followed by an invalid move of type 2. In the next three lemmas we analyze the result of these swaps.

Lemma 21. *Let $\Phi_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^{n,p}$ and let*

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{T_1^{(d) \wedge (d+1)}} \Phi_2 \xrightarrow{\textcircled{T_2^i}} \Phi_3$$

be a sequence where $T_1^{(d) \wedge (d+1)}$ is valid and T_2^i is invalid. If we swap both moves then we obtain the sequence

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{\textcircled{T_2^i}} T_2^i(\Phi_1) \xrightarrow{T_1^{(d) \wedge (d+1)}} \Phi_3$$

where $T_1^{(d) \wedge (d+1)}$ remains valid for $T_2^i(\Phi_1)$ and T_2^i can be valid or invalid.

Proof. As T_2^i does not change the tuples of Φ_1 then $T_1^{(d) \wedge (d+1)}$ will remain valid for $T_2^i(\Phi_1)$. On the other hand, as T_2^i is invalid then the i^{th} position is not dominant in Φ_2 . Since the i^{th} position in Φ_1 lies in a equal or smaller tuple than in Φ_2 , then we have two possibilities: if the i^{th} position in Φ_1 is dominant then T_2^i will become valid for Φ_1 , and if the i^{th} position in Φ_1 remains not dominant then T_2^i will become invalid for Φ_1 . □

Lemma 22. Let $\Phi_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^{n,p}$ and let

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{T_2^i} \Phi_2 \xrightarrow{\textcircled{T_2^k}} \Phi_3 \quad (6)$$

be a sequence where T_2^i is valid and T_2^k is invalid. If we swap both moves then it is not possible to obtain a sequence where both moves become invalid.

Proof. For convenience we will employ the notation Φ'_2 for the state $T_2^k(\Phi_1)$.

As T_2^k is invalid in sequence (6), then $i \neq k$. So we have two possibilities:

- (i) The i^{th} position and the k^{th} position belongs to different tuples of Φ_1 .

Then the moves do not interfere with each other. So after the swap we have

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{\textcircled{T_2^k}} \Phi'_2 \xrightarrow{T_2^i} \Phi_3.$$

- (ii) The i^{th} position and the k^{th} position belongs to the same tuple of Φ_1 .

As the i^{th} position is dominant in Φ_1 , then we have two possibilities:

- (a) $\Phi_1[i] = \Phi_1[k]$. Then

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{T_2^k} \Phi'_2 \xrightarrow{\textcircled{T_2^i}} \Phi_3$$

as the k^{th} position is dominant in Φ_1 and the i^{th} position is not dominant in Φ'_2 .

- (b) $\Phi_1[i] > \Phi_1[k]$. Then

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{\textcircled{T_2^k}} \Phi'_2 \xrightarrow{T_2^i} \Phi_3$$

as the k^{th} position is not dominant in Φ_1 and the i^{th} position is dominant in Φ'_2 .

□

Lemma 23. Let $\Phi_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^{n,p}$ and let

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{T_3^{ij}} \Phi_2 \xrightarrow{\textcircled{T_2^k}} \Phi_3, \quad (7)$$

be a sequence where T_3^{ij} is valid and T_2^k is invalid. If $k \neq j$ and we swap both moves then it is not possible to obtain a sequence where both moves become invalid.

Proof. For convenience we will employ the notation Φ'_2 for the state $T_2^k(\Phi_1)$.

Note that $i \neq k$, otherwise the second move T_2^k in sequence (7) would be valid.

As T_3^{ij} is valid for Φ_1 then the i^{th} and j^{th} positions on Φ_1 belongs to the same tuple. Now we analyze the cases depending on the i^{th} and k^{th} positions of Φ_1 :

- (i) On Φ_1 the i^{th} and k^{th} positions are on different tuples. Then T_3^{ij} and T_2^k do not interfere with each other, and after a swap we obtain the sequence

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{\textcircled{T_2^k}} \Phi'_2 \xrightarrow{T_3^{ij}} \Phi_3.$$

- (ii) On Φ_1 the i^{th} and k^{th} positions are on the same tuple. As T_3^{ij} is valid for Φ_1 then the i^{th} position is dominant in Φ_1 . Consider two possibilities:

- (a) If $\Phi_1[i] = \Phi_1[k]$ we obtain

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{T_2^k} \Phi'_2 \xrightarrow{\textcircled{T_3^{ij}}} \Phi_3$$

with T_2^k being valid for Φ_1 , and where T_3^{ij} is invalid for Φ'_2 since $\Phi'_2[i] < \Phi'_2[k]$.

- (b) If $\Phi_1[i] > \Phi_1[k]$ we obtain

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{\textcircled{T_2^k}} \Phi'_2 \xrightarrow{T_3^{ij}} \Phi_3$$

with T_2^k being invalid for Φ_1 , and where T_3^{ij} is valid for Φ'_2 since $\Phi'_2[i] \geq \Phi'_2[k]$.

□

In Lemma 23 the condition $k \neq j$ is necessary. For instance, in

$$(0, 1) \xrightarrow{T_3^{21}} (-1, 2) \xrightarrow{\textcircled{T_2^1}} (0, 2),$$

both moves become invalid after a swap

$$(0, 1) \xrightarrow{\textcircled{T_2^1}} (1, 1) \xrightarrow{\textcircled{T_3^{21}}} (0, 2).$$

From Lemmas 21, 22 and 23 it follows the following result that will play an important role in the proof of the main result.

Corollary 24. *Let $\Phi_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^{n,p}$ and let*

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{M} \Phi_2 \xrightarrow{\textcircled{T_2^k}} \Phi_3$$

be a sequence where T_2^k is invalid for Φ_2 and where M is a valid move of type 1, 2 or 3 different from T_3^{ik} . If we swap both moves then it is not possible to obtain a sequence where both moves become invalid.

6 A technical lemma

This very technical lemma and its corollaries are presented here, instead of including them as part of the proof of the main theorem, to streamline that proof.

Lemma 25. *Let Φ and Φ' be two states of $\mathbb{Z}^{n,d}$ that coincide (including their partitions into tuples) except at the a^{th} position where $\Phi[a] > \Phi'[a] \geq 0$ and at the b^{th} position where $\Phi[b] < \Phi'[b] \leq 0$. If*

$$\Phi \xrightarrow{M} \Psi$$

is a valid move of type 1, 2 or 3 such that $\Phi[a] = \Psi[a]$, then

$$\Phi' \xrightarrow{M} \Psi'$$

is a valid move.

Proof. For each type of move we will prove that M is valid for Φ' .

(a) Suppose that M is a type 1 move.

As Φ and Φ' have equal number of tuples and M is valid for Φ , then M is valid for Φ' .

(b) Suppose that $M = T_2^i$.

As $\Psi[a] = \Phi[a]$ then $i \neq a$, and as $\Phi[b] < 0$ then $i \neq b$.

As T_2^i is valid for Φ then the i^{th} position is dominant in Φ . As $\Phi'[i] = \Phi[i]$ and for each $k = 1, \dots, n$ we have that $0 \leq |\Phi'[k]| \leq |\Phi[k]|$, then the i^{th} position is also dominant in Φ' . So T_2^i is valid for Φ' .

(c) Suppose that $M = T_3^{ij}$.

As $\Psi[a] = \Phi[a]$ then $i \neq a$, and as $\Phi[a] > 0$ then $j \neq a$.

If T_3^{ij} is valid for Φ , then the i^{th} and j^{th} positions are in the same tuple, and the i^{th} position is dominant in Φ . That T_3^{ij} is valid for Φ' follows from the claims:

- (i) The i^{th} and j^{th} positions of Φ , and therefore of Φ' , are in the same tuple.
- (ii) The i^{th} position is dominant in Φ' (arguing as in (b)).
- (iii) $\Phi'[j] \leq 0$: if $j = b$ then $\Phi'[b] \leq 0$, and if $j \neq b$ then $\Phi'[j] = \Phi[j] \leq 0$.

□

We will write two versions of the previous Lemma where instead of two non-coincident positions in Φ and Φ' there is only one non-coincident position. The proofs are the same except that in the proof of Corollary 26 we would omit the reference to the b^{th} position, and in the proof of Corollary 27 we would omit the reference to the a^{th} position.

Corollary 26. *Let Φ and Φ' two states that coincide (including their partitions into tuples) except for the a^{th} position where $\Phi[a] > \Phi'[a] \geq 0$. If $\Phi \xrightarrow{M} \Psi$ is a valid move of type 1, 2 or 3 such that $\Psi[a] = \Phi[a]$, then $\Phi' \xrightarrow{M} \Psi'$ is valid.*

Corollary 27. *Let Φ and Φ' two states that coincide (including their partitions into tuples) except for the b^{th} position where $\Phi[b] < \Phi'[b] \leq 0$. If $\Phi \xrightarrow{M} \Psi$ is a valid move of Type 1, 2 or 3, then $\Phi' \xrightarrow{M} \Psi'$ is valid.*

7 Main Theorem

Theorem 28. *A multiset of integer numbers is $C_{\mathbb{Z},6}$ -realizable if and only if it is $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}$ -realizable.*

Proof. By Lemma 16 and Corollary 17, we only need to prove the statement of the theorem for states, namely, a tuple of integer numbers is $C_{\mathbb{Z},6}^*$ -realizable if and only if it is $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}^*$ -realizable.

Clearly, if a tuple of integer numbers is $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}^*$ -realizable, then it is $C_{\mathbb{Z},6}^*$ -realizable.

The rest of the proof will be devoted to prove that whenever a tuple of integer numbers is $C_{\mathbb{Z},6}^*$ -realizable, then it is also $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}^*$ -realizable. And it is enough to prove this with any sequence

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{M_1} \Phi_2 \xrightarrow{M_2} \dots \xrightarrow{M_{k-1}} \Phi_k \xrightarrow{M_k} \Lambda \quad (8)$$

where $\Phi_1 = ((0), \dots, (0))$; M_1, \dots, M_{k-1} are valid moves of type 1 to 3; and M_k is a valid move of type 4 to 6. We divide the proof according to the type of move that M_k is:

Type 4 : $M_k = T_4^{ij}$ The sequence (8) becomes

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{M_1} \Phi_2 \xrightarrow{M_2} \dots \xrightarrow{M_{k-1}} \Phi_k \xrightarrow{T_4^{ij}} \Lambda. \quad (9)$$

Therefore the i^{th} position is dominant in Φ_k with $\Phi_k[i] \geq \Phi_k[j] > 0$. And as M_1, \dots, M_k are of type 1 to 3 then, by the increasing-decreasing law, the values on the j^{th} position of states along the sequence $\Phi_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \Phi_k$ are non-decreasing.

Let h , with $1 \leq h < k$, be the unique integer such that

$$\Phi_h[j] + 1 = \Phi_{h+1}[j] = \dots = \Phi_k[j] > 0. \quad (10)$$

We analyze the only two possibilities for M_h :

4A : $M_h = T_2^j$ The sequence (9) becomes

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{M_1} \dots \xrightarrow{M_{h-1}} \Phi_h \xrightarrow{T_2^j} \Phi_{h+1} \xrightarrow{M_{h+1}} \Phi_{h+2} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \Phi_{k-1} \xrightarrow{M_{k-1}} \Phi_k \xrightarrow{T_4^{ij}} \Lambda. \quad (11)$$

Deleting T_2^j and replacing T_4^{ij} by T_4^i we obtain the sequence of moves

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{M_1} \dots \xrightarrow{M_{h-1}} \Phi_h = \Phi'_{h+1} \xrightarrow{(M_{h+1})} \Phi'_{h+2} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \Phi'_{k-1} \xrightarrow{(M_{k-1})} \Phi'_k \xrightarrow{(T_4^i)} \Lambda \quad (12)$$

that only contains moves of types 1 to 3. By convenience with the notation, in (12) we have also named the state Φ_h by Φ'_{h+1} . The sequences (11) and (12) end in the same state Λ since the only position that is affected by the changes is the j^{th} position. In (11) the j^{th} position is increased by one with T_2^j and then decreased by one with T_4^{ij} . We cancel out this increase-decrease in (12) by deleting T_2^j and replacing T_4^{ij} by T_4^i .

That Λ is $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}^*$ -realizable follows if all the moves of (12) are valid:

1. M_1, \dots, M_{h-1} are valid in (12).

These moves are equal in (11) and in (12).

2. M_{h+1}, \dots, M_{k-1} are valid in (12).

The elimination of T_2^j in sequence (11) makes that in sequence (12) the states $\Phi'_{h+1}, \dots, \Phi'_k$ are obtained, respectively, from $\Phi_{h+1}, \dots, \Phi_k$ just by subtracting one on the j^{th} position. So for $t = h+1, \dots, k-1$ the states Φ_t and Φ'_t are equal except that $\Phi'_t[j] = \Phi_t[j] - 1$. From (10) it follows that $\Phi_t[j] > \Phi'_t[j] \geq 0$. As $\Phi_t \xrightarrow{M_t} \Phi_{t+1}$ is a valid move of type 1 to 3 with $\Phi_{t+1}[j] = \Phi_t[j]$ then, by Corollary 26, $\Phi'_t \xrightarrow{M_t} \Phi'_{t+1}$ is also valid.

3. T_2^i is valid in (12).

As $\Phi_k \xrightarrow{T_4^{ij}} \Lambda$ is valid (11), then the i^{th} position is dominant in Φ_k . Note that the i^{th} position is also dominant in Φ'_k : the j^{th} position (the only difference between Φ_k and Φ'_k) is not a problem since $\Phi_k[j] > \Phi'_k[j] \geq 0$. So $\Phi'_k \xrightarrow{T_2^i} \Lambda$ is valid.

4B: $\mathbf{M}_h = \mathbf{T}_3^{jg}$ The sequence (8) becomes

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{M_1} \dots \xrightarrow{M_{h-1}} \Phi_h \xrightarrow{T_3^{jg}} \Phi_{h+1} \xrightarrow{M_{h+1}} \Phi_{h+2} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \Phi_{k-1} \xrightarrow{M_{k-1}} \Phi_k \xrightarrow{T_4^{ij}} \Lambda. \quad (13)$$

Let us first see that $g \neq i$. Note that $\Phi_{h+1}[g] < 0$ and that, by the increasing-decreasing law, $\Phi_k[g] < 0$. Then $g = i$ would imply that T_4^{ij} is invalid for Φ_k . A contradiction.

Deleting T_3^{jg} and replacing T_4^{ij} by T_3^{ig} we obtain

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{M_1} \dots \xrightarrow{M_{h-1}} \Phi_h = \Phi'_{h+1} \xrightarrow{\textcircled{M_{h+1}}} \Phi'_{h+2} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \Phi'_{k-1} \xrightarrow{\textcircled{M_{k-1}}} \Phi'_k \xrightarrow{\textcircled{T_3^{ig}}} \Lambda \quad (14)$$

that only contains moves of types 1 to 3. By convenience with the notation, in (14) we have also named the state Φ_h by Φ'_{h+1} . The sequences (13) and (14) end in the same state Λ since the only positions that are affected by the changes are the j^{th} and g^{th} positions. In (13) the j^{th} position is increased by one with $M_h = T_3^{jg}$ and then decreased by one with $M_k = T_4^{ij}$, and we cancel out this increase-decrease in (14) by deleting T_3^{jg} and replacing T_4^{ij} by T_3^{ig} . In (13) the g^{th} position is decreased by one with $M_h = T_3^{jg}$, and although we delete T_3^{jg} in (14) we obtain this decrease at the end of the sequence with T_3^{ig} .

Note that $\Phi'_{h+1}[j] = \Phi_h[j] = \Phi_{h+1}[j] - 1 \geq 0$, then from (10) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{h+1}[j] &= \Phi_{h+2}[j] = \dots = \Phi_{k-1}[j] = \Phi_k[j] \\ &\vee \\ \Phi'_{h+1}[j] &= \Phi'_{h+2}[j] = \dots = \Phi'_{k-1}[j] = \Phi'_k[j] \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Also note that $\Phi'_{h+1}[g] = \Phi_h[g] = \Phi_{h+1}[g] + 1 \leq 0$ and that $\Phi'_t[g] = \Phi_t[g] + 1$ for $t = h+2, \dots, k$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &> \Phi_{h+1}[g] \geq \Phi_{h+2}[g] \geq \dots \geq \Phi_{k-1}[g] \geq \Phi_k[g] \\ &\wedge \quad \quad \quad \wedge \quad \quad \quad \dots \quad \quad \quad \wedge \quad \quad \quad \wedge \\ 0 &\geq \Phi'_{h+1}[g] \geq \Phi'_{h+2}[g] \geq \dots \geq \Phi'_{k-1}[g] \geq \Phi'_k[g]. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

That Λ is $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}^*$ -realizable follows if all the moves of (14) are valid:

1. M_1, \dots, M_{h-1} are valid in (14).

These moves are equal in (13) and in (14).

2. M_{h+1}, \dots, M_{k-1} are valid in (14).

For $t = h+1, \dots, k-1$ the states Φ_t and Φ'_t are equal except that $\Phi_t[j] > \Phi'_t[j] \geq 0$ (see (15)) and $\Phi_t[g] < \Phi'_t[g] \leq 0$ (see (16)). As $\Phi_t \xrightarrow{M_t} \Phi_{t+1}$ is a valid move of type 1 to 3 with $\Phi_{t+1}[j] = \Phi_t[j]$ then, by Lemma 25, $\Phi'_t \xrightarrow{M_t} \Phi'_{t+1}$ is also valid.

3. T_3^{ig} is valid in (14).

First note that the states Φ_k and Φ'_k are equal except that $\Phi_k[j] > \Phi'_k[j] \geq 0$ (see (15)) and $\Phi_k[g] < \Phi'_k[g] \leq 0$ (see (16)). Now we verify the three conditions for T_3^{ig} to be valid:

- (a) The i^{th} position is dominant in Φ'_k .

As $\Phi_k \xrightarrow{T_4^{ij}} \Lambda$ is valid in (13), then the i^{th} position is dominant in Φ_k . Note that the i^{th} position, which verifies $j \neq i \neq g$, is also dominant in Φ'_k : the j^{th} and g^{th} positions

(the only difference between Φ_k and Φ'_k) are not a problem since $|\Phi_k[j]| > |\Phi'_k[j]| \geq 0$ and $|\Phi_k[g]| > |\Phi'_k[g]| \geq 0$.

- (b) The i^{th} and g^{th} positions of state Φ'_k are in the same tuple:
- The i^{th} and j^{th} positions are in the same tuple of Φ_k since T_4^{ij} is valid in sequence (13).
 - The j^{th} and g^{th} positions are in the same tuple of Φ_h since T_3^{jg} is valid in sequence (13). And, by the permanence law, they are also in the same tuple of Φ_k .
 - By transitivity the i^{th} and g^{th} positions are in the same tuple of Φ_k .
 - The only moves that alter the structure of the tuples in a state are type 1 moves. So, Φ'_k and Φ_k have the same structure of tuples since the only difference between both states comes from deleting the move T_3^{jg} in sequence (13). So the i^{th} and g^{th} positions are in the same tuple of Φ'_k .
- (c) $\Phi'_k[g] \leq 0$, as can be seen in (16).

Type 5 : $M_k = T_5^{ij}$ The sequence (8) becomes

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{M_1} \Phi_2 \xrightarrow{M_2} \dots \xrightarrow{M_{k-1}} \Phi_k \xrightarrow{T_5^{ij}} \Lambda. \quad (17)$$

Therefore the i^{th} position is dominant in Φ_k , with $\Phi_k[j] < 0$ and $\Phi_k[i] \geq |\Phi_k[j]| > 0$.

As M_1, \dots, M_{k-1} are of type 1 to 3 then, by the increasing-decreasing law, the values on the j^{th} position of states along the sequence $\Phi_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \Phi_k$ are non-increasing. Let h , with $1 \leq h < k$, be the unique integer such that

$$\Phi_h[j] - 1 = \Phi_{h+1}[j] = \dots = \Phi_k[j] < 0.$$

As M_h is of type 1 to 3, then the only possibility is that $M_h = T_3^{gj}$ for some g . The sequence (17) becomes

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{M_1} \dots \xrightarrow{M_{h-1}} \Phi_h \xrightarrow{T_3^{gj}} \Phi_{h+1} \xrightarrow{M_{h+1}} \Phi_{h+2} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \Phi_{k-1} \xrightarrow{M_{k-1}} \Phi_k \xrightarrow{T_5^{ij}} \Lambda. \quad (18)$$

Replacing T_3^{gj} by T_2^g and T_5^{ij} by T_2^i we obtain the sequence

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{M_1} \dots \xrightarrow{M_{h-1}} \Phi_h \xrightarrow{\overset{(T_2^g)}{\curvearrowright}} \Phi'_{h+1} \xrightarrow{\overset{(M_{h+1})}{\curvearrowright}} \Phi'_{h+2} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \Phi'_{k-1} \xrightarrow{\overset{(M_{k-1})}{\curvearrowright}} \Phi'_k \xrightarrow{\overset{(T_2^i)}{\curvearrowright}} \Lambda \quad (19)$$

that only contains moves of types 1 to 3. The sequences (18) and (19) end in the same state Λ since the only position that is affected by the changes is the j^{th} position. In (18) the j^{th} position is decreased by one with T_3^{gj} and then increased by one with T_5^{ij} . We cancel out this decrease-increase in (19) by replacing T_3^{gj} by T_2^g and T_5^{ij} by T_2^i .

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_h[j] - 1 = \Phi_{h+1}[j] = \Phi_{h+2}[j] = \dots = \Phi_{k-1}[j] = \Phi_k[j] \\ \wedge \\ \Phi_h[j] = \Phi'_{h+1}[j] = \Phi'_{h+2}[j] = \dots = \Phi'_{k-1}[j] = \Phi'_k[j] \leq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

That Λ is $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}^*$ -realizable follows if all the moves of (19) are valid:

1. M_1, \dots, M_{h-1} are valid in (19).
These moves are equal in (18) and in (19).
2. T_2^g is valid in (19).
This is so because T_3^{gj} is valid in (18), and so the g^{th} position is dominant in Φ_h .
3. M_{h+1}, \dots, M_{k-1} are valid in (19).
For $t = h+1, \dots, k-1$ the states Φ_t and Φ'_t are equal except that $\Phi_t[j] < \Phi'_t[j] \leq 0$ (see (20)). As $\Phi_t \xrightarrow{M_t} \Phi_{t+1}$ is a valid move of type 1 to 3 then, by Corollary 27, $\Phi'_t \xrightarrow{M_t} \Phi'_{t+1}$ is also valid.
4. T_2^i is valid in (19).
As $\Phi_k \xrightarrow{T_5^{ij}} \Lambda$ is valid in (18), then the i^{th} position is dominant in Φ_k . Note that the i^{th} position is also dominant in Φ'_k : the j^{th} position (the only difference between Φ_k and Φ'_k) is not a problem since $\Phi_k[j] < \Phi'_k[j] \leq 0$ and so $|\Phi'_k[j]| < |\Phi_k[j]|$. Thus $\Phi'_k \xrightarrow{T_2^i} \Lambda$ is valid.

Type 6 : $M_k = T_6^{ij}$ The original sequence (8) becomes

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{M_1} \Phi_2 \xrightarrow{M_2} \dots \xrightarrow{M_{k-1}} \Phi_k \xrightarrow{T_6^{ij}} \Lambda, \quad (21)$$

where M_1, \dots, M_{k-1} are of type 1 to 3, and different from T_3^{gj} by the increasing-decreasing law.

Note that $\Phi_k[i] \geq \Phi_k[j] \geq 0$, so we will consider two subcases:

6A : $\Phi_k[i] = \Phi_k[j] \geq 0$ All the following statements are true:

- (i) *The i^{th} and j^{th} positions are dominant in Φ_k .*
Since $\Phi_k[i] = \Phi_k[j]$ and T_6^{ij} is valid.
- (ii) *The i^{th} and j^{th} positions are dominant in $\Phi_1, \dots, \Phi_{k-1}$.*
By the dominance law.
- (iii) *There is a move $M_p = T_1^{(h) \wedge (h+1)}$ in (21) such that the i^{th} and j^{th} positions where in different tuples in Φ_p , and M_p puts them in the same tuple.*
The i^{th} and j^{th} positions where in different tuples in $\Phi_1 = ((0), \dots, (0))$, and they are in the same tuple in Φ_k , so the claim must be true. Note that (21) becomes:

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{M_1} \dots \xrightarrow{M_{p-1}} \Phi_p \xrightarrow{T_1^{(h) \wedge (h+1)}} \Phi_{p+1} \xrightarrow{M_{p+1}} \dots \xrightarrow{M_{k-1}} \Phi_k \xrightarrow{T_6^{ij}} \Lambda. \quad (22)$$

- (iv) $\Phi_{p+1}[i] = \Phi_{p+1}[j], \dots, \Phi_k[i] = \Phi_k[j]$.
Since the i^{th} and j^{th} positions are dominant in $\Phi_{p+1}, \dots, \Phi_k$ by (i) and (ii), and belong to the same tuple in all those states by (iii).
- (v) *The values at the i^{th} and j^{th} positions in $\Phi_{p+1}, \dots, \Phi_k$ remain unchanged.*
Otherwise, by (iv), both values increase simultaneously through moves of type 6. This is not possible since M_{p+1}, \dots, M_{k-1} are moves of type 1 to 3.
- (vi) *M_{p+1}, \dots, M_{k-1} can not be moves of type 2 or 3 that involve the tuple to which the i^{th} and j^{th} positions belong.*
By (i), (ii), and (v), the values in the tuple to which the i^{th} and j^{th} positions belong in states $\Phi_{p+1}, \dots, \Phi_k$ remain unchanged.

Now we modify sequence (22) to the sequence

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{M_1} \dots \xrightarrow{M_{p-1}} \Phi_p \xrightarrow{\widehat{T_2^i}} \xrightarrow{\widehat{T_2^j}} \Phi'_p \xrightarrow{T_1^{(h) \wedge (h+1)}} \Phi'_{p+1} \xrightarrow{\widehat{M_{p+1}}} \dots \xrightarrow{\widehat{M_{k-1}}} \Phi'_k = \Lambda. \quad (23)$$

The sequences (22) and (23) end in the same state Λ since the only positions that are affected by the changes are the i^{th} and j^{th} positions. In (22) the i^{th} and j^{th} positions are increased by one with T_6^{ij} , and in (23) the increase of the deleted T_6^{ij} is realized by T_2^i and T_2^j .

That Λ is $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}^*$ -realizable follows if all the moves of (23) are valid:

1. M_1, \dots, M_{p-1} are valid in (23).
These moves are equal in (22) and in (23).
2. T_2^i and T_2^j are valid in (23).
This is so because the i^{th} and j^{th} positions are dominant in Φ_p and belong to different tuples (see (ii) and (iii)).
3. M_{p+1}, \dots, M_{k-1} are valid in (23).
The only differences of Φ_{p+1} and Φ'_{p+1} are on the i^{th} and j^{th} positions with $\Phi'_{p+1}[i] = \Phi_{p+1}[i] + 1$ and $\Phi'_{p+1}[j] = \Phi_{p+1}[j] + 1$. So, by item (vi), the moves M_{p+1}, \dots, M_{k-1} are valid.

6B. $\Phi_k[i] > \Phi_k[j] \geq 0$

Taking into account that $T_6^{ij}(\Phi_k) = T_2^i(T_2^j(\Phi_k))$ and that $\Phi_k[i] > \Phi_k[j] \geq 0$, if in sequence (21) we replace T_6^{ij} by two consecutive moves T_2^j and T_2^i we obtain

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{M_1} \dots \xrightarrow{M_{k-2}} \Phi_{k-1} \xrightarrow{M_{k-1}} \Phi_k \xrightarrow{\widehat{T_2^j}} T_2^j(\Phi_k) \xrightarrow{T_2^i} \Lambda \quad (24)$$

where M_1, \dots, M_{k-1} are of type 1 to 3 and different from T_3^{gj} . Note that T_2^j is invalid for Φ_k , and so $T_2^j(\Phi_k)$ might not be $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}^*$ -realizable. So T_2^i is a valid move applied to a non-realizable state, but

this is not a contradiction since the validity of a move does not depend on the realizability of the state in which applies.

Now we start an algorithmic procedure, where the first step is to swap M_{k-1} and T_2^j . According to Corollary 24, we obtain one of the following possibilities:

(a) The sequence of valid moves

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{M_1} \dots \xrightarrow{M_{k-2}} \Phi_{k-1} \xrightarrow{T_2^j} \Phi'_k \xrightarrow{M_{k-1}} \Phi'_{k+1} \xrightarrow{T_2^i} \Lambda. \quad (25)$$

If this was the case, the procedure stops.

(b) The sequence of moves

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{M_1} \dots \xrightarrow{M_{k-2}} \Phi_{k-1} \xrightarrow{T_2^j} \Phi'_k \xrightarrow{\textcircled{M_{k-1}}} \Phi'_{k+1} \xrightarrow{T_2^i} \Lambda. \quad (26)$$

If this is the case, then the procedure also stops.

(c) The sequence of moves

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{M_1} \dots \xrightarrow{M_{k-2}} \Phi_{k-1} \xrightarrow{\textcircled{T_2^j}} \Phi'_k \xrightarrow{M_{k-1}} \Phi'_{k+1} \xrightarrow{T_2^i} \Lambda, \quad (27)$$

where the situation is similar to the one in sequence (24) with the invalid move T_2^j in a previous position in the sequence of moves. Then the procedure continues recursively by swapping M_{k-2} and T_2^j in (27) obtaining again three possibilities: a sequence similar to (25), to (26) or to (27). We repeat this argument recursively each time that we achieve a situation similar to the one in sequence (27).

Note that the procedure does not finish in a situation similar to (c) since if we take T_2^j all the way back to the beginning of the sequence it becomes valid since T_2^j is valid for $\Phi_1 = ((0), \dots, (0))$. So the procedure would finish in one of the following situations:

(a') A sequence of valid moves:

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{M_1} \dots \xrightarrow{M_{p-1}} \Phi_p \xrightarrow{T_2^j} M_p \xrightarrow{M_{p+1}} \dots \xrightarrow{M_{k-1}} T_2^i \xrightarrow{} \Lambda \quad (28)$$

If this was the case, then we have reached the main goal: the state Λ is $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}^*$ -realizable since it is obtained starting with $\Phi_1 = ((0), \dots, (0))$ by means of a sequence valid moves of type 1 to 3.

(b') A sequence

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{M_1} \dots \xrightarrow{M_{p-1}} \Phi_p \xrightarrow{T_2^j} \textcircled{M_p} \xrightarrow{M_{p+1}} \dots \xrightarrow{M_{k-1}} T_2^i \xrightarrow{} \Lambda. \quad (29)$$

where all moves are of type 1 to 3.

Now, in the next pages, we will analyse thoroughly what to do when we arrive to sequence (29) depending on what type of move is M_p . Note that M_p is not of type 1 due to Lemma 21 and so we will analyze the other two possibilities:

6B.I. $M_p = T_2^g$.

Then sequence (29) is

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{M_1} \dots \xrightarrow{M_{p-1}} \Phi_p \xrightarrow{T_2^j} \textcircled{T_2^g} \xrightarrow{M_{p+1}} \dots \xrightarrow{M_{k-1}} T_2^i \xrightarrow{} \Lambda.$$

Note that the last of the swaps of T_2^j is as follows:

$$\Phi_p \xrightarrow{T_2^g} \textcircled{T_2^j} \xrightarrow{} \Rightarrow \Phi_p \xrightarrow{T_2^j} \textcircled{T_2^g} \xrightarrow{}.$$

This happens, according to item (ia) of the proof of Lemma 22, when the j^{th} and g^{th} positions on Φ_p belong to the same tuple and $\Phi_p[j] = \Phi_p[g]$. Then we can merge T_2^j and T_2^g into T_6^{jg} to obtain a new sequence:

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{M_1} \dots \xrightarrow{M_{p-1}} \Phi_p \xrightarrow{T_6^{jg}} M_{p+1} \xrightarrow{} \dots \xrightarrow{M_{k-1}} T_2^i \xrightarrow{} \Lambda.$$

where T_6^{jg} is a valid move. And since $\Phi_p[j] = \Phi_p[g]$ then we can proceed as in the subcase 6A to prove that $T_6^{jg}(\Phi_p)$ is $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}^*$ -realizable, and so Λ is also $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}^*$ -realizable.

6B.II. $M_p = T_3^{gh}$.

The original sequence (21) is then

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{M_1} \dots \xrightarrow{M_{p-1}} \Phi_p \xrightarrow{T_3^{gh}} \Phi_{p+1} \xrightarrow{M_{p+1}} \dots \xrightarrow{M_{k-1}} \Phi_k \xrightarrow{T_6^{ij}} \Lambda.$$

Note that $h \neq j$ by the increasing-decreasing law. As the first part of the sequence

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{M_1} \dots \xrightarrow{M_{p-1}} \Phi_p$$

composed of valid moves of type 1 to 3 will not change in our arguments below, we consider only part of the sequence, namely from Φ_p ahead. That is,

$$\Phi_p \xrightarrow{T_3^{gh}} \Phi_{p+1} \xrightarrow{M_{p+1}} \dots \xrightarrow{M_{k-1}} \Phi_k \xrightarrow{T_6^{ij}} \Lambda \quad (30)$$

that after the swaps of T_2^j becomes

$$\Phi_p \xrightarrow{T_2^j} \Psi_{p+1} \xrightarrow{\textcircled{T_3^{gh}}} \Psi_{p+2} \xrightarrow{M_{p+1}} \dots \xrightarrow{M_{k-1}} \Psi_{k+1} \xrightarrow{T_2^i} \Lambda. \quad (31)$$

Note that in the last of the swaps of T_2^j we have

$$\Phi_p \xrightarrow{T_3^{gh}} \Phi_{p+1} \xrightarrow{\textcircled{T_2^j}} \Psi_{p+2} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \Phi_p \xrightarrow{T_2^j} \Psi_{p+1} \xrightarrow{\textcircled{T_3^{gh}}} \Psi_{p+2}$$

that corresponds to item (iia) of the proof of Lemma 23. And so $j \neq g$, the j^{th} and g^{th} positions in Φ_p belong to the same tuple, and $\Phi_p[j] = \Phi_p[g]$.

Consider the modification of (31) given by

$$\Phi_p \xrightarrow{T_2^j} \Psi_{p+1} \xrightarrow{\textcircled{T_2^g}} \Psi'_{p+2} \xrightarrow{\textcircled{M_{p+1}}} \Psi'_{p+3} \rightarrow \dots \xrightarrow{\textcircled{M_{k-1}}} \Psi'_{k+1} \xrightarrow{\textcircled{T_3^{ih}}} \Lambda, \quad (32)$$

where T_3^{gh} and T_2^i in (31) are replaced, respectively, by T_2^g and T_3^{ih} in (32). The only position affected by the changes is the h^{th} position and, clearly, the final state in both sequences is Λ . In what follows, we will show that sequence (32) is composed of valid moves of type 1 to 3 except the move T_2^g that is invalid. For this we will use the information of the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 > \Psi_{p+2}[h] & \geq & \Psi_{p+3}[h] & \geq & \dots & \geq & \Psi_k[h] & \geq & \Psi_{k+1}[h] \\ & \wedge & & \wedge & \dots & & \wedge & & \wedge \\ 0 & \geq & \Psi'_{p+2}[h] & \geq & \Psi'_{p+3}[h] & \geq & \dots & \geq & \Psi'_k[h] & \geq & \Psi'_{k+1}[h] \end{array} \quad (33)$$

that we obtain from the three following items:

(i) Let us see first that $0 > \Psi_{p+2}[h]$. Note that

$$\Psi_{p+2}[h] = \Psi_{p+1}[h] - 1 = \Phi_p[h] - 1 < 0$$

where the first equality follows from (31), the second equality follows from (31) since $h \neq j$, and the third inequality follows from (30) since T_3^{gh} is valid for Φ_p which implies that $\Phi_p[h] \leq 0$.

(ii) After that, as M_{p+1}, \dots, M_{k-1} are valid moves in (31), then by the increasing-decreasing law we have that

$$\Psi_{p+2}[h] \geq \Psi_{p+3}[h] \geq \dots \geq \Psi_{k+1}[h].$$

(iii) And to finish, as T_3^{gh} in (31) becomes T_2^g in (32) then

$$\Psi'_t[h] = \Psi_t[h] + 1 \quad \text{for } t = p+2, \dots, k+1.$$

Now we have the tools for determining the validity of the moves in sequence (32):

1. T_2^j is valid in (32).

This is so by hypothesis.

2. T_2^g is invalid in (32).

This is so because the g^{th} position is not dominant in Ψ_{p+1} . And this follows from the following facts: $j \neq g$, the j^{th} and g^{th} positions in Φ_p belong to the same tuple, and $\Phi_p[j] = \Phi_p[g]$. These claims were proved in the paragraph just after sequence (31).

3. M_{p+1}, \dots, M_{k-1} are valid in (32).

From diagram (33) it follows that for $t = p + 2, \dots, k$ the states Ψ_t and Ψ'_t are equal except that $\Psi_t[h] < \Psi'_t[h] \leq 0$. On the other hand, sequence (31) contains the move $\Psi_t \xrightarrow{M_{t-1}} \Psi_{t+1}$ which is valid of type 1 to 3. Then, by Corollary 27, $\Psi'_t \xrightarrow{M_{t-1}} \Psi'_{t+1}$ is also valid.

4. T_3^{ih} is valid in (32).

Now we verify the three conditions for T_3^{ih} to be valid:

- The i^{th} and h^{th} positions of state Ψ'_{k+1} are in the same tuple:
 - The last move in sequence (30) is a valid T_6^{ij} . This implies that the i^{th} and j^{th} position of states Φ_k and Λ are in the same tuple.
 - As we showed in the paragraph after sequence (31), the j^{th} and g^{th} position of Φ_p are in the same tuple. By the permanence law they also are in the same tuple of Λ .
 - From sequence (30) it follows that the g^{th} and h^{th} positions of Φ_p are in the same tuple. By the permanence law they are in the same tuple of Λ .
 - By transitivity

$$\text{the } i^{th} \text{ and } h^{th} \text{ positions of } \Lambda \text{ are in the same tuple.} \quad (34)$$

- Independently of its validity, the move T_3^{ih} in (32) maintains the structure of tuples in Ψ'_{k+1} and Λ . So the i^{th} and h^{th} positions are also in the same tuple of Ψ'_{k+1} .
- The i^{th} position is dominant in Ψ'_{k+1} .
Comparing sequences (30) and (32), as $j \neq h$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi'_{k+1}[j] &= \Phi_k[j] + 1 \\ \Psi'_{k+1}[h] &= \Phi_k[h] + 1 \\ \Psi'_{k+1}[t] &= \Phi_k[t] \quad \text{for each } t \neq j, h. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

In particular, $\Psi'_{k+1}[i] = \Phi_k[i]$ since $i \neq j, h$.

The i^{th} position is dominant in Φ_k , see (30), so the j^{th} and h^{th} are the only positions that could change the dominance of the i^{th} position in Ψ'_{k+1} . Let us see that this is not the case:

- $\Psi'_{k+1}[i] \geq |\Psi'_{k+1}[j]|$.
We will prove that

$$\Psi'_{k+1}[i] = \Phi_k[i] \geq |\Psi'_{k+1}[j]|.$$

The first equality follows from (35), for the second inequality apply (35) to $\Phi_k[i] > \Phi_k[j] \geq 0$ which is the hypothesis of this case: 6B.

- $\Psi'_{k+1}[i] > |\Psi'_{k+1}[h]|$.
We will prove that

$$\Psi'_{k+1}[i] = \Phi_k[i] \geq |\Phi_k[h]| > |\Psi'_{k+1}[h]|.$$

The first equality follows from (35).

Let us prove the second inequality. Note that the i^{th} and h^{th} positions belong to the same tuple in Λ , as we have seen in (34). Since $\Phi_k \xrightarrow{T_6^{ij}} \Lambda$ maintains the structure of the tuples in Φ_k and Λ , then the i^{th} and h^{th} positions also belong to same tuple in Φ_k . And so the second inequality follows from the dominance of the i^{th} position in Φ_k .

Finally, let us see the third inequality. Note that $\Phi_p \xrightarrow{T_3^{gh}} \Phi_{p+1}$ is valid, which implies that $\Phi_{p+1}[h] < 0$. By the increasing-decreasing law, $\Phi_k[h] < 0$. And now the third inequality follows from (35).

- $\Psi'_{k+1}[h] \leq 0$.

It follows from (35) since $\Phi_k[h] < 0$, as we have just seen above.

So we have seen that all the moves of sequence (32) are valid with the exception of T_2^g . On the other hand, as we pointed out in the paragraph just after sequence (31), we have that $j \neq g$, the j^{th} and the g^{th} position in Φ_p belong to the same tuple, and $\Phi_p[j] = \Phi_p[g]$. This means that we can substitute the pair of moves

$$\Phi_p \xrightarrow{T_2^j} \Psi_{p+1} \xrightarrow{\textcircled{T_2^g}} \Psi'_{p+2}$$

in (32) by the valid move T_6^{jg} to obtain the sequence of valid moves:

$$\Phi_p \xrightarrow{T_6^{jg}} \Psi'_{p+2} \xrightarrow{M_{p+1}} \Psi'_{p+3} \xrightarrow{M_{p+2}} \dots \xrightarrow{M_{k-1}} \Psi'_{k+1} \xrightarrow{T_3^{ih}} \Lambda.$$

Then we need to repeat our analysis of the original sequence (21) with the shorter sequence

$$\Phi_1 \xrightarrow{M_1} \dots \xrightarrow{M_{p-1}} \Phi_p \xrightarrow{T_6^{jg}} \Psi'_{p+2}.$$

Since $\Phi_p[j] = \Phi_p[g]$ then we can proceed as in the subcase 6A, where we proved that Ψ'_{p+2} is $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}^*$ -realizable. And so Λ is also $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}^*$ -realizable. □

8 Final remarks

The main theorem of this work and the techniques developed, seem to open an array of interesting questions. The most obvious question is to decide if the main theorem can be extended to rationals and to reals. On the other hand, the simplification of the C -realizability to just three moves, and the technique of swapping moves that has been extensively used, poses the question of finding a way of reorganizing the moves to obtain an order that can be considered canonical. In subsection 8.2 we propose such a canonical order.

Also, associated to the C -realizability we have a decision problem. That is, given a multiset, is it C -realizable? In [1], we studied this problem and concluded that it is NP-hard. But in this work we have considered states, or ordered lists. So, we might ask about the complexity of the decision problem of knowing if a given state is $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}^*$ -realizable or not. After considering the canonical order that was mentioned in the previous paragraph, it might happen that the decision problem associated to states has polynomial complexity, and that the NP-hardness of the decision problem for multisets comes from factorial amount of ways to order a multiset.

To conclude, we will talk more about some of the questions raised.

8.1 Extension of the main theorem to rationals and to reals

We would like to extend the main result of this work, Theorem 28, to rationals. That is, to prove the equivalence between $C_{\mathbb{Q},6}$ and $C_{\mathbb{Q},3}$ -realizability. First, note that $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}$ -realizability implies $C_{\mathbb{Q},3}$ -realizability in the following sense.

Lemma 29. *Let $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ be a multiset of integers numbers that is $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}$ -realizable, then for any integer q the multiset $\{\frac{\lambda_1}{q}, \dots, \frac{\lambda_n}{q}\}$ is $C_{\mathbb{Q},3}$ -realizable.*

Proof. Is trivial, since all the process that start with $\{0\}, \dots, \{0\}$ and finish with $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ by applying a sequence of rules of type (i)–(iii) of Theorem 10 can be reproduced introducing a factor $\frac{1}{q}$ in all the rules of type (ii) and (iii). □

On the other hand, if a multiset Λ is $C_{\mathbb{Q},3}$ -realizable by a sequence of rules of type (i)–(iii) of Theorem 7 then there exists an integer q that depends on the entries of Λ and on the rules applied such that $q \cdot \Lambda$ is $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}$ -realizable.

Lemma 30. *Let $\Lambda = \{\frac{\lambda_1}{\alpha_1}, \dots, \frac{\lambda_n}{\alpha_n}\}$ be a multiset of rational numbers that is $C_{\mathbb{Q},3}$ -realizable by the sequence M_1, \dots, M_r of rules of type (i)–(iii) of Theorem 7. Let M_{i_1}, \dots, M_{i_s} be the subsequence of all the rules of types (ii) or (iii), and let $\frac{\mu_1}{\beta_1}, \dots, \frac{\mu_s}{\beta_s}$ be the ϵ 's involved in these rules. If $q = \text{lcm}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_s)$ then $\Lambda' = \{q \cdot \frac{\lambda_1}{\alpha_1}, \dots, q \cdot \frac{\lambda_n}{\alpha_n}\}$ is $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}$ -realizable.*

Proof. We will construct a sequence of rules M'_1, \dots, M'_r of type (i)–(iii) of Theorem 7 for integers based on the given sequence. If M_j is a rule of type (i), let $M'_j = M_j$. For $k = 1, \dots, s$ substitute the rule M_{i_k} by rule M'_{i_k} where ϵ_{i_k} becomes $q \cdot \epsilon_{i_k}$. Then Λ' is $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}$ -realizable by the sequence of rules M'_1, \dots, M'_r . □

In the premises of Lemma 30 we know that $\{\frac{\lambda_1}{\alpha_1}, \dots, \frac{\lambda_n}{\alpha_n}\}$ is $C_{\mathbb{Q},3}$ -realizable by means of the concrete rules M_1, \dots, M_r and so we know the ϵ 's involved in the rules. These ϵ 's have an important role in the conclusion, and this is what we want to avoid. That is, the only premise we want to start from is that $\{\frac{\lambda_1}{\alpha_1}, \dots, \frac{\lambda_n}{\alpha_n}\}$ is $C_{\mathbb{Q},3}$ -realizable, and the optimal result that we wish to achieve is:

Conjecture 31. Let $\{\frac{\lambda_1}{\alpha_1}, \dots, \frac{\lambda_n}{\alpha_n}\}$ be a multiset $C_{\mathbb{Q},3}$ -realizable and let $p = lcm(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$. Then $\{\frac{\lambda_1}{\alpha_1}, \dots, \frac{\lambda_n}{\alpha_n}\}$ is $C_{\mathbb{Q},3}$ -realizable if and only if $\{p \cdot \frac{\lambda_1}{\alpha_1}, \dots, p \cdot \frac{\lambda_n}{\alpha_n}\}$ is $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}$ -realizable.

Lemma 30 says that $\{q \cdot \frac{\lambda_1}{\alpha_1}, \dots, q \cdot \frac{\lambda_n}{\alpha_n}\}$ is $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}$ -realizable being q a multiple of $lcm(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$. So to prove the conjecture, we would only need to prove that for any integer $m > 0$:

$$\text{if } \{m\lambda_1, \dots, m\lambda_n\} \text{ is } C_{\mathbb{Z},3}\text{-realizable then } \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\} \text{ is } C_{\mathbb{Z},3}\text{-realizable.}$$

We have not been able to prove this statement.

We also haven't been able to extend the main theorem to reals. We have tried to convert the reasoning in the proof of Theorem 28 to the rules of type (i)–(vi) of Theorem 7 with general ϵ , but we encountered technical difficulties.

8.2 Reordering the moves

As it was explained in Lemma 18 and the example after the Lemma, reordering moves of type 1 is troublesome. So these moves should remain fixed as much as possible.

Given a sequence of valid moves that $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}^*$ -realize a certain state, Corollary 20 tells us that we can take all the moves of type 2 to the beginning so that the moves of the whole sequence remain valid, and the final state will still be the same.

Once we put all the type 2 moves at the beginning of the sequence we obtain

$$((0), \dots, (0)) \xrightarrow{\underbrace{T_2^1 \dots T_2^1}_{a_1}} \xrightarrow{\underbrace{T_2^2 \dots T_2^2}_{a_2}} \dots \xrightarrow{\underbrace{T_2^n \dots T_2^n}_{a_n}} \left((a_1), (a_2), \dots, (a_n) \right) \longrightarrow \dots \longrightarrow \Lambda.$$

Now we can pull towards the beginning each move of type 3 as much as possible. Note that we can swap any two consecutive valid moves of type 3, just arguing as we did in Lemma 19 with valid moves of type 2. When we have a valid move of type 1 followed by a valid move T_3^{ij} of type 3 we can swap them so that both remain valid with one exception: if the type 1 move joins two tuples, one containing the i^{th} -position and the other one the j^{th} -position.

The final structure of the sequence after all these swaps is a new sequence of valid moves where first appears the moves of type 2. Then a move M_1 of type 1 that joins for instance tuples A_1 and B_1 , then any moves T_3^{ij} for which the i^{th} -position belongs A_1 and the j^{th} -position belongs to B_1 , or vice-versa. Then another move M_2 of type 1 that joins for instance tuples A_2 and B_2 , then any move T_3^{ij} for which the i^{th} -position belongs to A_2 and the j^{th} -position belongs to B_2 , or vice-versa. And so on. The final state would remain being Λ .

We believe that this order of moves for $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}^*$ -realizable states can simplify the search of an algorithm that solves the decision problem of knowing if a given state is $C_{\mathbb{Z},3}^*$ -realizable or not.

Acknowledgements: This research has been funded by the Agencia Estatal de Investigación of Spain through Grant PID2019-106362GB-I00/AEI/10.13039/501100011033.

References

- [1] A. Borobia, R. Canogar. The real nonnegative inverse eigenvalue problem is NP-hard. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 522 (2017) 127–139.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.laa.2017.02.010>
- [2] A. Borobia, J. Moro, R.L. Soto. Negativity compensation in the nonnegative inverse eigenvalue problem. *Linear Algebra Appl.* 393 (2004) 73–89.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.laa.2003.10.023>
- [3] A. Borobia, J. Moro, R.L. Soto. A unified view on compensation criteria in the real nonnegative inverse eigenvalue problem. *Linear Algebra Appl.* 428 (2008) 2574–2584.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.laa.2007.11.031>

- [4] R. Ellard, H. Šmigoc. Connecting sufficient conditions for the Symmetric Nonnegative Inverse Eigenvalue Problem. *Linear Algebra Appl.* 498 (2016) 521–552.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.laa.2015.10.035>
- [5] L. Elsner, R. Nabben, M. Neumann. Orthogonal Bases that Lead to Symmetric Nonnegative Matrices. *Linear Algebra Appl.* (1998) 271 (1998) 323–343.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-3795\(97\)00302-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-3795(97)00302-9)
- [6] W. Guo. Eigenvalues of nonnegative matrices. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 266 (1997) 261–270.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-3795\(96\)00007-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-3795(96)00007-9)
- [7] C.R. Johnson, C. Marijuán, P. Paparella, M. Pisonero. The NIEP. In: André, C., Bastos, M., Karlovich, A., Silbermann, B., Zaballa, I. (eds). *Operator Theory, Operator Algebras, and Matrix Theory. Operator Theory: Advances and Applications*, vol 267 (2018) 199–220. Birkhäuser, Cham.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-72449-2_10
- [8] C. Marijuán, J. Moro. A characterization of trace-zero sets realizable by compensation in the SNIEP. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 615 (2021) 42–76.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.laa.2020.12.021>
- [9] C. Marijuán, J. Moro. A characterization of sets realizable by compensation in the SNIEP. Preprint 2023.
- [10] C. Marijuán, M. Pisonero, R.L. Soto. A map of sufficient conditions for the symmetric nonnegative inverse eigenvalue problem. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, Volume 530 (2017) 344–365.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.laa.2017.05.023>
- [11] C. Marijuán, M. Pisonero, R.L. Soto. Updating a map of sufficient conditions for the real nonnegative inverse eigenvalue problem. *Special Matrices*, vol. 7, no. 1 (2019) pp. 246–256.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/spma-2019-0018>
- [12] R.L. Soto. A family of realizability criteria for the real and symmetric nonnegative inverse eigenvalue problem. *Numer. Linear Algebra Appl.* 20 (2) (2013) 336–348.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/nla.835>
- [13] G.W. Soules. Constructing symmetric nonnegative matrices. *Linear and Multilinear Algebra.* 13 (1983) 241–251.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03081088308817523>