

Lattice properties of the sharp partial order

Cecilia R. Cimadamore*, Laura A. Rueda†, Néstor Thome‡, Melina V. Verdecchia§

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to study lattice properties of the sharp partial order for complex matrices having index at most 1. We investigate the down-set of a fixed matrix B under this partial order via isomorphisms with two different partially ordered sets of projectors. These are, respectively, the set of projectors that commute with a certain (nonsingular) block of a Hartwig-Spindelböck decomposition of B and the set of projectors that commute with the Jordan canonical form of that block. Using these isomorphisms, we study the lattice structure of the down-sets and we give properties of them. Necessary and sufficient conditions under which the down-set of B is a lattice were found, in which case we describe its elements completely. We also show that every down-set of B has a distinguished Boolean subalgebra and we give a description of its elements. We characterize the matrices that are above a given matrix in terms of its Jordan canonical form. Mitra (1987) showed that the set of all $n \times n$ complex matrices having index at most 1 with $n \geq 4$ is not a lower semilattice. We extend this result to $n = 3$ and prove that it is a lower semilattice with $n = 2$. We also answer negatively a conjecture given by Mitra, Bhimasankaram and Malik (2010). As a last application, we characterize solutions of some matrix equations via the established isomorphisms.

AMS Classifications: 06A06 (primary), 15A09 (secondary), 15A21 (secondary).

Keywords: Sharp partial order, Hartwig-Spindelböck factorization, lattice structure, Jordan canonical form.

1 Introduction

In this paper we work with the sharp partial order defined on the set of complex matrices that have group inverse. This order were defined by Mitra in [15]. Later, Mitra, Bhimasankaram and Malik made in [16] an extensive study of this partial order and obtained interesting properties. The sharp partial order was also studied by other authors. Groß in [8] worked with this partial order and characterized the matrices that are above a given matrix using the Hartwig-Spindelböck decomposition of the matrices. More recently, Marovt in [12] and Rakić and Djordjević [17] studied this partial order in a ring with involution. Cvetković-Ilić, Mosić and Wei [6], and, Jose and Sivakumar [10] analyzed the sharp order for the case of bounded linear Hilbert space operators.

The set of complex $m \times n$ matrices is denoted by $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$. The conjugate transpose, range, and rank of $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ are denoted by A^* , $\mathcal{R}(A)$, and $\text{rk}(A)$, respectively. The set of all $n \times n$ complex matrices having index at most 1, that is, $\text{rk}(A^2) = \text{rk}(A)$, is denoted by \mathbb{C}_1^n . It is known

*Departamento de Matemática, Universidad Nacional del Sur (UNS), Bahía Blanca, Argentina. Instituto de Matemática (INMABB), Universidad Nacional del Sur (UNS)-CONICET, Bahía Blanca, Argentina. <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-5252-2352>, E-mail: crcima@criba.edu.ar.

†Departamento de Matemática, Universidad Nacional del Sur (UNS), Bahía Blanca, Argentina. Instituto de Matemática (INMABB), Universidad Nacional del Sur (UNS)-CONICET, Bahía Blanca, Argentina. E-mail: laura.rueda@uns.edu.ar.

‡Instituto Universitario de Matemática Multidisciplinar, Universitat Politècnica de València, 46022, Valencia, Spain. E-mail: njthome@mat.upv.es.

§Departamento de Matemática, Universidad Nacional del Sur (UNS), Bahía Blanca, Argentina. Instituto de Matemática (INMABB), Universidad Nacional del Sur (UNS)-CONICET, Bahía Blanca, Argentina. E-mail: mverdec@uns.edu.ar.

that $A \in \mathbb{C}_1^n$ if and only if A has group inverse, that is, there exists a (unique) square matrix $A^\#$ that satisfies $AA^\#A = A$, $A^\#AA^\# = A^\#$, and $AA^\# = A^\#A$. The identity matrix of order $n \times n$ is denoted by I_n and zero matrices are denoted simply by O . Let us recall that given a matrix B where $0 < r = \text{rk}(B)$ and the r positive singular values $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r$ of B are ordered in decreasing order, a Hartwig-Spindelböck decomposition of B (see [9]) is given by

$$B = U \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma K & \Sigma L \\ O & O \end{bmatrix} U^*, \quad (1)$$

where $U \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ is unitary, $\Sigma = \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r) \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times r}$ is a diagonal matrix with the r positive singular values $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r$ of B in its diagonal, $K \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times r}$ and $L \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times (n-r)}$ satisfy $KK^* + LL^* = I_r$ (note that L is absent when $r = n$). It is worth mentioning that this decomposition always exists but it is not necessarily unique, and that $B \in \mathbb{C}_1^n$ if and only if K is nonsingular.

The main aim of this paper is to study lattice properties of the sharp partial order. Malik, Rueda and Thome in [11] characterized the matrices that are below a given matrix B under the sharp partial order by using a type (1) decomposition of B . In that work, it is proved that there exists a bijection between the set of matrices that are below B and a certain set of projectors of the same size as Σ that commute with ΣK . In this paper, we prove that this bijection is an isomorphism by considering the set of projectors ordered by the partial order $T_1 \leq T_2$ if and only if $T_1 = T_1 T_2 = T_2 T_1$. This isomorphism is our starting point for the development of the paper. It brings significant advantages not only because the sizes of the matrices associated with projectors can be considerably smaller than the matrices that are below B but also because these projectors provide us a much easier way to work than by using directly the original matrices.

Many authors worked with projectors to characterize partial orders. This shows the importance of them in finite and infinite dimensions. See, for example, [4, 13, 14, 16, 19].

We first establish some lattice properties of the down-set of a fixed matrix B , by using this isomorphism. We start by computing the infimum and the supremum of two matrices in $[O, B]$ with commuting associated projectors. We prove that if the down-set is a lattice then it is complemented of finite height and if it is, in addition, a distributive lattice then it is a Boolean algebra. We also show that any interval $[A_1, A_2] = \{A \in \mathbb{C}_1^n : A_1 \overset{\#}{\leq} A \overset{\#}{\leq} A_2\}$, for $A_1 \overset{\#}{\leq} A_2$, of the poset \mathbb{C}_1^n is isomorphic to a down-set, namely $[O, A_2 - A_1]$. This is why studying the down-sets are not only important by themselves, but also contributes to the study of the poset \mathbb{C}_1^n .

On the other hand, we established another isomorphism between the set of projectors that commute with ΣK and the set of projectors that commute with the Jordan canonical form of ΣK . This isomorphism becomes very useful to study, in a more detailed way, the matrices that are below B . This tool allows us to characterize when the down-set of B is a lattice. In such a case, we describe it completely and establish some properties of it. We also show that every down-set of B has a distinguished Boolean subalgebra and we give a description of its elements.

In [16, Theorem 4.3.13] Mitra, Bhimasankaram and Malik give a characterization of the matrices A that are below a given matrix B by means of the Jordan decomposition of B , for the particular case of the geometric multiplicity of each nonnull eigenvalue equals 1. They also formulate the conjecture that states that the theorem given is valid even if the number of Jordan blocks corresponding to some or all distinct nonnull eigenvalues is greater than 1. We show that this conjecture is not true. In addition, we present a result that characterizes the matrices that are above a given matrix A in terms of the Jordan decomposition of the matrix A . We also prove that the set of all $n \times n$ complex matrices having index at most 1 is a lower semilattice if and only if $n \leq 2$. In this way, we extend to $n = 3$ the result demonstrated by Mitra in [15] which states that this poset is not a lower semilattice for $n \geq 4$.

In [7] the authors presented necessary and sufficient conditions for the k -commutative equality $B^k X = X B^k$, where X is an outer generalized inverse of the square matrix B . Similar matrix equations of type $B^k X^k B^k = B^k$ and $X^k B^k X^k = X^k$, for all k positive integer and where $B \in \mathbb{C}_1^n$ were studied previously in [18]. As an application of the isomorphism between the set of matrices that are below B and the set of projectors that commute with ΣK , we analyze certain matrix

systems that have equalities $B^k X = X B^k$ and $X B^k X = X B^k$, for all k positive integer, and where X is idempotent.

This paper is organized as follows. After a brief section of preliminaries, we devote the next two sections to the study of the down-set $[O, B]$ by showing that such a set is isomorphic to two posets of projectors that satisfy some conditions linked to the matrix ΣK obtained in decomposition (1). In Section 3, we work with the poset of projectors commuting with ΣK and in Section 4 with that of projectors commuting with the Jordan canonical form of ΣK . We also present here several results including the characterization of $[O, B]$ as a lattice. In Section 5, we prove the existence of a featured Boolean algebra within the down-set of a matrix B and describe its elements. In Section 6, we solve the conjecture formulated in [16]. We characterize matrices that are above a given matrix by using its Jordan decomposition, and we analyze when \mathbb{C}_1^n is a lower semilattice. Finally, in Section 7, we provide solutions to some matrix equations by using the isomorphism given in Section 3.

2 Preliminaries

For the sake of completeness, we recall some basic definitions of structures defined over a partially ordered set that are used throughout this paper. Recall that a partially ordered set (a poset from now on) (R, \leq) is a lower semilattice if for every $a, b \in R$ the greatest lower bound (or infimum) $a \wedge b$ of $\{a, b\}$ exists. The poset (R, \leq) is a lattice if for every $a, b \in R$ both the least upper bound (or supremum) $a \vee b$ and the infimum $a \wedge b$ of $\{a, b\}$ exist. Given two lattices R and S , the direct product $R \times S = \{\langle a, b \rangle : a \in R \text{ and } b \in S\}$ is also a lattice where $\langle a_1, b_1 \rangle \vee \langle a_2, b_2 \rangle = \langle a_1 \vee a_2, b_1 \vee b_2 \rangle$ and $\langle a_1, b_1 \rangle \wedge \langle a_2, b_2 \rangle = \langle a_1 \wedge a_2, b_1 \wedge b_2 \rangle$. Two elements a, b of a lattice with first element 0 and greatest element 1 are complementary if $a \vee b = 1$ and $a \wedge b = 0$. A complemented lattice is a lattice in which every element a has a complement a' . A distributive lattice is a lattice which satisfies either (and hence, as it is easy to see, both) of the distributive laws $a \wedge (b \vee c) = (a \wedge b) \vee (a \wedge c)$ or $a \vee (b \wedge c) = (a \vee b) \wedge (a \vee c)$. Finally, a Boolean algebra is a complemented distributive lattice. Let R and S be two posets. A map $\phi: R \rightarrow S$ is order-preserving if $\phi(a) \leq \phi(b)$ whenever $a \leq b$. We say that R and S are isomorphic if there exists a bijection ϕ from R to S such that both ϕ and ϕ^{-1} are order-preserving. In that case, ϕ is called an isomorphism and we write $R \simeq S$. We refer the reader to [2] for more information about the different structures defined above.

If $A \in \mathbb{C}_1^n$ then there exists a (unique) square matrix X that satisfies $AXA = A$, $XAX = X$, and $AX = XA$. This matrix X is called the group inverse of A and it is denoted by A^\sharp . For a given matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$, there exists a unique matrix $X \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$ such that AX and XA are Hermitian, $AXA = A$, and $XAX = X$, which is called the Moore-Penrose inverse of A and it is denoted by A^\dagger .

For $A, B \in \mathbb{C}_1^n$, let us recall that the sharp partial order is defined by: $A \leq^\sharp B$ if and only if $A^\sharp A = A^\sharp B$ and $AA^\sharp = BA^\sharp$, which is equivalent to $A^2 = AB = BA$.

For a fixed matrix B , by using decomposition (1), the predecessors A under the sharp partial order in \mathbb{C}_1^n are characterized as follows.

Theorem 1. [11, Theorem 5] *Let $B \in \mathbb{C}_1^n$ be a nonzero matrix written as in (1). The following conditions are equivalent.*

- (a) *There exists a matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}_1^n$ such that $A \leq^\sharp B$,*
- (b) *There exists an idempotent matrix $T \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times r}$ such that*

$$A = U \begin{bmatrix} T\Sigma K & T\Sigma L \\ O & O \end{bmatrix} U^*, \quad (2)$$

where $T\Sigma K = \Sigma KT$.

Remark 2. For each $A \in \mathbb{C}_1^n$ such that $A \leq^{\sharp} B$, it is easy to see that there exists a unique matrix $T \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times r}$ in the conditions indicated in Theorem 1.

We recall that if $A \in \mathbb{C}_1^n$ is a matrix written as in (2) (see [11, Lemma 3]) then

$$A^{\sharp} = U \begin{bmatrix} (T\Sigma K)^{\sharp} & (T\Sigma K)^{\sharp}K^{-1}L \\ O & O \end{bmatrix} U^*. \quad (3)$$

Moreover, if T is idempotent and $T\Sigma K = \Sigma KT$ then $(T\Sigma K)^{\sharp} = (\Sigma K)^{-1}T$.

Remark 3. If $A \leq^{\sharp} B$ then, by [1], $B^{\sharp} - A^{\sharp} = U \begin{bmatrix} (\Sigma K)^{-1}(I_r - T) & (\Sigma K)^{-1}(I_r - T)K^{-1}L \\ O & O \end{bmatrix} U^* = (B - A)^{\sharp}$ (see [10, Theorem 6.2]).

For a given matrix $M \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times r}$ with s distinct eigenvalues $\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_s\}$, the well-known Jordan decomposition theorem states that there exists a nonsingular matrix $P \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times r}$ such that $M = PJP^{-1}$ and

$$J = \text{diag}(J(\lambda_1), J(\lambda_2), \dots, J(\lambda_s)), \quad (4)$$

is a block diagonal matrix called the Jordan canonical form of M . Here each block $J(\lambda_j)$, for $1 \leq j \leq s$, is given by

$$J(\lambda_j) = \text{diag}(J_1(\lambda_j), J_2(\lambda_j), \dots, J_{t_j}(\lambda_j)) \in \mathbb{C}^{r_j \times r_j} \quad (5)$$

with

$$J_k(\lambda_j) = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_j & 1 & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & \ddots & 1 \\ & & & \lambda_j \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{r_{kj} \times r_{kj}}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq t_j.$$

The matrices $J_k(\lambda_j)$ are the Jordan blocks of J . We recall that the geometric multiplicity of λ_j corresponds to the number of Jordan blocks of J whose eigenvalue is λ_j , that is the geometric multiplicity of λ_j is equal to t_j .

Next, we need the concept of regular upper triangular matrix [5].

Definition 4. A matrix $X \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times r}$ is called a regular upper triangular matrix (RUTM) if it is upper triangular and all the elements on any given subdiagonal are equal. This matrix is also known as an upper triangular Toeplitz matrix.

Remark 5. Notice that if

$$N = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & \ddots & 1 \\ & & & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times r} \quad (6)$$

and X is a RUTM then $X = a_1 I_r + a_2 N + a_3 N^2 + \dots + a_r N^{r-1}$ for some $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r \in \mathbb{C}$. In addition, if $X^2 = X$ then $X = O$ or $X = I_r$. Indeed, $X^2 = a_1^2 I_r + 2a_1 a_2 N + \dots + (\sum_{i=1}^{l+1} a_i a_{l+2-i}) N^l + \dots + (\sum_{i=1}^r a_i a_{r+1-i}) N^{r-1}$, and comparing coefficients it follows that $a_1 \in \{0, 1\}$ and $a_i = 0$, $2 \leq i \leq r$.

Let $T \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times r}$ and J be written as in (4). In [5] the matrices T that commute with a matrix J given in Jordan canonical form are characterized. More precisely, by [5, Theorem 5.16],

$$TJ = JT \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad T = \text{diag}(D_1, D_2, \dots, D_s), \quad (7)$$

where

$$D_j = [R_{ik}] \in \mathbb{C}^{r_j \times r_j}, \quad 1 \leq i, k \leq t_j \quad (8)$$

such that the submatrices $R_{ik} \in \mathbb{C}^{r_{ij} \times r_{kj}}$ satisfy that

$$R_{ik}J_k(\lambda_j) = J_i(\lambda_j)R_{ik},$$

for $J_k(\lambda_j) \in \mathbb{C}^{r_{kj} \times r_{kj}}$, $J_i(\lambda_j) \in \mathbb{C}^{r_{ij} \times r_{ij}}$. Applying again [5, Theorem 5.16], we obtain that

$$R_{ik} = \begin{cases} \begin{bmatrix} X_{ik} \\ O \end{bmatrix} \text{ where } X_{ik} \in \mathbb{C}^{r_{kj} \times r_{kj}} \text{ is a RUTM,} & \text{if } r_{ij} > r_{kj} \\ \begin{bmatrix} O & X_{ik} \end{bmatrix} \text{ where } X_{ik} \in \mathbb{C}^{r_{ij} \times r_{ij}} \text{ is a RUTM,} & \text{if } r_{ij} < r_{kj} \\ X_{ik} \text{ where } X_{ik} \in \mathbb{C}^{r_{kj} \times r_{kj}} \text{ is a RUTM,} & \text{if } r_{ij} = r_{kj} \end{cases}. \quad (9)$$

3 Down-set of B via projectors that commutes with ΣK

For any fixed matrix $B \in \mathbb{C}_1^n$, we will consider the down-set

$$[O, B] = \{A \in \mathbb{C}_1^n : O \stackrel{\#}{\leq} A \stackrel{\#}{\leq} B\}.$$

Clearly, $\left([O, B], \stackrel{\#}{\leq}\right)$ is a poset where O is the least element and B the greatest one.

According to Theorem 1, we consider the set

$$\tau = \{T \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times r} : T^2 = T \text{ and } T\Sigma K = \Sigma K T\}$$

endowed with the partial order given by $T_1 \leq T_2$ if and only if $T_1 = T_1 T_2 = T_2 T_1$. Note that if $T \in \tau$ then $T \in \mathbb{C}_1^r$. The least element and the greatest element of τ are O and I_r , respectively.

In this section, we prove that the down-set $[O, B]$ is isomorphic to the poset τ , which is our starting point for the forthcoming results of this paper. From this isomorphism, we begin the investigation of the ordered structure of $[O, B]$ establishing in this section some lattice properties of the down-set of B . Note that matrices $T \in \tau$ are projectors that belong to $\mathbb{C}^{r \times r}$ (instead of $\mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$), with $0 < r \leq n$, where r can be considerably smaller than n . So, working with the matrices $T \in \tau$ is easier than using the matrices A .

In order to prove the isomorphism, we define the map

$$\phi: [O, B] \rightarrow \tau$$

by $\phi(A) = T$ where T is the corresponding projector from Theorem 1. As for each A , the matrix T is unique, we can assure that ϕ is well-defined and it is easy to prove that ϕ is a bijection.

Theorem 6. *Let $B \in \mathbb{C}_1^n$ be a nonzero matrix written as in (1). The posets $[O, B]$ and τ are isomorphic. Moreover, the rank function is preserved under the isomorphism ϕ .*

Proof. Let $A_i \in [O, B]$ and $\phi(A_i) = T_i$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. We want to see that $A_1 \stackrel{\#}{\leq} A_2$ iff $T_1 \leq T_2$. Since

$$A_i = U \begin{bmatrix} T_i \Sigma K & T_i \Sigma L \\ O & O \end{bmatrix} U^*,$$

from $T_1 \in \tau$ and the expression of the group inverse (3), we have

$$A_1^{\#} = U \begin{bmatrix} (\Sigma K)^{-1} T_1 & (\Sigma K)^{-1} T_1 K^{-1} L \\ O & O \end{bmatrix} U^*.$$

Thus, $A_1^{\#} A_1 = A_1^{\#} A_2$ iff $\begin{bmatrix} T_1 & (\Sigma K)^{-1} T_1 \Sigma L \\ O & O \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} T_1 T_2 & (\Sigma K)^{-1} T_1 T_2 \Sigma L \\ O & O \end{bmatrix}$ iff $T_1 = T_1 T_2$. Analogously, $A_1 A_1^{\#} = A_2 A_1^{\#}$ iff $\begin{bmatrix} T_1 & T_1 K^{-1} L \\ O & O \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} T_2 T_1 & T_2 T_1 K^{-1} L \\ O & O \end{bmatrix}$ iff $T_1 = T_2 T_1$. So, $A_1 \stackrel{\#}{\leq} A_2$ iff $T_1 \leq T_2$. Hence, $[O, B] \simeq \tau$.

The proof that ϕ preserves the rank follows as in [3, Theorem 3]. \square

Lemma 7. Let $T_1, T_2 \in \tau$ be such that $T_1T_2 = T_2T_1$. Then $T_1 \wedge T_2$ and $T_1 \vee T_2$ both exist, and, $T_1 \wedge T_2 = T_1T_2$ and $T_1 \vee T_2 = T_1 + T_2 - T_1T_2$.

Proof. From the assumptions, it is easy to show that $(T_1T_2)^2 = T_1T_2$ and $(T_1T_2)\Sigma K = \Sigma K(T_1T_2)$. So, $T_1T_2 \in \tau$. Moreover, if $\tilde{T} \in \tau$ is such that $\tilde{T} \leq T_1$ and $\tilde{T} \leq T_2$ then $\tilde{T}(T_1T_2) = (\tilde{T}T_1)T_2 = \tilde{T}T_2 = \tilde{T} = T_1\tilde{T} = T_1(T_2\tilde{T}) = (T_1T_2)\tilde{T}$. So, $\tilde{T} \leq T_1T_2$, hence $T_1T_2 = T_1 \wedge T_2$.

If T_1 and T_2 commute then $(T_1 + T_2 - T_1T_2)^2 = T_1 + T_2 - T_1T_2$ and $(T_1 + T_2 - T_1T_2)\Sigma K = \Sigma K(T_1 + T_2 - T_1T_2)$. So $T_1 + T_2 - T_1T_2 \in \tau$. Let $\tilde{T} \in \tau$ be such that $T_1 \leq \tilde{T}$ and $T_2 \leq \tilde{T}$. Then,

$$(T_1 + T_2 - T_1T_2)\tilde{T} = T_1\tilde{T} + T_2\tilde{T} - T_1T_2\tilde{T} = T_1 + T_2 - T_1T_2 = \tilde{T}(T_1 + T_2 - T_1T_2).$$

Therefore, $T_1 + T_2 - T_1T_2 = T_1 \vee T_2$. □

As an immediate consequence of the above result and the fact that ϕ is an isomorphism we have the following result.

Corollary 8. Let $A_1, A_2 \in [O, B]$ be written as in (2) such that $T_1T_2 = T_2T_1$, where $T_i = \phi(A_i)$ for every $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Then:

(a) $A_1 \wedge A_2 = A_1B^\dagger A_2$,

(b) $A_1 \vee A_2 = A_1 + A_2 - A_1 \wedge A_2$.

Proof. To see (a),

$$\begin{aligned} A_1B^\dagger A_2 &= U \begin{bmatrix} T_1\Sigma K & T_1\Sigma L \\ O & O \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} K^*\Sigma^{-1} & O \\ L^*\Sigma^{-1} & O \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} T_2\Sigma K & T_2\Sigma L \\ O & O \end{bmatrix} U^* = U \begin{bmatrix} T_1T_2\Sigma K & T_1T_2\Sigma L \\ O & O \end{bmatrix} U^* \\ &= A_1 \wedge A_2. \end{aligned}$$

Part (b) follows directly from Lemma 7. □

Remark 9. Assume $A \leq^{\#} B$ and $A \neq B$. It is easy to see that $\text{rk}(A) < \text{rk}(B)$. From this, we deduce the following:

(a) If $\text{rk}(A) = \text{rk}(B)$ then A and B are incomparable.

(b) The largest subchain in $[O, B]$ has at most $\text{rk}(B) + 1$ elements.

Proposition 10. If $[O, B]$ is a lattice then it is complemented of finite height.

Proof. Let $T \in \tau$. Let us see that $I_r - T \in \tau$. Indeed, it is clear that $(I_r - T)^2 = I_r - T$. Since $T\Sigma K = \Sigma KT$, then $(I_r - T)\Sigma K = \Sigma K(I_r - T)$. So $I_r - T \in \tau$. Since $T(I_r - T) = (I_r - T)T = O$ then $T \wedge (I_r - T) = O$ and $T \vee (I_r - T) = I_r$ by Lemma 7. □

Let us observe that the complement of an element is not necessarily unique. However, if the lattice is distributive then the complements are unique and the following result is satisfied.

Corollary 11. If $[O, B]$ is a distributive lattice then $[O, B]$ is a Boolean algebra.

In the last part of the section, we will prove that any interval is a copy of a certain down-set, more specifically, the interval $[A_1, A_2] = \{A \in \mathbb{C}_1^n : A_1 \leq^{\#} A \leq^{\#} A_2\}$, for any $A_1 \leq^{\#} A_2 \in \mathbb{C}_1^n$ is isomorphic to $[O, A_2 - A_1]$.

Remark 12. Let $P, T, Q \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times r}$ be projectors such that $P \leq T$ and $TQ = QT = O$. It is easy to see that $PQ = QP = O$.

Lemma 13. Let $A, A_1, A_2, B \in \mathbb{C}_1^n$. If $A_1 \leq^{\#} A_2 \leq^{\#} B$ then $[A_1, A_2]$ and $[O, A_2 - A_1]$ are isomorphic. In particular, if $A \leq^{\#} B$ then $[O, B - A]$ and $[A, B]$ are isomorphic.

Proof. Assume that $A_1 \stackrel{\#}{\leq} A_2 \stackrel{\#}{\leq} B$ and set T_1, T_2 such that $\phi(A_i) = T_i$, for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$. If P satisfies $P^2 = P \leq T_2 - T_1$, by $(T_2 - T_1)T_1 = O = T_1(T_2 - T_1)$ and Remark 12, we have that $PT_1 = T_1P = O$. It is easy to see that $P + T_1$ is idempotent and $T_1 \leq P + T_1$. Now, again from $P \leq T_2 - T_1$, we have that $P = P(T_2 - T_1) = PT_2$ and $P = (T_2 - T_1)P = T_2P$. Then, $(P + T_1)T_2 = PT_2 + T_1T_2 = P + T_1 = T_2P + T_2P_1 = T_2(P + T_1)$, i.e., $P + T_1 \leq T_2$. Thus, the map $\varphi: [O, T_2 - T_1] \rightarrow [T_1, T_2]$ given by $\varphi(P) = P + T_1$ is well-defined. Let us prove that φ is an isomorphism. Indeed, let $Q \in [T_1, T_2]$ and $P = Q - T_1$. Then $P(T_2 - T_1) = (Q - T_1)(T_2 - T_1) = QT_2 - T_1T_2 - QT_1 + T_1^2 = Q - T_1 - T_1 + T_1 = Q - T_1 = P$. Similarly, $(T_2 - T_1)P = P$. So, $P \in [O, T_2 - T_1]$ and $\varphi(P) = Q$. Thus, φ is surjective. Let $P_1, P_2 \in [O, T_2 - T_1]$. Since $T_1P_2 = P_1T_1 = T_1P_1 = P_2T_1 = O$ then, $\varphi(P_1) \leq \varphi(P_2)$ if and only if $P_1P_2 = P_2P_1 = P_1$ if and only if $P_1 \leq P_2$. Then, φ is an isomorphism.

The second statement follows by setting $A_1 = A$ and $A_2 = B$. \square

4 Down-set of B via projectors that commutes with the Jordan canonical form of ΣK

Let $B \in \mathbb{C}_1^n$ be written as in (1) and the Jordan decomposition of the nonsingular matrix ΣK , that is, $\Sigma K = PJP^{-1}$ where the Jordan canonical form of ΣK is $J = \text{diag}(J(\lambda_1), J(\lambda_2), \dots, J(\lambda_s))$ as in (4) and s is the number of distinct eigenvalues of ΣK .

In the previous section we considered the poset $\tau = \{T \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times r} : T^2 = T \text{ and } T\Sigma K = \Sigma KT\}$ endowed with the partial order given by $T_1 \leq T_2$ if and only if $T_1 = T_1T_2 = T_2T_1$, and we proved that this poset is isomorphic to the down-set of B . Now, we introduce a new poset

$$\delta = \{T \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times r} : T^2 = T \text{ and } TJ = JT\},$$

also ordered by \leq . In this section we establish an isomorphism between the poset τ and the poset δ . Clearly, we will have an isomorphism between the down-set of B and the poset δ given by the composition of both isomorphisms. Consequently, we can study the down-set of B through the poset δ . This brings significant advantages, not only because elements in δ are projectors (with sizes smaller than those of the corresponding matrices which are in the down-set of B) but also because, as these projectors commute with the Jordan canonical form of ΣK , we can describe them with more precision. So, we get a deeper description of the matrices that are below a given matrix B . From this, we obtain conditions under which the down-set of B is a lattice and we completely describe this lattice. We also analyze when it is distributive and we give conditions for the down-set of B to be a Boolean algebra.

In the following result we will prove that τ is isomorphic to δ . To do this, we define the map $\psi: \delta \rightarrow \tau$ by $\psi(T) = PTP^{-1}$, where P is the nonsingular matrix obtained in the Jordan decomposition of ΣK .

Proposition 14. *The posets τ and δ , ordered by \leq in both cases, are isomorphic.*

Proof. Is clear that $[\psi(T)]^2 = \psi(T)$ because $T^2 = T$ and $\psi(T)\Sigma K = \Sigma K\psi(T)$ holds from $TJ = JT$. Then $\psi(T) \in \tau$. Hence, ψ is well defined. If $T \in \tau$, we have that $P^{-1}TP \in \delta$ and $\psi(P^{-1}TP) = T$, that is ψ is onto. Finally, for all $T_1, T_2 \in \delta$ we have that $T_1 \leq T_2$ iff $T_1 = T_1T_2 = T_2T_1$ iff $PT_1P^{-1} = PT_1P^{-1}PT_2P^{-1} = PT_2P^{-1}PT_1P^{-1}$ iff $\psi(T_1) = \psi(T_1)\psi(T_2) = \psi(T_2)\psi(T_1)$ iff $\psi(T_1) \leq \psi(T_2)$. \square

It is easy to see that the rank function is preserved under ψ .

Let M be a given square matrix. We consider the poset δ_M of all the projectors with the same size of M and commuting with M , that is,

$$\delta_M = \{T: T^2 = T \text{ and } TM = MT\}$$

ordered by \leq . Obviously, $\delta = \delta_J$.

We start by studying the poset δ_J in the special case in which J is a Jordan matrix with only one eigenvalue having geometric multiplicity equal to 2. In the following lemma, we determine the possible ranks of a projector in this δ_J . This case is important because it will be our starting point for describing the poset δ , and thus the down-set of B , in the general case.

Lemma 15. *Let $J = J(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} J_1(\lambda) & O \\ O & J_2(\lambda) \end{bmatrix}$ be a block matrix where $J_1(\lambda)$ and $J_2(\lambda)$ are the Jordan blocks associated to the same eigenvalue λ , $J_1(\lambda) \in \mathbb{C}^{q \times q}$, $J_2(\lambda) \in \mathbb{C}^{p \times p}$, $q \geq p$ and $q + p = r$. Let $T \in \delta_J$.*

(a) *If $q > p$ then $\text{rk}(T) \in \{0, p, q, r\}$.*

(b) *If $q = p$ then $\text{rk}(T) \in \{0, r/2, r\}$.*

Proof. Since $TJ = JT$, particularizing in (7) and (8), we get $T = D_1 = \begin{bmatrix} R_{11} & R_{12} \\ R_{21} & R_{22} \end{bmatrix}$, where $R_{11} \in \mathbb{C}^{q \times q}$, $R_{22} \in \mathbb{C}^{p \times p}$, $R_{12} \in \mathbb{C}^{q \times p}$ and $R_{21} \in \mathbb{C}^{p \times q}$. The equality $T^2 = T$ implies

$$\begin{bmatrix} R_{11}^2 + R_{12}R_{21} & R_{11}R_{12} + R_{12}R_{22} \\ R_{21}R_{11} + R_{22}R_{21} & R_{22}^2 + R_{21}R_{12} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} R_{11} & R_{12} \\ R_{21} & R_{22} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (10)$$

(a) If $q > p$ then by (9) $T = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} X_{11} & X_{12} \\ \hline O & X_{21} \end{array} \middle| \begin{array}{c} X_{12} \\ O \\ X_{22} \end{array} \right]$ where $X_{11} \in \mathbb{C}^{q \times q}$, $X_{12}, X_{21}, X_{22} \in \mathbb{C}^{p \times p}$ are

RUTM's. Firstly, we observe that $R_{12}R_{21} = \begin{bmatrix} X_{12} \\ O \end{bmatrix} [O \ X_{21}] = \begin{bmatrix} O & X_{12}X_{21} \\ O & O \end{bmatrix}$ and then the

main diagonal has all the elements equal 0. Secondly, we have that $R_{21}R_{12} = [O \ X_{21}] \begin{bmatrix} X_{12} \\ O \end{bmatrix}$ and easy computations yields to the elements in the main diagonal of $R_{21}R_{12}$ are again all equal 0.

Since $R_{11} = X_{11}$ is a RUTM, the elements in the main diagonal of R_{11} are all equal to certain a . From the above and (10) we have that $a = a^2$. So, $a = 0$ or $a = 1$. Similarly, if we call b the elements in the main diagonal of $R_{22} = X_{22}$ we obtain that $b = 0$ or $b = 1$.

Now, we argue by computing ranks. Let us recall that if T is a projector then $\text{rk}(T)$ is equal to the trace of T which is denoted by $\text{tr}(T)$. Thus, if $a = b = 0$ then $T = O$ and if $a = b = 1$ then $T = I_r$. If $a = 1$ and $b = 0$ then $\text{rk}(T) = q$ and if $a = 0$ and $b = 1$ then $\text{rk}(T) = p$.

(b) If $q = p$, then $r = 2q$ and then by (9) $T = \begin{bmatrix} X_{11} & X_{12} \\ X_{21} & X_{22} \end{bmatrix}$ where $X_{ij} \in \mathbb{C}^{q \times q}$ is a RUTM, for $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$. Let a, b, c, d be the elements of the main diagonal of X_{11} , X_{22} , X_{12} , and X_{21} , respectively. Using (10) we have $a^2 + cd = a$ and $b^2 + cd = b$. Thus, $(a - b)(a + b) = a - b$. If $a \neq b$, then $a = 1 - b$ and $\text{rk}(T) = \text{tr}(T) = q = r/2$. If $a = b$ then $\text{rk}(T) = \text{tr}(T) = ra$. If $a = 1$ then $T = I_r$ and if $a = 0$ then $T = O$. If $a \neq 0$ and $a \neq 1$ then $\text{rk}(X_{11}) = r/2$ and this implies that $\text{rk}(T) \geq r/2$. Similarly, $\text{rk}(I_r - T) \geq r/2$. Since $\text{rk}(T) + \text{rk}(I_r - T) = r$ then $\text{rk}(T) = r/2$. \square

Remark 16. From the proof of Lemma 15 we also obtain that if $q > p$ and $\text{rk}(T) = q$ then the elements in the main diagonal of X_{11} are all equal to 1 and the elements in the main diagonal of X_{22} are equal to 0. In the same way, if $\text{rk}(T) = p$ then the elements in the main diagonal of X_{11} are all equal to 0 and the elements in the main diagonal of X_{22} are equal to 1.

In the next theorem we describe the poset δ_J in which J is a Jordan matrix as in (4) having only one eigenvalue and no more than two Jordan blocks associated to it.

Theorem 17. *Let $J = J(\lambda) \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times r}$ be a Jordan matrix having only one eigenvalue λ .*

- (a) If the geometric multiplicity of λ is 1 then $\delta_J = \{O, I_r\}$.
- (b) If the geometric multiplicity of λ is 2 then the projectors in δ_J distinct from O and I_r are pairwise incomparable. Thus, δ_J is a lattice with first element, greatest element, and between both of them infinite incomparable elements as shown in the Hasse diagram given in Figure 1.




Figure 1: δ_J when J has exactly only one eigenvalue of geometric multiplicity 2.

Proof. (a) Let $T \in \delta_J$. Since J has only one eigenvalue with geometric multiplicity 1 and $TJ = JT$, then T is a RUTM and $T = a_1 I_r + a_2 N + a_3 N^2 + \dots + a_r N^{r-1}$ for some $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r \in \mathbb{C}$. Moreover, $T = T^2$. Then by Remark 5, $a_1 \in \{0, 1\}$ and $a_i = 0$ for $2 \leq i \leq r$. Thus $\delta_J = \{O, I_r\}$.

- (b) Let J have exactly two Jordan blocks of sizes q and p . Suppose first that $q > p$ and we take $T_1, T_2 \in \delta_J \setminus \{O, I_r\}$. If $\text{rk}(T_1) = \text{rk}(T_2)$ then T_1 and T_2 are incomparable by part (a) in Remark 9. If $\text{rk}(T_1) \neq \text{rk}(T_2)$ then by Lemma 15 either $\text{rk}(T_1) = q$ and $\text{rk}(T_2) = p$, or, $\text{rk}(T_1) = p$ and $\text{rk}(T_2) = q$. Without loss of generality, we can suppose that $\text{rk}(T_1) = q$ and

$$\text{rk}(T_2) = p. \text{ We know that } T_1 = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} X_{11} & X_{12} \\ \hline O & X_{21} & X_{22} \end{array} \right] \text{ where } X_{11} \in \mathbb{C}^{q \times q}, X_{12}, X_{21}, X_{22} \in \mathbb{C}^{p \times p}$$

are RUTM's. Moreover, by Remark 16, the elements in the main diagonal of X_{11} are all equal to 1 and the elements in the main diagonal of X_{22} are equal to 0. In the same way,

$$T_2 = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} Y_{11} & Y_{12} \\ \hline O & Y_{21} & Y_{22} \end{array} \right] \text{ where } Y_{11} \in \mathbb{C}^{q \times q}, Y_{12}, Y_{21}, Y_{22} \in \mathbb{C}^{p \times p} \text{ are RUTM's with all the}$$

elements in the main diagonal of Y_{11} equal to 0 and all the elements in the main diagonal of Y_{22} equal to 1. It is straightforward to see that the elements in the main diagonal of $T_1 T_2$ are all equal to 0. So, $T_1 T_2 \neq T_1$ and $T_1 T_2 \neq T_2$. Thus, T_1 and T_2 are incomparable.

If $q = p$ then all $T \in \delta_J \setminus \{O, I_r\}$ have the same rank by Lemma 15 and thus they are pairwise incomparable by Remark 9. \square

As a consequence of the previous theorem and the isomorphism between the poset $\delta = \delta_J$ and the down-set of B , we can describe this last poset for the case where the Jordan canonical form J of ΣK has only one eigenvalue and no more than two Jordan blocks associated to it.

Theorem 18. Let $B \in \mathbb{C}_1^n$ be as in (1) where ΣK has only one eigenvalue λ and $J = J(\lambda)$ is the Jordan canonical form of ΣK .

- (a) If the geometric multiplicity of λ is 1 then δ and $[O, B]$ are lattices (chains) with only two elements.
- (b) If the geometric multiplicity of λ is 2 then δ and $[O, B]$ are lattices as shown in Figure 1.

Now we analyze the general case where ΣK has more than one eigenvalue. First, we study the case in which the geometric multiplicity of each eigenvalue is less than or equal to 2.

Theorem 19. *Let $B \in \mathbb{C}_1^n$ be written as in (1) where ΣK has s distinct eigenvalues such that the geometric multiplicity of each one of them is less or equal to 2. Then δ is isomorphic to a finite direct product of lattices that are either chains of two elements or isomorphic to the lattice whose diagram is given in Figure 1.*

Proof. Let $T_i \in \delta$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Then $T_i = \text{diag}(D_{i1}, \dots, D_{is})$ where each $D_{ij} \in \delta_{J(\lambda_j)}$. Moreover, $T_1 \leq T_2$ if and only if $\text{diag}(D_{11}, \dots, D_{1s}) \leq \text{diag}(D_{21}, \dots, D_{2s})$ if and only if $D_{1j} \leq D_{2j}$ for each $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$. Applying Theorem 18 for each j , we have that $\delta = \delta_{J(\lambda_1)} \times \dots \times \delta_{J(\lambda_s)}$ where $\delta_{J(\lambda_j)}$ is either a chain of two elements or the lattice depicted in Figure 1. It is easy to see that $T_1 \vee T_2 = \text{diag}(D_{11} \vee D_{21}, \dots, D_{1s} \vee D_{2s})$ and $T_1 \wedge T_2 = \text{diag}(D_{11} \wedge D_{21}, \dots, D_{1s} \wedge D_{2s})$. \square

Corollary 20. *Let $B \in \mathbb{C}_1^n$ be decomposed as in (1) where ΣK has s distinct eigenvalues and J is the Jordan canonical form of ΣK . If J has only one Jordan block for each eigenvalue, that is $t_j = 1$ in (5) for all $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, then δ , and in consequence the down-set $[O, B]$ and τ , are Boolean algebra with 2^s elements.*

It is well-known that a lattice R is nondistributive if and only if there is a sublattice of R isomorphic to M_5 , whose Hasse diagram is given in Figure 2 (see for example [2, Theorem 3.6]). So, the next result holds.




Figure 2: The lattice M_5

Corollary 21. *If J is such that some $t_j = 2$ in (5) then $[O, B]$ is nondistributive.*

In the next example we show the lattice $[O, B]$ where ΣK has two distinct eigenvalues, λ_1 and λ_2 , such that the geometric multiplicity of λ_1 is 2 and the geometric multiplicity of λ_2 is 1.

Example 22. Let $B \in \mathbb{C}_1^n$ be such that $\Sigma K = PJP^{-1}$ with $J = \begin{bmatrix} J(\lambda_1) & O \\ O & J(\lambda_2) \end{bmatrix}$, $J(\lambda_1) = \begin{bmatrix} J_1(\lambda_1) & O \\ O & J_2(\lambda_1) \end{bmatrix}$, and $J(\lambda_2) = J_1(\lambda_2)$ with $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$, that is $t_1 = 2$ and $t_2 = 1$. Then $[O, B]$ is the lattice presented in Figure 3 where $\phi(A_1) = \text{diag}(D_1, O)$, $D_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{r_1 \times r_1}$ a projector as in Lemma 15, $\phi(A_2) = \text{diag}(I_{r_1}, O)$, $\phi(A_3) = \text{diag}(O, I_{r_2})$ and $\phi(A_4) = \text{diag}(D_1, I_{r_2})$.

In the next theorem we give the characterization of $[O, B]$ as a lattice in terms of the Jordan canonical form of ΣK .

Theorem 23. *Let $B \in \mathbb{C}_1^n$ be written as in (1) and let $J = \text{diag}(J(\lambda_1), J(\lambda_2), \dots, J(\lambda_s))$ be the Jordan canonical form of ΣK as in (4). Then, $[O, B]$ is a lattice if and only if $t_j \in \{1, 2\}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq s$.*

Proof. Let us suppose that $t_j \geq 3$ for some $1 \leq j \leq s$. Without loss of generality, we can assume $t_1 \geq 3$. Then, there are at least three Jordan blocks $J_k(\lambda_1) \in \mathbb{C}^{r_{k1} \times r_{k1}}$, for $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ associated to the eigenvalue λ_1 . We can assume also that the sizes of the matrices satisfy that $r_{11} \geq r_{21} \geq r_{31}$.




Figure 3: $[O, B]$ with $t_1 = 2$ and $t_2 = 1$




Figure 4: Neither $T_1 \vee T_2$ nor $T_3 \wedge T_4$ exist

We will find $T_1, T_2, T_3, T_4 \in \delta$ such that neither the infimum of T_3 and T_4 nor the supremum of T_1 and T_2 exist (see Figure 4), which leads to a contradiction.

Let $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, $T_i = \text{diag}(D_{i1}, D_{i2}, \dots, D_{is})$ as in (7) with $D_{ij} = O$ if $j > 1$ and $D_{i1} = \begin{bmatrix} G_i & O \\ O & O \end{bmatrix}$. Here the size of the G_i is $(r_{11} + r_{21} + r_{31}) \times (r_{11} + r_{21} + r_{31})$.

Let us consider $X = \begin{bmatrix} I_{r_{21}} \\ O \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{r_{11} \times r_{21}}$ and $Y = \begin{bmatrix} O & I_{r_{31}} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{r_{31} \times r_{21}}$. It is easy to see

that $J_1(\lambda_1)X = XJ_2(\lambda_1)$ and $J_3(\lambda_1)Y = YJ_2(\lambda_1)$. We also consider $G_1 = \begin{bmatrix} O & X & O \\ O & I_{r_{21}} & O \\ O & O & O \end{bmatrix}$,

$G_2 = \begin{bmatrix} O & X & O \\ O & I_{r_{21}} & O \\ O & Y & O \end{bmatrix}$ and $G_3 = \begin{bmatrix} O & X & O \\ O & I_{r_{21}} & O \\ O & O & I_{r_{31}} \end{bmatrix}$. It is straightforward to see that $T_1, T_2, T_3 \in \delta$,

$T_1 \leq T_3$, $T_2 \leq T_3$, and T_1 is incomparable with T_2 . Let $T \in \delta$ such that $T_2 \leq T \leq T_3$. Then $T_2 = T$ or $T_3 = T$. Indeed, from $T \leq T_3$ we have that $T = \text{diag}(D_1, O, \dots, O)$ where $D_1 = \begin{bmatrix} D & O \\ O & O \end{bmatrix}$ with

$D = \begin{bmatrix} R_{11} & R_{12} & R_{13} \\ R_{21} & R_{22} & R_{23} \\ R_{31} & R_{32} & R_{33} \end{bmatrix}$ as in (9), $R_{kk} \in \mathbb{C}^{r_{k1} \times r_{k1}}$, $1 \leq k \leq 3$. Since $T_2 = T_2T$ then $R_{22} = I_{r_{21}}$,

$R_{21} = O$ and $R_{23} = O$. By $T = TT_3 = T_3T$ we have that $R_{11} = O$, $R_{31} = O$, $R_{12} = X$ and

$R_{13} = O$, that is $D = \begin{bmatrix} O & X & O \\ O & I_{r_{21}} & O \\ O & R_{32} & R_{33} \end{bmatrix}$. From $T_2 = TT_2$ we obtain $R_{32} + R_{33}Y = Y$. Now, using

that $T^2 = T$ we have that $R_{33}^2 = R_{33}$ and $R_{33}R_{32} = O$. Since R_{33} is a RUTM, by Remark 5 we arrive at $R_{33} = O$ or $R_{33} = I_{r_{31}}$. If $R_{33} = O$ then $R_{32} = Y$ and $T = T_2$. If $R_{33} = I_{r_{31}}$ then $R_{32} = O$ and $T = T_3$. Analogously, we can prove that if $T \in \delta$ and $T_1 \leq T \leq T_3$, then $T_1 = T$ or $T_3 = T$.

In order to construct T_4 we consider two cases. If $r_{11} = r_{21}$ then $G_4 = \begin{bmatrix} O & X & O \\ O & I_{r_{21}} & O \\ Z & Y & I_{r_{31}} \end{bmatrix}$ where

$Z = \begin{bmatrix} O & X & O \\ O & I_{r_{21}} & O \\ Z & O & I_{r_{31}} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{r_{31} \times r_{11}}$. If $r_{11} > r_{21}$ then $G_4 = \begin{bmatrix} O & X & O \\ O & I_{r_{21}} & O \\ Z & O & I_{r_{31}} \end{bmatrix}$ with $Z = (z_{ij}) \in \mathbb{C}^{r_{31} \times r_{11}}$,

where $z_{ij} = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } i = 1 \text{ and } j = r_{11} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$. Taking into account that $ZJ_1(\lambda_1) = J_3(\lambda_1)Z$, it is straightforward to see that $T_4 \in \delta$, T_3 and T_4 are incomparable, and that T_4 covers T_1 and T_2 . This means that $[O, B]$ is not a lattice.

The ‘‘if’’ part is given by Theorem 19. \square

5 A distinguished Boolean algebra in the down-set

In this section we prove that there exists a distinguished poset within the down-set of a matrix B that turns out to be a Boolean algebra and describe its elements. We present this algebra in the next Lemma.

Lemma 24. *The poset $\mathcal{C} = \{T \in \tau : T\tilde{T} = \tilde{T}T \text{ for all } \tilde{T} \in \tau\}$ ordered by \leq is a Boolean algebra.*

Proof. It is clear that $O, I_r \in \mathcal{C}$ and if $T_1, T_2 \in \mathcal{C}$ then $T_1T_2, T_1 + T_2 - T_1T_2, I_r - T \in \mathcal{C}$. By Lemma 7, $T_1 \wedge T_2 = T_1T_2$ and $T_1 \vee T_2 = T_1 + T_2 - T_1T_2$. Moreover, if $T_3 \in \mathcal{C}$ then $T_1 \wedge (T_2 \vee T_3) = (T_1 \wedge T_2) \vee (T_1 \wedge T_3)$. So, \mathcal{C} is a complemented distributive lattice and this implies that it is a Boolean algebra. \square

Now we use the isomorphism $\psi: \delta \rightarrow \tau$ defined by $\psi(T) = PTP^{-1}$ in the previous section to describe the elements in the Boolean algebra. Since ψ is an isomorphism, we know that the set $\psi^{-1}(\mathcal{C})$ is a Boolean algebra within the poset δ . By the definition of ψ , it is easy to see that ψ preserves the matrix product. Indeed,

$$\psi(T_1)\psi(T_2) = PT_1P^{-1}PT_2P^{-1} = PT_1T_2P^{-1} = \psi(T_1T_2).$$

Thus, if $T \in \psi^{-1}(\mathcal{C})$ then T commutes with all the projectors in δ . Moreover, in particular $T \in \delta$ then by the characterization given in (7) of projectors that commutes with the Jordan canonical form $J = \text{diag}(J(\lambda_1), J(\lambda_2), \dots, J(\lambda_s))$ of ΣK , we know that $T = \text{diag}(D_1, D_2, \dots, D_s)$ and $D_j = [R_{\alpha\beta}]$ where the submatrices $R_{\alpha\beta}$ have the form given in (9). In the next lemma we characterize the submatrices D_j , for each j , and in consequence we obtain a description of the elements in the Boolean algebra $\psi^{-1}(\mathcal{C})$.

Lemma 25. *Let \mathcal{C} be the Boolean algebra defined in Lemma 24 and $T \in \psi^{-1}(\mathcal{C})$. Then $T = \text{diag}(D_1, D_2, \dots, D_s)$ with $D_j \in \{O, I_{r_j}\}$. Therefore, $\psi^{-1}(\mathcal{C})$ has 2^s elements, where s is the number of distinct eigenvalues of ΣK .*

Proof. First, we are going to construct a family $\{T_{kj}\}$ of projectors in δ as follows. For each j , $1 \leq j \leq s$, and for each k , $1 \leq k \leq t_j$ consider $T_{kj} = \text{diag}(O, \dots, D_{kj}, \dots, O)$ with D_{kj} at the j -th position and $D_{kj} = [\tilde{R}_{\alpha\beta}] \in \mathbb{C}^{r_j \times r_j}$ as in (9) where $\tilde{R}_{\alpha\beta} = \begin{cases} I_{r_{kj}} & \text{if } \alpha = \beta = k \\ O & \text{elsewhere} \end{cases}$. We recall

that $r_{kj} \times r_{kj}$ is the size of the Jordan block $J_k(\lambda_j)$ of $J(\lambda_j)$.

Take $T \in \psi^{-1}(\mathcal{C})$. Then $T = \text{diag}(D_1, D_2, \dots, D_s)$ where $D_j = [R_{\alpha\beta}] \in \mathbb{C}^{r_j \times r_j}$, for each $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, and since T commutes with the projectors of δ , in particular T commutes with the projectors T_{kj} . Now, $TT_{kj} = T_{kj}T$ iff $D_jD_{kj} = D_{kj}D_j$, for all j , iff $[R_{\alpha\beta}][\tilde{R}_{\alpha\beta}] = [\tilde{R}_{\alpha\beta}][R_{\alpha\beta}]$

iff

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{bmatrix} R_{11} & \cdots & R_{1k} & \cdots & R_{1t_j} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ R_{k1} & \cdots & R_{kk} & \cdots & R_{kt_j} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ R_{t_j 1} & \cdots & R_{t_j k} & \cdots & R_{t_j t_j} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} O & \cdots & O & \cdots & O \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ O & \cdots & I_{r_{kj}} & \cdots & O \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ O & \cdots & O & \cdots & O \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} O & \cdots & R_{1k} & \cdots & O \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ O & \cdots & R_{kk} & \cdots & O \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ O & \cdots & R_{t_j k} & \cdots & O \end{bmatrix} = \\ & \begin{bmatrix} O & \cdots & O & \cdots & O \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ O & \cdots & I_{r_{kj}} & \cdots & O \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ O & \cdots & O & \cdots & O \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} R_{11} & \cdots & R_{1k} & \cdots & R_{1t_j} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ R_{k1} & \cdots & R_{kk} & \cdots & R_{kt_j} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ R_{t_j 1} & \cdots & R_{t_j k} & \cdots & R_{t_j t_j} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} O & \cdots & O & \cdots & O \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ R_{k1} & \cdots & R_{kk} & \cdots & R_{kt_j} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ O & \cdots & O & \cdots & O \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

iff $R_{\alpha k} = O$ and $R_{k\alpha} = O$ for all $\alpha \neq k$, $1 \leq k \leq t_j$ and $1 \leq \alpha \leq t_j$. Hence, $D_j = \text{diag}(R_{11}, R_{22}, \dots, R_{t_j t_j})$. Since $D_j = D_j^2$ then $R_{kk} = R_{kk}^2$ and by Remark 5 we have that $R_{kk} \in \{O, I_{r_{kj}}\}$.

If the Jordan canonical form J has only one Jordan block associated with the eigenvalue λ_j , that is if $t_j = 1$, then $D_j = R_{11}$ and, in consequence $D_j \in \{O, I_{r_j}\}$. Hence, our claim has been proved in this particular case.

Now, let us consider that $t_j > 1$. Then $D_j = \text{diag}(R_{11}, R_{22}, \dots, R_{t_j t_j})$. Without loss of generality we can assume that the sizes of the submatrices R_{kk} , $1 \leq k \leq t_j$, satisfy that $r_{1j} \geq r_{2j} \geq \dots \geq r_{t_j j}$. To prove our claim, we consider the j projectors in δ defined as follows

$$T_j = \text{diag}(O, \dots, \tilde{D}_j, \dots, O) \text{ where } \tilde{D}_j = \left[\begin{array}{c|ccc} I_{r_{1j}} & O & \cdots & O \\ O & I_{r_{2j}} & & O \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \\ O & I_{r_{t_j j}} & & O \end{array} \right]. \text{ Then, } TT_j = T_j T \text{ if and}$$

only if $D_j \tilde{D}_j = \tilde{D}_j D_j$ if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{bmatrix} R_{11} & O & \cdots & O \\ O & R_{22} & \cdots & O \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ O & O & \cdots & R_{t_j t_j} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{r_{1j}} & O & \cdots & O \\ O & I_{r_{2j}} & & O \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \\ O & I_{r_{t_j j}} & & O \end{bmatrix} = \\ & \begin{bmatrix} I_{r_{1j}} & O & \cdots & O \\ O & I_{r_{2j}} & & O \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \\ O & I_{r_{t_j j}} & & O \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} R_{11} & O & \cdots & O \\ O & R_{22} & \cdots & O \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ O & O & \cdots & R_{t_j t_j} \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

if and only if $R_{kk} \begin{bmatrix} O & I_{r_{kj}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} O & I_{r_{kj}} \end{bmatrix} R_{11}$ for each k , $2 \leq k \leq t_j$. From this and taking into account that $R_{kk} \in \{O, I_{r_{kj}}\}$, $R_{11} = O$ implies that $R_{kk} = O$ for each k , and $R_{11} = I_{r_{1j}}$ implies that $R_{kk} = I_{r_{kj}}$ for each k . Therefore $D_j = O$ or $D_j = I_{r_j}$, and this completes the proof. \square

As an example, if we consider the down-set of B given in Example 22, then the Boolean subalgebra \mathcal{C} has the elements $\{O, \phi(A_2), \phi(A_3), I_r\}$ depicted in Figure 3.

6 The poset \mathbb{C}_1^n

In this section we prove that $\left(\mathbb{C}_1^n, \overset{\#}{\leq}\right)$ is a lower semilattice if and only if $n \leq 2$. In order to do that, we establish a characterization of the matrices that are above a given matrix A in terms of its Jordan canonical form.

The Jordan decomposition of a given matrix B provides us a description of matrices A that are below B ([16]). More precisely, let A and B be square matrices of the same size. Let $B \in \mathbb{C}_1^n$ and let $B = P \text{diag}(J_1, \dots, J_l, O) P^{-1}$ be the Jordan decomposition of B , where J_1, \dots, J_l are nonsingular Jordan blocks and P is a nonsingular matrix. Let $A = P \text{diag}(D_1, \dots, D_l, O) P^{-1}$ where $D_i \in \{O, J_i\}$. It is easy to check that A is of index less or equal 1 and $A \stackrel{\#}{\leq} B$. The converse of this statement in the special case where there is exactly one Jordan block corresponding to each nonzero eigenvalue is given in [16, Theorem 4.3.13].

Theorem 26. [16, Theorem 4.3.13] *Let A and B be square matrices of the same size. Let B be of index less or equal 1 and $B = P \text{diag}(J_1, \dots, J_l, O) P^{-1}$ be the Jordan decomposition of B , where J_1, \dots, J_l are nonsingular Jordan blocks corresponding to distinct eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_l$ and P is a nonsingular matrix. Then A is of index less or equal 1 and $A \stackrel{\#}{\leq} B$ if and only if $A = P \text{diag}(D_1, \dots, D_l, O) P^{-1}$ where $D_i \in \{O, J_i\}$.*

In [16] the authors state the following conjecture:

Conjecture: The conclusion of Theorem 4.3.13 remains valid even when some or all distinct nonzero eigenvalues are of geometric multiplicity exceeding 1.

The conjecture is not true as we can see in the following example. Let $B = I_3$ (with $P = I_3$) and $A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$. It is easy to see that $A \stackrel{\#}{\leq} B$ but $A \neq I_3 \text{diag}(D_1, D_2, D_3) I_3^{-1}$.

However, the conjecture is not far from being true since the nonsingular matrix in the Jordan decomposition of A is not necessarily equal to the nonsingular matrix P in the Jordan decomposition of B but the Jordan blocks of A satisfy the conclusion of [16, Theorem 4.3.13]. We can establish the following result which characterizes the matrices that are above a given matrix A in terms of the Jordan decomposition of the matrix A and answer the question that arises behind the conjecture.

Lemma 27. *Let A and B be matrices in \mathbb{C}_1^n and $A = P \text{diag}(J_1, \dots, J_t, O) P^{-1}$ the Jordan decomposition of A , where J_1, \dots, J_t are nonsingular Jordan blocks and P is a nonsingular matrix. If $A \stackrel{\#}{\leq} B$ then $B = P \text{diag}(J_1, \dots, J_t, X) P^{-1}$ where X is a matrix of adequate size.*

Proof. Let $B = P \begin{bmatrix} X_{11} & \cdots & X_{1t} & X_{1(t+1)} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ X_{t1} & \cdots & X_{tt} & X_{t(t+1)} \\ X_{(t+1)1} & \cdots & X_{(t+1)t} & X_{(t+1)(t+1)} \end{bmatrix} P^{-1}$ for X_{ij} being matrices of adequate size. If $A \stackrel{\#}{\leq} B$ then, in particular, $A^2 = AB$. So,

$$\begin{bmatrix} J_1^2 & \cdots & O & O \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ O & \cdots & J_t^2 & O \\ O & \cdots & O & O \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} J_1 X_{11} & \cdots & J_1 X_{1t} & J_1 X_{1(t+1)} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ J_t X_{t1} & \cdots & J_t X_{tt} & J_t X_{t(t+1)} \\ O & \cdots & O & O \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since J_i are nonsingular, we have that $X_{ii} = J_i$, for $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ and $X_{ij} = O$, for $i \neq j$, $j \in \{1, \dots, t+1\}$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$. That is, $B = P \begin{bmatrix} J_1 & \cdots & O & O \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ O & \cdots & J_t & O \\ X_{(t+1)1} & \cdots & X_{(t+1)t} & X_{(t+1)(t+1)} \end{bmatrix} P^{-1}$.

Now from $A^2 = BA$, we obtain that

$$\begin{bmatrix} J_1^2 & \cdots & O & O \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ O & \cdots & J_t^2 & O \\ O & \cdots & O & O \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} J_1^2 & \cdots & O & O \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ O & \cdots & J_t^2 & O \\ X_{(t+1)1}J_1 & \cdots & X_{(t+1)t}J_t & O \end{bmatrix}.$$

Thus $X_{(t+1)j} = O$ for every $j \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, from where we clearly get the result. \square

Corollary 28. *Let A and B be matrices in \mathbb{C}_1^n and $A = P \text{diag}(J_1, \dots, J_t, O) P^{-1}$ the Jordan decomposition of A , where J_1, \dots, J_t are nonsingular Jordan blocks and P is a nonsingular matrix. If $A \stackrel{\#}{\leq} B$ then all the nonsingular Jordan blocks of A are Jordan blocks of B .*

The converse is not true. For example, if $B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ and $A = P \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} P^{-1}$, where $P = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 3 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$, then it is easy to see that A is not a predecessor of B .

Let us observe that the maximal elements of $\left(\mathbb{C}_1^n, \stackrel{\#}{\leq}\right)$ are nonsingular matrices. Indeed, let B be decomposed as in (1). If we consider the nonsingular matrix $C = U \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma K & (\Sigma - K^{-1})L \\ O & I_{n-r} \end{bmatrix} U^*$, we have that $B \stackrel{\#}{\leq} C$.

Remark 29. The maximum length of any subchain in $\left(\mathbb{C}_1^n, \stackrel{\#}{\leq}\right)$ is $l + 1$ where $1 \leq l \leq n$. Indeed, let B be a nonsingular matrix, $B = P \text{diag}(J_1, \dots, J_l) P^{-1}$ be the Jordan decomposition of B . By Corollary 28, the sharp order does not “split” the Jordan blocks. So, the length of any chain of matrices that are below B has at most $l + 1$ elements. Moreover, if we consider the matrices $A_i = P \text{diag}(F_1, \dots, F_i) P^{-1} \in \mathbb{C}_1^n$ where $F_k = \begin{cases} J_k & \text{if } k \leq i \\ O & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$, then we obtain a chain

$$O \stackrel{\#}{\leq} A_1 \stackrel{\#}{\leq} \dots \stackrel{\#}{\leq} A_l = B,$$

with $l + 1$ elements of maximum length.

In [15] Mitra showed that $\left(\mathbb{C}_1^n, \stackrel{\#}{\leq}\right)$ with $n \geq 4$ is not a lower semilattice. As a consequence of Theorem 23, we can extend this result to $n = 3$. Moreover, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 30. *The poset $\left(\mathbb{C}_1^n, \stackrel{\#}{\leq}\right)$ is a lower semilattice if and only if $n \leq 2$.*

Proof. If $n \geq 3$, then $\left(\mathbb{C}_1^n, \stackrel{\#}{\leq}\right)$ is not a lower semilattice. To see this it is enough to take a matrix B where ΣK has one eigenvalue such that its geometric multiplicity is greater than or equal to 3 and construct T_3 and T_4 as in the proof of the Theorem 23. Then $T_3 \wedge T_4$ does not exist in $[O, B]$ and also it is clear that $T_3 \wedge T_4$ does not exist in \mathbb{C}_1^n .

It is trivial that $\left(\mathbb{C}_1^1, \stackrel{\#}{\leq}\right)$ is a lower semilattice.

Let us prove that the poset $\left(\mathbb{C}_1^2, \stackrel{\#}{\leq}\right)$ is a lower semilattice. In order to do that, let $B_1, B_2 \in \mathbb{C}_1^2$ where $B_1 \neq B_2$. If the rank of any of them is 1 or 0 then $B_1 \wedge B_2$ clearly exists in \mathbb{C}_1^2 . Let us

suppose that B_1 and B_2 have both rank equal to 2, that is, B_1 and B_2 are maximal in the set \mathbb{C}_1^2 . Since O is the least element in \mathbb{C}_1^2 , the set of lower bounds of $\{B_1, B_2\}$ is nonempty. If O is the only element of this set, then $B_1 \wedge B_2$ exists and $B_1 \wedge B_2 = O$. We want to show that if there exists a matrix $A \neq O$ in the set of lower bounds then it is unique. In such a case, $A = B_1 \wedge B_2$.

We will argue by contradiction. Let A_1, A_2 be two distinct matrices of rank 1 which are both lower bounds of $\{B_1, B_2\}$. Let λ_1 and λ_2 be the unique nonzero eigenvalue of A_1 and A_2 respectively. If $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$ then λ_1 and λ_2 must be the eigenvalues of B_1 and B_2 . Then $B_1 = B_2$ by Lemma 27. Let us suppose now that $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda$. Then λ must be an eigenvalue of B_1 and B_2 . Neither B_1 nor B_2 can have a unique Jordan block. In fact, if $B_1 = Q \begin{bmatrix} \lambda & 1 \\ 0 & \lambda \end{bmatrix} Q^{-1}$ and since $A_1 \leq B_1$, $A_1 \neq B_1$, then by Theorem 26 we obtain that $A_1 = O$, which is a contradiction.

Suppose now that $B_1 = Q \begin{bmatrix} \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & \mu \end{bmatrix} Q^{-1}$ where $\lambda \neq \mu$. By Theorem 26, $A_1 = Q \begin{bmatrix} \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} Q^{-1}$ and $A_2 = Q \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mu \end{bmatrix} Q^{-1}$, or vice versa. Now, by Lemma 27, it follows that B_1 is the unique upper bound of $\{A_1, A_2\}$ and then $B_1 = B_2$, which is a contradiction.

So, $B_1 = Q \begin{bmatrix} \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda \end{bmatrix} Q^{-1} = \lambda I_2 = B_2$ and we have again a contradiction. \square

7 Solutions of some matrix equations

In this section we give a characterization of solutions of matrix systems via the posets τ and δ .

Let us recall that a matrix $B \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ is an EP-matrix if $\mathcal{R}(B) = \mathcal{R}(B^*)$.

Lemma 31. *Let $B \in \mathbb{C}_1^n$ be an EP-matrix written as in (1). Then, a matrix S is a solution of the system $\begin{cases} BX = XB \\ X^2 = X \end{cases}$ if and only if $S = U \text{diag}(T, W) U^*$ where $T \in \tau$, $T \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times r}$, and $W \in \mathbb{C}^{(n-r) \times (n-r)}$ is a projector.*

Proof. Since B is an EP-matrix, then $L = O$ when B is written as in (1). Let us write $S = U \begin{bmatrix} T & V \\ Z & W \end{bmatrix} U^*$ where $T \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times r}$. Let S be a solution of the system. If $BS = SB$ then $\begin{bmatrix} \Sigma K T & \Sigma K V \\ O & O \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} T \Sigma K & O \\ Z \Sigma K & O \end{bmatrix}$, so $\Sigma K T = T \Sigma K$, $Z \Sigma K = O$ and $\Sigma K V = O$; hence $Z = O$ and $V = O$. If $S^2 = S$, then $\begin{bmatrix} T^2 & O \\ O & W^2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} T & O \\ O & W \end{bmatrix}$. Thus, $T \in \tau$ and $W^2 = W$. The converse is straightforward. \square

Corollary 32. *Let $B \in \mathbb{C}_1^n$ be written as in (1) and consider the Jordan canonical form J of ΣK , such that $t_j = 1$ in (5) for all $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$.*

(a) *If B is a nonsingular matrix, then there exist 2^s projectors that commute with B .*

(b) *If B is an EP-matrix such that $\text{rk}(B) = n - 1$, then the system $\begin{cases} BX = XB \\ X^2 = X \end{cases}$ has 2^{s+1} solutions.*

Proof. By Corollary 20, τ has 2^s elements.

(a) If B is a nonsingular matrix, then it is an EP-matrix and by Lemma 31 the projectors that commute with B are $S = UTU^*$, with $T \in \tau$. Then (a) holds.

(b) If $\text{rk}(B) = n - 1$, by Lemma 31, we have that the projectors S that commute with B are $S = U \begin{bmatrix} T & O \\ O & a \end{bmatrix} U^*$, with $T \in \tau$ and $a \in \{0, 1\}$. So, the system has 2^{s+1} solutions. \square

Lemma 33. Let $B \in \mathbb{C}_1^n$ be an EP-matrix written as in (1) and $S = U \text{diag}(T, W) U^*$ where $T \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times r}$, $T \in \tau$ and $W \in \mathbb{C}^{(n-r) \times (n-r)}$ is a projector, then S is a solution of $\begin{cases} XB^k = B^k X \\ X^2 = X \end{cases}$, for each k positive integer.

Proof. It follows easily by using the definition of τ and taking into account that $T\Sigma K = \Sigma K T$ implies $T(\Sigma K)^k = (\Sigma K)^k T$, for each k . \square

Next we give a result where B is not necessarily an EP-matrix. Its proof is also straightforward as in Lemma 31 by using the definition of τ .

Lemma 34. Let $B \in \mathbb{C}_1^n$ be a matrix written as in (1) and $S = U \text{diag}(T, O) U^*$ where $T \in \tau$. Then S is a solution of the system $\begin{cases} X B X = B X \\ X^2 = X \end{cases}$.

Lemma 35. Let $B \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ be such that $B = P J P^{-1}$, where J is the Jordan canonical form of B . Then S is a solution of $\begin{cases} B X = X B \\ X^2 = X \end{cases}$ if and only if $S = P T P^{-1}$, with $T \in \delta_J$.

Proof. It follows easily by using the definition of δ_J and taking into account that $B S = S B$ iff $P J P^{-1} P P^{-1} S = S P P^{-1} P J P^{-1}$ iff $J(P^{-1} S P) = (P^{-1} S P) J$, and $S^2 = S$ iff $(P^{-1} S P)^2 = P^{-1} S P$. \square

Corollary 36. Let $B \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ be a nonsingular matrix such that has only one eigenvalue λ .

(a) If the geometric multiplicity of λ is 1 and S is a solution of $\begin{cases} B X = X B \\ X^2 = X \end{cases}$ then $S \in \{O, I_n\}$.

(b) If the geometric multiplicity of λ is 2, that is $B = P \text{diag}(J_1(\lambda), J_2(\lambda)) P^{-1}$, where $J_1(\lambda) \in \mathbb{C}^{q \times q}$ and S is a solution of $\begin{cases} B X = X B \\ X^2 = X \end{cases}$ then $S = O$ or the geometric multiplicity of the eigenvalue 1 of S is q , $n - q$, or n .

Corollary 37. Let $B \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ be a nonsingular matrix with Jordan decomposition $B = P J P^{-1}$, where J has only one Jordan block for each eigenvalue, that is $t_j = 1$ in (5) for all $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$. Then, S is a projector that commute with B if and only if $S = P \text{diag}(D_1, \dots, D_s) P^{-1}$, where $D_i \in \{O, I_{r_i}\}$. Thus, there exist 2^s projectors that commute with B .

Remark 38. As we have characterized matrices A that are below B under the sharp partial order, we also have characterized solutions of $X^2 = X B = B X$ in the case that $B \in \mathbb{C}_1^n$ is nonsingular.

Declaration of competing interest

There is no competing interest to declare.

Data availability

No data was used for the research described in the article.

Funding

The authors were partially supported by projects PGI 24/L128 and PGI 24/ZL22, Departamento de Matemática, Universidad Nacional del Sur (UNS), Argentina. The third author was partially supported by Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades of Spain (Grant REDES DE INVESTIGACIÓN, MICINN-RED2022-134176-T), by Universidad Nacional de Río Cuarto (Grant PPI 083/2020), and by Universidad Nacional de La Pampa, Facultad de Ingeniería (Grant Resol. Nro. 135/19).

References

- [1] Oskar Maria Baksalary and Götz Trenkler. Core inverse of matrices. *Linear Multilinear Algebra*, 58(5-6):681–697, 2010.
- [2] Stanley Burris and H. P. Sankappanavar. *A course in universal algebra*, volume 78 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1981.
- [3] C. R. Cimadamore, L. A. Rueda, L. Sauras-Altuzarra, and N. Thome. Lattice properties of partial orders for complex matrices via orthogonal projectors. *Linear Multilinear Algebra*, 72(5):718–736, 2024.
- [4] C. R. Cimadamore, L. A. Rueda, N. Thome, and M. Verdecchia. Some results on the left sharp partial order and the right sharp partial order for matrices. *Revista Matemática Aplicada, Computacional e Industrial (MACI)*, 9:30–33, 2023.
- [5] Charles G. Cullen. *Matrices and linear transformations*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading, Mass.-London-Don Mills, Ont., second edition, 1972.
- [6] Dragana S. Cvetković-Ilić, Dijana Mosić, and Yimin Wei. Partial orders on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 481:115–130, 2015.
- [7] D. E. Ferreyra, F. E. Levis, and N. Thome. Characterizations of k -commutative equalities for some outer generalized inverses. *Linear Multilinear Algebra*, 68(1):177–192, 2020.
- [8] Jürgen Groß. Remarks on the sharp partial order and the ordering of squares of matrices. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 417(1):87–93, 2006.
- [9] Robert E. Hartwig and Klaus Spindelböck. Matrices for which A^* and A^\dagger commute. *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, 14(3):241–256, 1983.
- [10] Shani Jose and K.C. Sivakumar. On partial orders of Hilbert space operators. *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, 63(7):1423–1441, 2015.
- [11] Saroj B. Malik, Laura Rueda, and Néstor Thome. Further properties on the core partial order and other matrix partial orders. *Linear Multilinear Algebra*, 62(12):1629–1648, 2014.
- [12] Janko Marovt. On partial orders in Rickart rings. *Linear Multilinear Algebra*, 63(9):1707–1723, 2015.
- [13] Janko Marovt. On star, sharp, core, and minus partial orders in Rickart rings. *Banach J. Math. Anal.*, 10(3):495–508, 2016.
- [14] Janko Marovt. Orders in rings based on the core-nilpotent decomposition. *Linear Multilinear Algebra*, 66(4):803–820, 2018.
- [15] Sujit Kumar Mitra. On group inverses and the sharp order. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 92:17–37, 1987.

- [16] Sujit Kumar Mitra, P. Bhimasankaram, and Saroj B. Malik. *Matrix partial orders, shorted operators and applications*, volume 10 of *Series in Algebra*. World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ, 2010.
- [17] Dragan S. Rakić and Dragan S. Djordjević. Star, sharp, core and dual core partial order in rings with involution. *Appl. Math. Comput.*, 259:800–818, 2015.
- [18] C. Radhakrishna Rao and Sujit Kumar Mitra. *Generalized inverse of matrices and its applications*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York-London-Sydney, 1971.
- [19] Peter Šemrl. Automorphism of $B(H)$ with respect to minus partial order. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 369(1):205–213, 2010.