COLLECTANEA MATHEMATICA

UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA

Volume LX
Issue 3(2009)

Collect. Math. **60**, 3 (2009), 241–247

A remark on the rational cohomology of $\overline{S}_{1,n}$

Gilberto Bini

Dipartimento di Matematica, Università degli Studi di Milano
Via C. Saldini 50, 20133 Milano (Italy)
E-mail: gilberto.bini@mat.unimi.it

Claudio Fontanari

Dipartimento di Matematica, Politecnico di Torino
Corso Duca degli Abruzzi 24, 10129 Torino (Italy)
E-mail: claudio.fontanari@polito.it

Received June 10, 2008.

Abstract

We focus on the rational cohomology of Cornalba's moduli space of spin curves of genus 1 with n marked points. In particular, we show that both its first and its third cohomology group vanish and the second cohomology group is generated by boundary classes.

1. Introduction

The moduli space of spin curves $\overline{S}_g$ was constructed by Cornalba in [6] in order to compactify the moduli space of pairs {smooth genus g complex curve C, theta-characteristic on C}. Cornalba's compactification turns out to be a normal projective variety equipped with a finite morphism:

$$\chi : \overline{S}_g \longrightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$$

onto the Deligne-Mumford moduli space of stable curves of genus g (see [6, Proposition (5.2)]). The geometry of $\overline{S}_g$ (in particular, its Picard group) was investigated by Cornalba himself in [6, 7]; here instead we begin the study of the rational cohomology of $\overline{S}_g$.

Keywords: pointed spin curves, stable elliptic curves, rational cohomology, inductive method.
MSC2000: 14H10, 14F25.

As shown by Arbarello and Cornalba in [3], the rational cohomology of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_g$ vanishes in low odd degree, so it seems reasonable to expect that the same holds also for $\overline{S}_g$; however, a priori it is not clear at all that the morphism χ does not increase cohomology. The inductive method of [3] provides indeed an effective tool to check our guess, but the set up of the induction requires to work with moduli of pointed spin curves. Namely, for all integers g, n such that $2g-2+n>0$, we consider the moduli spaces

$\overline{S}_{g,n} := \{[(C, p_1, \ldots, p_n; \zeta; \alpha)] : (C, p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ is a genus g quasi-stable projective curve with n marked points; ζ is a line bundle of degree $g-1$ on C having degree 1 on every exceptional component of C, and $\alpha : \zeta^{\otimes 2} \to \omega_C$ is a homomorphism which is not zero at a general point of every non-exceptional component of $C\}$.

In order to put an analytic structure on $\overline{S}_{g,n}$, we can easily adapt Cornalba's construction in [6]: from the universal deformation of the stable model of $(C, p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ we obtain exactly as in [6, § 4], a universal deformation $\mathcal{U}_X \to B_X$ of $X = (C, p_1, \ldots, p_n; \zeta; \alpha)$; next, we transplant on $\overline{S}_{g,n}$ the structure of $B_X/\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ following [6, § 5]. Alternatively, we can regard $\overline{S}_{g,n}$ as the coarse moduli space associated in the easiest case $r=2$ to the stack of r-spin curves constructed by Jarvis in [10] and revisited by Abramovich and Jarvis in [1].

We recall that $\overline{S}_{g,n}$ is the union of two connected components, $\overline{S}^+_{g,n}$ and $\overline{S}^-_{g,n}$, which correspond to even and odd theta-characteristics, respectively. The main result of the present paper, which completes the research project started in [4] and continued in [5], is the following:

Theorem 1

For every n,

$$H^1(\overline{S}^+_{1,n}, \mathbb{Q}) = H^3(\overline{S}^+_{1,n}, \mathbb{Q}) = 0\,,$$

and $H^2(\overline{S}^+_{1,n}, \mathbb{Q})$ is generated by boundary classes.

We note that a similar statement holds true for the moduli space of odd theta-characteristics (see [8]) since $\overline{S}^-_{1,n} \cong \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{1,n}$.

In what follows, we work over the field $\mathbb{C}$ of complex numbers; all cohomology groups are implicitly assumed to have rational coefficients.

2. The inductive approach

As pointed out in the Introduction, we are going to apply the inductive strategy developed by Arbarello and Cornalba in [3] for the moduli space of curves. Namely, we consider the long exact sequence of cohomology with compact supports:

$$\ldots \to H^k_c(S_{1,n}) \to H^k(\overline{S}_{1,n}) \to H^k(\partial S_{1,n}) \to \ldots \tag{1}$$

Hence, whenever $H^k_c(S_{1,n}) = 0$, there is an injection $H^k(\overline{S}_{1,n}) \hookrightarrow H^k(\partial S_{1,n})$. Moreover, from [6, § 3], it follows that each irreducible component of the boundary of $\overline{S}_{1,n}$ is the image of a morphism:

$$\mu_i : X_i \to \overline{S}_{1,n}$$

where either

$$X_i = \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,s+1} \times \overline{S}_{1,t+1}$$

where $s + t = n$; or

$$X_i = \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,n+2}\,.$$

Finally, exactly as in [3, Lemma 2.6], a bit of Hodge theory implies that the map $H^k(\overline{S}_{1,n}) \to \oplus_i H^k(X_i)$ is injective whenever $H^k(\overline{S}_{1,n}) \to H^k(\partial S_{1,n})$ is. Thus, we obtain the first claim of Theorem 1 by induction, provided we show that $H^1_c(S_{1,n}) = H^3_c(S_{1,n}) = 0$ for almost all values of n, and we check that $H^1(\overline{S}_{1,n}) = H^3(\overline{S}_{1,n}) = 0$ for all remaining values of n. The first task is accomplished by the following.

Lemma 1

We have $H_k(S_{1,n}) = 0$ *for* $k > n$.

Indeed, $\mathcal{M}_{1,1} \cong \mathbb{A}^1$ is affine. Moreover, it is well-known that the forgetful morphism $\mathcal{M}_{1,n} \to \mathcal{M}_{1,1}$ is affine. Finally, the morphism $S_{1,n} \to \mathcal{M}_{1,n}$ is finite since it is the restriction of the finite morphism $\overline{S}_{1,n} \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{1,n}$, hence the claim holds.

Now, we give a closer inspection to $\overline{S}_{1,n}$. Of course, it is the disjoint union of $\overline{S}^+_{1,n}$ and $\overline{S}^-_{1,n}$, corresponding to even and odd spin structures respectively. However, since the unique odd theta characteristic on a smooth elliptic curve E is $\mathcal{O}_E$, there is a natural isomorphism $\overline{S}^-_{1,n} \cong \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{1,n}$, so we may restrict our attention to $\overline{S}^+_{1,n}$. First of all, the following holds:

Proposition 2

$H^1(\overline{S}^+_{1,n}) = 0$.

Proof. By the above argument, it is enough to check that $H^1(\overline{S}^+_{1,n})$ vanishes for $n = 1$. In order to do so, we claim that there is a surjective morphism

$$f : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4} \longrightarrow \overline{S}^+_{1,1}\,.$$

Indeed, let $(C; p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4)$ be a 4-pointed stable genus zero curve. The morphism f associates to it the admissible covering E of C branched at the p_i's, pointed at q_1 and equipped with the line bundle $\mathcal{O}_E(q_1 - q_2)$, where q_i denotes the point of E lying above p_i. It follows that

$$H^1(\overline{S}^+_{1,1}) \hookrightarrow H^1(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,4}) = H^1(\mathbb{P}^1) = 0$$

and Proposition 2 is completely proved. □

Recall that the boundary components of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{1,n}$ are Δ_{irr}, whose general member is an irreducible n-pointed curve C of geometric genus zero with exactly one node, and $\Delta_{1,I}$, whose general member is the union of two smooth curves meeting at one node, C_1 of genus 1 with marked points labelled by $I \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\}$, and C_2 of genus 0 with marked points labelled by $\{1, \ldots, n\} \setminus I$ (of course $|I| \leq n - 2$). The corresponding boundary components of $\overline{S}^+_{1,n}$ are:

- A^+_{irr}, with an even spin structure on C;
- B^+_{irr}, with an even spin structure on C blown up at the node;
- $A^+_{1,I}$, with even theta-characteristics on C_1 and C_2.

Notice that in this case $B^+_{1,I}$, whose general member should carry odd theta-characteristics on both C_1 and C_2, is empty since a smooth rational curve has no odd theta-characteristic.

Hence on $\overline{S}^+_{1,n}$ we have the *boundary classes* α^+_{irr}, β^+_{irr}, and $\alpha^+_{1,I}$; there are also the classes

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{\mathrm{irr}} &= p^*(\delta_{\mathrm{irr}})\\ \delta_{i,I} &= p^*(\delta_{i,I})\end{aligned}$$

where

$$p : \overline{S}^+_{1,n} \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{1,n}$$

is the natural projection. Exactly as in [6, § 7], there are relations

$$\delta_{\mathrm{irr}} = \alpha^+_{\mathrm{irr}} + 2\beta^+_{\mathrm{irr}} \tag{2}$$

$$\delta_{1,I} = 2\alpha^+_{1,I}\,. \tag{3}$$

Lemma 3

The vector space $H^2(\overline{S}^+_{1,2})$ is generated by boundary classes.

Proof. We are going to deduce this from an Euler characteristic computation. Indeed, we are going to show that

$$\chi(\overline{S}^+_{1,2}) = 4\,. \tag{4}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}\chi(\overline{S}^+_{1,2}) &= 2h^0(\overline{S}^+_{1,2}) - 2h^1(\overline{S}^+_{1,2}) + h^2(\overline{S}^+_{1,2})\\ &= 2 + h^2(\overline{S}^+_{1,2})\end{aligned}$$

from (4) we may deduce that $h^2(\overline{S}^+_{1,2}) = 2$. On the other hand, since the natural projection $\overline{S}^+_{1,2} \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{1,2}$ is surjective, $H^2(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{1,2})$ injects into $H^2(\overline{S}^+_{1,2})$. It follows that $H^2(\overline{S}^+_{1,2})$ is generated by δ_{irr} and $\delta_{1,\emptyset}$, which are linear combinations of α^+_{irr}, β^+_{irr}, and $\alpha^+_{1,\emptyset}$ by (2) and (3).

First of all, we compute $\chi(S^+_{1,1})$. It is clear that

$$\chi(\overline{S}^+_{1,1}) = 2h^0(\overline{S}^+_{1,1}) - h^1(\overline{S}^+_{1,1}) = 2\,.$$

On the other hand, $\partial S^+_{1,1}$ consists of exactly two points, corresponding to a 3-pointed rational curve with two marked points either identified or joined by an exceptional component. Hence

$$\chi(S^+_{1,1}) = \chi(\overline{S}^+_{1,1}) - \chi(\partial S^+_{1,1}) = 0\,. \tag{5}$$

Next, we compute $\chi(S^+_{1,2})$. The natural projection $S^+_{1,2} \to \mathcal{M}_{1,2}$ is generically three-to-one, but there are a few special fibers with less than three points. Indeed, let $(E; p_1, p_2)$ be a smooth 2-pointed elliptic curve.

The linear series $|2p_1|$ provides a realization of E as a two-sheeted covering of $\mathbb{P}^1$ ramified over ∞, 0, 1 and λ. Denote by q_0, q_1, and q_λ the points of E lying above 0, 1, and λ, so that the three even theta-characteristics of E are given by $\mathcal{O}_E(p_1 - q_0)$, $\mathcal{O}_E(p_1 - q_1)$, and $\mathcal{O}_E(p_1 - q_\lambda)$. If $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}$ and $p_2 = q_\lambda$, then the projectivity of $\mathbb{P}^1$ defined by $z \mapsto 1 - z$ induces an automorphism of $(E; p_1, p_2)$ exchanging $\mathcal{O}_E(p_1 - q_0)$ and $\mathcal{O}_E(p_1 - q_1)$. If $\lambda = -\omega$ (with $\omega^3 = 1$) and p_2 is one point lying above $\frac{\omega}{\omega - 1}$, then the projectivity of $\mathbb{P}^1$ defined by $z \mapsto \frac{z+\omega}{\omega}$ induces an automorphism of $(E; p_1, p_2)$ that exchanges ciclically its three even theta-characteristics. Since it is clear (for instance, from [9, IV, proof of Corollary 4.7]) that the above ones are the only exceptional cases, we have:

$$\chi(S^+_{1,2}) = 3\chi(\mathcal{M}_{1,2} \setminus \{2 \text{ points}\}) + 2\chi(\text{point}) + \chi(\text{point}) = 0\,. \tag{6}$$

In fact, $\chi(\mathcal{M}_{1,2}) = 1$, as observed in [3, (5.4)]. Finally we turn to the Euler characteristic of $\overline{S}^+_{1,2}$. From [6, Examples (3.2)], and (3.3), and [3], Figure 1, we may deduce that

$$\chi(\overline{S}^+_{1,2}) = \chi(S^+_{1,2}) + 2\chi(\mathcal{M}'_{0,4}) + \chi(S^+_{1,1}) + 4\,,$$

where $\mathcal{M}'_{0,n}$ denotes the quotient of $\mathcal{M}_{0,n}$ modulo the operation of interchanging the labelling of two of the marked points.

Since $\chi(\mathcal{M}'_{0,4}) = 0$ (see [3, (5.4)]), relation (4) follows from (5) and (6). □

Let P a finite set with $|P| = n$ and let x and y be distinct and not belonging to P; define

$$\xi : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,P\cup\{x,y\}} \longrightarrow B^+_{\text{irr}} \hookrightarrow \overline{S}^+_{1,n}$$

by joining the points labelled x and y with an exceptional component and taking the unique even theta characteristic on the resulting curve. Then the analogue of [3, Lemma 4.5] holds:

Lemma 4

The kernel of

$$\xi^* : H^2(\overline{S}^+_{1,n}) \longrightarrow H^2(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,P\cup\{x,y\}})$$

is one-dimensional and generated by δ_{irr}.

Proof. By [3, Lemma 3.16], it is clear that $\xi^*(\delta_{\text{irr}}) = 0$. Moreover, from Lemma 3 it follows that $H^2(\overline{S}^+_{1,2})$ is generated by δ_{irr} and $\delta_{1,\emptyset}$; since $\delta_{1,\emptyset}$ pulls back to $\delta_{0,\{x,y\}}$, which is not zero, the claim holds for $n = 2$. Hence we can apply the inductive argument of [3, pp. 113–114]. It follows that if $\xi^*(\alpha) = 0$ for $\alpha \in H^2(\overline{S}^+_{1,n})$ then there exists a constant a such that $\alpha - a\delta_{\text{irr}}$ restricts to zero on all boundary components of $\overline{S}^+_{1,n}$ different from A^+_{irr}. However, we claim that A^+_{irr} is linearly equivalent to $2B^+_{\text{irr}}$. Indeed, this is clear in $\overline{S}^+_{1,1} \cong \mathbb{P}^1$. If $\pi : \overline{S}^+_{1,n} \to \overline{S}^+_{1,1}$ is the natural forgetful map, then $A^+_{\text{irr}} = \pi^*(A^+_{\text{irr}})$ and $B^+_{\text{irr}} = \pi^*(B^+_{\text{irr}})$. Hence $\alpha - a\delta_{\text{irr}}$ restricts to zero on all boundary components of

$\overline{S}^+_{1,n}$ and the claim follows exactly as in [3, Lemma 4.5], from Proposition 1 and the analogue of [3, Proposition 2.8]. □

Proposition 5

The vector space $H^2(\overline{S}^+_{1,n})$ is generated by boundary classes.

Proof. Let V be the subspace of $H^2(\overline{S}^+_{1,n})$ generated by the elements $\alpha^+_{1,I}$. In view of Lemma 4 and (2), it will be sufficient to show that the morphism ξ^* vanishes modulo V. The proof is by induction on n: for the inductive step we refer to [3, pp. 114–118], while the basis of the induction is provided by Lemma 3. □

Finally, we are also able to prove the last part of Theorem (1).

Lemma 6

We have $H^3(\overline{S}^+_{1,n}) = 0$.

Proof. Once again, by the exact sequence (1) and Lemma 1, it is enough to check that $H^3(\overline{S}^+_{1,n}) = 0$ for $n \leq 3$. First, we deal with the case $n = 3$. By Proposition 5, $H^2(\overline{S}^+_{1,3})$ is generated by the six boundary classes α^+_{irr}, β^+_{irr}, $\alpha^+_{1,\emptyset}$, $\alpha^+_{1,\{1\}}$, $\alpha^+_{1,\{2\}}$, and $\alpha^+_{1,\{3\}}$. Notice further that α^+_{irr} and β^+_{irr} are linearly dependent. Indeed, if $\pi : \overline{S}^+_{1,3} \to \overline{S}^+_{1,1}$ is the natural forgetful map, from [3, Lemma 3.1 (iii)], it follows that $\alpha^+_{\mathrm{irr}} = \pi^*(\alpha^+_{\mathrm{irr}})$ and $\beta^+_{\mathrm{irr}} = \pi^*(\beta^+_{\mathrm{irr}})$, while Poincaré duality yields $H^2(\overline{S}^+_{1,1}) \cong H^0(\overline{S}^+_{1,1}) \cong \mathbb{Q}$. Hence we deduce $h^2(\overline{S}^+_{1,3}) \leq 5$; next, we claim that

$$\chi(\overline{S}^+_{1,3}) = 12\,. \tag{7}$$

The statement is a direct consequence of the claim, since

$$\begin{aligned}\chi(\overline{S}^+_{1,3}) \;=\; & 2h^0(\overline{S}^+_{1,3}) + 2h^2(\overline{S}^+_{1,3}) - 2h^1(\overline{S}^+_{1,3}) \\ & - h^3(\overline{S}^+_{1,3}) \leq 12 - h^3(\overline{S}^+_{1,3})\,.\end{aligned}$$

First of all, we compute $\chi(S^+_{1,3})$. The natural projection $S^+_{1,3} \to \mathcal{M}_{1,3}$ is generically three-to-one, but there is a special fiber with only one point. Indeed, if $(E; p_1, p_2, p_3)$ is a smooth 3-pointed elliptic curve realized by the linear series $|2p_1|$ as a two-sheeted covering of $\mathbb{P}^1$ ramified over ∞, 0, 1 and $-\omega$ (with $\omega^3 = 1$) and p_2, p_3 are the two points lying above $\frac{\omega}{\omega-1}$, then the projectivity of $\mathbb{P}^1$ defined by $z \mapsto \frac{z+\omega}{\omega}$ induces automorphisms of $(E; p_1, p_2, p_3)$ exchanging ciclically its three even theta-characteristics. Therefore we have:

$$\chi(S^+_{1,3}) = 3\chi(\mathcal{M}_{1,3} \setminus \{\text{ point}\}) + \chi(\text{point}) = -2\,. \tag{8}$$

Recall that $\chi(\mathcal{M}_{1,3}) = 0$, as observed in [3, (5.4)]. Finally we turn to the Euler characteristic of $\overline{S}^+_{1,3}$. From [6, Examples (3.2)], and (3.3), and [3, Figure 2], it is clear that

$$\begin{aligned}\chi(\overline{S}^+_{1,3}) \;=\; & \chi(S^+_{1,3}) + 2\chi(\mathcal{M}'_{0,5}) + \chi(S^+_{1,1})\chi(\mathcal{M}_{0,4}) \\ & + 3\chi(S^+_{1,2}) + 2\chi(\mathcal{M}_{0,4}) + 12\chi(\mathcal{M}'_{0,4}) + 3\chi(S^{(0),+}_{1,1}) + 14\,.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\chi(\mathcal{M}_{0,4}) = -1$, $\chi(\mathcal{M}'_{0,4}) = 0$ and $\chi(\mathcal{M}'_{0,5}) = 1$ (see [3, (5.4)]), now (7) follows from (5), (6) and (8). Finally, by Hodge theory of complex projective orbifolds, the surjective morphism $\overline{S}_{1,3} \to \overline{S}_{1,n}$ for $n \leq 3$ induces an injective morphism $H^3(\overline{S}_{1,n}) \to H^3(\overline{S}_{1,3})$ for $n \leq 3$. Hence the claim follows. □

Acknowledgements. The first named author is supported by the University of Milan "FIRST" and by MiUR Cofin 2006 - Varietà algebriche: geometria, aritmetica, strutture di Hodge. The second named author is supported by MiUR Cofin 2006 - Geometria delle varietà algebriche e dei loro spazi di moduli.

References

1. D. Abramovich and T.J. Jarvis, Moduli of twisted spin curves, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **131** (2003), 685–699.
2. E. Arbarello and M. Cornalba, The Picard groups of the moduli spaces of curves, *Topology* **26** (1987), 153–171.
3. E. Arbarello and M. Cornalba, Calculating cohomology groups of moduli spaces of curves via algebraic geometry, *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.* **88** (1998), 97–127.
4. G. Bini and C. Fontanari, Moduli of curves and spin structures via algebraic geometry, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **358** (2006), 3207–3217.
5. G. Bini and C. Fontanari, On the geometry of $\overline{S}_2$, *Internat. J. Math.*, to appear.
6. M. Cornalba, Moduli of curves and theta-characteristics, *Lectures on Riemann surfaces (Trieste, 1987)*, 560–589, World Sci. Publ., Teaneck, NJ, 1989.
7. M. Cornalba, A remark on the Picard group of spin moduli space, *Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Natur. Rend. Lincei (9) Mat. Appl.* **2** (1991), 211–217.
8. E. Getzler, The semi-classical approximation for modular operads, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **194** (1998), 481–492.
9. R. Hartshorne, *Algebraic Geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **52**, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1977.
10. T.J. Jarvis, Geometry of the moduli of higher spin curves, *Internat. J. Math.* **11** (2000), 637–663.

Collect. Math. **60**, 3 (2009), 335–348

Controllability of partially prescribed matrices*

GLÓRIA CRAVO

Departamento de Matemática e Engenharias, Universidade da Madeira
9000-390 Funchal, Madeira, Portugal

E-mail: gcravo@uma.pt

Received November 12, 2008. Revised January 29, 2009

ABSTRACT

Let F be an infinite field and let n, p_1, p_2, p_3 be positive integers such that $n = p_1 + p_2 + p_3$. Let $C_{1,2} \in F^{p_1 \times p_2}$, $C_{1,3} \in F^{p_1 \times p_3}$ and $C_{2,1} \in F^{p_2 \times p_1}$. In this paper we show that appart from an exception, there always exist $C_{1,1} \in F^{p_1 \times p_1}$, $C_{2,2} \in F^{p_2 \times p_2}$ and $C_{2,3} \in F^{p_2 \times p_3}$ such that the pair

$$(A_1, A_2) = \left(\begin{bmatrix} C_{1,1} & C_{1,2} \\ C_{2,1} & C_{2,2} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} C_{1,3} \\ C_{2,3} \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

is completely controllable. In other words, we study the possibility of the linear system $\dot{\chi}(t) = A_1\chi(t) + A_2\zeta(t)$ being completely controllable, when $C_{1,2}, C_{1,3}$ and $C_{2,1}$ are prescribed and the other blocks are unknown.

We also describe the possible characteristic polynomials of a partitioned matrix of the form

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} C_{1,1} & C_{1,2} & C_{1,3} \\ C_{2,1} & C_{2,2} & C_{2,3} \\ C_{3,1} & C_{3,2} & C_{3,3} \end{bmatrix} \in F^{n \times n},$$

where $C_{1,1}, C_{2,2}, C_{3,3}$ are square submatrices (not necessarily with the same size), when $C_{1,2}, C_{1,3}$ and $C_{2,1}$ are fixed and the other blocks vary.

* This research was done within the activities of the *Centro de Estruturas Lineares e Combinatórias.*
Keywords: Controllability; Characteristic Polynomials; Matrix Completion Problems.
MSC2000: 15A18, 15A29, 93B05, 93C05.

1. Introduction

Control Theory is an important branch of mathematics that has several applications to technology, engineering, economics and sociology.

Very often we use applications of Control Theory, as the air-conditioning system, the oven, the iron, the hairdryer, the vehicle speed, and so on.

Currently a problem from Control Theory can be formalized as follows: "Given a mathematical description of a system how to manipulate the input variables in order to achieve a satisfactory performance, according to initial specifications?"

A very important problem in Control Theory is the following:

Problem. *Given a system*

$$\dot{\chi}\,(t) = A\chi(t) + B\zeta(t), \tag{1}$$

where $\chi(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ *denotes the state of a certain physical system to be controllable by the input* $\zeta(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$, *and* $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$, *how to select the input* $\zeta(t)$ *in such way that* $\chi(t)$ *is driven to a certain desirable state?*

In other words, the aim of this problem is to establish conditions under which the system (1) is completely controllable, i.e., the pair (A, B) is completely controllable. This problem is usually known as the *Pole Assignment Problem.*

Now consider F a field and let $A \in F^{n\times n}, B \in F^{n\times m}$. The characterization of (1) being completely controllable, when some entries of $[A\ B]$ are prescribed and the others are unknown has been often studied for many authors. In particular, when several entries of $[A\ B]$ are prescribed as 0, the problem is completely solved, see [12, 14, 15, 22]. When the prescribed entries are not necessarily equal to 0, there are only partial solutions, see [1, 6, 27, 28]. In this paper we characterize the possibility of (1) being completely controllable, where A and B are partitioned matrices of the forms:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} C_{1,1} & C_{1,2} \\ C_{2,1} & C_{2,2} \end{bmatrix} \in F^{n\times n},\ B = \begin{bmatrix} C_{1,3} \\ C_{2,3} \end{bmatrix} \in F^{n\times m},$$

with $C_{1,1}$, $C_{2,2}$ square submatrices (not necessarily with the same size), when F is an infinite field, $C_{1,2}$, $C_{1,3}$ and $C_{2,1}$ are prescribed and the other blocks are unknown.

The approach used allows to solve another question in Matrix Completion Problems. In general, these problems consist in studying the possibility to "complete" a matrix, when some of its entries are prescribed (i.e., are fixed), such that the resulting matrix satisfies certain properties. In this context "to complete" means to attribute values to the remaining entries. In other words, given a matrix and a part of the given matrix (as a submatrix or some entries) the aim of these problems is to describe conditions under which we can fill the unknown entries, such that the resultant matrix satisfies the required properties. An important problem that motivates our work is the following, a particular case of the Matrix Completion Problems, proposed by G.N. de Oliveira in 1975.

Problem[18]. *Let* F *be a field and let* n, p, q *be positive integers such that*

$n = p + q$. Let $f(x) \in F[x]$ be a monic polynomial of degree n. Let

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} A_{1,1} & A_{1,2} \\ A_{2,1} & A_{2,2} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{2}$$

be a partitioned matrix, where $A_{1,1} \in F^{p\times p}$, $A_{2,2} \in F^{q\times q}$. Suppose that some of the blocks $A_{i,j}$,$i, j \in \{1, 2\}$, are known. Under which conditions does there exist a matrix of the form (2) *with characteristic polynomial $f(x)$*?

Note that this problem gives rise to essentially seven distinct problems, according to the prescription of some blocks of A:

(P_1) $A_{1,1}$ prescribed;
(P_2) $A_{1,2}$ prescribed;
(P_3) $A_{1,1}$ and $A_{1,2}$ prescribed;
(P_4) $A_{1,1}$ and $A_{2,2}$ prescribed;
(P_5) $A_{1,2}$ and $A_{2,1}$ prescribed;
(P_6) $A_{1,1}, A_{1,2}$ and $A_{2,2}$ prescribed;
(P_7) $A_{1,1}, A_{1,2}$ and $A_{2,1}$ prescribed.

Concerning problem (P_1), G.N. de Oliveira presented the complete answer in [17]. The complete answer to problem (P_2) was established by G.N. de Oliveira in [18]. H.K. Wimmer in [30] gave the complete answer to problem (P_3). Problem (P_4) has only some partial answers obtained by G.N. de Oliveira in [20, 21] and by F.C. Silva in [25]. Concerning problem (P_5), as in the previous case, there exist some partial results, established by G.N. de Oliveira in [19], F.C. Silva in [24] and M.G. Marques and F.C. Silva in [13]. In [26] F.C. Silva presented a partial solution for problem (P_6). Concerning problem (P_7) we do not know any reference with nontrivial results.

It is remarkable the fact that after more than 30 years, many of these questions are still unsolved.

Motivated by this problem, a natural question that arises is the following. Let F be an arbitrary field. Let $n, k, p_1, \ldots, p_k$ be positive integers such that $n = p_1 + \cdots + p_k$. Let

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} C_{1,1} & \cdots & C_{1,k} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ C_{k,1} & \cdots & C_{k,k} \end{bmatrix} \in F^{n\times n}, \tag{3}$$

where the blocks $C_{i,j} \in F^{p_i\times p_j}, i, j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ and $C_{1,1}, \ldots, C_{k,k}$ are square submatrices.

Problem. *Suppose that some of the blocks $C_{i,j}$ are prescribed. Under which conditions does there exist a matrix of the form* (3) *with prescribed eigenvalues or characteristic polynomial*?

Obviously the prescription of the characteristic polynomial is more general since it covers the situation of the eigenvalues of the matrix being outside of the field F. Clearly, if all the eigenvalues of (3) are in F, the description of the possible characteristic polynomials of (3) simply consists in studying the eigenvalues of (3).

In [3] we showed that given a matrix of the form (3) partitioned into $k \times k$ blocks of the same size $p \times p$, with entries in an arbitrary field F, it is always possible to prescribe $2k-3$ blocks of the matrix and the eigenvalues in F, except if, either all the principal blocks are prescribed, or all the blocks of one row or column are prescribed. In these exceptional cases, we identified necessary and sufficient conditions under which it is possible to prescribe $2k-3$ blocks of the matrix and the eigenvalues in F. We also noticed that there are additional necessary conditions if more than $2k-3$ blocks are fixed.

Later, in [2] we described the possible characteristic polynomials of a matrix of the form (3) partitioned into $k \times k$ blocks of the same size $p \times p$, with entries in an arbitrary field F. Our answer shows that it is always possible to prescribe $k-1$ blocks of the matrix and the characteristic polynomial, except if all the nonprincipal blocks of a row or column are prescribed equal to 0 and the characteristic polynomial has not any divisor of degree p.

When the blocks are not necessarily of the same size, the description of the eigenvalues of a matrix of the form (3), when some of its blocks are prescribed and the others are unknown, becomes more difficult. In [4] we studied the possible eigenvalues of a matrix of the form (3) with entries in an arbitrary field F, where $C_{i,j} \in F^{p_i \times p_j}$ and $C_{1,1}, \ldots, C_{k,k}$ are square submatrices, when a diagonal of blocks is prescribed. Notice that when the prescribed positions correspond to "large" submatrices, then there are necessary interlacing inequalities for the invariant factors [23, 29].

In this paper we study a particular case, when $k = 3$ and F is infinite. In fact, we describe the possible characteristic polynomials of

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} C_{1,1} & C_{1,2} & C_{1,3} \\ C_{2,1} & C_{2,2} & C_{2,3} \\ C_{3,1} & C_{3,2} & C_{3,3} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{4}$$

where $C_{i,j} \in F^{p_i \times p_j}$, $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $C_{1,1}$, $C_{2,2}$, $C_{3,3}$ are square submatrices, when $C_{1,2}, C_{1,3}$ and $C_{2,1}$ are prescribed and the remaining blocks are unknown.

2. Background

Let F be a field.

Let $D = F$ or $D = F[x]$ and let m, n be positive integers. We denote by $D^{m \times n}$ the set of all matrices in D of type $m \times n$.

The symbol $|$ is used in the following way: if $f(x)$, $g(x) \in F[x]$, then $f(x)|g(x)$ means "$f(x)$ divides $g(x)$".

Given $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in F$, we denote by $\operatorname{diag}(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ the following matrix:

$$\begin{bmatrix} a_1 & & 0 \\ & \ddots & \\ 0 & & a_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

Now we present some definitions and results that are necessary for the rest of the paper. In general these results can be found in many books on Linear Algebra, for example see [5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 16].

Let R be the set of all monic polynomials and the zero polynomial.

DEFINITION 1 Let $A(x) \in F[x]^{m\times n}$. The greatest common divisor choosen in R, of the determinants of the submatrices of size $k \times k$ of $A(x)$, $k \in \{1, \ldots, \min\{m, n\}\}$ is denoted by $d_k(x)$. If $k \leq \text{rank}A(x)$, we say that $d_k(x)$ is the k-th determinantal divisor of $A(x)$. Make convention that $d_0(x) = 1$.

It is known that if $A(x) \in F[x]^{m\times n}$ and $\text{rank}A(x) = r$, then:

(*i*) $d_k(x) \neq 0$ if and only if $k \leq r$;
(*ii*) $d_{k-1}(x)|d_k(x), k \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$.

DEFINITION 2 The k-th invariant factor of $A(x)$ is the element

$$i_k(x) = \frac{d_k(x)}{d_{k-1}(x)}, k \in \{1, \ldots, \text{rank}A(x)\},$$

with the convention that $i_0(x) = 1$.

Note that according to the previous definitions, the determinantal divisors and the invariant factors of the matrix $A(x)$ are monic polynomials.

It is known that $i_{k-1}(x)|i_k(x), k \in \{1, \ldots, \text{rank}A(x)\}$.

It is also known that:

(*i*) $A(x)$, $B(x) \in F[x]^{m\times n}$ are equivalent if and only if they have the same invariant factors.
(*ii*) $A(x)$, $B(x) \in F[x]^{m\times n}$ are equivalent if and only if they have the same determinantal divisors.

Let $A \in F^{m\times m}$. The polynomial matrix $xI_m - A$ is called the *characteristic matrix* of A and its determinant is called the *characteristic polynomial* of A.

The invariant factors of $xI_m - A$ are called the *invariant polynomials* of A.

Note that the matrix $xI_m - A$ has rank m, since its determinant is different from zero. Consequently A has m invariant polynomials,

$$f_1(x) \mid \cdots \mid f_m(x).$$

It is also known that the characteristic polynomial of a matrix $A \in F^{m\times m}$ it is equal to the product of its invariant polynomials.

The invariant polynomials of A which are equal to 1, are called the *trivial invariant polynomials* of A. The remaining invariant polynomials of A are called the *nontrivial invariant polynomials* of A and are denoted by $i(A)$.

Remark 1 $A, B \in F^{m\times m}$ are similar matrices in F if and only if they have the same invariant polynomials.

Let $f(x) = x^n + a_{n-1}x^{n-1} + \cdots + a_1x + a_0$, $n \geq 1$, be a monic polynomial of $F[x]$. The matrix

$$C(f) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} 0 & I_{n-1} \\ \hline -a_0 & -a_1 \cdots - a_{n-1} \end{array}\right]$$

is known as the *companion matrix* of $f(x)$.

It is not hard to see that the only nontrivial polynomial of $C(f)$ is $f(x)$ and consequently, its characteristic polynomial is $f(x)$.

If $A \in F^{p\times p}, B \in F^{p\times q}$, $C \in F^{q\times p}$, we denote by $i[A\ B]$ the number of nontrivial invariant factors of the matrix pencil $[xI_p - A| - B]$ and by

$$i\begin{bmatrix} A \\ C \end{bmatrix}$$

the number of nontrivial invariant factors of the matrix pencil

$$\begin{bmatrix} xI_p - A \\ -C \end{bmatrix}.$$

It is known from systems theory [9] that a pair (A, B), where $A \in F^{p\times p}$, $B \in F^{p\times q}$ is *completely controllable* if and only if all the invariant factors of the matrix pencil

$$[xI_p - A| - B]$$

are equal to 1, if and only if the controllability matrix

$$\mathcal{C}(A, B) = \begin{bmatrix} B & AB & \cdots & A^{p-1}B \end{bmatrix} \in F^{p\times pq}$$

has rank equal to p, if and only if

$$\min_{\lambda\in\overline{F}} \operatorname{rank}[\lambda I_p - A| - B] = p,$$

where $\overline{F}$ is an algebraic closure of F.

Let $A_1, A_2 \in F^{p\times p}$, $B_1, B_2 \in F^{p\times q}$. The matrices $[A_1\ B_1]$ and $[A_2\ B_2]$ are said to be *block-similar* if there exist nonsingular matrices $P \in F^{p\times p}$, $Q \in F^{q\times q}$ and a matrix $R \in F^{q\times p}$, such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_2 & B_2 \end{bmatrix} = P^{-1}\begin{bmatrix} A_1 & B_1 \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} P & 0 \\ R & Q \end{bmatrix}.$$

It is known that $[A_1\ B_1]$ and $[A_2\ B_2]$ are block-similar if and only if the matrix pencils $[xI_p - A_1| - B_1]$ and $[xI_p - A_2| - B_2]$ are strictly equivalent.

It is also known that the matrices $[A_1\ B_1]$ and $[A_2\ B_2]$ are block-similar if and only if the matrix pencils $[xI_p - A_1| - B_1]$ and $[xI_p - A_2| - B_2]$ have the same invariant factors and the same column minimal indices.

3. Main Results

Let F be a field and let $n, k, p_1, \ldots, p_k$ be positive integers such that $n = p_1 + \cdots + p_k$. Let $(r_1, s_1), \ldots, (r_k, s_k) \in \{1, \ldots, k\}\times\{1, \ldots, k\}$ and assume that $r_i < k, i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. Let $A_{r_i,s_i} \in F^{p_{r_i}\times p_{s_i}}, i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. Our main goal is to solve the following problem.

Problem. *Under which conditions does there exist a completely controllable pair of the form*

$$(A_1, A_2) = \left(\begin{bmatrix} C_{1,1} & \cdots & C_{1,k-1} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ C_{k-1,1} & \cdots & C_{k-1,k-1} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} C_{1,k} \\ \vdots \\ C_{k-1,k} \end{bmatrix}\right) \tag{5}$$

with $C_{r_i,s_i} = A_{r_i,s_i}, i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$?

In [2] we established conditions under which there exists a completely controllable pair of the form (5), when $k-1$ blocks of the same size are prescribed and the others are unknown.

Proposition 3

Let F be an arbitrary field. Let $A_{r_i,s_i} \in F^{p_{r_i} \times p_{s_i}}$, $i \in \{1,\ldots,k\}$. If one of the following conditions holds, then there exists no completely controllable pair of the form (5) such that $C_{r_i,s_i} = A_{r_i,s_i}, i \in \{1,\ldots,k\}$. The conditions are the following:

(i_3) *There exists $r \in \{1,\ldots,k-1\}$ such that all the positions (r,j), with $j \in \{1,\ldots,k\}\backslash\{r\}$, are prescribed equal to* 0.

(ii_3) *All the positions (i,k), with $i \in \{1,\ldots,k-1\}$, are prescribed equal to* 0.

Proof. Let (A_1, A_2) be a pair of the form (5) such that $C_{r_i,s_i} = A_{r_i,s_i}, i \in \{1,\ldots,k\}$, and assume that one of the conditions (i_3), (ii_3) occurs.

Case 1. Suppose that (i_3) holds. We may assume, without loss of generality, that $r = 1$. Let $\lambda \in \overline{F}$ be an eigenvalue of $C_{1,1}$. Hence,

$$\operatorname{rank}\left[\lambda I_{n-p_1} - A_1 | - A_2\right] < n - p_1. \tag{6}$$

Consequently, (A_1, A_2) is not completely controllable.

Case 2. Suppose that (ii_3) holds. Now let $\lambda \in \overline{F}$ be an eigenvalue of A_1. Again, as in the previous case, (6) holds. Therefore (A_1, A_2) is not completely controllable. □

In the previous result we identified exceptional conditions for this problem, nevertheless its solution is still an open problem. In order to give some insight into this question, we start by studying the case $k = 3$. In this paper we identify conditions under which the pair of the form (5) is completely controllable, when $C_{1,2}, C_{1,3}, C_{2,1}$ are prescribed and the other blocks are unkown.

Our main result is the following.

Theorem 4

Let F be an infinite field. Let n, p_1, p_2, p_3 be positive integers such that $n = p_1 + p_2 + p_3$. Let $C_{1,2} \in F^{p_1 \times p_2}$, $C_{1,3} \in F^{p_1 \times p_3}$ and $C_{2,1} \in F^{p_2 \times p_1}$. Then, there exist $C_{1,1} \in F^{p_1 \times p_1}$, $C_{2,2} \in F^{p_2 \times p_2}$, $C_{2,3} \in F^{p_2 \times p_3}$ such that the pair

$$(A_1, A_2) = \left(\begin{bmatrix} C_{1,1} & C_{1,2} \\ C_{2,1} & C_{2,2} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} C_{1,3} \\ C_{2,3} \end{bmatrix} \right) \tag{7}$$

is completely controllable, except if the following condition (E) holds:

(E) $C_{1,2} = 0$ *and* $C_{1,3} = 0$.

Lemma 5

Let F be an arbitrary field. If (E) occurs, then there exists no completely controllable pair of the form (7), with $C_{1,2}$, $C_{1,3}$ and $C_{2,1}$ prescribed.

Proof. This result is a particular situation of Proposition 3. □

The following theorem was established separately by E.M. Sá [23] and R.C. Thompson [29] and it is a very important result in Matrix Completion Problems. Usually in Matrix Theory this result is known as *The Interlacing Inequalities for the Invariant factors.*

Theorem 6 [23, 29]

Let F be an arbitrary field. Let $l_1(x), \ldots, l_s(x) \in F[x]$ be monic polynomials such that $l_1(x) \mid \cdots \mid l_s(x)$. Let $A(x) \in F[x]^{p\times q}$ and let $i_1(x), \ldots, i_r(x)$ be the invariant factors of $A(x)$. Then, there exist $B(x) \in F[x]^{p\times(n-q)}$, $C(x) \in F[x]^{(m-p)\times q}$, $D(x) \in F[x]^{(m-p)\times(n-q)}$ such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} A(x) & B(x) \\ C(x) & D(x) \end{bmatrix} \in F[x]^{m\times n}$$

has invariant factors $l_1(x), \ldots, l_s(x)$ if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:

(i_6) $r \leq s \leq r + (m-p) + (n-q)$;
(ii_6) $s \leq \min\{m, n\}$;
(iii_6) $l_k \mid i_k$, *for every* $k \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$;
(iv_6) $i_k \mid l_{k+(m-p)+(n-q)}$, *for every* $k \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ *such that* $k + (m-p) + (n-q) \leq s$.

The following lemma is a consequence of a result established by F.C. Silva in [28].

Lemma 7 [28]

Let F be an infinite field. Let $A_{1,1} \in F^{q_1\times q_1}$, $A_{1,2} \in F^{q_1\times q_2}$, $A_{1,3} \in F^{q_1\times q_3}$, $A_{2,1} \in F^{q_2\times q_1}$ and let $v \in \{0, \ldots, q_1+q_2\}$. There exist $A_{2,2} \in F^{q_2\times q_2}$ and $A_{2,3} \in F^{q_2\times q_3}$ such that

$$i\begin{bmatrix} A_{1,1} & A_{1,2} & A_{1,3} \\ A_{2,1} & A_{2,2} & A_{2,3} \end{bmatrix} \leq v$$

if and only if

$$\max\left\{ i\begin{bmatrix} A_{1,1} & A_{1,2} & A_{1,3} \end{bmatrix}, i\begin{bmatrix} A_{1,1} \\ A_{2,1} \end{bmatrix} - q_3 \right\} \leq v.$$

The following result was obtained by H.K. Wimmer in [30], where the author provided the complete answer to problem (P_3) presented in Section 1.

Theorem 8 [30]

Let F be an arbitrary field. Let p, q be positive integers such that $n = p + q$ and let $f \in F[x]$ be a monic polynomial of degree n. Let $A_{1,1} \in F^{p\times p}$, $A_{1,2} \in F^{p\times q}$. Let $f_1 | \cdots | f_p$ be the invariant factors of the matrix

$$[xI_p - A_{1,1} | -A_{1,2}].$$

Then, there exist $A_{2,1} \in F^{q\times p}$, $A_{2,2} \in F^{q\times q}$ such that the matrix of the form (2) has characteristic polynomial f if and only if $f_1 \cdots f_p | f$.

The following result was established by F.C. Silva in [24], where the author obtained a partial solution to problem (P_5) presented in Section 1.

Theorem 9 [24]

Let F be an arbitrary field. Let p, q be positive integers such that $n = p + q$. Let $c_1, \ldots, c_n \in F$. Let $A_{1,2} \in F^{p\times q}$, $A_{2,1} \in F^{q\times p}$. Then there exist $A_{1,1} \in F^{p\times p}$, $A_{2,2} \in F^{q\times q}$ such that the matrix of the form (2) has eigenvalues $c_1, \ldots, c_n$ if and only if one of the following conditions is satisfied:

(i_9) *$p \neq 1$ or $q \neq 1$;*

(ii_9) *$p = q = 1$ and the equation*

$$x^2 - (c_1 + c_2)x + ab + c_1c_2 = 0$$

has one root in F, where $A_{1,2} = [a]$ and $A_{2,1} = [b]$.

Proof of Theorem 4. Exception (E) has already been justified. Now, suppose that condition (E) is not satisfied. Let $r = \text{rank}C_{1,3}$. Let $P \in F^{p_1\times p_1}, Q \in F^{p_3\times p_3}$ be nonsingular matrices such that

$$PC_{1,3}Q = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ I_r & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Partition $PC_{1,2}$ as follows:

$$PC_{1,2} = \begin{bmatrix} B_1 \\ B_2 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $B_1 \in F^{(p_1-r)\times p_2}$, $B_2 \in F^{r\times p_2}$. Let $s = \text{rank}B_1$. Bearing in mind that (E) is not satisfied, at least one of the numbers r, s is different from zero. Let $R \in F^{(p_1-r)\times(p_1-r)}$, $S \in F^{p_2\times p_2}$ be nonsingular matrices such that

$$RB_1S = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_s \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let

$$C'_{1,2} = \begin{bmatrix} RB_1S \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \in F^{p_1\times p_2},$$

and $C'_{1,3} = PC_{1,3}Q$. Consider $C_{2,1}P^{-1}$ partitioned as follows:

$$C_{2,1}P^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} E_1 & E_2 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $E_1 \in F^{p_2\times(p_1-r)}$, $E_2 \in F^{p_2\times r}$. Let $C'_{2,1} = \begin{bmatrix} S^{-1}E_1R^{-1} & S^{-1}E_2 \end{bmatrix}$. Let $C'_{1,1} = C(x^{p_1}) \in F^{p_1\times p_1}$. Since at least one of the numbers r, s is different from zero, it follows that the pair

$$\left(C'_{1,1}, \begin{bmatrix} C'_{1,2} & C'_{1,3} \end{bmatrix}\right)$$

is completely controllable, i.e.,

$$i\begin{bmatrix} C'_{1,1} & C'_{1,2} & C'_{1,3} \end{bmatrix} = 0.$$

Now suppose that $\alpha_1|\cdots|\alpha_{p_1}$ are the invariant polynomials of $C'_{1,1}$ and $\beta_1|\cdots|\beta_{p_1}$ are the invariant factors of the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} xI_{p_1} - C'_{1,1} \\ -C'_{2,1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

According to Theorem 6, it follows that $\beta_i|\alpha_i, i \in \{1,\ldots,p_1\}$. Since $\alpha_1 = \cdots = \alpha_{p_1-1} = 1$, then $\beta_1 = \cdots = \beta_{p_1-1} = 1$. Consequently

$$i \begin{bmatrix} C'_{1,1} \\ C'_{2,1} \end{bmatrix} \leq 1.$$

Then

$$\max\left\{ i \begin{bmatrix} C'_{1,1} & C'_{1,2} & C'_{1,3} \end{bmatrix}, i \begin{bmatrix} C'_{1,1} \\ C'_{2,1} \end{bmatrix} - p_3 \right\} = 0.$$

By Lemma 7 there exist $C'_{2,2} \in F^{p_2\times p_2}$, $C'_{2,3} \in F^{p_2\times p_3}$ such that

$$(A'_1, A'_2) = \left(\begin{bmatrix} C'_{1,1} & C'_{1,2} \\ C'_{2,1} & C'_{2,2} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} C'_{1,3} \\ C'_{2,3} \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

is completely controllable. And $\begin{bmatrix} A'_1 & A'_2 \end{bmatrix}$ is block-similar to

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_1 & A_2 \end{bmatrix} = Y_1^{-1}Y_2^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} A'_1 & A'_2 \end{bmatrix} Z_1Z_2Z_3,$$

where

$$Z_1 = \begin{bmatrix} I_{p_1+p_2} & 0 \\ A & I_{p_3} \end{bmatrix}, \text{ with}$$

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & X \end{bmatrix} \in F^{p_3\times(p_1+p_2)}, \; X = \begin{bmatrix} B_2S \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \in F^{p_3\times p_2},$$

$$Z_2 = \begin{bmatrix} Y_2 & 0 \\ 0 & I_{p_3} \end{bmatrix}, Z_3 = \begin{bmatrix} Y_1 & 0 \\ 0 & Q^{-1} \end{bmatrix}, \text{ with}$$

$$Y_1 = \begin{bmatrix} P & 0 \\ 0 & S^{-1} \end{bmatrix}, Y_2 = \begin{bmatrix} R & 0 \\ 0 & I_{r+p_2} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since $[A_1\ A_2]$ and $[A'_1\ A'_2]$ are block-similar, then the matrix pencils

$$[xI_{p_1+p_2} - A_1|-A_2]$$

and

$$[xI_{p_1+p_2} - A'_1|-A'_2]$$

have the same invariant factors. As (A'_1, A'_2) is completely controllable, i.e., $i\,[A'_1\ A'_2] = 0$, then $i\,[A_1\ A_2] = 0$, i.e., (A_1, A_2) is completely controllable. Clearly the pair (A_1, A_2) has the prescribed form. □

Proposition 10

Let F be an arbitrary field. Let n, p_1, p_2, p_3 be positive integers such that $n = p_1 + p_2 + p_3$. Let $f \in F[x]$ be a monic polynomial of degree n. Let $C_{1,2} \in F^{p_1 \times p_2}$, $C_{1,3} \in F^{p_1 \times p_3}$ and $C_{2,1} \in F^{p_2 \times p_1}$. If the exceptional condition (E) is satisfied, then there exist $C_{1,1} \in F^{p_1 \times p_1}$, $C_{2,2} \in F^{p_2 \times p_2}$, $C_{2,3} \in F^{p_2 \times p_3}$, $C_{3,1} \in F^{p_3 \times p_1}$, $C_{3,2} \in F^{p_3 \times p_2}$, $C_{3,3} \in F^{p_3 \times p_3}$ such that the matrix of the form (4) has characteristic polynomial f if and only if f has a divisor of degree p_1.

Proof. Suppose that condition (E) occurs and assume that there exist $C_{1,1} \in F^{p_1 \times p_1}$, $C_{2,2} \in F^{p_2 \times p_2}$, $C_{2,3} \in F^{p_2 \times p_3}$, $C_{3,1} \in F^{p_3 \times p_1}$, $C_{3,2} \in F^{p_3 \times p_2}$, $C_{3,3} \in F^{p_3 \times p_3}$ such that the matrix of the form (4) has characteristic polynomial f. Let $\alpha_1 | \cdots | \alpha_{p_1}$ be the invariant polynomials of $C_{1,1}$ and let $\beta_1 | \cdots | \beta_n$ be the invariant polynomials of (4). Note that $\alpha_1 | \cdots | \alpha_{p_1}$ are the invariant factors of the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} xI_{p_1} - C_{1,1} & -C_{1,2} & -C_{1,3} \end{bmatrix}.$$

According to Theorem 6, $\alpha_i | \beta_{i+p_2+p_3}$, $i \leq p_1$. Therefore,

$$\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_{p_1} | \beta_{1+p_2+p_3} \cdots \beta_n | \beta_1 \cdots \beta_n = f.$$

As $\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_{p_1}$ is the characteristic polynomial of $C_{1,1}$, then $\deg(\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_{p_1}) = p_1$ and so the result is satisfied.

Conversely, let $g(x), h(x) \in F[x]$ such that $f = gh$, with $\deg(g) = p_1$. Let $G = C(g) \in F^{p_1 \times p_1}$ and $H = C(h) \in F^{(p_2+p_3) \times (p_2+p_3)}$. Then for every $C_{3,1} \in F^{p_3 \times p_1}$ the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} G & B \\ D & H \end{bmatrix}, \tag{8}$$

where

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} C_{1,2} & C_{1,3} \end{bmatrix} \tag{9}$$

and

$$D = \begin{bmatrix} C_{2,1} \\ C_{3,1} \end{bmatrix} \tag{10}$$

has characteristic polynomial f. □

Corollary 11

Let F be an infinite field. Let n, p_1, p_2, p_3 be positive integers such that $n = p_1 + p_2 + p_3$. Let $f \in F[x]$ be a monic polynomial of degree n. Let $C_{1,2} \in F^{p_1 \times p_2}$, $C_{1,3} \in F^{p_1 \times p_3}$ and $C_{2,1} \in F^{p_2 \times p_1}$. If (E) is not satisfied, then there exist $C_{1,1} \in F^{p_1 \times p_1}$, $C_{2,2} \in F^{p_2 \times p_2}$, $C_{2,3} \in F^{p_2 \times p_3}$, $C_{3,1} \in F^{p_3 \times p_1}$, $C_{3,2} \in F^{p_3 \times p_2}$, $C_{3,3} \in F^{p_3 \times p_3}$ such that the matrix of the form (4) has characteristic polynomial f.

Proof. Assume that condition (E) is not satisfied. According to Theorem 4 there exist $C_{1,1} \in F^{p_1 \times p_1}$, $C_{2,2} \in F^{p_2 \times p_2}$, $C_{2,3} \in F^{p_2 \times p_3}$, such that the pair of the form (7) is completely controllable. Since $1 | f$, applying Theorem 8, there exist $C_{3,1} \in F^{p_3 \times p_1}$, $C_{3,2} \in F^{p_3 \times p_2}$, $C_{3,3} \in F^{p_3 \times p_3}$ such that the matrix of the form (4) has characteristic polynomial f. □

The following result is an immediate consequence of Proposition 10 and Corollary 11.

Corollary 12

Let F be an infinite field. Let $c_1, \ldots, c_n \in F$. Let $C_{1,2} \in F^{p_1 \times p_2}$, $C_{1,3} \in F^{p_1 \times p_3}$ and $C_{2,1} \in F^{p_2 \times p_1}$. Then there exist $C_{1,1} \in F^{p_1 \times p_1}$, $C_{2,2} \in F^{p_2 \times p_2}$, $C_{2,3} \in F^{p_2 \times p_3}$, $C_{3,1} \in F^{p_3 \times p_1}$, $C_{3,2} \in F^{p_3 \times p_2}$, $C_{3,3} \in F^{p_3 \times p_3}$ such that the matrix of the form (4) has eigenvalues $c_1, \ldots, c_n$.

Note that Corollary 12 is still valid for arbitrary fields, as we show in the following result, with a different approach.

Proposition 13

Let F be an arbitrary field. Let $c_1, \ldots, c_n \in F$. Let $C_{1,2} \in F^{p_1 \times p_2}$, $C_{1,3} \in F^{p_1 \times p_3}$ and $C_{2,1} \in F^{p_2 \times p_1}$. Then there exist $C_{1,1} \in F^{p_1 \times p_1}$, $C_{2,2} \in F^{p_2 \times p_2}$, $C_{2,3} \in F^{p_2 \times p_3}$, $C_{3,1} \in F^{p_3 \times p_1}$, $C_{3,2} \in F^{p_3 \times p_2}$, $C_{3,3} \in F^{p_3 \times p_3}$ such that the matrix of the form (4) has eigenvalues $c_1, \ldots, c_n$.

Proof. *Case* 1. Suppose that condition (E) is satisfied. Let $G = \operatorname{diag}(c_1, \ldots, c_{p_1})$, $H = \operatorname{diag}(c_{p_1+1}, \ldots, c_n)$ and let $C_{3,1} \in F^{p_3 \times p_1}$ be an arbitrary matrix. Let $B \in F^{p_1 \times (p_2+p_3)}$ and $D \in F^{(p_2+p_3) \times p_1}$ with the forms (9) and (10), respectively. Then, the matrix of the form (8) has eigenvalues $c_1, \ldots, c_n$.

Case 2. Suppose that condition (E) is not satisfied and $C_{2,1} = 0$. Let G and H defined as in the previous case. Let $C_{3,1} = 0 \in F^{p_3 \times p_1}$. Let $B \in F^{p_1 \times (p_2+p_3)}$ and $D \in F^{(p_2+p_3) \times p_1}$ with the forms (9) and (10), respectively. Then the matrix of the form (8) has eigenvalues $c_1, \ldots, c_n$.

Case 3. Suppose that condition (E) is not satisfied and $C_{2,1} \neq 0$. Let $C_{3,1} \in F^{p_3 \times p_1}$ be an arbitrary matrix. Let $B \in F^{p_1 \times (p_2+p_3)}$ and $D \in F^{(p_2+p_3) \times p_1}$ with the forms (9) and (10), respectively. Since $p_2 + p_3 \neq 1$, according to Theorem 9 there exist $G \in F^{p_1 \times p_1}$ and $H \in F^{(p_2+p_3) \times (p_2+p_3)}$ such that the matrix of the form (8) has eigenvalues $c_1, \ldots, c_n$. □

4. Concluding Remarks

In this paper we establish conditions under which the system of the form (1) is completely controllable, when some entries of $[A\ B]$ are prescribed and the others are unknown. This is an advance in this type of problems. However the general problem of finding a completely controllable pair of the form (5), when k of its blocks are fixed and the remaining are unknown, is still open.

Our approach allows to solve a special question on Matrix Completion Problems. Considerable work has been done in this type of problems, however many questions still have only partial solutions and others remain open. Further research is required to solve this type of problems.

The general problem of describing the possible characteristic polynomials of a matrix of the form (3) when $k > 3$, and some of its blocks are prescribed and the remaining are unknown is still open. When the prescribed positions correspond to "large" submatrices, there are necessary interlacing inequalities involving invariant factors [23, 29]. The technique used to prove these inequalities can be very hard.

In this paper we establish new results for the case $k = 3$, which is an advance concernig this question. On the other hand, our approach unifies important problems in this area. In particular, the work developed in this paper is an extension of Oliveira's problem [18].

References

1. I. Cabral, Matrices with prescribed submatrices and the number of invariant polynomials, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **219** (1995), 207–224.
2. G. Cravo, J.A. Dias da Silva, and F.C. Silva, Characteristic polynomials and controllability of partially prescribed matrices, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **335** (2001), 157–166.
3. G. Cravo and F.C. Silva, Eigenvalues of matrices with several prescribed blocks, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **311** (2000), 13–24.
4. G. Cravo and F.C. Silva, Eigenvalues of matrices with several prescribed blocks, II, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **364** (2003), 81–89.
5. F.R. Gantmacher, *The Theory of Matrices, I, II,* Chelsea Publishing Co., New York, 1959, 1960.
6. L. Gurvits, L. Rodman, and T. Shalom, Controllability by completions of partial upper triangular matrices, *Math. Control Signals Systems* **6** (1993), 30–40.
7. R.A. Horn and C.R. Johnson, *Matrix Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1985.
8. R.A. Horn and C.R. Johnson, *Topics in Matrix Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991.
9. T. Kailath, *Linear Systems*, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1980.
10. P. Lancaster and M. Timenetsky, *The Theory of Matrices*, Computer Science and Applied Mathematics, Academic Press, Inc., Orlando, FL, 1985.
11. S. Lang, *Algebra*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **211**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002.
12. C.T. Lin, Structural controllability, *IEEE Trans. Automatic Control* **AC-19** (1974), 201–208.
13. M.G. Marques and F.C. Silva, The characteristic polynomial of a matrix with prescribed off-diagonal blocks, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **250** (1997), 21–29.
14. H. Mayeda, On structural controllability theorem, *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control* **AC-26** (1981), 795–798.
15. K. Murota, *Systems Analysis by Graphs and Matroids, Structural Solvability and Controllability,* Algorithms and Combinatorics: Study and Research Texts **3**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987.
16. M. Newman, *Integral Matrices*, Pure and Applied Mathematics **45**, Academic Press, New York-London, 1972.
17. G.N. de Oliveira, Matrices with prescribed characteristic polynomial and a prescribed submatrix III, *Monatsh. Math.* **75** (1971), 441–446.
18. G.N. de Oliveira, Matrices with prescribed characteristic polyomial and several prescribed submatrices, *Linear and Multilinear Algebra* **2** (1975), 357–364.
19. G.N. de Oliveira, The characteristic values of the matrix $A + XBX^{-1}$, *Numerical Methods (Third Colloq., Keszthely, 1977)*, 491–500, Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai **22**, North-Holland, Amsterdam-New York, 1980.
20. G.N. de Oliveira, Matrices with prescribed characteristic polynomial and principal blocks, *Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc. (2)* **24** (1981), 203–208.
21. G.N. de Oliveira, Matrices with prescribed characteristic polynomial and principal blocks II, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **47** (1982), 35–40.
22. J.B. Pearson and R.W. Shields, Structural controllability of multiinput linear systems, *IEEE Trans. Automatic Control* **AC-21** (1976), 203–212.
23. E.M. Sá, Imbedding conditions for λ-matrices, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **24** (1979), 33–50.
24. F.C. Silva, Matrices with prescribed characteristic polynomial and submatrices, *Portugal. Math.* **44** (1987), 261–264.

25. F.C. Silva, Matrices with prescribed eigenvalues and principal submatrices, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **92** (1987), 241–250.
26. F.C. Silva, Matrices with prescribed eigenvalues and blocks, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **148** (1991), 59–73.
27. F.C. Silva, On controllability of partially prescribed matrices, *Linear and Multilinear Algebra* **40** (1995), 95–102.
28. F.C. Silva, On the number of invariant factors of partially prescribed matrices and control theory, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **311** (2000), 1–12.
29. R.C. Thompson, Interlacing inequalities for invariant factors, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **24** (1979), 1–31.
30. H.K. Wimmer, Existenzsätze in der theorie der matrizen und lineare kontrolltheorie, *Monatsh. Math.* **78** (1974), 256–263.

Index Volume 60 (2009)

Elke Wolf, Differences of weighted composition operators 1–10

L. Robbiano, On border basis and Gröbner basis schemes 11–25

Alice Garbagnati and Flavia Repetto, A Geometrical approach to Gordan-Noether's and Franchetta's contributions to a question posed by Hesse 27–41

Jean-Pierre Rosay, Notes on the Diederich-Sukhov-Tumanov normalization for almost complex structures 43–62

Hannah Markwig and Josephine Yu, The space of tropically collinear points is shellable 63–77

S. Lalithambigai, Ball proximinality of equable spaces 79–88

F. Cioffi, M.G. Marinari, and L. Ramella, Regularity bounds by minimal generators and Hilbert function 89–100

A. Eduardo Gatto, Boundedness on inhomogeneous Lipschitz spaces of fractional integrals singular integrals and hypersingular integrals associated to non-doubling measures 101–114

Y.Q. Yan, Characterization of matrix operators on Orlicz spaces 115–122

Hussain Al-Qassem and Yibiao Pan, On certain estimates for Marcinkiewicz integrals and extrapolation 123–145

Laura Felicia Matusevich, Weyl closure of hypergeometric systems 147–158

A.V. Geramita, Brian Harbourne, and Juan Migliore, Classifying Hilbert functions of fat point subschemes in $\mathbb{P}^2$ 159–192

Wenchang Chu and Wenlong Zhang, Abel's method on summation by parts and nonterminating q-series identities 193–211

Kabe Moen, Weighted inequalities for multilinear fractional integral operators 213–238

Pascal Auscher and Frédéric Bernicot, Corrigendum to Maximal regularity and Hardy spaces 239–240

Gilberto Bini and Claudio Fontanari, A remark on the rational cohomology of $\overline{S}_{1,n}$ 241–247

O. Blasco and T.A. Gillespie, Dimension free estimates for the bilinear Riesz transform 249–259

Lucio Guerra and Gian Pietro Pirola, On the finiteness theorem for rational maps on a variety of general type 261–276

Maria Vallarino, Spaces H^1 and BMO on $ax+b$–groups 277–295

Marco Annoni, Loukas Grafakos, and Petr Honzík, On an inequality of Sagher and Zhou concerning Stein's lemma 297–306

Denis Mercier and Virginie Régnier, Boundary controllability of a chain of serially connected Euler-Bernoullibeams with interior masses Hardy spaces . 307–334

Glória Cravo, Controllability of partially prescribed matrices 335–348