

DESCRIPTION OF ALL SOLUTIONS OF A LINEAR COMPLEMENTARITY PROBLEM*

JIRI ROHN†

Abstract. Description of all solutions of an $n \times n$ linear complementarity problem $x^+ = Mx^- + q$ in terms of 2^n matrices and their Moore-Penrose inverses is given. The result is applied to describe all solutions of the absolute value equation $Ax + B|x| = b$.

Key words. Linear complementarity problem, Moore-Penrose inverse, Verified solution, Absolute value equation.

AMS subject classifications. 90C33.

1. Introduction. In this paper we consider a linear complementarity problem (LCP) in the form

$$x^+ = Mx^- + q, \quad (1.1)$$

where $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $q \in \mathbb{R}^n$; for $x = (x_i)_{i=1}^n$ the vectors x^+ and x^- are defined by $x^+ = (\max(x_i, 0))_{i=1}^n$, $x^- = (\max(-x_i, 0))_{i=1}^n$, so that $x^+ \geq 0$, $x^- \geq 0$, $(x^+)^T x^- = 0$,

$$x = x^+ - x^- \quad (1.2)$$

and

$$|x| = x^+ + x^-, \quad (1.3)$$

where $|x| = (|x_i|)_{i=1}^n$. The linear complementarity problem has been much studied in the last forty years, as evidenced in the monographs by Cottle, Pang and Stone [2], Murty [4] and Schäfer [7]. The traditional approach, as demonstrated e.g., in Lemke's algorithm [3], looks for *some* solution of (1.1). On the contrary, we are interested here in the description of *all* solutions of (1.1). This is done in full generality in Theorem 2.2 of Section 2, where the Moore-Penrose inverses of 2^n matrices F_z are employed for this purpose. In Proposition 2.4 we show that the description essentially simplifies

*Received by the editors February 5, 2009. Accepted for publication April 18, 2009. Handling Editor: Raphael Loewy.

†Institute of Computer Science, Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague, and School of Business Administration, Anglo-American University, Prague, Czech Republic (rohn@cs.cas.cz). Supported by the Czech Republic Grant Agency under grants 201/09/1957 and 201/08/J020, and by the Institutional Research Plan AV0Z10300504.

if all the matrices F_z are nonsingular, in which case the LCP (1.1) has at most 2^n solutions. Section 3 contains a 10×10 example which has exactly $2^{10} = 1024$ solutions. In Section 4 we show how the main ideas behind the proof of Theorem 2.2 can be used for the description of all solutions of the absolute value equation $Ax + B|x| = b$ (see Theorem 4.1).

We use the following notation. I is the unit matrix and $e = (1, \dots, 1)^T$ is the vector of all ones. $Z_n = \{z \mid |z| = e\}$ is the set of all ± 1 -vectors in \mathbb{R}^n , so that its cardinality is 2^n . For each $z \in Z_n$ we denote

$$T_z = \text{diag}(z_1, \dots, z_n) = \begin{pmatrix} z_1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & z_2 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & z_n \end{pmatrix}.$$

For a matrix F , F^\dagger denotes its Moore-Penrose inverse (see [1], [5]). We shall utilize its property

$$FF^\dagger F = F. \tag{1.4}$$

2. Main result. The core of our approach consists in reformulating the LCP (1.1) as an absolute value equation.

PROPOSITION 2.1. *A vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a solution of the linear complementarity problem (1.1) if and only if it solves the equation*

$$\frac{1}{2}(I + M)x + \frac{1}{2}(I - M)|x| = q. \tag{2.1}$$

Proof. Let x solve (1.1). From (1.2) and (1.3) we have $x^+ = \frac{1}{2}(|x| + x)$ and $x^- = \frac{1}{2}(|x| - x)$, which, when substituted into (1.1), gives (2.1). Conversely, (2.1) in the light of (1.2) and (1.3) implies (1.1). \square

Let us denote the solution set of the LCP (1.1) by X , i.e.,

$$X = \{x \mid x^+ = Mx^- + q\}.$$

Our main result below gives a description of the solution set in the general case. It builds on the ideas of Penrose's description of the solution set of a system of linear equations [6].

THEOREM 2.2. *For any $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $q \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the solution set X of (1.1) is given by*

$$X = \{F_z^\dagger q + G_z y \mid T_z G_z y \geq -T_z F_z^\dagger q, H_z q = 0, y \in \mathbb{R}^n, z \in Z_n\}, \tag{2.2}$$

where

$$F_z = \frac{1}{2}((I + M) + (I - M)T_z), \quad (2.3)$$

$$G_z = I - F_z^\dagger F_z, \quad (2.4)$$

$$H_z = I - F_z F_z^\dagger \quad (2.5)$$

for each $z \in Z_n$.

Proof. Let x solve (1.1), then, by Proposition 2.1, it also solves (2.1). Set $z_i = 1$ if $x_i \geq 0$ and $z_i = -1$ otherwise ($i = 1, \dots, n$), then $z \in Z_n$ and $T_z x = (z_i x_i)_{i=1}^n = (|x_i|)_{i=1}^n = |x| \geq 0$. Substituting $|x| = T_z x$ into (2.1), we get that x satisfies

$$\frac{1}{2}((I + M) + (I - M)T_z)x = q, \quad (2.6)$$

i.e.,

$$F_z x = q, \quad (2.7)$$

where F_z is given by (2.3). Then

$$H_z q = (I - F_z F_z^\dagger)q = (I - F_z F_z^\dagger)F_z x = (F_z - F_z F_z^\dagger F_z)x = 0 \quad (2.8)$$

because of (1.4). Now set $y = x - F_z^\dagger q$, then we have

$$F_z y = F_z x - F_z F_z^\dagger q = q - F_z F_z^\dagger q = H_z q = 0$$

by (2.8), therefore x can be written as

$$x = F_z^\dagger q + y = F_z^\dagger q + (I - F_z^\dagger F_z)y = F_z^\dagger q + G_z y,$$

and $T_z x \geq 0$ implies that y satisfies

$$T_z G_z y \geq -T_z F_z^\dagger q.$$

In this way we have proved that

$$X \subseteq \{ F_z^\dagger q + G_z y \mid T_z G_z y \geq -T_z F_z^\dagger q, H_z q = 0, y \in \mathbb{R}^n, z \in Z_n \}$$

holds. To prove the converse inclusion, let x be of the form $x = F_z^\dagger q + G_z y$ for some $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $z \in Z_n$ satisfying $T_z G_z y \geq -T_z F_z^\dagger q$ and $H_z q = 0$. Then

$$F_z x = F_z F_z^\dagger q + F_z G_z y = q - H_z q + (F_z - F_z F_z^\dagger F_z)y = q$$

and

$$T_z x = T_z F_z^\dagger q + T_z G_z y \geq 0,$$

hence x solves (2.6) and since $T_z x = |x|$, it satisfies (2.1) and thus also (1.1). This concludes the proof of (2.2). \square

Let us note that the columns of a matrix F_z can be expressed by

$$(F_z)_{.j} = \begin{cases} I_{.j} & \text{if } z_j = 1, \\ M_{.j} & \text{if } z_j = -1 \end{cases} \quad (j = 1, \dots, n).$$

Taking into account the singularity/nonsingularity of F_z , we can bring the description of X to a more complex, but also a more specific form.

PROPOSITION 2.3. *For any $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $q \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the solution set X of (1.1) is given by*

$$X = \{ F_z^\dagger q + G_z y \mid F_z \text{ singular}, T_z G_z y \geq -T_z F_z^\dagger q, H_z q = 0, y \in \mathbb{R}^n, z \in Z_n \} \cup \{ F_z^{-1} q \mid F_z \text{ nonsingular}, T_z F_z^{-1} q \geq 0, z \in Z_n \}, \quad (2.9)$$

where F_z, G_z, H_z are as in Theorem 2.2.

Proof. If F_z is nonsingular for some $z \in Z_n$, then we have $F_z^\dagger = F_z^{-1}, G_z = 0$ and $H_z = 0$, hence (2.2) becomes (2.9). \square

In particular, if each matrix $F_z, z \in Z_n$, is nonsingular, we have the following simplified description of X .

PROPOSITION 2.4. *Let $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $q \in \mathbb{R}^n$. If each $F_z, z \in Z_n$, is nonsingular, then*

$$X = \{ F_z^{-1} q \mid T_z F_z^{-1} q \geq 0, z \in Z_n \}. \quad (2.10)$$

Hence, if each $F_z, z \in Z_n$, is nonsingular, then the linear complementarity problem (1.1) has a finite number of solutions (at most 2^n). It is easy to show that this upper bound can really be attained. Consider the LCP

$$x^+ = -x^- + e, \quad (2.11)$$

which, in view of (1.3), is equivalent to

$$|x| = e.$$

This shows that the solution set X of (2.11) consists of all the ± 1 -vectors, i.e., $X = Z_n$. A less obvious example is given in the next section.

Finally we give a sufficient condition for (1.1) to have infinitely many solutions.

PROPOSITION 2.5. *Let $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $q \in \mathbb{R}^n$. If $T_z F_z^\dagger q > 0, G_z \neq 0$ and $H_z q = 0$ for some $z \in Z_n$, then (1.1) has infinitely many solutions.*

Proof. Under the assumptions, the inequality $T_z G_z y \geq -T_z F_z^\dagger q$ has not only the solution $y = 0$, but also a whole neighborhood of it, hence by Theorem 2.2 there are infinitely many solutions to (1.1). \square

3. Example. At the author's web page [10] there is a freely available verification software package VERSOFT written in MATLAB, currently consisting of more than 50 verification programs. One of them, called VERLCPALL, is dedicated to the present problem; it can be directly assessed at [9]. Its syntax is

```
[X,all]=verlcpall(M,q)
```

where M, q are the data of (1.1) and X is a matrix whose columns are interval vectors each of whom is guaranteed to contain a solution of (1.1). The parameter *all* satisfies $all = 1$ if it is verified that all solutions have been found, and $all = -1$ otherwise.

Consider the following example with random (but somewhat structured) data

```
>> n=10; M=-eye(n,n)+0.03*(2*rand(n,n)-1); M=round(100*M)
M =
-100    -1    -2     2    -1     3     2    -1     2     3
     2   -99     2     1     2     1    -2    -1     1     1
     0     0  -101     0    -1     2     3    -1    -2     3
    -2     2    -1  -102     0    -3    -1     2    -2    -2
    -1     3     2     1   -99    -1    -1     0     2    -2
    -1    -1     0    -3    -2  -102     3     1     2    -1
     3     0     2     0     0     0  -100    -1     1     2
     1    -2    -3    -1     2     0     1  -101    -2     2
    -1     1    -1    -2     0     3     1     1  -102    -2
    -3    -2     0     0     2    -3    -2    -2     1   -97

>> q=rand(n,1); q=round(100*q)
q =
32
21
74
41
48
32
10
87
86
96
```

Running the program gives the following result:

```
>> tic, [X,all]=verlcpall(M,q); sols=size(X,2), all, toc
sols =
    1024
all =
     1
Elapsed time is 9.563235 seconds.
```

Here, *sols* is the number of columns of *X*, i.e., the number of solutions found. We see that $sols = 1024 = 2^{10}$, and “*all* = 1” indicates that all the solutions have been found, all of them verified. The rather long computation time is due to the verification procedure involved. We have suppressed the output of *X* since it is a 10×1024 interval matrix. But we can look e.g., at the last solution:

```
>> X(:,1024)
intval ans =
 [ -0.32628969214138, -0.32628969214137]
 [ -0.24832082740008, -0.24832082740006]
 [ -0.71247684314471, -0.71247684314469]
 [ -0.38263062365052, -0.38263062365051]
 [ -0.52000025193934, -0.52000025193933]
 [ -0.31502584347121, -0.31502584347120]
 [ -0.12420810850764, -0.12420810850763]
 [ -0.82951280893732, -0.82951280893731]
 [ -0.84650089698698, -0.84650089698697]
 [ 93.55847130433784, 93.55847130433789]
```

This interval vector is guaranteed to contain a solution of (1.1). Observe the high accuracy of the result.

4. The equation $Ax + B|x| = b$. The method employed in the proof of Theorem 2.2 can be extended to describe all solutions of the absolute value equation

$$Ax + B|x| = b \tag{4.1}$$

($A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$), which is more general but less frequently used than (1.1). Denote

$$X_a = \{ x \mid Ax + B|x| = b \}.$$

Then we have this description.

THEOREM 4.1. *For any $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the solution set X_a of (4.1) is given by*

$$X_a = \{ F_z^\dagger b + G_z y \mid T_z G_z y \geq -T_z F_z^\dagger b, H_z b = 0, y \in \mathbb{R}^n, z \in Z_n \},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}F_z &= A + BT_z, \\G_z &= I - F_z^\dagger F_z, \\H_z &= I - F_z F_z^\dagger\end{aligned}$$

for each $z \in Z_n$.

Proof. If x solves (4.1), then it satisfies $(A + BT_z)x = b$, where z is the sign vector of x , hence

$$F_z x = b.$$

The rest of the proof runs exactly as in Theorem 2.2 (with q replaced by b) because from (2.7) on, it does not depend on the actual form of F_z . \square

We do not formulate here the analogues of Propositions 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 as they are obvious. We note in passing that VERSOFT [10] also contains a program VERABSVALEQNALL for finding and verifying all solutions of (4.1); it works similarly to VERLCPALL and can be directly assessed at [8].

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Ben-Israel and T. N. Greville. *Generalized Inverses, Theory and Applications*. Springer, New York, 2003.
- [2] R. W. Cottle, J.-S. Pang, and R. E. Stone. *The Linear Complementarity Problem*. Academic Press, Boston, 1992.
- [3] C. E. Lemke. Bimatrix equilibrium points and mathematical programming. *Manag. Sci.*, 11:681–689, 1965.
- [4] K. G. Murty. *Linear Complementarity, Linear and Nonlinear Programming*. Heldermann, Berlin, 1988.
- [5] R. Penrose. A generalized inverse for matrices. *Proc. Camb. Philos. Soc.*, 51:406–413, 1955.
- [6] R. Penrose. On best approximate solutions of linear matrix equations. *Proc. Camb. Philos. Soc.*, 52:17–19, 1956.
- [7] U. Schäfer. *Das lineare Komplementaritätsproblem, Eine Einführung (The Linear Complementarity Problem, An Introduction)*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2008.
- [8] VERABSVALEQNALL: Verified all solutions of the equation $Ax + B|x| = b$, 2008. Available at <http://www.cs.cas.cz/rohn/matlab/verabsvaleqnall.html>.
- [9] VERLCPALL: Verified all solutions of a linear complementarity problem, 2008. Available at <http://www.cs.cas.cz/rohn/matlab/verlcpall.html>.
- [10] VERSOFT: Verification software in MATLAB/INTLAB, 2009. Available at <http://www.cs.cas.cz/rohn/matlab>.