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A NEW SOLVABLE CONDITION FOR A PAIR OF GENERALIZED SYLVESTER EQUATIONS

QING WEN WANG†, HUA-SHENG ZHANG‡, AND GUANG-JING SONG§

Abstract. A necessary and sufficient condition is given for the quaternion matrix equations $A_iX + YB_i = C_i$ ($i = 1, 2$) to have a pair of common solutions $X$ and $Y$. As a consequence, the results partially answer a question posed by Y.H. Liu (Y.H. Liu, Ranks of solutions of the linear matrix equation $AX + YB = C$, Comput. Math. Appl., 52 (2006), pp. 861-872).
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1. Introduction. Throughout this paper, we denote the real number field by $\mathbb{R}$, the complex number field by $\mathbb{C}$, the set of all $m \times n$ matrices over the quaternion algebra

$$\mathbb{H} = \{a_0 + a_1i + a_2j + a_3k \mid i^2 = j^2 = k^2 = ijk = -1, a_0, a_1, a_2, a_3 \in \mathbb{R}\}$$

by $\mathbb{H}^{m \times n}$, the identity matrix with the appropriate size by $I$, the transpose of a matrix $A$ by $A^T$, the column right space, the row left space of a matrix $A$ over $\mathbb{H}$ by $\mathcal{R}(A)$, $\mathcal{N}(A)$, respectively, a reflexive inverse of a matrix $A$ by $A^+$ which satisfies simultaneously $AA^+A = A$ and $A^+AA^+ = A^+$. Moreover, $R_A$ and $L_A$ stand for the two projectors $L_A = I - A^+A$, $R_A = I - AA^+$ induced by $A$. By [1], for a quaternion matrix $A$, $\dim \mathcal{R}(A) = \dim \mathcal{N}(A)$, which is called the rank of $A$ and denoted by $r(A)$.

Many problems in systems and control theory require the solution of the generalized Sylvester matrix equation $AX + YB = C$. Roth [2] gave a necessary and sufficient condition for the consistancy of this matrix equation, which was called Roth’s theorem on the equivalence of block diagonal matrices. Since Roth’s paper appeared
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in 1952, Roth’s theorem has been widely extended (see, e.g., [2]-[16]). Perturbation analysis of generalized Sylvester eigenspaces of matrix quadruples [17] leads to a pair of generalized Sylvester equations of the form

\[(1.1) \quad A_1X + YB_1 = C_1, A_2X + YB_2 = C_2.\]

In 1994, Wimmer [12] gave a necessary and sufficient condition for the consistency of (1.1) over \(\mathbb{C}\) by matrix pencils. In 2002, Wang, Sun and Li [14] established a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of constant solutions with bi(skew)symmetric constrains to (1.1) over a finite central algebra. Liu [16] in 2006 presented a necessary and sufficient condition for the pair of equations in (1.1) to have a common solution \(X\) or \(Y\) over \(\mathbb{C}\), respectively, and proposed an open problem: find a necessary and sufficient condition for system (1.1) to have a pair of solutions \(X\) and \(Y\) by ranks.

Motivated by the work mentioned above and keeping applications and interests of quaternion matrices in view (e.g., [18]-[34]), in this paper we investigate the above open problem over \(\mathbb{H}\). In Section 2, we establish a necessary and sufficient condition for (1.1) to have a pair of solutions \(X\) and \(Y\) over \(\mathbb{H}\). In section 3, we present a counterexample to illustrate the errors in Liu’s paper [16]. A conclusion and a further research topic related to (1.1) are also given.

2. Main results. The following lemma is due to Marsaglia and Styan [35], which can also be generalized to \(\mathbb{H}\).

**Lemma 2.1.** Let \(A \in \mathbb{H}^{m \times n}\), \(B \in \mathbb{H}^{m \times k}\) and \(C \in \mathbb{H}^{l \times n}\). Then they satisfy the following:

(a) \(r[AB] = r(A) + r(R_AB) = r(B) + r(R_BA)\).

(b) \(r[A\begin{bmatrix} C \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}] = r(A) + r(CL_A) = r(C) + r(AL_C)\).

(c) \(r[A\begin{bmatrix} B \\ C \end{bmatrix}] = r(B) + r(C) + r(R_BAL_C)\).

From Lemma 2.1 we can easily get the following.

**Lemma 2.2.** Let \(A \in \mathbb{H}^{m \times n}\), \(B \in \mathbb{H}^{m \times k}\), \(C \in \mathbb{H}^{l \times n}\), \(D \in \mathbb{H}^{j \times k}\) and \(E \in \mathbb{H}^{i \times j}\). Then

(a) \(r(CL_A) = r[A\begin{bmatrix} C \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}] - r(A)\).

(b) \(r[B\begin{bmatrix} A \\ C \end{bmatrix}] = r[B\begin{bmatrix} A \\ C \end{bmatrix}] - r(C)\).

(c) \(r[C\begin{bmatrix} R_BA \\ C \end{bmatrix}] = r[C\begin{bmatrix} R_BA \\ C \end{bmatrix}] - r(B)\).
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(d) \[ r \begin{bmatrix} A & B L D \\ R E C & 0 \end{bmatrix} = r \begin{bmatrix} A & B & 0 \\ C & 0 & E \\ 0 & D & 0 \end{bmatrix} - r(D) - r(E). \]

The following three lemmas are due to Baksalary and Kala [6], Tian [36],[37], respectively, which can be generalized to \( \mathbb{H} \).

**Lemma 2.3.** Let \( A \in \mathbb{H}^{m \times p}, B \in \mathbb{H}^{q \times n} \) and \( C \in \mathbb{H}^{m \times n} \) be known and \( X \in \mathbb{H}^{p \times q} \) unknown. Then the matrix equation \( AX + YB = C \) is solvable if and only if

\[ r \begin{bmatrix} B & A \\ 0 & C \end{bmatrix} = r(A) + r(B). \]

In this case, the general solution to the matrix equation is given by

\[ X = A^+ C + UB + LA V, \]
\[ Y = RA C - AU + LA W R B, \]

where \( U \in \mathbb{H}^{p \times q}, V \in \mathbb{H}^{p \times n} \) and \( W \in \mathbb{H}^{m \times q} \) are arbitrary.

**Lemma 2.4.** Let \( A \in \mathbb{H}^{m \times n}, B \in \mathbb{H}^{m \times p}, C \in \mathbb{H}^{q \times n} \) be given, \( Y \in \mathbb{H}^{p \times n}, Z \in \mathbb{H}^{m \times q} \) be two variant matrices. Then

\[
\begin{align*}
\max_{Y,Z} r(A - BY - ZC) &= \min \left\{ m, n, r \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\}; \\
\min_{Y,Z} r(A - BY - ZC) &= r \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & 0 \end{bmatrix} - r(B) - r(C).
\end{align*}
\]

**Lemma 2.5.** The matrix equation \( A_1 X_1 B_1 + A_2 X_2 B_2 + A_3 Y + Z B_3 = C \) is solvable if and only if the following four rank equalities are all satisfied:

\[ r \begin{bmatrix} C & A_1 & A_2 & A_3 \\ B_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = r(A_1, A_2, A_3) + r(B_3), \]
\[ r \begin{bmatrix} C & A_3 \\ B_1 & 0 \\ B_2 & 0 \\ B_3 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = r(A_3) + r \begin{bmatrix} B_1 \\ B_2 \\ B_3 \end{bmatrix}, \]
\[ r \begin{bmatrix} C & A_1 & A_3 \\ B_2 & 0 & 0 \\ B_3 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = r \begin{bmatrix} B_2 \\ B_3 \end{bmatrix} + r(A_1, A_3), \]
Q.W. Wang, H.S. Zhang, and G.J. Song

$$r \begin{bmatrix} C & A_2 & A_3 \\ B_1 & 0 & 0 \\ B_3 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = r \begin{bmatrix} B_1 \\ B_3 \end{bmatrix} + r [A_2, A_3].$$

**Lemma 2.6.** (Lemma 2.3 in [38]) Let $A, B$ be matrices over $\mathbb{H}$ and

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} A_1 \\ A_2 \end{bmatrix}, B = [B_1, B_2], S = A_2 L_{A_1}, T = R_{B_1} B_2.$$

Then

$$A^+ = [A_1^+ - L_{A_1} S^+ A_2 A_1^+, L_{A_1} S^+] , B^+ = \begin{bmatrix} B_1^+ - B_1^+ B_2 T^+ R_{B_1} \\ T^+ R_{B_1} \end{bmatrix}$$

are reflexive inverses of $A$ and $B$, respectively.

**Lemma 2.7.** Suppose $A_1, A_2 \in \mathbb{H}^{m \times p}, B_1, B_2 \in \mathbb{H}^{q \times n}$ and $\hat{B} = \begin{bmatrix} B_1 \\ B_2 \end{bmatrix}$ are given, $V = \begin{bmatrix} V_1 \\ V_2 \end{bmatrix}$ and $W = \begin{bmatrix} W_1 & W_2 \end{bmatrix}$ are any matrices with compatible dimensions. Then

(a) $[I_p, 0] L_{[A_1, A_2]} V$ and $[0, I_p] L_{[A_1, A_2]} V$ are independent, that is, for any $V = \begin{bmatrix} V_1 \\ V_2 \end{bmatrix}$,

$[I_p, 0] L_{[A_1, A_2]} V$ only relates to $V_2$ and the change of $[0, I_p] L_{[A_1, A_2]} V$ only relates to $V_1$, if and only if

$$r [A_1, A_2] = r (A_1) + r (A_2).$$

(b) $WR_{\hat{B}} \begin{bmatrix} I_q \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and $WR_{\hat{B}} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I_q \end{bmatrix}$ are independent, that is, for any $W = \begin{bmatrix} W_1 & W_2 \end{bmatrix}$,

$WR_{\hat{B}} \begin{bmatrix} I_q \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$ only relates to $W_1$ and $WR_{\hat{B}} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I_q \end{bmatrix}$ only relates to $W_2$, if and only if

$$r \begin{bmatrix} B_1 \\ B_2 \end{bmatrix} = r (B_1) + r (B_2).$$

**Proof.** From Lemma 2.6, we have

$$[I_p, 0] L_{[A_1, A_2]} V$$

$$= [I_p, 0] \left( I - \begin{bmatrix} A_1^+ - A_1^+ A_2 [(I - A_1 A_1^+) A_2] + (I - A_1 A_1^+) \\ (I - A_1 A_1^+) A_2 \\ (I - A_1 A_1^+) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A_1, A_2 \end{bmatrix} \right) V$$

$$= [I_p, 0] \left( I - \begin{bmatrix} A_1 A_1^+ - A_1^+ A_2 - A_1^+ A_2 [(I - A_1 A_1^+) A_2] + (I - A_1 A_1^+) A_2 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A_1, A_2 \end{bmatrix} \right) \begin{bmatrix} V_1 \\ V_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= V_1 - [A_1 A_1^+, A_1^+ A_2 - A_1^+ A_2 [(I - A_1 A_1^+) A_2] + (I - A_1 A_1^+) A_2] \begin{bmatrix} V_1 \\ V_2 \end{bmatrix}.$$
Similarly, we have
\[
[0, I_p] L_{[A_1, A_2]} V = V_2 - [0, [(I - A_1 A_1^+) A_2]^+ (I - A_1 A_1^+) A_2] \begin{bmatrix} V_1 \\ V_2 \end{bmatrix}.
\]
Thus, \([I_p, 0] L_{[A_1, A_2]} V\) and \([0, I_p] L_{[A_1, A_2]} V\) are independent if and only if
\[
A_1^+ A_2 - A_1^+ A_2 [(I - A_1 A_1^+) A_2]^+ (I - A_1 A_1^+) A_2 = 0.
\]

According to Lemma 2.2, we have
\[
r [A_1^+ A_2 - A_1^+ A_2 [(I - A_1 A_1^+) A_2]^+ (I - A_1 A_1^+) A_2]
= r \begin{bmatrix} (I - A_1 A_1^+) A_2 \\ A_1^+ A_2 \end{bmatrix} - r [(I - A_1 A_1^+) A_2]
= r \begin{bmatrix} A_2 & A_1 \\ A_1^+ A_2 & 0 \end{bmatrix} - r [A_2, A_1]
= r \begin{bmatrix} A_2 & 0 \\ 0 & A_1 \end{bmatrix} - r [A_2, A_1].
\]
That is \(r [A_1, A_2] = r (A_1) + r (A_2)\).

Similarly, we can prove (b). \(\square\)

Now we give the main result of this article.

**Theorem 2.8.** Suppose that every matrix equation in system (1.1) is consistent and
\[
r [A_1, A_2] = r (A_1) + r (A_2), r \begin{bmatrix} B_1 \\ B_2 \end{bmatrix} = r (B_1) + r (B_2).\]
(2.3)
Then system (1.1) has a pair of solutions \(X\) and \(Y\) if and only if
\[
r \begin{bmatrix} B_1 & 0 \\ -C_1 & A_1 \\ C_2 & A_2 \end{bmatrix} = r \begin{bmatrix} A_1 \\ A_2 \end{bmatrix} + r \begin{bmatrix} B_1 \\ B_2 \end{bmatrix},\]
(2.4)
\[
r \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & A_2 \\ 0 & -C_1 \\ 0 & B_1 \\ B_2 \end{bmatrix} = r [A_1, A_2] + r [B_1, B_2],\]
(2.5)
\[
r \begin{bmatrix} 0 & B_1 & B_2 \\ A_1 & 0 & 0 \\ A_2 & 0 & F \end{bmatrix} = r \begin{bmatrix} A_1 \\ A_2 \end{bmatrix} + r [B_1, B_2],\]
(2.6)
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\[(2.7)\]
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
0 & B_1 & B_2 \\
A_1 & 0 & 0 \\
A_2 & 0 & \hat{F}
\end{bmatrix} = r \begin{bmatrix}
A_1 \\
A_2
\end{bmatrix} + r [B_1, B_2],
\]

where

\[(2.8)\]
\[
F = A_1 \left( A_2^T C_2 - A_1^T C_1 \right) \begin{bmatrix}
B_1 \\
- B_2
\end{bmatrix}^T + \begin{bmatrix}
B_1 \\
- B_2
\end{bmatrix} + \Omega B_1
\]

and

\[(2.9)\]
\[
\hat{F} = A_2 \left( A_2^T C_2 - A_1^T C_1 \right) \begin{bmatrix}
B_1 \\
- B_2
\end{bmatrix}^T + \begin{bmatrix}
B_1 \\
- B_2
\end{bmatrix} + \Omega B_2
\]

with \( \Omega = [-A_1, A_2] [ -A_1, A_2]^T (R_{A_2} C_2 B_2^+ - R_{A_1} C_1 B_1^+) \).

**Proof.** Clearly, system (1.1) has a pair of solutions \( X \) and \( Y \) if and only if

\[(2.10)\]
\[
A_1 X_1 + Y_1 B_1 = C_1
\]

\[(2.11)\]
\[
A_2 X_2 + Y_2 B_2 = C_2
\]

are consistent and \( X_1 = X_2 \) and \( Y_1 = Y_2 \). It follows from Lemma 2.3 that \( A_i X_i + Y_i B_i = C_i, i = 1, 2 \), are consistent if and only if

\[
C_i - A_i A_i^T C_i - C_i B_i^T B_i + A_i A_i^T C_i B_i^T B_i = 0, i = 1, 2.
\]

In that case, the general solutions can be written as

\[(2.12)\]
\[
X_i = A_i^T C_i + U_i B_i + L_{A_i} V_i,
\]

\[(2.13)\]
\[
Y_i = R_{A_i} C_i - A_i U_i + L_{A_i} W_i R_{B_i},
\]

where \( U_i \in \mathbb{H}^{p \times q}, V_i \in \mathbb{H}^{p \times n}, W_i \in \mathbb{H}^{m \times q}, i = 1, 2 \), are arbitrary. Hence, \n
\[(2.14)\]
\[
X_1 - X_2
\]
\[
= A_1^T C_1 - A_2^T C_2 + [U_1, U_2] \begin{bmatrix}
B_1 \\
- B_2
\end{bmatrix} + [L_{A_1}, -L_{A_2}] \begin{bmatrix}
V_1 \\
V_2
\end{bmatrix},
\]

\[(2.15)\]
\[
Y_1 - Y_2
\]
\[
= R_{A_1} C_1 B_1^+ - R_{A_2} C_2 B_2^+ + [-A_1, A_2] \begin{bmatrix}
U_1 \\
U_2
\end{bmatrix} + [W_1, W_2] \begin{bmatrix}
R_{B_1} \\
- R_{B_2}
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

Obviously, the equations (2.10) and (2.11) have common solutions, \( X_1 = X_2, Y_1 = Y_2 \), if and only if there exist \( U_1 \) and \( U_2 \) in (2.14) and (2.15) such that

\[(2.16)\]
\[
\min_{A_1 X_1 + Y_1 B_1 = C_1, A_2 X_2 + Y_2 B_2 = C_2} r(X_1 - X_2) = 0,
\]

\[(2.17)\]
\[
\min_{A_1 X_1 + Y_1 B_1 = C_1, A_2 X_2 + Y_2 B_2 = C_2} r(Y_1 - Y_2) = 0,
\]
which is equivalent to the existence of $U_1$ and $U_2$ such that
\begin{equation}
A_1^t C_1 - A_2^t C_2 + [U_1, U_2] \begin{bmatrix} B_1 \\ -B_2 \end{bmatrix} + [L_{A_1}, -L_{A_2}] \begin{bmatrix} V_1 \\ V_2 \end{bmatrix} = 0, \tag{2.18}
\end{equation}

and
\begin{equation}
R_{A_1} C_1 B_1^{t+} - R_{A_2} C_2 B_2^{t+} + [-A_1, A_2] \begin{bmatrix} U_1 \\ U_2 \end{bmatrix} + [W_1, W_2] \begin{bmatrix} R_{B_1} \\ -R_{B_2} \end{bmatrix} = 0. \tag{2.19}
\end{equation}

It follows from (2.16-2.17) and Lemma 2.3 that
\begin{equation}
\min_{A_1 X_1 + Y_1 B_1 = C_1, A_2 X_2 + Y_2 B_2 = C_2} r (X_1 - X_2)
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
= r \begin{bmatrix} B_1 & 0 \\ B_2 & 0 \\ -C_1 & A_1 \\ C_2 & A_2 \end{bmatrix} - r \begin{bmatrix} A_1 \\ A_2 \end{bmatrix} - r \begin{bmatrix} B_1 \\ B_2 \end{bmatrix} = 0
\end{equation}

and
\begin{equation}
\min_{A_1 X_1 + Y_1 B_1 = C_1, A_2 X_2 + Y_2 B_2 = C_2} r (Y_1 - Y_2)
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
= r \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & A_2 \\ 0 & 0 \\ -C_1 & C_2 \\ B_1 & B_2 \end{bmatrix} - r [A_1, A_2] - r [B_1, B_2] = 0
\end{equation}

implying, from Lemma 2.3, that (2.18) and (2.19) are solvable for $[U_1, U_2]$ and $\begin{bmatrix} U_1 \\ U_2 \end{bmatrix}$, respectively, and
\begin{equation}
[U_1, U_2]
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
= R_{[L_{A_1}, -L_{A_2}]} (A_2^t C_2 - A_1^t C_1)^+ - [L_{A_1}, -L_{A_2}] \tilde{U} + W R_{B},
\end{equation}

and
\begin{equation}
\begin{bmatrix} U_1 \\ U_2 \end{bmatrix}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
= [-A_1, A_2]^+ (R_{A_2} C_2 B_2^{t+} - R_{A_1} C_1 B_1^{t+}) + \tilde{U} \begin{bmatrix} R_{B_1} \\ -R_{B_2} \end{bmatrix} + L_{[-A_1, A_2]} V,
\end{equation}

where $\tilde{U}, \tilde{U}, W$ and $V$ are any matrices over $\mathbb{H}$ with appropriate dimensions. Clearly,
\begin{equation}
[U_1, U_2] \begin{bmatrix} I_q \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = [I_p, 0] \begin{bmatrix} U_1 \\ U_2 \end{bmatrix},
\end{equation}
and

\[(2.25) \quad [U_1, U_2] \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I_q \end{bmatrix} = [0, I_p] \begin{bmatrix} U_1 \\ U_2 \end{bmatrix}.\]

Substituting (2.22) and (2.23) into (2.24) and (2.25) yields

\[(2.26) R_{[L_A, -L_A]} \begin{bmatrix} A_2^+C_2 - A_1^+C_1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} B_1 \\ -B_2 \end{bmatrix}^+ \begin{bmatrix} I_q \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} - [I_p, 0] \alpha
= [L_A, -L_A] \begin{bmatrix} I_q \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + [I_p, 0] \begin{bmatrix} R_{B_1} \\ -R_{B_2} \end{bmatrix} - WR_B \begin{bmatrix} I_q \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + [I_p, 0] L_{[-A_1, A_2]} V,
\]

and

\[(2.27) R_{[L_A, -L_A]} \begin{bmatrix} A_2^+C_2 - A_1^+C_1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} B_1 \\ -B_2 \end{bmatrix}^+ \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I_q \end{bmatrix} - [0, I_p] \alpha
= [L_A, -L_A] \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I_q \end{bmatrix} + [0, I_p] \begin{bmatrix} R_{B_1} \\ -R_{B_2} \end{bmatrix} - WR_B \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I_q \end{bmatrix} + [0, I_p] L_{[-A_1, A_2]} V\]

where

\[\alpha = [-A_1, A_2]^+ (R_{A_2}C_2B_2^+ - R_{A_1}C_1B_1^+) , \quad \hat{B} = \begin{bmatrix} B_1 \\ -B_2 \end{bmatrix}.\]

Let

\[\tilde{U} = [\tilde{U}_1, \tilde{U}_2], \quad \hat{U} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{U}_1 \\ \hat{U}_2 \end{bmatrix}\]

in (2.26) and (2.27) where \(\tilde{U}_1, \tilde{U}_2, \hat{U}_1\) and \(\hat{U}_2\) are matrices over \(\mathbb{H}\) with appropriate dimensions. Then it follows from (2.3) and Lemma 2.7 that (2.26) and (2.27) can be written as

\[(2.28) \quad R_{[L_A, -L_A]} \begin{bmatrix} A_2^+C_2 - A_1^+C_1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} B_1 \\ -B_2 \end{bmatrix}^+ \begin{bmatrix} I_q \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} - [I_p, 0] \alpha
= [L_A, -L_A] \tilde{U}_1 + \hat{U}_1 \begin{bmatrix} R_{B_1} \\ -R_{B_2} \end{bmatrix} - W_1 R_{B_2} L_{B_1} + V_1 R_{A_1},\]

and

\[(2.29) \quad R_{[L_A, -L_A]} \begin{bmatrix} A_2^+C_2 - A_1^+C_1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} B_1 \\ -B_2 \end{bmatrix}^+ \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I_q \end{bmatrix} - [0, I_p] \alpha
= [L_A, -L_A] \tilde{U}_2 + \hat{U}_2 \begin{bmatrix} R_{B_1} \\ -R_{B_2} \end{bmatrix} - W_2 L_{B_1} + V_2 R_{A_1, A_2}.\]
Therefore, the equations (2.10) and (2.11) have common solutions, \( X_1 = X_2, Y_1 = Y_2 \), if and only if there exist \( W_1, V_1, U_1, \hat{U}_1; W_2, V_2, \hat{U}_2, \hat{U}_2 \) such that (2.28) and (2.29) hold, respectively. By Lemma 2.5, the equation (2.28) is solvable if and only if

\[
(2.30) \quad \begin{bmatrix}
C & [L_{A_1}, -L_{A_2}] & [I_p, 0] L_{[-A_1, A_2]}
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
C
R_{B_1}
-R_{B_2}
-R_{B_2}
-I_q
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
B_1
-I_q
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
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\[ r \left[ \begin{bmatrix} L_{A_1}, -L_{A_2} \end{bmatrix}, [I_p, 0] L_{[-A_1, A_2]} \right] = r \begin{bmatrix} A_1 \\ A_2 \end{bmatrix} + p - r (A_1) - r (A_2) \]

implying that (2.6) follows from (2.3) and (2.30).

Similarly, the equation (2.29) is solvable if and only if

\[
\begin{align*}
\hat{C} & = \left( I - [L_{A_1}, -L_{A_2}] [L_{A_1}, -L_{A_2}]^+ \right) (A_1^+ C_2 - A_1^+ C_1) \left( \begin{array}{c}
B_1 \\
-B_2
\end{array} \right) + \left( \begin{array}{c}
0 \\
I_q
\end{array} \right) \\
- [0, I_p] [-A_1, A_2]^+ \left( R_{A_1} C_2 B_2^+ - R_{A_1} C_1 B_1^+ \right).
\end{align*}
\]

Simplifying (2.31) yields (2.7) from (2.3) and (2.9). Moreover, (2.4) and (2.5) follow from (2.20) and (2.21), respectively. This proof is completed.

Under an assumption, we have derived a necessary and sufficient condition for system (1.1) to have a pair of solutions \(X\) and \(Y\) over \(H\) by ranks. The open problem in [16] is, therefore, partially solved. By the way, we find that Corollary 2.3 in [16] is wrong.

Now we present a counterexample to illustrate the error. We first state the wrong corollary mentioned above: Suppose that the complex matrix equation \((A_0 + A_1 i) X + Y (B_0 + B_1 i) = (C_0 + C_1 i)\) is consistent. Then

(a) Equation \((A_0 + A_1 i) X + Y (B_0 + B_1 i) = (C_0 + C_1 i)\) has a pair of real solutions \(X = X_0\) and \(Y = Y_0\) if and only if

\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{bmatrix} B_0 \\ B_1 \\ C_0 \\ C_1 \end{bmatrix} & = r \begin{bmatrix} A_0 \\ A_1 \end{bmatrix} + r \begin{bmatrix} B_0 \\ B_1 \end{bmatrix}, \\
\begin{bmatrix} A_0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ B_0 \end{bmatrix} & = r \begin{bmatrix} A_1 \\ C_0 \\ B_0 \\ B_1 \end{bmatrix} = r [A_0, A_1] + r [B_0, B_1].
\end{align*}
\]

A counterexample is as follows. Let

\[
A_0 = B_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, A_1 = B_1 = C_0 = 0, C_1 = \begin{bmatrix} i & 0 \\ 0 & i \end{bmatrix}.
\]
Then we have

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
B_0 & 0 \\
B_1 & 0 \\
C_0 & A_0 \\
C_1 & A_1
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
A_0 & A_1 & C_0 & C_1 \\
0 & 0 & B_0 & B_1
\end{bmatrix}
= 4,
\]

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
A_0 \\
A_1
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
B_0 \\
B_1
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
[A_0, A_1] = [B_0, B_1] = 2,
\]

i.e. (2.32) and (2.33) hold. However, the following matrix equation

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 \\
0 & 1
\end{bmatrix}
X + 
\begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 \\
0 & 1
\end{bmatrix}
= 
\begin{bmatrix}
i & 0 \\
0 & i
\end{bmatrix}
\]

has no real solution obviously.

Similarly, we can give a counterexample to illustrate that the part (c) of Corollary 2.3 in [16] is also wrong.

Using the methods in this paper, we can correct the mistakes mentioned above. We are planning to present these corrections in a separate article.
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