

UNITARY-INVARIANT DECOMPOSITION OF REDUCIBLE TOTAL LEAST SQUARES CORE PROBLEMS

SIJIA YU, BRUNO CARPENTIERI, AND YAN-FEI JING

ABSTRACT. The analysis of a total least square problem (TLS) can be reduced to that of an associated core problem, which typically has lower dimension and improved solubility properties. Nevertheless, even a core problem may remain reducible, admitting further decomposition into irreducible component subproblems with simpler structure and better analytical properties. However, no systematic and invariant procedure is available for identifying all such component subproblems, either over either real or complex field.

In this paper, a complete and constructive framework is developed for the exact decomposition of TLS core problems into unitary-unique irreducible component subproblems.

By working over the complex field and exploiting the spectral structure of covariance operators associated with $\{C\}$ -subset subproblems, the proposed strategy yields all complex indivisible subspaces which will lead to irreducible component sub-problems. As a consequence, we prove that irreducible component subproblems are uniquely determined up to unitary transformations and permutation, thereby partially resolving an open question left in [Yu, Jing. SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl., 46 (2025), pp. 1616–1639.]

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we consider an inconsistent linear problem of the form

$$(1.1) \quad AX \approx B,$$

where $A \in \mathbb{F}^{m \times n}$ is a system (data) matrix, $B \in \mathbb{F}^{m \times d}$ is a matrix of observations, and $X \in \mathbb{F}^{n \times d}$ is the unknown solution matrix, with $\mathbb{F} \in \{\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}\}$. We assume that $A^*B \neq 0$ and that $\mathcal{R}(B) \not\subset \mathcal{R}(A)$, so that (1.1) admits no exact solution.

Such inconsistency is not exceptional but naturally arises in a wide range of applications in which both the system model and the observed data are affected by noise, modeling uncertainty, or measurement errors. Typical examples include system identification [1, 18], signal processing [2], and linear regression with errors in variables [5], as commonly encountered in statistical learning and data-driven modeling. In these settings, the construction of reliable approximate solutions and the analysis of error propagation in the presence of incompatible data are of central importance, and have therefore attracted considerable attention in the literature [7, 8].

Classical approaches to inconsistent linear problems include the least squares (LS) formulation [8, 17, 23], the data least squares (DLS) problem [3, 17], and the total least squares (TLS) problem [6, 23, 24]. While LS accounts for perturbations

Key words and phrases. total least square problem, reducible core problem, row separation problem.

only in the observation matrix and DLS assumes errors solely in the data matrix, the TLS framework allows for simultaneous perturbations in both A and B . For this reason, TLS provides a more realistic modeling paradigm in applications where uncertainty affects both the system and the measurements.

A substantial body of work has established fundamental results on the existence of TLS solutions and has led to the development of effective algorithms for computing exact or approximate, including truncated, TLS solutions [7, 10, 17, 21]. Most of these contributions, however, are primarily concerned with the computation of TLS solutions and place less emphasis on the internal structure of large-scale TLS problems.

A central idea in the classical analysis of TLS problems, and the main tool for dimension reduction, is the use of orthogonal transformations to isolate the essential part of the data [7]. With this spirit, Paige and Strakoš introduced the notion of the TLS core problem, which yields a reduced subproblem retaining all the information required to solve the original TLS problem with a single right-hand side [19]. This concept was subsequently extended to multiple right-hand sides [11], to complex-valued TLS problems [13], and to bilinear and tensor formulations [13, 14, 16]. The TLS core problem is unique up to orthogonal equivalence and can be computed efficiently using Krylov-based techniques [12].

However, while the TLS core problem isolates the essential part of the data responsible for incompatibility, it does not by itself explain how this core may further decompose internally, nor how unsolvability is distributed across its substructures. These observations motivate the development of a finer structural theory for TLS core problems.

As shown in [9, 15, 26], certain classes of TLS core problems, referred to as *reducible* core problems, admit further decomposition into independent component subproblems through suitable orthogonal transformations.

In particular, component subproblems are typically lower-dimensional and structurally simpler, which makes them natural candidates for future solvability and numerical analysis. This suggests that meaningful and interpretable solutions may still be obtained by identifying and solving these components, even when the full TLS core problem remains unsolvable. Despite these insights, no systematic and general methodology is currently available for identifying such component subproblems or for distinguishing reducible core problems from irreducible ones, especially in high-dimensional settings.

More recently, the notion of the *row separation problem* was introduced as a key tool for identifying admissible decompositions of TLS core problems [25]. Within this framework, component subproblems are associated with row separation subspaces, which can in turn be generated from indivisible subspaces. However, the analysis in [25] does not fully address the intersection properties of ambiguous subspaces, nor does it establish uniqueness of the resulting reduced structures. Moreover, it still remains an open problem to find component sub-problems when the data matrix has multiple singular values. These issues in complex cases will be resolved by the theoretical developments to be presented in this paper.

The aim of this paper is to develop a complete and intrinsic strategy to find all the component sub-problems via unitary transformations and as a natural result, to distinguish the unitary irreducible core problems, which also solves the open problems of complex cases in [9] and [25]. Moreover, we identify irreducible building

blocks which are invariant under unitary transformations and establish comparison principles between different decompositions.

The identification of unitary irreducible components provides a more natural starting point for the study of solubility than the original reducible core problem, since these components are lower-dimensional and typically exhibit improved solubility properties. Moreover, the proposed framework offers direct guidance for the design of exact and approximate decomposition algorithms, as it predicts the intrinsic decomposable structure underlying large-scale TLS core problems. We emphasize that the present work is primarily theoretical and structural in nature; algorithmic exploitation and detailed solvability analysis are natural next steps and are left for future investigation.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we review basic definitions and fundamental results concerning TLS core problems and row separation problems. Section 3 presents structural property and comparison relation of row separation subspaces. In Section 4, we introduce the notion of the c -division problem in both the real and complex settings and derive essential computational criteria for distinguishing different levels of homogeneity which provide essential theoretical basis for our strategy. Section 5 proposes an alternative construction based on division by distinct eigenvalues of covariance matrices for partially inhomogeneous cases and provide construction basis for our strategy.

Then we present the final strategy for treating TLS core problems via unitary transformations and then partially address the open problem posed in [25]. Finally, Section 6 summarizes the main results and discusses remaining open questions in the real-valued case.

2. PRELIMINARIES AND ROW SEPARATION FRAMEWORK

We begin by recalling the notion of a TLS core problem and summarizing its essential properties [13], which provide the natural starting point for any intrinsic analysis of unsolvable TLS instances. We then introduce the row separation framework and the associated subspaces [25], which supply the abstract language and mechanisms needed to identify admissible decompositions and irreducible components. Together, these concepts form the theoretical foundation for the decomposition strategies to be developed in Sections 3–5.

For clarity, most definitions are collected here and referenced later when needed, allowing the subsequent sections to focus on the development of the main results without repeated technical interruptions.

2.1. Notation and Conventions. Throughout the paper, $\sigma(A)$ and $\lambda(A)$ denote, respectively, the set of singular values and the set of eigenvalues of a matrix A . We write A^T for the transpose of A , \bar{A} for its entry-wise complex conjugate, and A^* for its conjugate transpose. The symbols I and 0 denote the identity matrix and the zero matrix, respectively. Unless otherwise stated, all spaces and linear operations are considered over the field $\mathbb{F} \in \{\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}\}$. For a matrix A , $\mathcal{R}(A)$ and $\mathcal{N}(A)$ respectively denote its column space and null space over \mathbb{F} . For a subspace \mathcal{A} , $\dim(\mathcal{A})$ denotes its dimension, while $\text{rank}(A)$ denotes the rank of a matrix A , both taken over \mathbb{F} . \oplus denotes sum of linear subspaces.

To distinguish between ordered and unordered collections of indices, we adopt the following notation. The symbol (a_1, \dots, a_k) denotes an ordered collection of k elements, where the order is fixed. The notation $\{C\} = \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ denotes

an unordered collection of k distinct elements, where the order is irrelevant and repetitions are not allowed.

2.2. TLS Problem and Core Problem in \mathbb{F} . We briefly recall the TLS formulation and introduce the notion of the TLS core problem, which serves as the starting point for the structural analysis developed in this paper.

Given a system matrix $A \in \mathbb{F}^{m \times n}$ and a right-hand side matrix $B \in \mathbb{F}^{m \times d}$, the TLS framework accounts for perturbations in both the data matrix and the observations. Specifically, it introduces perturbation matrices $E \in \mathbb{F}^{m \times n}$ and $G \in \mathbb{F}^{m \times d}$ and seeks to solve

$$(2.1) \quad \min_{E, G} \|[E \mid G]\|_F \quad \text{subject to} \quad (A + E)X_{\text{TLS}} = B + G,$$

where $X_{\text{TLS}} \in \mathbb{F}^{n \times d}$ denotes a TLS solution and $\|\cdot\|_F$ is the Frobenius norm.

The existence, uniqueness, and structural properties of TLS solutions have been extensively studied in the literature; see, for example, [10, 13] for classical solvability conditions and characterizations. In the present work, however, our focus is not on computing TLS solutions directly, but rather on analyzing the intrinsic structure of the associated core problem obtained through unitary transformations.

Next we recall the notion of the TLS core problem, which provides a dimension-reduced representation that retains all structurally relevant information for the analysis of TLS problems.

Definition 2.1 (Core Problem in \mathbb{F} [13]). To isolate the essential part of the approximation problem $AX \approx B$, consider unitary matrices P , Q , and R , with $P^{-1} = P^*$, $Q^{-1} = Q^*$, and $R^{-1} = R^*$, such that

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{bmatrix} \widehat{B} & \widehat{A} \end{bmatrix} = P^* [B \mid A] \begin{bmatrix} R & 0 \\ 0 & Q \end{bmatrix} = P^* [BR \mid AQ] \equiv \left[\begin{array}{c|c} B_1 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 \end{array} \middle| \begin{array}{c|c} A_{11} & 0 \\ \hline 0 & A_{22} \end{array} \right],$$

where the block $[B_1 \mid A_{11}]$ has minimal dimension and the block A_{22} has maximal dimension among all such unitary transformations.

The subproblem $A_{11}X_{11} \approx B_1$ is called the *core problem*.

Remark 2.2. The detailed relationship between the TLS problem and its core problem, including how solutions of the original problem can be recovered from solutions of the core problem, is described in [13, 20].

The core problem provides a natural starting point for the subsequent structural analysis. In particular, both the data matrix A_{11} and the observation matrix B_1 are of full column rank; see [13] for details. Moreover, let columns of U_1, \dots, U_{k+1} denote orthonormal bases of the left singular vector subspaces associated with A_{11} , including a basis of $\mathcal{N}(A_{11}^*)$. Then $U_j^* B_1$ is of full row rank for each j , which excludes degenerate (trivial) components in the subsequent decomposition; see Definition 2.8.

Definition 2.3 (Reducible (Irreducible) Core Problem in \mathbb{F} [9]). A core problem $[B_1 \mid A_{11}]$ is called *reducible* (or *composed*) if, after a unitary transformation, it admits the block-diagonal structure

$$(2.3) \quad P^* [B_1 \mid A_{11}] \begin{bmatrix} R & 0 \\ 0 & Q \end{bmatrix} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} B_1^{(1)} & A_{11}^{(1)} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ B_1^{(g)} & A_{11}^{(g)} \end{array} \right],$$

where $P^{-1} = P^*$, $Q^{-1} = Q^*$, and $R^{-1} = R^*$, possibly including the case in which some block $A_{11}^{(t)}$ has no columns, for $t = 1, \dots, g$. A core problem that is not reducible is called *irreducible* (or *indecomposable*).

The individual subproblems $[B_1^{(t)} \mid A_{11}^{(t)}]$, $t = 1, \dots, g$, are called the *components* of the core problem. If $\mathcal{R}(B_1^{(t)}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(A_{11}^{(t)})$, the component is called *compatible*; otherwise, it is called *incompatible*. If $A_{11}^{(t)}$ has no columns, the component $[B_1^{(t)}]$ is called *degenerate*.

Remark 2.4. In this paper, we aim to identify component subproblems of a TLS core problem via unitary transformations. Even when the given core problem is real-valued, working over \mathbb{C} allows for a more general structural analysis and often simplifies the characterization of reducible and irreducible structures.

To distinguish between reducibility at the level of individual components and reducibility of the overall decomposition, we recall the following notion.

Definition 2.5 (Irreducible Reduced Structure [25]). A reduced structure is called *irreducible* if all of its component subproblems are irreducible core problems.

For further insight into the significance of reducible core problems, we refer to [19, 22] for results on singular vector perturbations of $[B \mid A]$ and to [24] for the solution theory of TLS problems.

2.3. Row Separation Problem. It is shown in [25] that the component subproblems of a given TLS core problem can be identified through *row separation subspaces*. This framework provides a powerful mechanism for detecting admissible decompositions of TLS core problems via subspace analysis.

Since the notion of row separation subspaces is purely based on linear subspace properties, the underlying theory extends naturally from the real to the complex field. Accordingly, we formulate the row separation problem over $\mathbb{F} \in \{\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}\}$, with the aim of constructing row separation structures directly from the row blocks D_1, \dots, D_{k+1} .

Definition 2.6 (Row Separation Problem in \mathbb{F}). Let $D_1 \in \mathbb{F}^{r_1 \times \hat{d}}, \dots, D_{k+1} \in \mathbb{F}^{r_{k+1} \times \hat{d}}$ be $k+1$ row blocks with a common number of columns, where $r_1, \dots, r_{k+1} \leq \hat{d}$, and define

$$D = [D_1^T \quad \dots \quad D_{k+1}^T]^T.$$

The *row separation problem* associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$ consists of finding:

- a commutation matrix E^D of dimension $\sum_{j=1}^{k+1} r_j$,
- unitary (orthogonal when $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$) matrices H_1, \dots, H_{k+1} of dimensions r_1, \dots, r_{k+1} , respectively,
- a unitary (orthogonal when $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$) matrix L^D of dimension \hat{d} ,
- and a block diagonal matrix $\text{diag}\{B_1^D, \dots, B_g^D\}$, where g is an a priori unknown integer,

such that

$$E^D \operatorname{diag}\{H_1, \dots, H_{k+1}\} \begin{bmatrix} D_1 \\ D_2 \\ \vdots \\ D_{k+1} \end{bmatrix} L^D = \operatorname{diag}\{B_1^D, \dots, B_g^D\}.$$

Informally, the row separation problem seeks unitary (orthogonal when $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$) transformations that reorganize the row information carried by the blocks D_1, \dots, D_{k+1} into mutually independent structural components, thereby exposing decomposable structure that is not apparent in the original block formulation.

Remark 2.7. The matrix D is not required to have full column rank, and the row blocks D_j may coincide. In such cases, the row separation problem admits trivial components corresponding to zero columns, see Theorem 4.4 in [25]. These trivial components can be separated from the nontrivial ones and subsequently recombined, allowing the complete row separation structure to be recovered without loss of generality. We assume in the following discussion that each row block D_j has full row rank.

In the remainder of this subsection, we will repeatedly use the convention of identifying a row separation problem by its associated block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$, without further comment.

Definition 2.8 (Row Separation Problem Constructed from a Core Problem). Let $A_{11}X_1 \approx B_1$ be a core problem as described in 2.1, and let U_1, \dots, U_{k+1} denote orthonormal bases of the left singular vector subspaces associated with A_{11} , including a basis of $\mathcal{N}(A_{11}^*)$. The row separation problem associated with the block set

$$\{U_1^* B_1, \dots, U_{k+1}^* B_1\}$$

is called the *row separation problem constructed from the core problem*.

Remark 2.9. It is shown in [25] that any reduced structure of a real TLS core problem, obtained via orthogonal transformations, can be recovered from a suitable solution of the corresponding row separation problem constructed over \mathbb{R} . The same result extends naturally to the complex setting, since the construction relies only on linear subspace properties.

In [25], the identification of component subproblems of a TLS core problem is reduced to the analysis of a collection of *row separation subspaces*, which encode the essential decomposable structure of the data. These subspaces arise naturally from solutions of the associated row separation problem and provide the fundamental objects for detecting reducible structures.

Definition 2.10 (Row Separation Subspace [25]). A nonempty subspace \mathcal{S} is called a *row separation subspace* of the row separation problem associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$ if there exists a solution of the row separation problem with transformation matrix L^D and a diagonal block B_t^D such that

$$\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{R}\left(\overline{L^D} (B_t^D)^T\right),$$

where B_t^D denotes the sub-block of B_t^D corresponding to \mathcal{S} .

Remark 2.11. We denote by $\{\mathcal{S}\}^{\text{full}}$ the collection of all row separation subspaces associated with a given row separation problem.

To facilitate the analysis of the full row separation problem, it is useful to consider lower-dimensional subproblems obtained by restricting attention to subsets of the row blocks.

Definition 2.12 ($\{C\}$ -Subset Subproblem [25]). Consider the row separation problem associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$. Let $\{C\}$ be an index subset such that $\{C\} \subset \{1, \dots, k+1\}$, where c denotes the cardinality of $\{C\}$. The $\{C\}$ -subset subproblem is defined as the row separation problem associated with the reduced block set

$$\{D_{j_1}, \dots, D_{j_c}\}.$$

Remark 2.13. To distinguish row separation subspaces associated with a $\{C\}$ -subset subproblem from those of the full problem, we indicate the index set explicitly by a superscript, writing, for example, $\mathcal{S}^{\{C\}}$.

To simplify the analysis of the collection $\{\mathcal{S}\}^{\text{full}}$ of row separation subspaces, two notions describing minimal elements at different levels were introduced in [25]. Minimized subspaces provide a canonical way to associate each direction vector with the smallest row separation subspace that contains it, while indivisible subspaces represent the atomic building blocks of the overall row separation structure.

Definition 2.14 (Minimized Subspace [25]). Consider the row separation problem associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$ and a vector $v \in \mathcal{R}(D^T)$. The *minimized subspace* $\mathcal{M}(v)$ is defined as the unique subspace satisfying:

- (1) $v \in \mathcal{M}(v)$;
- (2) $\mathcal{M}(v) \in \{\mathcal{S}\}^{\text{full}}$;
- (3) for every $\mathcal{S} \in \{\mathcal{S}\}^{\text{full}}$ such that $v \in \mathcal{S}$, one has $\mathcal{M}(v) \subseteq \mathcal{S}$.

Remark 2.15. Detailed construction procedures for the minimized subspace $\mathcal{M}(v)$ are given in [[25], Theorem 3.11].

Definition 2.16 (Indivisible Subspace [25]). A subspace \mathcal{I} is called an *indivisible subspace* of the row separation problem associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$ if it satisfies:

- (1) $\mathcal{I} \neq \emptyset$;
- (2) $\mathcal{I} \in \{\mathcal{S}\}^{\text{full}}$;
- (3) for every $\mathcal{S} \in \{\mathcal{S}\}^{\text{full}}$, either $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{I}$ or $\mathcal{S} \not\subseteq \mathcal{I}$.

The following characterization establishes a direct connection between indivisible subspaces and minimized subspaces, providing an operational interpretation of indivisibility.

Lemma 2.17 ([25]). *A row separation subspace \mathcal{I} is an indivisible subspace if and only if, for every $v \in \mathcal{I}$, one has*

$$\mathcal{M}(v) = \mathcal{I}.$$

Indivisible subspaces can be further classified according to how they interact with other row separation subspaces. This distinction is essential for understanding which structural components can be reliably detected through local analysis and which require a more global treatment.

Definition 2.18 (Unambiguous Subspace [25]). A subspace \mathcal{G} is called an *unambiguous subspace* of the row separation problem associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$ if it satisfies:

- (1) $\mathcal{G} \neq \emptyset$;
- (2) $\mathcal{G} \in \{\mathcal{S}\}^{\text{full}}$;
- (3) for every $\mathcal{S} \in \{\mathcal{S}\}^{\text{full}}$, either $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ or $\mathcal{G} \perp \mathcal{S}$.

Remark 2.19. Every unambiguous subspace \mathcal{G} is necessarily an indivisible subspace.

Definition 2.20 (Ambiguous Subspace [25]). A subspace \mathcal{L} is called an *ambiguous subspace* of the row separation problem associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$ if it satisfies:

- (1) $\mathcal{L} \neq \emptyset$;
- (2) $\mathcal{L} \in \{\mathcal{S}\}^{\text{full}}$;
- (3) for every $\mathcal{S} \in \{\mathcal{S}\}^{\text{full}}$ such that $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{L}$, there exists $\mathcal{S}' \in \{\mathcal{S}\}^{\text{full}}$ with $\mathcal{S} \not\subseteq \mathcal{S}'$ and $\mathcal{S} \not\perp \mathcal{S}'$.

Remark 2.21. Unlike unambiguous subspaces, ambiguous subspaces are not necessarily indivisible; see Section 3.2.2 in [25] for a detailed discussion. To isolate the truly atomic building blocks within this class, we introduce the following notion.

Definition 2.22 (Indivisible Ambiguous Subspace [25]). A subspace \mathcal{J} is called an *indivisible ambiguous subspace* of the row separation problem associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$ if it satisfies:

- (1) \mathcal{J} is an indivisible subspace;
- (2) \mathcal{J} is an ambiguous subspace.

In particular, an unambiguous subspace detected in a subset subproblem remains unambiguous for the full row separation problem (see also 4.1). By contrast, ambiguous indivisible subspaces do not enjoy this stability property and require a more delicate analysis.

3. ROW SEPARATION PROBLEM SUPPLEMENT

This section develops general structural results for row separation problems over the field $\mathbb{F} \in \{\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}\}$. Building on the framework introduced in 2.3, we will clarify how global row separation structures emerge from their elementary subspace constituents and propose a partial relationship among different row separation problems (and also their corresponding core problems).

All results in this section apply to arbitrary row separation problems over both the real and complex fields and require no additional structural assumptions. In particular, 3.1 establishes the abstract structural principles that will later be specialized to the class of *division problems* studied in 4, where additional algebraic constraints lead to partially homogeneous configurations and stronger, more constructive decomposition properties. Finally, 3.2 introduces comparison tools for relating different row separation problems, which will be used to justify the alternative construction proposed in 5.

3.1. Structure Property. We begin by introducing a notion that links individual direction vectors to the atomic structure of row separation subspaces. This concept provides an operational viewpoint on indivisibility, allowing abstract subspace properties to be detected and analyzed through individual vectors.

Definition 3.1. Consider the row separation problem associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$ and a nonzero vector $v \in \mathcal{R}(D^T)$. The vector v is called an *indivisible direction vector* if its minimized subspace $\mathcal{M}(v)$ is an indivisible subspace.

Remark 3.2. As shown in [25], the decomposition of a reducible TLS core problem can be reduced to the identification of its indivisible subspaces. Definition 3.1 refines this perspective by recasting the search for indivisible subspaces as the identification of special direction vectors whose associated minimized subspaces are indivisible.

The following theorem shows that indivisible subspaces provide a complete and nonredundant description of the row separation structure. In particular, it shows that every row separation subspace admits a decomposition into pairwise orthogonal indivisible components.

Theorem 3.3. Consider the row separation problem associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$ and let \mathcal{S} be a row separation subspace. Then there exist indivisible subspaces $\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_g$ such that

$$\mathcal{S} = \bigoplus_{t=1}^g \mathcal{I}_t,$$

with $\mathcal{I}_t \perp \mathcal{I}_{t'}$ for all $t \neq t'$.

Proof. The result follows from 2.14, 2.16, 2.17, and Theorem 3.11, Definition 3.12, Theorem 3.15, and Corollary 3.20 in [25]. \square

As a consequence, the family of row separation subspaces is closed under orthogonal direct sums, and its structure is entirely determined by the collection of indivisible subspaces.

Corollary 3.4. Consider the row separation problem associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$ and two row separation subspaces \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{S}' . If $\mathcal{S} \perp \mathcal{S}'$, then there exists a row separation subspace \mathcal{S}'' such that

$$\mathcal{S}'' = \mathcal{S} \oplus \mathcal{S}'.$$

We now illustrate the relation between row separation subspaces of a $\{C\}$ -subset subproblem and those of the original row separation problem. These results formalize how structural information behaves under restriction to a subset of row blocks.

Corollary 3.5. Consider the row separation problem associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$ and a non-repetitive index subset $\{C\} = \{j_1, \dots, j_c\} \subset \{1, \dots, k+1\}$. Let $\mathcal{M}^{\{C\}}(v)$ denote the minimized subspace of a vector v in the $\{C\}$ -subset subproblem, and let $\mathcal{M}(v)$ denote the minimized subspace of v in the original row separation problem. Then, for any $v \in \mathcal{R}(D_{j_i}^T)$ with $j_i \in \{C\}$, one has

$$\mathcal{M}^{\{C\}}(v) \subseteq \mathcal{M}(v).$$

Remark 3.6. 3.5 follows directly from Theorem 3.11 in [25] and formalizes the monotonicity of minimized subspaces with respect to restriction. That is, restricting the row separation problem to a subset of row blocks can only reduce, but never enlarge, the minimized subspace associated with a given direction.

Remark 3.7. Even if \mathcal{I} is an indivisible subspace of the original row separation problem, the restricted subspace

$$\bigoplus_{j_i \in \{C\}} \mathcal{R}(D_{j_i}^T) \cap \mathcal{I}$$

is not necessary to be an indivisible subspace of the $\{C\}$ -subset subproblem. Moreover, for a given indivisible ambiguous subspace $\mathcal{J}^{\{C\}}$ of the $\{C\}$ -subset subproblem, there may not exist an indivisible subspace \mathcal{I} of the original row separation problem such that $\mathcal{J}^{\{C\}} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$.

We conclude this subsection with a practical criterion that allows indivisible subspaces to be identified directly from the geometric structure of row separation subspaces. Unlike the 3.3 and 3.5, which are primarily structural and existential, the following theorem provides a concrete and verifiable condition that can be checked using only low-dimensional intersection information.

Theorem 3.8. *Consider the row separation problem associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$ and a nonzero vector $v \in \mathcal{R}(D_j^T)$ for some $j \in [1, \dots, k+1]$. Suppose there exists a row separation subspace \mathcal{S} such that*

$$\dim(\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{R}(D_j^T)) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad v \in \mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{R}(D_j^T).$$

Then the minimized subspace $\mathcal{M}(v)$ is an indivisible subspace.

Proof. Assume, by contradiction, that $\mathcal{M}(v)$ is not indivisible. Then, by 3.3, there exists an indivisible subspace \mathcal{I} such that $\mathcal{I} \not\subseteq \mathcal{M}(v)$ and $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{M}(v)$. By the property of minimized subspaces (2.14), we obtain the chain of inequalities

$$1 = \dim(\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{R}(D_j^T)) \geq \dim(\mathcal{M}(v) \cap \mathcal{R}(D_j^T)) \geq \dim(\mathcal{I} \cap \mathcal{R}(D_j^T)) \geq 1.$$

Hence,

$$\dim(\mathcal{I} \cap \mathcal{R}(D_j^T)) = 1,$$

which implies that $v \in \mathcal{I}$. Consequently, $\mathcal{M}(v) \subseteq \mathcal{I}$, contradicting the minimality of $\mathcal{M}(v)$. Therefore, $\mathcal{M}(v)$ must be indivisible. \square

Remark 3.9. Theorem 3.8 provides a concrete and verifiable criterion for certifying indivisibility directly from a solution of the row separation problem.

This property will be repeatedly exploited in the constructive procedures to be developed in later sections, where such low-dimensional intersection tests serve as practical tools for detecting irreducible structures.

3.2. Comparison Property. In this subsection, we introduce a framework for comparing different row separation problems (also their corresponding core problems) and for formalizing inclusion and equivalence relations among them. While the previous subsection focused on the internal structure of a single row separation problem, the aim here is to understand how this structure behaves under changes in the underlying block representation.

More precisely, we address the following questions: when do distinct collections of row blocks induce exactly the same family of row separation subspaces? When can one row separation problem be regarded as a refinement or a simplification of another? And under which conditions can local structural information be transferred or recombined without altering the global decomposition? Answering these questions is essential for replacing complex problems with structurally equivalent

ones, for assembling global problems from simpler subproblems, and for justifying the exchange of block subsets used in later constructions.

Throughout this subsection and the remainder of the paper, the symbol P will be used to denote a generic row separation problem.

We begin by introducing a notion of equivalence that isolates the intrinsic structure of a row separation problem and disregards inessential differences in its representation. Since the decomposition properties of interest depend only on the family of row separation subspaces generated by a problem, it is natural to regard two problems to be equivalent whenever they induce the same collection of such subspaces.

Definition 3.10 (Equivalent with respect to Row Separation Subspaces). The row separation problems associated with the block sets $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$ and $\{D'_1, \dots, D'_{k'+1}\}$ are said to be *equivalent with respect to row separation subspaces* if they have the same collection of row separation subspaces.

Remark 3.11. This notion of equivalence abstracts away from the specific representation of the row blocks and retains only the induced row separation structure. For example, the row separation problems associated with $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$ and $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}, D_1\}$ are equivalent in this sense, since duplicating a row block does not generate new row separation subspaces. More generally, this equivalence allows one to replace a given row separation problem with an alternative but structurally identical formulation—possibly simpler or more convenient—while preserving all information relevant to decomposition, which is also the main idea of the strategy to be proposed in 5.

The next corollary shows that indivisible subspaces form a complete structural invariant for row separation problems, which is a direct extension of 3.3. This observation provides a strong justification for focusing on indivisible subspaces in the analysis and comparison of different row separation problems.

Corollary 3.12. Let P_1 be a row separation problem associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$ and let P_2 be another row separation problem associated with the block set $\{D'_1, \dots, D'_{k'+1}\}$. If P_1 and P_2 have the same collection of indivisible subspaces, then they are equivalent with respect to row separation subspaces.

We now introduce a relation that allows row separation problems to be compared in terms of the amount of structural information they encode. This relation induces a partial order on the class of row separation problems and also, their corresponding core problems (see 2.8 for detail), based on inclusion of their row separation subspaces, and provides a formal way to distinguish problems that admit strictly more refined decompositions than others.

Definition 3.13 (Dense Relationship). Let P_1 and P_2 be two row separation problems. We say that P_1 is *denser* than P_2 if every row separation subspace of P_2 is also a row separation subspace of P_1 .

Remark 3.14. If P_1 is denser than P_2 and P_2 is denser than P_1 , then the two problems admit exactly the same collection of row separation subspaces. More generally, the dense relationship allows one to compare non-equivalent problems and to formalize when one problem strictly refines the row separation structure of another.

Remark 3.15. A row separation problem in \mathcal{F} is always denser than the similar problem in \mathbb{R} constructed by the same real row blocks collections. The strategy proposed in 5 aims to find complex indivisible subspaces. With the density relation, one can also utilize the complex subspaces to form the real ones, especially the unambiguous ones.

We next introduce a construction that allows one to assemble a global row separation problem from several smaller ones, while preserving their local row separation structures. This operation plays a key conceptual role in the sequel: it provides a formal mechanism for reconstructing a full problem from independently analyzed subproblems.

Definition 3.16 (Row Block Composition). Let $\{P_1, \dots, P_l\}$ be a collection of row separation problems, where P_s has $k_s + 1$ row blocks for $s = 1, \dots, l$. The *row block composition* of these problems is a row separation problem P^{Com} with

$$\sum_{s=1}^l k_s + l$$

row blocks, such that:

- (1) the $(1, \dots, k_1 + 1)$ -subset subproblem of P^{Com} is equivalent to P_1 up to a unitary (orthogonal when $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$) transformation;
- ⋮
- (2) the $(\sum_{s=1}^{l-1} k_s + l, \dots, \sum_{s=1}^l k_s + l)$ -subset subproblem of P^{Com} is equivalent to P_l up to a unitary (orthogonal when $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$) transformation.

We conclude this section with a result that synthesizes the comparison framework developed above and makes precise when subset subproblems can be replaced without altering the global row separation structure. The result provides the theoretical justification for modifying or reconstructing parts of a row separation problem while maintaining structural equivalence, and will serve as a key tool in the alternative constructions developed in 5.1.

Theorem 3.17 (Subset Exchange). *Let P_1 be a row separation problem associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$. Let $\{C_1\}$ and $\{C_2\}$ be two index subsets such that*

$$\{C_1\} \cup \{C_2\} = \{1, \dots, k + 1\}, \quad \{C_1\} \cap \{C_2\} = \emptyset.$$

Assume that P_2 is a row separation problem whose indivisible subspaces coincide with those of the $\{C_1\}$ -subset subproblem of P_1 . Let P_3 be the row block composition of P_2 and the $\{C_2\}$ -subset subproblem of P_1 .

Then P_3 and P_1 are equivalent with respect to row separation subspaces.

Proof. Let \mathcal{S}^{P_1} be an arbitrary row separation subspace of P_1 . Define its restriction to the $\{C_1\}$ -subset as

$$\mathcal{S}_{P_1}^{\{C_1\}} = \mathcal{S}^{P_1} \cap \left(\bigoplus_{j \in \{C_1\}} \mathcal{R}(D_j^T) \right).$$

By construction, $\mathcal{S}_{P_1}^{\{C_1\}}$ is a row separation subspace of the $\{C_1\}$ -subset subproblem of P_1 .

Since P_2 has the same indivisible subspaces as this $\{C_1\}$ -subset subproblem, 3.12 guarantees the existence of a row separation subspace \mathcal{S}^{P_2} of P_2 such that

$$\mathcal{S}^{P_2} = \mathcal{S}_{P_1}^{\{C_1\}}.$$

Similarly, define the restriction of \mathcal{S}^{P_1} to the $\{C_2\}$ -subset as

$$\mathcal{S}_{P_1}^{\{C_2\}} = \mathcal{S}^{P_1} \cap \left(\bigoplus_{j \in \{C_2\}} \mathcal{R}(D_j^T) \right).$$

Now consider the subspace

$$\mathcal{S}^{P_3} = \mathcal{S}^{P_2} \oplus \mathcal{S}_{P_1}^{\{C_2\}}.$$

By construction of the row block composition, \mathcal{S}^{P_3} is a row separation subspace of P_3 .

Finally, since $\{C_1\} \cup \{C_2\} = \{1, \dots, k+1\}$ and the two index sets are disjoint, we obtain

$$\mathcal{S}^{P_3} = \mathcal{S}^{P_1}.$$

Because \mathcal{S}^{P_1} is arbitrary, P_3 and P_1 admit the same collection of row separation subspaces and are therefore equivalent with respect to row separation subspaces. \square

The results of this section establish that the global structure of a row separation problem is entirely determined by its indivisible subspaces. Moreover, this structure can be recovered from suitably chosen $\{C\}$ -subset subproblems and remains invariant under controlled exchanges of such subproblems. As a summary, these results provide a flexible and robust framework for analyzing and reconstructing row separation structures independently of the specific representation of the row blocks.

4. DIVISION PROBLEM THEORY

Section 3 showed that reducible TLS core problems can be analyzed through indivisible directions, providing a local structural description. But there is still not a systematic procedure for identifying these indivisible directions even in a simpler sub-problem. To address this issue, we recall the concepts of 1 and 2-division problems introduced in [25] and further extend them to c -division in real or complex field while reserving the intrinsic properties. In particular, we clarify the role of strict and loose behavior, identify the admissible configurations within the c -division framework, and thereby provide a structured setting in which global consistency can be studied. This analysis prepares the ground for the subspace equivalence with general row separation problems and the c -division problems developed in Section 5.

Division problems form a structured subclass of row separation problems in which uniform decomposition properties are enforced on collections of row blocks of bounded size. The parameter c measures the level at which such homogeneity constraints are imposed: loosely speaking, all subproblems involving fewer than c row blocks are required to exhibit compatible structural behavior. To build intuition and fix notation, we begin by recalling the low-order cases $c \leq 3$, which were introduced and analyzed in [25]. These cases display increasingly strong structural rigidity, are easy to recognize, and serve as the foundation for the general theory.

We then extend the notion of division to the case $c \geq 4$ and analyze the new structural phenomena that arise in this setting.

4.1. Division Problem of $c \leq 3$. The following definition describes a 1-division problem, which corresponds to the simplest case in which unambiguous subspaces are represented by single-row blocks.

Definition 4.1 (1-division Problem in \mathbb{F} [25]). The row separation problem associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$ is called a 1-division problem if the following conditions hold:

- (1) For all $j \in [1, \dots, k+1]$, the matrix $\bar{D}_j D_j^T$ has exactly one eigenvalue.
- (2) For all $j \in \{1, \dots, k+1\}$, $\text{rank}(D_j) \geq 2$.

The following definition introduces a graph-based representation of orthogonality relations among row blocks, which will be used to characterize connection

Definition 4.2 (Total Covariance Matrix in \mathbb{F} [25]). For the row separation problem associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$, the *total covariance matrix* Dov is the $(k+1) \times (k+1)$ symmetric matrix defined by

- (1) $\text{Dov}_{j,j} = 1$, for $j = 1, \dots, k+1$;
- (2) $\text{Dov}_{j,j'} = 0$ if $\bar{D}_j D_{j'}^T$ is a zero matrix, for $j \neq j'$;
- (3) $\text{Dov}_{j,j'} = 1$ if $\bar{D}_j D_{j'}^T$ is a nonzero matrix, for $j \neq j'$.

The following definition of a 2-division problem extends the notion of division by treating each row block as a coherent unit rather than as isolated rows.

Definition 4.3 (2-division Problem in \mathbb{F} [25]). The row separation problem associated with the row block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$ is called a 2-division problem if the following conditions hold:

- (1) It is a 1-division problem.
- (2) For all $j, j' = 1, \dots, k+1$, the matrix $\bar{D}_j D_{j'}^T$ has exactly one singular value.
- (3) The graph induced by the total covariance matrix Dov is connected; that is, for any indices $j, j' \in \{1, \dots, k+1\}$, there exists a finite sequence of indices $(\ell_0, \ell_1, \dots, \ell_m)$ such that

$$\ell_0 = j, \quad \ell_m = j', \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Dov}_{\ell_t, \ell_{t+1}} = 1 \quad \text{for all } t = 0, \dots, m-1.$$

Remark. Condition (3) ensures that the row separation problem cannot be decomposed into independent, mutually orthogonal subproblems. In particular, for any 2-division problem, one has $r_1 = \dots = r_{k+1}$, and for all i, j the matrix $\bar{D}_j D_i^T$ is a unitary matrix (orthogonal matrix when $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$) multiplied by a scalar.

We now introduce the notion of a 3-division problem, which further strengthens the homogeneity conditions by enforcing compatibility across all triples of row blocks.

Definition 4.4 (3-division Problem in \mathbb{F} [25]). The row separation problem associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$ is called a 3-division problem if the following conditions hold:

- (1) It is a 2-division problem.
- (2) For all $j, j', j'' = 1, \dots, k+1$, the matrix

$$D_j^T \bar{D}_j D_{j''}^T \bar{D}_{j''} D_{j'}^T \bar{D}_{j'} D_j^T \bar{D}_j,$$

has at most one nonzero eigenvalue.

Remark 4.5. Unlike 1- and 2-division problems, the definition of a 3-division problem imposes constraints on eigenvalues rather than on singular values. This represents a substantially stronger spectral requirement. As a consequence, row separation problems arising from purely orthogonal matrices H_j do not generically satisfy the 3-division conditions, except in highly structured or degenerate configurations.

In general, these additional and increasingly restrictive conditions refine the structural homogeneity imposed by the 1- and 2-division cases. In particular, the 3-division problem inherits all preceding properties while enforcing strong spectral constraints on triple interactions among row blocks. These results in a more rigid structural setting, making 3-division problems a natural starting point for extending the theory to general c -division problems, as developed in the next subsection.

4.2. General c -Division Problems for $c \geq 4$. We now extend the notion of division problems to the general cases $c \geq 4$. While the low-order cases $c \leq 3$ impose strong homogeneity constraints and lead to highly rigid structures, the general setting exhibits additional structural phenomena that cannot be captured by a direct extension of the low-order definitions. In particular, new types of internal configurations arise when considering interactions among larger collections of row blocks, requiring a more careful and systematic analysis.

This subsection is organized as follows. In 4.2.1, we present the definition and basic properties of c -division problems, including the loose case. In 4.2.2, we introduce algebraic quantities that describe relations between row blocks within a c -division problem. Finally, in 4.2.3, we analyze the conditions under which a c -division problem fails to extend to a $(c + 1)$ -division problem, thereby identifying structurally exceptional configurations.

Throughout this subsection, index collections are treated at the level of unordered subsets of row blocks. Order-dependent constructions will be introduced explicitly in subsequent subsections whenever required.

4.2.1. Basic Analysis of c -Division Problems. In this Subsubsection, we present the definitions and basic structural properties of general c -division problems, including the loose case. The notion of c -division is defined recursively so as to inherit the essential constraints of the 1- and 2-division cases, while also satisfying the properties established in 3.

The definition of division problems is motivated by the structural characterization of indivisible row separation subspaces in 3.8 and by the compatibility condition introduced in the second requirement of 4.3. The recursive formulation provides a systematic way to control the internal structure of row blocks as the order c increases.

Definition 4.6 (c -division Problem in \mathbb{F}). The row separation problem associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$ is called a c -division problem ($c \geq 4$) if the following conditions are satisfied:

- (1) It is a $(c - 1)$ -division problem.
- (2) For any non-repetitive and ordered index collection (j_1, \dots, j_c) , let $\{C\} = \{j_1, \dots, j_c\}$. And for any $v \in \mathcal{R}(D_{j_1}^T)$, there exists a row separation subspace $\mathcal{S}^{\{C\}}$ of the $\{C\}$ -subset subproblem such that

$$v \in \mathcal{S}^{\{C\}}, \quad \dim\left(\mathcal{S}^{\{C\}} \cap \mathcal{R}(D_{j_i}^T)\right) = 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, c.$$

Remark 4.7. For a c -division problem, the homogeneity level c manifests at the level of $\{C\}$ -subset subproblems associated with index sets of cardinality c .

Example 4.8. Let D_1 be an orthogonal matrix of dimension \hat{d} . Then the row separation problem associated with the block set $\{a_1 D_1, \dots, a_{k+1} D_1\}$ is a $(k+1)$ -division problem. In particular, it is a complete division problem in the sense of 4.9.

Definition 4.9 (Complete Division Problem in \mathbb{F}). The row separation problem associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$ is called a complete division problem if it is a $(k+1)$ -division problem.

Remark 4.10. Complete division problems represent the fully homogeneous endpoint of the division hierarchy.

We now introduce a relaxed version of the division framework, referred to as a *loose c -division problem*. Loose c -division problems retain the essential structural features of c -division problems while allowing for limited violations of strict global connectivity. In practice, strict and loose division problems will often be treated together and collectively referred to as (*loose*) *c -division problems*.

Definition 4.11 (Loose c -division Problem in \mathbb{F}). A row separation problem associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$ ($k \geq 2$) is called a *loose c -division problem* ($c \geq 3$) if the following conditions hold:

- (1) It is a 1-division problem.
- (2) For all $j, j' = 1, \dots, k+1$, the matrix $\bar{D}_j D_{j'}^T$ has exactly one singular value.
- (3) For any non-repetitive and ordered index collection (j_1, \dots, j_c) , let $\{C\} = \{j_1, \dots, j_c\} \subset \{1, \dots, k+1\}$. For any $v \in \mathcal{R}(D_{j_1}^T)$, there exists a row separation subspace $\mathcal{S}^{\{C\}}$ of the $\{C\}$ -subset subproblem such that

$$v \in \mathcal{S}^{\{C\}}, \quad \dim\left(\mathcal{S}^{\{C\}} \cap \mathcal{R}(D_{j_i}^T)\right) = 1, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, c.$$

The following result shows that loose c -division problems admit a natural structural decomposition into independent division subproblems. This property will play a key role in simplifying the analysis in 4.2.3.

Corollary 4.12. Let a loose c -division problem ($c \geq 3$) be associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$. Then there exist index subsets $\{C_1\}, \dots, \{C_g\}$ ($g \geq 2$) such that:

- (1) $\bigcup_{t=1}^g \{C_t\} = \{1, \dots, k+1\}$;
- (2) $\{C_t\} \cap \{C_{t'}\} = \emptyset$ for $t \neq t'$;
- (3) for each $t = 1, \dots, g$, the $\{C_t\}$ -subset subproblem is either a c -division problem or a complete division problem;
- (4) for $t \neq t'$, all row blocks indexed by $\{C_t\}$ and $\{C_{t'}\}$ are mutually orthogonal, i.e.,

$$\bar{D}_{j'} D_j^T = 0, \quad j \in \{C_t\}, j' \in \{C_{t'}\}.$$

The following corollary explains why complete division problems and loose $(k + 1)$ -division problems play a central role in the analysis. It should be noted, however, that not every vector $v \in \mathcal{R}(D^T)$ is necessarily an indivisible direction.

Corollary 4.13. Let a (loose) $(k + 1)$ -division problem ($k \geq 2$) be associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$. Then for every $j = 1, \dots, k + 1$ and every nonzero $v \in \mathcal{R}(D_j^T)$, the minimized subspace $\mathcal{M}(v)$ is an indivisible subspace.

The following corollary establishes a direct link between indivisible subspaces and the notion of ambiguity. In particular, this result allows one to characterize structural orthogonality relations without invoking the total covariance matrix introduced in 4.2.

Corollary 4.14. Consider a (loose) $(k + 1)$ -division problem ($k \geq 2$) associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$. Then every indivisible subspace of the (loose) $(k + 1)$ -division problem is an ambiguous subspace.

The next theorem provides a stronger and more practical consequence of this ambiguity: within a given row block, all indivisible subspaces exhibit the same intersection pattern with the remaining row blocks.

Theorem 4.15. Let a (loose) $(k + 1)$ -division problem ($k \geq 2$) be associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$. Then, for any index $j \in \{1, \dots, k + 1\}$ and any nonzero vectors $v, v' \in \mathcal{R}(D_j^T)$, their minimized subspaces $\mathcal{M}(v)$ and $\mathcal{M}(v')$ satisfy

$$\dim(\mathcal{M}(v) \cap \mathcal{R}(D_s^T)) = \dim(\mathcal{M}(v') \cap \mathcal{R}(D_s^T)), \quad \forall s \in \{1, \dots, k + 1\}.$$

Proof. By 4.13 and 4.14, both $\mathcal{M}(v)$ and $\mathcal{M}(v')$ are indivisible ambiguous subspaces.

If v and v' are not orthogonal, the conclusion follows directly from [[25], Theorem 3.43].

If $v \perp v'$, consider the vector $v'' = v + v'$. Its minimized subspace $\mathcal{M}(v'')$ is again an indivisible ambiguous subspace. Applying Theorem 3.43 in [25] yields, for all $s \in \{1, \dots, k + 1\}$,

$$\dim(\mathcal{M}(v) \cap \mathcal{R}(D_s^T)) = \dim(\mathcal{M}(v'') \cap \mathcal{R}(D_s^T)) = \dim(\mathcal{M}(v') \cap \mathcal{R}(D_s^T)),$$

which completes the proof. \square

The following corollary translates the structural information carried by indivisible subspaces into exact orthogonality relations among row blocks.

Corollary 4.16. Considering a (loose) $k + 1$ -division problem ($k \geq 2$) associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$ and an indivisible subspace \mathcal{I} , if there exists an index $j \in \{1, \dots, k + 1\}$ such that

$$\dim(\mathcal{I} \cap \mathcal{R}(D_j^T)) = 0,$$

then for every index $s \in \{1, \dots, k + 1\}$ satisfying

$$\dim(\mathcal{I} \cap \mathcal{R}(D_s^T)) = 1,$$

it holds that

$$\bar{D}_s D_j^T = 0.$$

The following theorem provides a sharp criterion distinguishing genuine $(k + 1)$ -division problems from loose ones, based solely on the existence and structure of indivisible subspaces.

Theorem 4.17. *Consider a (loose) $(k + 1)$ -division problem ($k \geq 2$) associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$. Then the following statements hold:*

- (1) *The problem is a $(k + 1)$ -division problem if and only if there exists an indivisible subspace \mathcal{I} such that*

$$\dim(\mathcal{I} \cap \mathcal{R}(D_j^T)) = 1, \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, k + 1.$$

- (2) *The problem is a loose $(k + 1)$ -division problem if and only if there exists an indivisible subspace \mathcal{I} and an index $j \in \{1, \dots, k + 1\}$ such that*

$$\dim(\mathcal{I} \cap \mathcal{R}(D_j^T)) = 0.$$

Proof. The sufficiency of statement (2) follows directly from 4.16. The necessity of statement (1) can be deduced from the sufficiency of statement (2). Finally, by invoking 4.12, the necessity of (2) and the sufficiency of (1) are obtained. \square

Remark 4.18. Theorem 4.17 allows one to work flexibly with loose division problems while retaining a clear and verifiable criterion for global connectivity.

We conclude this subsection with a key structural result that significantly simplifies the verification of the c -division property. The following corollary shows that this requirement of Definition 4.6 can be relaxed: it is sufficient to analyze unordered c -element subsets and to identify, within each subset, a single distinguished row block that controls the divisibility structure.

Corollary 4.19. Let $c \geq 4$. The row separation problem associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$ is a c -division problem if and only if the following conditions hold:

- (1) It is a $(c - 1)$ -division problem.
(2) For every non-repetitive index subset $\{C\} \subset \{1, \dots, k + 1\}$ of cardinality c , there exists an index $j \in \{C\}$ such that, for every vector $v \in \mathcal{R}(D_j^T)$, there exists a row separation subspace $\mathcal{S}^{\{C\}}$ of the $\{C\}$ -subset sub-problem satisfying

$$v \in \mathcal{S}^{\{C\}}, \quad \dim(\mathcal{S}^{\{C\}} \cap \mathcal{R}(D_s^T)) = 1 \quad \forall \quad s \in \{C\}.$$

Remark 4.20. 4.19 can be obtained by tracing suitable paths in the total covariance matrix (Definition 4.2). It shows that the c -division property is governed by the existence of a single controlling row block within each c -element subset.

It is useful to keep in mind that Condition (2) of Definition 4.3 remains a guiding principle for recognizing division problems. The analysis in Subsection 4.2.1 is entirely subspace-driven; in the next subsection, we turn to a covariance-based formulation that provides a complementary computational perspective.

4.2.2. Covariance Structure Associated with $\{C\}$ -subset Sub-problems. In this subsection, we introduce an algebraic object that provides a complementary, computable description of these structures. Specifically, for each ordered index collection (j_1, \dots, j_c) , we associate a covariance matrix $\text{Cov}^{(j_1, \dots, j_c)}$. The covariance matrix encodes the orthogonality relations between row blocks along the corresponding index sequence. We show that the spectral properties of covariance matrices are tightly linked to the homogeneity conditions defining (loose) c -division problems.

The definition below introduces the covariance matrix associated with a fixed ordering of a given index subset.

Definition 4.21 (Covariance Matrix). Consider a row separation problem associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$ with $k \geq 2$. Let (j_1, \dots, j_c) be a non-repetitive and ordered index collection, where $j_i \in \{1, \dots, k+1\}$. The *covariance matrix* associated with this ordering is defined by

$$\text{Cov}^{(j_1, \dots, j_c)} = D_{j_1}^T \bar{D}_{j_1} D_{j_2}^T \bar{D}_{j_2} \cdots D_{j_c}^T \bar{D}_{j_c} D_{j_1}^T \bar{D}_{j_1}.$$

Remark 4.22. The covariance matrix $\text{Cov}^{(j_1, \dots, j_c)}$ depends on the chosen ordering of the index subset (j_1, \dots, j_c) and is generally neither symmetric nor Hermitian. When the underlying row separation problem is a (loose) c -division problem with $c \geq 3$, the matrix $\text{Cov}^{(j_1, \dots, j_c)}$ is always normal.

The next corollary clarifies the structural meaning of the covariance matrix $\text{Cov}^{(j_1, \dots, j_c)}$. In particular, it shows that the non-vanishing of the covariance matrix associated with a given ordering of (j_1, \dots, j_c) is equivalent to the existence of a closed chain of non-orthogonal interactions among the corresponding row blocks.

Corollary 4.23. Consider a (loose) c -division problem with $k+1 \geq c \geq 3$ associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$, and let (j_1, \dots, j_c) be a non-repetitive and ordered index collection, where $\{C\} = \{j_1, \dots, j_c\} \subset \{1, \dots, k+1\}$. Then the following statements hold:

- (1) $\text{Cov}^{(j_1, \dots, j_c)} \neq 0$ if and only if

$$\bar{D}_{j_i} D_{j_{i+1}}^T \neq 0 \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, c-1, \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{D}_{j_c} D_{j_1}^T \neq 0.$$

That is, all consecutive block interactions along the cycle induced by the ordering (j_1, \dots, j_c) are non-orthogonal.

- (2) If $\text{Cov}^{(j_1, \dots, j_c)} \neq 0$, then for any indivisible subspace $\mathcal{I}^{\{C\}}$ of the $\{C\}$ -subset sub-problem and for all $i = 1, \dots, c$, one has

$$\dim(\mathcal{I}^{\{C\}} \cap \mathcal{R}(D_{j_i}^T)) \geq 1.$$

We now establish a key numerical property of the covariance matrix $\text{Cov}^{(j_1, \dots, j_c)}$ associated with ordered index collection in a (loose) c -division problem. This result shows that the homogeneity constraints defining division problems translate into a strong spectral restriction on the associated covariance matrices.

Corollary 4.24. Consider a (loose) c -division problem with $c \geq 3$ associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$. Let (j_1, \dots, j_c) be a non-repetitive and ordered index collection and $\{C\} = \{j_1, \dots, j_c\} \subset \{1, \dots, k+1\}$. Then the covariance matrix $\text{Cov}^{(j_1, \dots, j_c)}$ has at most one nonzero eigenvalue.

The condition that there exists an ordering (j_1, \dots, j_c) of $\{C\}$ such that $\text{Cov}^{(j_1, \dots, j_c)} \neq 0$ is therefore strictly stronger than the criterion provided by 4.17. In particular, even when a $\{C\}$ -subset sub-problem satisfies the definition of a c -division problem, the associated covariance matrix may still vanish. The following example illustrates this situation.

Example 4.25. Let

$$D_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad D_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad D_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The row separation problem associated with the block set $\{D_1, D_2, D_3\}$ is a 3-division problem. However, since $D_1 D_3^T = 0$, one obtains

$$\text{Cov}^{(1,2,3)} = \text{Cov}^{(1,3,2)} = \text{Cov}^{(2,1,3)} = \text{Cov}^{(2,3,1)} = \text{Cov}^{(3,1,2)} = \text{Cov}^{(3,2,1)} \equiv 0.$$

The covariance matrices $\text{Cov}^{(j_1, \dots, j_c)}$ thus provide a bridge between the homogeneity properties of division problems and a computable spectral criterion. In the next subsection, we refine this analysis by combining covariance information associated with $\{C\}$ -subset sub-problems with the global information encoded in the total covariance matrix (4.2).

4.2.3. Extension from $\{C\}$ -subset to $\{C+1\}$ -subset Sub-problems. In the previous subsection, we introduced covariance matrices $\text{Cov}^{(j_1, \dots, j_c)}$ associated with ordered index subsets of a given $\{C\}$ -subset sub-problem and showed that their spectral properties provide a numerical characterization of local homogeneousness within a division problem. A natural question is whether such lower covariance information can be used to infer higher homogeneousness, namely to determine when a c -division problem extends to a $(c+1)$ -division problem. This subsection addresses this question by developing a general computational criterion for identifying division problems with higher homogeneousness level $c \geq 3$.

To handle the different structural patterns that may arise in $\{C+1\}$ -subset sub-problems with $c+1$ elements within a c -division problem, we classify $\{C+1\}$ -subset sub-problems into three classes according to the number of non-zero entries of $\text{Dov}^{\{C\}}$ (4.2). We show that the first two classes are always guaranteed to be (loose) $(c+1)$ -division problems. Only a highly structured and exceptional family of configurations—characterized by a single-cycle interaction pattern in 3-class may fail to exhibit $(c+1)$ -division, which will be exploited in 5.

For clarity of exposition, we begin by analyzing a k -division problem consisting of $k+1$ row blocks; the extension to general index sets then follows naturally from 4.6. Recalling the total covariance matrix Dov defined in 4.2, consider a (loose) k -division problem associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$. We classify such a problem into three classes according to the number of non-zero entries in Dov :

- **1-class:** Dov has fewer than $3k+2$ non-zero entries;
- **2-class:** Dov has more than $3k+4$ non-zero entries;
- **3-class:** Dov has exactly $3k+3$ non-zero entries.

Again, we interpret row blocks as vertices of a graph and non-orthogonality relations among row blocks (as defined in 4.3) as edges. Under this interpretation, the structure of Dov corresponds to the edge pattern of the graph, and cycles play a central role in determining whether local covariance information propagates to higher-order division properties. The following lemma and corollary formalize these observations and will be essential when utilizing covariance matrices $\text{Cov}^{(j_1, \dots, j_c)}$ associated with orderings of index subsets.

We begin with a classical graph-theoretic result.

Lemma 4.26 (Cycle [4]). *A graph with k vertices and k edges contains at least one cycle.*

The next corollary refines this observation and is particularly relevant for the analysis of 2-class problems.

Corollary 4.27. A graph with k vertices and $k+1$ edges contains a cycle involving k' vertices, where $k' \leq k-1$.

These simple structural facts allow us to establish a strong and easily verifiable sufficient condition for the extension of a k -division problem to a $(k+1)$ -division problem, based solely on the existence of a non-zero covariance matrix.

Theorem 4.28. *Considering a (loose) k -division problem associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$, the problem is a (loose) $(k+1)$ -division problem if there exists an ordering (j_1, \dots, j_c) with $k \geq c \geq 3$ such that*

$$\text{Cov}^{(j_1, \dots, j_c)} \neq 0.$$

Proof. Let $\{C\} = \{j_1, \dots, j_c\}$. We distinguish three mutually exclusive situations, according to the structure of the underlying k -division problem.

Case L1: The problem is a loose k -division problem.

In this case, the conclusion follows immediately from 4.12: any loose k -division problem is automatically a loose $(k+1)$ -division problem.

Case L2: The problem is a k -division problem admitting a loose k -subset.

Assume that the problem is a k -division problem and that there exists a non-repetitive index subset

$$\{C'\} \subset \{1, \dots, k+1\}, \quad |\{C'\}| = k,$$

such that the $\{C'\}$ -subset sub-problem is a loose k -division problem. Let $j' \notin \{C'\}$ and let

$$\{C'_1\}, \dots, \{C'_g\}, \quad |\{C'_t\}| \leq k-1,$$

be the splitting index subsets provided by 4.12.

For any $v' \in \mathcal{R}(D_{j'}^T)$, consider the minimized subspaces

$$\mathcal{M}^{\{C'_t\} \cup \{j'\}}(v'), \quad t = 1, \dots, g.$$

By 4.13 and 4.17,

$$\mathcal{S} = \bigoplus_{t=1}^g \mathcal{M}^{\{C'_t\} \cup \{j'\}}(v')$$

is a row separation subspace of the original problem satisfying the conditions of 4.19. Hence, the problem is a complete division problem and therefore also a $(k+1)$ -division problem.

Case L3: All k -subsets are k -division problems.

Assume now that the problem is a k -division problem and that every $\{C'\}$ -subset with $|\{C'\}| = k$ is itself a k -division problem. Let

$$\{C_1\} = \{1, \dots, k+1\} \setminus \{j_1\}, \quad \{C_2\} = \{1, \dots, k+1\} \setminus \{j_2\}.$$

For $v_1 \in \mathcal{R}(D_{j_1}^T)$, define

$$v_2 = D_{j_2}^T \bar{D}_{j_2} v_1.$$

Let $\mathcal{M}^{\{C_2\}}(v_1)$ and $\mathcal{M}^{\{C_1\}}(v_2)$ be the corresponding minimized subspaces.

If for all $j \neq j_1, j_2$,

$$\mathcal{R}(D_j^T) \cap \mathcal{M}^{\{C_2\}}(v_1) = \mathcal{R}(D_j^T) \cap \mathcal{M}^{\{C_1\}}(v_2),$$

then

$$\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{M}^{\{C_2\}}(v_1) \oplus \mathcal{M}^{\{C_1\}}(v_2)$$

is a row separation subspace satisfying 4.19.

Otherwise, there exists an index j for which the two intersections differ. In this case, define

$$\{C_{1,2}\} = \{C_1\} \setminus \{j_2\} = \{C_2\} \setminus \{j_1\}.$$

By 3.5, 4.13 and 4.17, the $\{C_{1,2}\}$ -subset sub-problem is a loose $(k-1)$ -division problem.

Let

$$\{C_1^{1,2}\}, \dots, \{C_g^{1,2}\}$$

be its splitting index subsets. For the unique t' such that $j \in \{C_{t'}^{1,2}\}$, the sub-problem associated with $\{C_{t'}^{1,2}\} \cup \{j_1, j_2\}$ is a complete division problem. Let

$$u_j \in \mathcal{R}(D_j^T) \cap \mathcal{M}^{\{C_{t'}^{1,2}\} \cup \{j_1, j_2\}}(v_1), \quad u_j \neq 0.$$

By construction, u_j belongs simultaneously to $\mathcal{M}^{\{C_2\}}(v_1)$ and $\mathcal{M}^{\{C_1\}}(v_2)$, closing the argument. \square

The following theorem shows that 1 and 2-class problems are naturally (loose) $(k+1)$ -division and provide a computational criterion.

Theorem 4.29. *Considering a (loose) k -division problem associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$, the problem is also a (loose) $(k+1)$ -division problem if and only if for every non-repetitive index subset $\{C\} \subset \{1, \dots, k+1\}$ with $|\{C\}| = k+1$ and for every ordering (j_1, \dots, j_{k+1}) of $\{C\}$, the covariance matrix $\text{Cov}^{(j_1, \dots, j_{k+1})}$ has at most one non-zero eigenvalue.*

Proof. The necessity condition is proved with 4.24. Now we prove the sufficient condition.

If the problem is a loose k -division problem, the conclusion follows immediately from 4.12.

1-class cases

If it is *1-class*, there exist two distinct indices $j', j'' \in \{1, \dots, k+1\}$ such that

$$\bar{D}_{j''} D_j^T = 0 \quad \text{for all } j \neq j', j''.$$

This means that $D_{j''}$ is orthogonal to all row blocks except for possibly $D_{j'}$. For any $v_{j''} \in \mathcal{R}(D_{j''}^T)$, define

$$v_{j'} = D_{j'}^T \bar{D}_{j'} v_{j''}, \quad \{C\} = \{1, \dots, k+1\} \setminus \{j''\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{M}^{\{C\}}(v_{j'})$ be the minimized subspace of the $\{C\}$ -subset sub-problem associated with $v_{j'}$. Then the subspace

$$\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{M}^{\{C\}}(v_{j'}) \oplus \mathcal{R}(D_{j''}^T)$$

is a row separation subspace of the original problem and satisfies the conditions of 4.19. Hence, it is a $(k+1)$ -division problem.

2-class cases

If it is *2-class*, by 4.27, there exists a cycle involving $k' \leq k$ vertices, corresponding to a non-repetitive index subset $\{C\}$ with k' elements. By 4.23, the existence of such a cycle implies that there exists an ordering $(j_1, \dots, j_{k'})$ of $\{C\}$ such that all consecutive block interactions along the induced cycle are non-orthogonal, and hence

$$\text{Cov}^{(j_1, \dots, j_{k'})} \neq 0.$$

The conclusion then follows directly from 4.28.

3-class cases

If it is *3-class*, by 4.26, there exists a cycle involving $k' \leq k$ row blocks, associated with a non-repetitive index subset $\{C\}$ of cardinality k' , such that there exists an ordering $(j_1, \dots, j_{k'})$ of $\{C\}$ satisfying

$$\text{Cov}^{(j_1, \dots, j_{k'})} \neq 0.$$

If $k' \leq k$, the claim follows from 4.28.

In the remaining case $k' = k+1$, there exists an index subset $\{C\} = \{j_1, \dots, j_{k+1}\}$ whose non-orthogonality relations form a single cycle. More precisely, for any $i, i' \in \{1, \dots, k+1\}$,

$$\bar{D}_{j_{i'}} D_{j_i}^T \neq 0 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad i' = i - 1 \text{ or } i' = i + 1,$$

with the indices interpreted cyclically (i.e., $j_0 = j_{k+1}$ and $j_{k+2} = j_1$).

The ordering (j_1, \dots, j_{k+1}) therefore induces a single cycle, and the associated covariance matrix $\text{Cov}^{(j_1, \dots, j_{k+1})}$ satisfies the stated spectral condition. The conclusion then follows from 4.19. \square

We conclude and extend the above analyses of k -division problem with $k+1$ row blocks to general c -division problems as the following corollary.

Corollary 4.30. Considering a $(c-1)$ -division problem associated with block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$ (where $c \geq 4$), then:

1. It is also a c -division problem if and only if for any non-repetitive and ordered index collection (j_1, \dots, j_c) $\text{Cov}^{(j_1, \dots, j_c)}$ has at most one non-zero eigenvalue.
2. It is not a c -division problem if and only if there is non-repetitive and ordered index collection (j_1, \dots, j_c) making $\text{Cov}^{(j_1, \dots, j_c)}$ having at least two non-zero eigenvalue.

5. SOLUTIONS OF THE ROW SEPARATION PROBLEM VIA UNITARY TRANSFORMATIONS

Sections 3–4 developed a structural view of reducible TLS core problems through row separation subproblems, indivisible subspaces, and (non-)homogeneous $\{C\}$ -subset behavior. However, this analysis is not yet constructive: even when the theory predicts that a core problem decomposes, it does not by itself provide a practical procedure to identify the component subproblems and extract the corresponding indivisible subspaces.

A constructive approach for the real case is proposed in [25], where the row separation problem is transformed by orthogonal matrices H_j and 1–2 division problems are built recursively. The difficulty arises when one moves beyond the 2-division regime. For $c \geq 3$, the splitting mechanism naturally involves the spectrum of the covariance matrices $\text{Cov}^{(j_1, \dots, j_c)}$ associated with $\{C\}$ -subset subproblems, but $\text{Cov}^{(j_1, \dots, j_c)}$ is in general not symmetric. As a consequence, complex eigenvalues may occur, and a direct eigen-space splitting carried out over \mathbb{R} is no longer sufficient to describe the relevant invariant directions in a way that remains compatible with real orthogonal transformations.

This motivates an explicit shift to the complex field. Working over \mathbb{C} allows us to use unitary transformations and to carry out a consistent spectral splitting of $\text{Cov}^{(j_1, \dots, j_c)}$. Moreover, as suggested by the notion of dense problems introduced

in 3.13, the row separation structure over \mathbb{C} can be regarded as a refinement of the real one: the complex formulation typically reveals a denser (and hence more informative) indivisible-subspace decomposition. The reconstruction of real solutions from complex ones—via admissible combinations constrained, for instance, by conjugacy and orthogonality—is important but is left for future work. In this section, we focus on the complex problem and show how to compute its indivisible subspaces in a systematic way.

This section is organized as follows. In 5.1, we address the failure of ideal homogeneity in certain $\{C\}$ -subset subproblems by introducing a replacement construction that preserves the row separation subspaces while restoring a tractable structure. In 5.2, this construction is embedded into a recursive procedure that yields all indivisible subspaces of a row separation problem over \mathbb{C} . Finally, 5.3 applies the resulting decomposition to clarify the structure and uniqueness of irreducible reduced forms of core problems in the complex setting, addressing the open issues left in [25].

5.1. Alternative Construction. Starting from a k -division problem that is not a $(k + 1)$ -division problem, we show how to replace a non-ideally homogeneous $\{C\}$ -subset subproblem by an equivalent row separation problem with improved structural properties, without altering the collection of row separation subspaces. All arguments in this subsection are carried out over the complex field \mathbb{C} .

Consider a k -division problem P associated with the block set $\{D_1, \dots, D_{k+1}\}$, where $D_1, \dots, D_{k+1} \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times d}$. If P is not a $(k + 1)$ -division problem, then by the contrapositive of 4.28 there exists a non-repetitive and ordered index collection (j_1, \dots, j_{k+1}) such that the associated covariance matrix $\text{Cov}^{(j_1, \dots, j_{k+1})}$ has more than one non-zero eigenvalue.

The following corollaries summarize two intrinsic properties of P that will be crucial for the construction.

Corollary 5.1. Let P be a k -division problem and let (j_1, \dots, j_{k+1}) be defined as above. Then:

- (1) $\forall i = 2, \dots, k, \bar{D}_{j_{i'}} D_{j_i}^T \neq 0$ if and only if $i' = i - 1$ or $i' = i + 1$.
- (2) If $i = 1, \bar{D}_{j_{i'}} D_{j_1}^T \neq 0$ if and only if $i' = 2$ or $i' = k + 1$.
- (3) If $i = k + 1, \bar{D}_{j_{i'}} D_{j_{k+1}}^T \neq 0$ if and only if $i' = 1$ or $i' = k$.

Remark 5.2. 5.1 shows the special 3-class problems characterized by a single-cycle structure are (loose) $(k + 1)$ -divisions from 4.29.

Corollary 5.3. Let P be a k -division problem and let $\{C\}$ be defined as above. Then:

- (1) For any indivisible subspace \mathcal{I} of P and for all $j \in \{1, \dots, k + 1\}$,

$$\dim(\mathcal{I} \cap \mathcal{R}(D_j^T)) \geq 1.$$

- (2) For any indivisible subspace \mathcal{I} of P and any nonzero vector $v \in \mathcal{I} \cap \mathcal{R}(D_{j_1}^T)$, the vector v is an eigenvector of $\text{Cov}^{(j_1, \dots, j_{k+1})}$ associated with some eigenvalue λ_s .

Suppose that $\text{Cov}^{(j_1, \dots, j_{k+1})}$ has l distinct eigenvalues. Let λ_s denote the s th eigenvalue of $\text{Cov}^{(j_1, \dots, j_{k+1})}$, and let f_s be its algebraic multiplicity, for $s =$

$1, \dots, l$. For each s , let $D_{j_1}^s \in \mathbb{C}^{f_s \times d}$ be a matrix whose rows form an orthonormal basis of the eigenspace associated with λ_s , and define recursively

$$D_i^s = D_{i-1}^s D_{j_i}^* D_{j_i}, \quad 2 \leq i \leq k+1.$$

Using these matrices, we define the following row separation problems:

- P_s : the row separation problem constructed from the block set $\{D_1^s, \dots, D_{k+1}^s\}$.

Corollary 5.4. Let P_s be defined above and let f_s denote the algebraic multiplicity of the eigenvalue λ_s of $\text{Cov}^{(j_1, \dots, j_{k+1})}$. Then:

- (1) $\forall s, s'$ and $\forall i, i'$, if $s \neq s'$,

$$\bar{D}_i^s \left(\bar{D}_{i'}^{s'} \right)^T = 0$$

- (2) If $f_s = 1$, the problem P_s has exactly one indivisible subspace \mathcal{I}^{P_s} .
(3) The problem P_s is a complete division problem if and only if $f_s \geq 2$.

The following theorem establishes the equivalence, in terms of row separation subspaces, between the original problem P and the problem P_s constructed above.

Theorem 5.5. Let P_s be defined above. Then P and row block composition of $\{P_1, \dots, P_l\}$ are equivalent with respect to row separation subspaces.

Proof. We firstly show that every indivisible subspace of P_s is also an indivisible subspace of P . Fix $s \in \{1, \dots, l\}$. If $f_s = 1$, the claim follows directly from 3.8 and 5.4. If $f_s \geq 2$, then by 4.13, 4.17, and 5.4, for any indivisible subspace \mathcal{I}^{P_s} of P_s there exists a nonzero vector $v \in \mathcal{R}((D_1^s)^T)$ such that $v \in \mathcal{I}^{P_s}$. Let $\mathcal{M}(v)$ denote the minimized subspace of P generated by v . By construction, $\mathcal{M}(v) = \mathcal{I}^{P_s}$, and by 3.8, $\mathcal{M}(v)$ is an indivisible subspace of P .

We then prove the converse inclusion. Let \mathcal{I} be an indivisible subspace of P , and let v be a nonzero vector such that $v \in \mathcal{I} \cap \mathcal{R}(D_{j_1}^T)$. By 5.3, the vector v is an eigenvector of $\text{Cov}^{(j_1, \dots, j_{k+1})}$ associated with some eigenvalue λ_s , and therefore $v \in \mathcal{R}((D_1^s)^T)$. This implies that \mathcal{I} is an indivisible subspace of P_s . \square

This result shows that a $\{C\}$ -subset subproblem with non-ideal homogeneity can be replaced by an equivalent row separation problem with a complete division structure, without altering the underlying row separation subspaces. However, performing such replacements locally may destroy the global division structure of the problem. To address this issue, we introduce in the next subsection a recursive strategy that restores global consistency while systematically extracting all indivisible subspaces.

5.2. Final Strategy. The construction of a row separation problem associated with a given core problem is described in [25] and recalled in 2. Moreover, once the indivisible subspaces of a row separation problem are known, all the corresponding component subproblems can be reconstructed explicitly.

Building on these ingredients, we now present a complete strategy for identifying all indivisible subspaces of a row separation problem in \mathbb{C} . The strategy combines the structural results developed in 4 with the alternative construction introduced in 5.1. At each step, the procedure replaces a non-ideally homogeneous subproblem by

an equivalent one with improved division structure, without altering the underlying row separation subspaces.

An important feature of the proposed strategy is that it necessarily terminates. Indeed, each iteration strictly reduces the row dimension of at least one row block, and therefore an infinite recursion is impossible. For the initial stages leading up to the 2-division regime, the strategy coincides with the construction described in [25]; the novel aspects arise in the treatment of higher-order division problems.

The proposed strategy is intended as a structural decomposition framework: it provides an exact and invariant description of irreducible components, while numerical efficiency, implementation details, and complexity analysis are left to future work.

We now describe the final strategy for computing all indivisible subspaces of a row separation problem. The procedure is organized into successive division cycles and operates entirely over the complex field \mathbb{C} . Throughout, we assume that each row block D_j has full row rank, which can always be enforced from core problems.

1-division cycle.

Input: a row separation problem over \mathbb{C} .

- Step 1.1** For each $j = 1, \dots, k + 1$, split the row block D_j according to its distinct singular values.
- Step 1.2** If there exists a block D_j consisting of a single row d , then d represents an indivisible (unambiguous) direction. Construct the minimized subspace $\mathcal{M}(d)$ and extract the corresponding row separation subproblem.
- Step 1.3** Repeat Steps 1.1–1.2 until, for all $j = 1, \dots, k + 1$, each block D_j has at least two rows. At this point, the problem is a 1-division problem and the procedure enters the 2-division cycle.

2-division cycle.

Input: a 1-division problem.

- Step 2.1** For all pairs $j, j' \in \{1, \dots, k + 1\}$, split the blocks D_j and $D_{j'}$ according to the singular values of the matrix $D_j D_{j'}^T$.
- Step 2.2** If, after splitting, there exists a block D_j with only one row, return to the 1-division cycle. Otherwise, proceed to Step 2.3.
- Step 2.3** Partition the full index set $\{1, \dots, k + 1\}$ into independent subsets $\{C^t\}_{t=1}^g$ according to 4.3. For each $t = 1, \dots, g$, the $\{C^t\}$ -subset subproblem is a 2-division problem. Initialize g as independent 3-division cycles, each with input given by the corresponding $\{C^t\}$ -subset subproblem.

c -division cycle ($c \geq 3$).

Input: a $(c - 1)$ -division problem.

- Step c.1** Search for a non-repetitive and ordered index collection (j_1, \dots, j_c) such that the associated covariance matrix $\text{Cov}^{(j_1, \dots, j_c)}$ has more than one nonzero eigenvalue. If no such subset exists, proceed to Step c.3.
- Step c.2** Apply the spectral splitting described in 5.1 to the $\{j_1, \dots, j_c\}$ -subset subproblem, and replace it by row block composition of the corresponding problems P_s . Return to the 1-division cycle.
- Step c.3** If Step c.1 fails, then the current problem is a c -division problem. Proceed to the $(c + 1)$ -division cycle.

The strategy terminates when the input problem is a complete division problem.

Remarks on parallelism and extensions. The proposed strategy exhibits a high degree of inherent parallelism. For instance, after Step 2.3, the resulting 2-division subproblems associated with distinct index subsets $\{C^t\}$ can be processed independently. More generally, for $c \geq 3$, incompatible index subsets $\{C_1\}$ and $\{C_2\}$ with $\{C_1\} \cap \{C_2\} = \emptyset$ can be split and exchanged simultaneously.

In addition, machine learning techniques may be employed to accelerate the identification of suitable index subsets non-repetitive and ordered index collection (j_1, \dots, j_c) , since division problems with $c \geq 2$ admit a well-defined and structured graph representation. Finally, alternative decomposition algorithms may be considered, provided that their outputs are provably equivalent—either exactly or approximately—to the indivisible-subspace decomposition produced by the present strategy.

5.3. Core Problem Structure. The strategy developed in 5.2 does more than provide a constructive way to compute indivisible subspaces: it also clarifies the structural properties of row separation problems and their associated core problems in the complex setting. In particular, it allows us to address several questions that were left open in [25] concerning the role of complex-valued decompositions and the uniqueness of reduced structures under unitary transformations.

In this subsection, we collect a number of direct consequences of the proposed strategy. We first show that any row separation problem over \mathbb{C} is equivalent, at the level of row separation subspaces, to a row block composition of complete division problems and irreducible row separation problems which have only one indivisible subspaces. We then characterize when the collection of indivisible subspaces is infinite when ambiguous subspaces exist. Finally, we establish a unitary uniqueness result for irreducible component subproblems associated with a fixed indivisible subspace.

Corollary 5.6. Let P be a row separation problem over \mathbb{C} . Then there exists a group $\{P_1, \dots, P_l\}$ consisting of complete division problems and irreducible row separation problems such that P and the row block composition of $\{P_1, \dots, P_l\}$ are equivalent with respect to their row separation subspaces.

Corollary 5.7. Let P be a row separation problem over \mathbb{C} . Then the following statements are equivalent:

- (1) P has a finite number of indivisible subspaces;
- (2) all indivisible subspaces of P are unambiguous.

The following theorem shows that, regardless of whether the associated indivisible subspaces are unambiguous or ambiguous, the irreducible reduced structure is uniquely defined up to unitary transformations and permutation of component subproblems. This result resolves the question of unitary uniqueness for irreducible reduced structures in the complex setting, partially addressing an open problem raised in [25].

Theorem 5.8. *Let a core problem be given over \mathbb{C} . Then its irreducible reduced structure is unique up to unitary transformations and permutation of irreducible component subproblems.*

Proof. It is shown in [25] that any reduced structure admits a general form that is unique up to unitary transformations. To simplify the argument, we assume

without loss of generality that the given irreducible reduced structure is already expressed in such a general form.

Let \mathbf{P} denote the row separation problem constructed from the block set $\{U_1^* B_1, \dots, U_{k+1}^* B_{k+1}\}$. By 2.5, assume that the irreducible reduced structure consists of g irreducible component subproblems

$$[B_1^{(t)} \mid A_{11}^{(t)}], \quad t = 1, \dots, g.$$

For each t , define the associated indivisible subspace

$$\mathcal{I}_t = \mathcal{R}\left(\bar{R}(B_1^{(t)'})^T\right),$$

where $B_1^{(t)'}$ denotes the corresponding row block in the transformed matrix $P^* B_1 R$. As shown in [25], each \mathcal{I}_t is an indivisible subspace of \mathbf{P} .

If \mathcal{I}_t is an unambiguous subspace, unitary uniqueness follows immediately from Definition 3.1 and Theorem 3.2 in [25].

Assume now that \mathcal{I}_t is an indivisible ambiguous subspace. Suppose that there exists another irreducible reduced structure, also expressed in general form, consisting of g irreducible component subproblems

$$[B_1^{(t')} \mid A_{11}^{(t')}], \quad t' = 1, \dots, g,$$

where the equality of g is guaranteed by Theorem 3.51 in [25]. Let

$$\mathcal{I}'_1 = \mathcal{R}\left(\bar{R}(B_1^{(1)'})^T\right)$$

be an indivisible subspace of the second reduced structure such that $\mathcal{I}'_1 \not\subseteq \mathcal{I}_t$. By construction and by the results of 5.2, these two subspaces belong to the same complete division problem.

Applying LU factorizations to $B_1^{(t)'}(R')^*$ and $B_1^{(t)}R^*$ therefore yields the same lower triangular factor. This implies that $B_1^{(t)}$ and $B_1^{(t)'}$ are equivalent under a unitary transformation, completing the proof. \square

Remark 5.9. The presence of indivisible ambiguous subspaces in a row separation problem over \mathbb{C} indicates that the associated core problem contains repetitive irreducible component subproblems. This observation is particularly relevant for the analysis of solvability and identifiability properties of the core problem.

Corollary 5.10. A core problem admits only a finite number of irreducible reduced structures up to unitary equivalence.

Although the results of 5.3 are formulated in the complex setting, they also provide a foundation for understanding real row separation problems. In particular, real row separation subspaces can be recovered by combining appropriate complex indivisible subspaces, subject to constraints such as complex conjugacy, orthogonality of unambiguous components, and interactions among ambiguous subspaces. A systematic treatment of these mechanisms lies beyond the scope of the present work and will be addressed in future research.

6. CONCLUSIONS

This work extends the structural theory of TLS core problems introduced in [25] by providing, a framework for identifying *all* component subproblems associated

with a reducible TLS core problem via unitary transformation. The central contribution of this paper is an exact strategy to find all the complex indivisible subspaces which determine unitary-unique irreducible component subproblems within any given core problem via unitary transformations, without any knowledge of solubility or block structure. It also proposes a partial relationship between different core problems, which reveals that real TLS structure can be understood as arising from a restricted combination of complex indivisible subspaces, subject to algebraic and geometric compatibility conditions. This clarifies the relationship between real and complex TLS formulations and highlights the structural role played by ambiguity.

The results shed light on solubility and conditioning phenomena in TLS. They show that small but structured perturbations of the observation matrix may qualitatively alter the interaction among component subproblems, while other—even large—perturbations may leave the decomposition unchanged. This observation has direct implications for the analysis of TLS condition numbers and for the controlled modification of reducible core problems with unfavorable solubility properties.

It establishes a clear roadmap for future research directions, including the development of efficient numerical algorithms, the systematic study of conditioning and stability of irreducible components, and applications to data-driven and machine-learning settings where structured low-rank models play a central role.

7. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Bruno Carpentieri's work is supported by the European Regional Development and Cohesion Funds (ERDF) 2021–2027 under Project AI4AM - EFRE1052. He is a member of the *Gruppo Nazionale per il Calcolo Scientifico* (GNCS) of the *Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica* (INdAM).

The authors would like to thank Dr. Plesinger [Technical University of Liberec] for helpful comments and insightful suggestions on the manuscript.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Aoki and P. Yue. On a priori error estimates of some identification methods. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 15:541–548, 1970.
- [2] Y. Bresler and A. Macovski. Exact maximum likelihood parameter estimation of superimposed exponential signals in noise. *IEEE Trans. Acust., Speech, Signal Process.*, 34:1081–1089, 1986.
- [3] R. D. DeGroat and E. M. Dowling. The data least squares problem and channel equalization. *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, 41:407–411, 1993.
- [4] Reinhard Diestel. *Graph Theory*. Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, 5th edition, 2017.
- [5] L. Gleser. Estimation in a multivariate “errors in variable” regression model: Large sample results. *Ann. Stat.*, 9(1):24–44, 1981.
- [6] G. H. Golub. Some modified matrix eigenvalue problems. *SIAM Rev.*, 15:318–344, 1973.
- [7] G. H. Golub and C. F. Van Loan. An analysis of the total least squares problem. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 19(6):883–893, 1980.
- [8] G. H. Golub and C. F. Van Loan. *Matrix Computations*. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 4th edition, 2013.
- [9] I. Hnětynková, M. Plešinger, and D. M. Sima. Solvability of the core problem with multiple right-hand sides in the TLS sense. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 37:861–876, 2016.
- [10] I. Hnětynková, M. Plešinger, D. M. Sima, Z. Strakoš, and S. V. Huffel. The total least squares problem in $AX \approx B$: A new classification with the relationship to the classical works. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 32:748–770, 2011.

- [11] I. Hnětynková, M. Plešinger, and Z. Strakoš. The core problem within a linear approximation problem $AX \approx B$ with multiple right-hand sides. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 34:917–931, 2013.
- [12] I. Hnětynková, M. Plešinger, and Z. Strakoš. Band generalization of the Golub-Kahan bidiagonalization, generalized Jacobi matrices, and the core problem. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 36:417–434, 2015.
- [13] I. Hnětynková, M. Plešinger, and J. Žáková. TLS formulation and core reduction for problems with structured right-hand sides. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 555:241–265, 2018.
- [14] I. Hnětynková, M. Plešinger, and J. Žáková. On TLS formulation and core reduction for data fitting with generalized models. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 577:1–20, 2019.
- [15] I. Hnětynková, M. Plešinger, and J. Žáková. Solvability classes for core problems in matrix total least squares minimization. *Applications of Mathematics*, 64:103–128, 2019.
- [16] I. Hnětynková, M. Plešinger, and J. Žáková. Krylov Subspace approach to core problems within multilinear approximation problems: a unifying framework. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 44:53–79, 2023.
- [17] S. V. Huffel and P. U. Lemmerling. *Total Least Squares and Errors-in-Variables Modeling: Analysis, Algorithms and Applications*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2002.
- [18] M. Levin. Estimation of a system pulse transfer function in the presence of noise. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 9:229–235, 1964.
- [19] C. C. Paige and Z. Strakoš. Scaled total least squares fundamentals. *Numerische Mathematik*, 91:117–146, 2002.
- [20] M. Plešinger. The Total Least Squares Problem and Reduction of Data in $AX \approx B$. Ph.D. dissertation, Technical University of Liberec, Liberec, Czech Republic, 2008.
- [21] J. S and Y. Wei. Optimal backward error of a total least squares and its randomized algorithms. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 46(3):2116–2139, 2025.
- [22] R.C. Thompson. Principal submatrices ix: Interlacing inequalities for singular values of submatrices. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 5(1):1–12, 1972.
- [23] M. Wei. Algebraic relations between the total least squares and least squares problems with more than one solution. *Numerische Mathematik*, 62:123–148, 1992.
- [24] M. Wei. The analysis for the total least squares problem with more than one solution. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 13(3):746–763, 1992.
- [25] S. Yu and Y. Jing. Possible reduced structure of the core problem within the total least square problem. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 46(2):1616–1639, 2025.
- [26] J. Žáková. The core problem—analysis, properties, and behaviour. Ph.D. dissertation, Technical University of Liberec, Liberec, Czech Republic, 2023.