

# COMPOSITIO MATHEMATICA

GERARD SIERKSMA

KLAAS DE VOS

## **Convex polytopes as matrix invariants**

*Compositio Mathematica*, tome 52, n° 2 (1984), p. 203-210

[http://www.numdam.org/item?id=CM\\_1984\\_\\_52\\_2\\_203\\_0](http://www.numdam.org/item?id=CM_1984__52_2_203_0)

© Foundation Compositio Mathematica, 1984, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Compositio Mathematica » (<http://www.compositio.nl/>) implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (<http://www.numdam.org/legal.php>). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

NUMDAM

Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme  
Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques

<http://www.numdam.org/>

## CONVEX POLYTOPES AS MATRIX INVARIANTS

Gerard Sierksma and Klaas de Vos

### Abstract

For a convex polytope  $P$  which is the convex hull of a finite number of points, the set  $\pi(P)$  consists of all real square matrices  $A$  such that  $AP \subset P$ , i.e. that leave  $P$  invariant. In this paper the extremals of  $\pi(P)$  are characterized for  $P$  being a convex simplex, and the number of its extremes is determined.

### 1. Introduction

In Berman and Plemmons [2] the first chapter deals with matrices that leave a cone invariant, i.e.  $\pi(K) = \{A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \mid AK \subset K\}$  with  $K$  a cone in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . An extensive bibliography on properties of  $\pi(K)$  can be found in this book. In e.g. Tam [8] it is shown that  $\pi(K)$  is a polyhedral cone if  $K$  is a polyhedral cone. One of the main problems is to characterize the extremals of such a polyhedral cone  $\pi(K)$ ; see e.g. Adin [1]. Instead of taking a cone as matrix invariant we consider in this paper convex polytopes, with a convex polytope being the convex hull of a finite nonempty set of points in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ; see e.g. Eggleston [4] and Sierksma [6]. In Valentine [9] the term convex polyhedron is used. In a recent paper by Elsner [3] is also deviated from the idea of using cones; here so-called nontrivial convex sets are used as matrix invariants. In this paper we restrict ourselves mainly to convex simplices  $S_0$  with one vertex at the origin. By a convex simplex  $P$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  we mean the convex hull of  $d+1$  points in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with nonempty interior. We shall characterize the extremes of  $\pi(S_0)$  and calculate its number. In general, we define for  $X \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  the set of matrices

$$\pi(X) = \{A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \mid AX \subset X\}.$$

Note that if  $X = \{0\}$ , then  $\pi(X) = \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ . If  $X = \{x\}$  with  $x \neq 0$ , then  $\pi(X)$  consists of all  $(d, d)$ -matrices with eigenvector  $x$  and eigenvalue 1. Before restricting ourselves to convex polytopes we give the following result for arbitrary sets. Note that if  $X$  is convex then so is  $\pi(X)$ . By cone  $X$  we mean the convex cone generated by  $X$ , i.e. all nonnegative linear combinations of  $X$ . The set cone  $X$  is also denoted by  $X^G$ ; see [2].

**THEOREM 1:** *Let  $X \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ . Then the following holds*

- (a)  $\text{cone } \pi(X) \subset \pi(\text{cone } X)$ ;  
 (b)  $\text{cone } \pi(X) = \pi(\text{cone } X)$  if  $X$  is compact, convex and contains 0.

**PROOF:** (a) Take any  $A \in \text{cone } \pi(X)$ . Then there are matrices  $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \pi(X)$  such that  $A = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i A_i$  with  $\lambda_i \geq 0$  for all  $i$ . Furthermore let  $x = \sum_{i=1}^k \mu_i x_i \in \text{cone } X$  with  $\mu_i \geq 0$  and  $x_i \in X$  for all  $i$ . Then it follows that  $Ax = A(\sum_{i=1}^k \mu_i x_i) = \sum_{i=1}^k \mu_i Ax_i = \sum_{i=1}^k \mu_i (\sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j A_j x_i) = \sum_{i,j} \lambda_j \mu_i A_j x_i \in \text{cone } X$ . Hence,  $A \in \pi(\text{cone } X)$ .

(b) Take any  $A \in \pi(\text{cone } X)$  and let  $X \neq \{0\}$ . Hence  $A(\text{cone } X) \subset \text{cone } X$ . As  $0 \in X$  and  $X$  convex it follows that for each  $x \in X$  there are  $\lambda, \mu > 0$  and  $y \in X$  such that

$$A(\lambda x) = \mu y,$$

or that  $(\lambda/\mu)Ax \in X$ . Let  $\lambda^*$  be the infimum of all  $\lambda/\mu$  over  $x$ . Then  $\lambda^* \neq 0$ , and  $(\lambda^*A)X \subset X$ . This means that  $\lambda^*A \in \pi(X)$ . As  $\pi(X)$  is convex and contains 0, it follows that  $A \in \text{cone } \pi(X)$ .

In Theorem 1(b) we have a sufficient condition in order to obtain equality in (a). Note that we also have equality if  $X = \text{cone } X$ , because in that case both  $X$  and  $\pi(X)$  are convex cones; see e.g. Berman and Plemmons [2]. The following example shows that equality does not hold in general in Theorem 1. Take  $X = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x_1, x_2 \geq 0, x_1 + x_2 = 1\}$ . Then  $\text{cone } X = \mathbb{R}_+^2$ , and  $\pi(\text{cone } X)$  consists of all nonnegative (2,2)-matrices. On the other hand  $\pi(X)$  consists of all matrices

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 1-a & 1-b \end{pmatrix}$$

with  $0 \leq a, b \leq 1$ , so  $\text{cone } \pi(X)$  consists of all nonnegative multiples of these matrices. Hence  $\pi(\text{cone } X) \neq \text{cone } \pi(X)$ .

In the following chapters we replace ‘‘cone’’ by ‘‘conv’’ and ‘‘extr’’, so we consider  $\pi(\text{conv } X)$ ,  $\text{conv } \pi(X)$  and  $\pi(\text{extr } X)$ ,  $\text{extr } \pi(X)$ .

## 2. Polytopes and simplices as matrix invariants

The main purpose of this chapter is to study the commutativity of  $\pi$  and  $\text{conv}$ , i.e.  $\pi(\text{conv } X) = \text{conv } \pi(X)$  for  $X$  a polytope. Clearly, if  $X$  is convex so is  $\pi(X)$ , and in that case we have  $\text{conv } \pi(X) = \pi(\text{conv } X)$ .

**THEOREM 2:** *For each  $X$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  the following holds*

$$\text{conv } \pi(X) \subset \pi(\text{conv } X).$$

**PROOF:** Take any  $X \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ . Clearly  $\pi(\text{conv } X)$  is convex in  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ . So we only have to show that  $\pi(X) \subset \pi(\text{conv } X)$ . Take any  $A \in \pi(X)$ . Then  $AX \subset X$ . Now let  $x \in A(\text{conv } X)$ . Then there are  $x_1, \dots, x_s \in X$  and  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s \geq 0$  with  $\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_s = 1$ , such that  $x = A(\sum_{i=1}^s \lambda_i x_i) = \sum_{i=1}^s \lambda_i Ax_i$ . As  $Ax_i \in X$  for each  $i$  we have  $x \in \text{conv } X$ , and it follows that  $A(\text{conv } X) \subset \text{conv } X$ . Hence,  $A \in \pi(\text{conv } X)$ .

Equality does not hold in general in the above theorem as is shown by the following example. Take  $X = \{(1,0), (0,1), (\frac{1}{2},0), (1,1), (0,0)\}$ . Then

$$\pi(X) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}.$$

Then  $\text{conv } X = \{(x_1, x_2) \mid 0 \leq x_1, x_2 \leq 1\}$ , and  $\pi(\text{conv } X)$  consists of all non-negative matrices with row sums  $\leq 1$ . On the other hand the (2,1)-th element of each matrix in  $\text{conv } \pi(X)$  is zero. Equality also does not hold, in general, in case  $X$  consists of the extremals of a convex cone  $X$ , i.e.  $X = \text{extr } K$ .

It is well-known that  $\text{conv } X = \text{conv}(\text{extr } K) = K$  (the Krein-Milman theorem). However, in general,  $\pi(\text{conv } X) = \pi(K) \neq \text{conv } \pi(\text{extr } K)$ . In order for  $\pi(K)$  being equal to  $\text{conv } \pi(\text{extr } K)$  it is therefore necessary that  $\text{extr } \pi(K) \subset \pi(\text{extr } K)$  which is a conjecture of Loewy and Schneider [5].

In the following we shall write  $0 \cup S$  instead of  $\{0\} \cup S$ . In the next theorem  $S_0 = \text{conv}(0 \cup S)$  is a convex simplex i.e. a convex simplex with one vertex at the origin and  $|S| = d$ . The theorem shows the commutativity of  $\pi$  and  $\text{conv}$  for  $0 \cup S$ . The proof of it is after Theorem 6.

**THEOREM 3:** *Let  $0 \cup S$  be the vertices of a convex simplex in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Then the following holds*

$$\pi(\text{conv}(0 \cup S)) = \text{conv } \pi(0 \cup S).$$

In order to prove this theorem we need a nonsingular transformation  $T: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  such that

$$T(e_1, \dots, e_d) = S$$

with  $S$  as in the above theorem. We denote  $E_d = \{e_1, \dots, e_d\}$ , i.e. the set of unit vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

**THEOREM 4:** *The following assertions are equivalent:*

- (i)  $A \in \pi(\text{conv}(0 \cup E_d))$ ;
- (ii)  $Ae_1, \dots, Ae_d \in \text{conv}(0 \cup E_d)$ ;
- (iii)  $A \geq 0$ , column sums of  $A \leq 1$ ;

PROOF: We shall show that (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i).

(i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii): Let  $A \in \pi(\text{conv}(0 \cup E_d))$ , so  $A(\text{conv}(0 \cup E_d)) \subset \text{conv}(0 \cup E_d)$ . As  $e_i \in \text{conv}(0 \cup E_d)$ , it follows that  $Ae_i \in \text{conv}(0 \cup E_d)$  for each  $i = 1, \dots, d$ .

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii): As  $Ae_j \in \text{conv}(0 \cup E_d)$  for each  $j$ , it follows that the  $j$ -th column of  $A$  is equal to  $\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_{ij} e_i$  with  $\lambda_{1j}, \dots, \lambda_{dj} \geq 0$  and  $\lambda_{1j} + \dots + \lambda_{dj} \leq 1$ , so the  $j$ -th column sum of  $A$  is equal to  $\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_{ij}$  and is  $\leq 1$ . The matrix  $A$  is nonnegative, because all  $\lambda_{ij}$ 's are nonnegative.

(iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i): Take any  $x \in \text{conv}(0 \cup E_d)$ . Then there are scalars  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d \geq 0$  with  $\alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_d \leq 1$  such that  $x = \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i e_i$ . Hence,  $Ax = A(\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i e_i) = \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i Ae_i$ . As the column sums of  $A$  are  $\leq 1$ , it follows directly that  $Ae_i \in \text{conv}(0 \cup E_d)$  for each  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , and therefore we have  $Ax \in \text{conv}(0 \cup E_d)$ , and hence  $A \in \pi(\text{conv}(0 \cup E_d))$ .

Theorem 4 implies that all matrices in  $\pi(0 \cup E_d)$  have *Perron-Frobenius eigen-value*  $\leq 1$ ; this is the well-known Minkowski-theorem, see e.g. Sierksma [7].

LEMMA 5: Let  $T: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  be a nonsingular transformation and let  $X \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ . Then the following assertions hold:

- (a)  $\text{conv}(TX) = T(\text{conv } X)$ ,
- (b)  $\pi(TX) = T\pi(X)T^{-1}$ ;
- (c)  $\text{conv } \pi(TX) = T[\text{conv } \pi(X)]T^{-1}$ .

PROOF: (a) is left to the reader. In order to prove (b), take any  $A \in \pi(TX)$ . Hence,  $A(TX) \subset TX$ , and this implies that  $(T^{-1}AT)(X) \subset X$ , so that  $T^{-1}AT \in \pi(X)$ , or  $A \in T[\pi(X)]T^{-1}$ . The converse inclusion is shown similarly. To prove (c), take any  $A \in \text{conv } \pi(TX) = \text{conv}[T\pi(X)T^{-1}]$ . Then there are matrices  $B_1, \dots, B_k \in \pi(X)$ , and scalars  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k \geq 0$  with  $\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_k = 1$  such that  $A = \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i (TB_i T^{-1}) = T(\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i B_i)T^{-1}$ . As  $\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i B_i \in \text{conv } \pi(X)$ , it follows that  $A \in T[\text{conv } \pi(X)]T^{-1}$ . The other conclusion is also shown similarly.

The following theorem gives the commutativity of  $\pi$  and  $\text{conv}$  for  $0 \cup E_d$ .

THEOREM 6:  $\pi(\text{conv}(0 \cup E_d)) = \text{conv } \pi(0 \cup E_d)$ .

PROOF: According to Theorem 2, we only have to show that  $\pi(\text{conv}(0 \cup E_d)) \subset \text{conv } \pi(0 \cup E_d)$ . Take any  $A \in \pi(\text{conv}(0 \cup E_d))$ . Then  $A(\text{conv}(0 \cup E_d)) \subset \text{conv}(0 \cup E_d)$ . Theorem 4 then gives that  $A \geq 0$  and that all column sums of  $A$  are  $\leq 1$ . We must show now that  $A$  can be written as a convex combination of matrices from  $\pi(0 \cup E_d)$ . To show this, we first define  $A = A_1 = \{a_{ij}^{(1)}\}$ . Moreover, we define

$$\lambda_1 = \min_j \max_i a_{ij}^{(1)}.$$

and  $I_1$  is the matrix with precisely one 1 in the  $j$ -th column in the  $(i, j)$ -th position if  $a_{ij}$  is the maximum in the  $j$ -th column of  $A_1$  (if there are more maxima in the  $j$ -th column choose one!) and zeroes otherwise ( $j = 1, \dots, d$ ). Then consider the matrix

$$A_2 = A_1 - \lambda_1 I_1,$$

with  $A_2 = \{a_{ij}^{(2)}\}$  and define

$$\lambda_2 = \min \max a_{ij}^{(2)}.$$

Also define  $A_3 = A_2 - \lambda_2 I_2 = A_1 - \lambda_1 I_1 - \lambda_2 I_2$ , where  $I_2$  is defined for the matrix  $A_2$  in the same way as  $I_1$  for  $A_1$ . Continuing this process we obtain, after at most  $d^2$  steps, the zero-matrix. So we obtain

$$0 = A_{d^2+1} = A - \lambda_1 I_1 - \lambda_2 I_2 - \dots - \lambda_{d^2} I_{d^2}.$$

Hence,  $A = \sum_{i=1}^{d^2} \lambda_i I_i$ . Clearly,  $A \geq 0$ , and each  $\lambda_i \geq 0$ . Note that a column of  $I_i$  becomes zero if the corresponding column of  $A_i$  is zero. If after  $d^2 - 1$  steps there still is some nonzero element in  $A_{d^2-1}$  we have, say in the  $j$ -th column,

$$a_{ij} + \dots + a_{dj} - (\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_{d^2}) = 0,$$

or  $\sum_{i=1}^{d^2} \lambda_i = \sum_{i=1}^d a_{ij} \leq 1$ . And this means that in fact  $A \in \text{conv } \pi(0 \cup E_d)$ .

The number of steps in the proof of the above theorem is, in general  $\leq d^2$ . Question: under what conditions is the number of steps equal to  $d^2$ ?

**PROOF OF THEOREM 3:** First note that  $0 \cup S$  is the set of vertices of a simplex, so  $|S| = d$ . We must show that

$$\pi(\text{conv}(0 \cup S)) \subset \text{conv } \pi(0 \cup S).$$

Clearly, there is a nonsingular transformation  $T: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $S = TE_d = T(e_1, \dots, e_d)$ . According to Lemma 5 and Theorem 6 we have  $\pi(\text{conv}(0 \cup S)) = \pi(\text{conv}(0 \cup TE_d)) = \pi(\text{conv } T(0 \cup E_d)) = \pi(T\text{conv}(0 \cup E_d)) = T(\pi(\text{conv}(0 \cup E_d)))T^{-1} = T(\text{conv } \pi(0 \cup E_d))T^{-1} = \text{conv } \pi(T(0 \cup E_d)) = \text{conv } \pi(0 \cup TE_d) = \text{conv } \pi(0 \cup S)$ .

### 3. The extremes of $\pi(S_0)$

In this chapter we shall characterize the extreme vertices of  $\pi(S_0)$  and determine their number. If  $P$  is a convex polytope then, in general,  $\pi(P)$  is not a polytope. For instance if we take the two points  $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$

then  $P = \text{conv} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$  is convex but  $\pi(P)$  is not: in  $\pi(P)$  there are matrices  $A = (a_{ij})$  with  $a_{11} = -a_{12}$ , so  $a_{11}$  can be as large as possible which means that  $\pi(P)$  is not bounded, so certainly is not a convex polytope. The following theorem gives a sufficient condition in order to save the boundedness of  $\pi(P)$ .

**THEOREM 7:** *If  $X$  is a bounded set in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with  $\text{intconv}(0 \cup X) \neq \emptyset$  then  $\pi(X)$  is bounded.*

**PROOF:** Suppose, to the contrary, that  $\pi(X)$  is not bounded. Then there is a sequence of matrices  $A_k$  in  $\pi(X)$  such that one of the elements, say the  $(i, j)$ -th element, of the  $A_k$ 's goes to infinity. As the interior of  $\text{conv}(0 \cup X)$  is nonempty, there is an element  $y \in \text{intconv}(0 \cup X)$  with  $y_i \neq 0$ . Then  $y = \sum_{i=1}^s \lambda_i x_i$  with  $x_i \in X$ ,  $\lambda_i \geq 0$ , and  $\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_s \leq 1$ . Then  $(A_k y)_j \rightarrow \infty$  for  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . As  $A_k y = \sum_{i=1}^s \lambda_i A_k x_i$  is a finite sum, we have  $A_k x_i \rightarrow \infty$  for  $k \rightarrow \infty$  and for some  $i$ . As  $A_k x_i \in X$ , it follows that  $X$  is not bounded which is a contradiction. Therefore we have in fact that  $\pi(X)$  is bounded.

It is open question whether  $\pi(X)$  is a convex polytope in case  $X$  is a convex polytope in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with  $\text{intconv}(0 \cup X) \neq \emptyset$ . Question: Is the number of extreme vertices of  $\pi(X)$  less then or equal to  $(d + 1)^d$  (see the following theorem)?

**THEOREM 8:** *Let  $0 \cup S$  be the vertices of a convex simplex. Then the following holds:*

$$|\pi(0 \cup S)| = |\pi(0 \cup E_d)| = (d + 1)^d.$$

**PROOF:** There is a nonsingular transformation  $T: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $0 \cup S = T(0 \cup E_d)$ , so we have directly that  $|\pi(0 \cup S)| = |\pi(0 \cup E_d)|$ . We only have to show that

$$|\pi(0 \cup E_d)| = (d + 1)^d.$$

First note that  $A0 = 0$  for each  $A \in \pi(0 \cup E_d)$ . The problem of determining the number of matrices in  $\pi(0 \cup E_d)$  is therefore equivalent to the problem of finding the number of bipartite graphs  $(G, H)$  on  $2(d + 1)$  vertices with  $|G| = |H| = d + 1$ , with one edge fixed, and such that the degree of each vertex in  $G$  is 1. Let there be a fixed edge between  $a \in G$  and  $b \in H$ . Then there are for each vertex  $\neq a$  in  $G$  precisely  $d + 1$  possibilities in  $H$ . This holds for all of the vertices in  $G$  that are  $\neq a$ . So the number of such bipartite graphs is equal to

$$\frac{(d + 1) \times \dots \times (d + 1)}{d \text{ times}}.$$

Hence,  $|\pi(0 \cup E_d)| = (d + 1)^d$ .

To illustrate the above theorem we consider the following example. Let  $d = 2$  and  $S_0 = \text{conv}\left\{\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}\right\} = \text{conv}(0 \cup E_2)$ . Then we have

$$\pi(0 \cup S) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \right. \\ \left. \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\}, \text{ and}$$

$$\pi(S_0) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \mid a, b, c, d \geq 0, a + c \leq 1, b + d \leq 1 \right\}.$$

Note that  $|\pi(0 \cup S)| = 3^2 = 9$ . In order to characterize the extreme vertices of  $S_0$  we need the following two lemmas.

LEMMA 9: Let  $X \subset \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  be convex and  $T: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  be nonsingular. Then the following holds:

$$\text{extr}(TXT^{-1}) = T(\text{extr } X)T^{-1}$$

PROOF: Take any  $A \in \text{extr}(TXT^{-1})$ . Hence,  $A \notin \text{conv}(TXT^{-1}) \setminus \{A\}$ . Suppose, to the contrary, that  $A \notin T(\text{extr } X)T^{-1}$ . We shall show first that  $T^{-1}AT \in \text{extr } X$ , or that  $T^{-1}AT \notin \text{conv } X \setminus \{T^{-1}AT\}$ . Taking  $T^{-1}AT \in \text{conv } X \setminus \{T^{-1}AT\}$ , there should exist matrices  $B_1, \dots, B_k \in X$ , all  $\neq T^{-1}AT$ , and scalars  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k \geq 0$  with  $\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_k = 1$ , such that  $T^{-1}AT = \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i B_i$ , or  $A = \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i TB_i T^{-1}$ , and  $B_i \neq T^{-1}AT$  for all  $i$ . Because  $TB_i T^{-1} \in \text{conv}(TXT^{-1})$  for all  $i$ , we have  $A \in \text{conv}(TXT^{-1}) \setminus \{A\}$ , hence  $A \notin \text{extr}(TXT^{-1})$ , and this is a contradiction. Therefore we have,  $T^{-1}AT \in \text{extr } X$ , and this means that  $A \in T(\text{extr } X)T^{-1}$ . The converse can be shown similarly.

LEMMA 10:  $\text{extrconv } \pi(0 \cup E_d) = \pi(0 \cup E_d)$ .

PROOF: As all columns of the matrices in  $\pi(0 \cup E_d)$  consists of zero or unit vectors, no such a matrix can be written as a convex combination of the other ones in  $\pi(0 \cup E_d)$ .

The next theorem characterizes the extreme vertices of  $\pi(S_0) = \pi(\text{conv}(0 \cup S))$ ; they are precisely the matrices that leave the vertices invariant.

THEOREM 11:  $\text{extr } \pi(S_0) = \text{extr } \pi(\text{conv}(0 \cup S)) = \pi(0 \cup S)$ .

PROOF: Let  $T: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  be a nonsingular transformation such that



$0 \cup S = T(0 \cup E_d)$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{extr } \pi(S_0) &= \text{extr } \pi(\text{conv}(0 \cup S)) = \text{extr } \pi(\text{conv}(T(0 \cup E_d))) \\
 &= \text{extrconv } \pi(T(0 \cup E_d)) = \text{extrconv}[T\pi(0 \cup E_d)T^{-1}] \\
 &= \text{extr}(T[\text{conv } \pi(0 \cup E_d)]T^{-1}) \\
 &= T[\text{extrconv } \pi(0 \cup E_d)]T^{-1} = T[\pi(0 \cup E_d)]T^{-1} \\
 &= \pi(T(0 \cup E_d)) = \pi(0 \cup S).
 \end{aligned}$$

### Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Evert Jan Bakker for his helpful suggestions.

### References

- [1] R.M. ADIN, Extreme positive operators on minimal and almost-minimal cones. *Linear Algebra Appl.* 44 (1982) 61–86.
- [2] A. BERMAN and R.J. PLEMMONS: *Non-negative Matrices in the Mathematical Sciences*. Academic (1979).
- [3] L. ELSNER: On matrices leaving invariant a nontrivial convex set. *Linear Algebra Appl.* 42 (1982) 103–107.
- [4] H.G. EGGLESTON: *Convexity*. Cambridge Univ. Press (1958).
- [5] R. LOEWY and H. SCHNEIDER: Indecomposable cones. *Linear Algebra Appl.* 11 (1975) 235–245.
- [6] G. SIERKSMA: *Axiomatic Convexity Theory*. Doct. Diss., Univ. Groningen (1976).
- [7] G. SIERKSMA: Non-negative matrices; the open Leontief model. *Linear Algebra Appl.* 26 (1979) 175–201.
- [8] B.-S. TAM: *Some aspects of Finite Dimensional Cones*. Doct. Diss., Univ. Hongkong (1977).
- [9] F.A. VALENTINE: *Convex Sets* New York: McGraw-Hill (1964).

(Oblatum 24-VIII-1982 & 10-II-1983)

University of Groningen  
 Econometric Institute  
 Subdepartment Mathematics  
 Groningen  
 The Netherlands