

Off-Diagonal Elements of Normal Matrices*

Robert Grone**

(February 4, 1977)

Let A be an $n \times n$ complex matrix, and let $W(A)$ denote the numerical range of A . In this paper, results of Parker and Mirsky are shown to be a consequence of the following fact. If A is normal, then the maximum value of $|(Ax, y)|$ as x and y run over all orthonormal pairs in C^n coincides with the radius of the smallest closed disk in C which contains $W(A)$.

Key words: Constrained extrema of quadratic forms; numerical range.

1. Introduction

For an $n \times n$ complex matrix, Parker [1]¹ has proven that the maximum value, for fixed A , of

$$|(Ax, y)| \quad (1)$$

subject to the constraint $\|x\| = \|y\| = 1$ is the maximum singular value, or *Hilbert norm*, $s_1(A)$ of A . In fact, it is clear that the maximum value in (1) occurs exactly when x is a unit eigenvector in C^n corresponding to the maximum eigenvalue of A^*A , and $y = Ax/\|Ax\|$.

If in (1) we require that $x = y$, then the maximum value of (1) is the *numerical radius* of A , $r(A)$. A moments reflection yields that

$$r(A) = \max_{U \text{ unitary}} |(U^*AU)_{1,1}|. \quad (2)$$

Relations between $s_1(A)$ and $r(A)$ have been studied. See for example [2,3].

Parker in [1] also investigated the maximum value of (1) when A is Hermitian and x, y range over all orthonormal pairs. In this case, the maximum value of (1) is $1/2(\lambda_1(A) - \lambda_n(A))$, where $\lambda_1(A) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(A)$ are the eigenvalues of A . Mirsky later obtained [4] that if A is normal with eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$, then

$$\max_{x, y \text{ orthonormal}} |(Ax, y)| \leq \max_{i, j} \left| \frac{\lambda_i - \lambda_j}{\sqrt{2}} \right|. \quad (3)$$

We remark that for any A , the left-hand side of (3) is identical with

$$\max_{U \text{ unitary}} |(U^*AU)_{1,2}|. \quad (4)$$

In this paper we completely characterize this maximum value for A , and obtain the results of Parker and Mirsky as corollaries.

2. Notation

- (i) A will denote an $n \times n$ complex matrix with eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$.
- (ii) $W(A) = \{(Ax, x) \mid \|x\| = 1\}$ is the *numercial range* of A . It is well known that if A is normal, then $W(A) = \mathcal{H}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$, the convex hull of $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$.

AMS Subject Classification: (1970), 15A63.

*An invited paper. The work of this author was supported in part by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research.

**Present address: Department of Mathematics, University of California, Santa Barbara, Calif. 93106.

¹ Figures in brackets indicate the literature references at the end of this paper.

- (iii) $S(A)$ will denote $\{(Ax, y) | x, y \text{ orthonormal}\}$. A theorem of Marcus and Robinson [5] states that $S(A)$ is a closed disk centered at 0 in the complex plane. We will use the notation $\rho(A)$ for the radius of $S(A)$.

The following lemma is an immediate consequence of definitions (ii) and (iii).

LEMMA: Let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$. Then

- (i) $S(\alpha A + \beta I_n) = |\alpha| S(A)$
- (ii) $W(\alpha A + \beta I_n) = \alpha W(A) + \beta$.

We are now in a position to state the following:

THEOREM: If A is normal, then $\rho(A)$ is the radius of the smallest closed disc containing $W(A)$.

PROOF: By the lemma, there is no loss of generality in assuming that the smallest closed disk containing $W(A)$ is the unit circle. Since A is normal this implies that the Hilbert norm of A is 1, and by Cauchy-Schwarz we have

$$\max_{x, y \text{ orthonormal}} |(Ax, y)| \leq \max_{\|x\|=1} \|Ax\| = 1.$$

Hence $\rho(A) \leq 1$, and to complete the proof we need only exhibit an orthonormal pair x, y for which $|(Ax, y)| = 1$. Since $W(A)$ is closed and convex, and the unit disk is the (unique) smallest disk containing $W(A)$, we must have at least one of the following holding:

- (i) There exist extreme points λ_1, λ_2 of $W(A)$ such that $\overline{\lambda_1 \lambda_2}$ is a diameter of the unit disk.
- (ii) There exist extreme points $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$ of $W(A)$ such that the triangle $\Delta(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$ is an acute triangle inscribed in the unit circle.

Since A is normal, these extreme points of $W(A)$ are eigenvalues of A . If (i) holds, then we have eigenvalues $\lambda_1, -\lambda_1$ of A with $|\lambda_1| = 1$. Since A is normal there exists an orthonormal pair of eigenvectors u, v corresponding to $\lambda_1, -\lambda_1$ respectively. The pair

$$x = \frac{u+v}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad y = \frac{u-v}{\sqrt{2}}$$

is orthonormal, and we calculate that

$$|(Ax, y)| = \frac{1}{2} |\lambda_1 - (-\lambda_1)| = 1,$$

and the proof is finished in this case.

If case (ii) holds, let u, v, w be a set of orthonormal eigenvectors corresponding to $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$ respectively. Also, let a, b, c be the unique positive numbers which satisfy

$$a + b + c = 1$$

$$a\lambda_1 + b\lambda_2 + c\lambda_3 = 0.$$

Then, let

$$x = \sqrt{a}u + \sqrt{b}v + \sqrt{c}w.$$

$$y = \sqrt{a}\lambda_1u + \sqrt{b}\lambda_2v + \sqrt{c}\lambda_3w.$$

Again, trivial calculations yield that x, y is an orthonormal pair, and that $(Ax, y) = 1$.

COROLLARY 1: If $W(A)$ is a line segment with endpoints λ_1, λ_n , then $\rho(A) = \frac{1}{2} |\lambda_1 - \lambda_n|$.

PROOF: If $W(A)$ is a line segment, then A is essentially Hermitian and we may apply the theorem.

COROLLARY 2: Let A be a normal matrix with eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$.
Then

$$\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \rho(A) \leq \max_{i,j} \frac{|\lambda_i - \lambda_j|}{2} \leq \rho(A).$$

PROOF: This follows from the theorem and the geometric fact that if a non-obtuse triangle with longest side s is inscribed in a circle of radius 1, then $\sqrt{3} \leq s \leq 2$.

In light of the theorem it is of interest to be able to compute the radius of the smallest circle containing a triangle Δ with sides of length a , b , and c . For non-obtuse triangles we may use the following proposition. The proof, which is omitted, uses the formula for $\cos(\alpha + \beta)$ and the law of cosines.

PROPOSITION 1: Let the triangle Δ have sides of length a , b , c . Then the radius of the circle circumscribed about Δ is

$$\frac{abc}{\sqrt{2E_2(a^2, b^2, c^2) - (a^4 + b^4 + c^4)}},$$

where E_2 denotes the second elementary symmetric function.

The theorem may be restated as follows: "For A normal,

$$\rho(A) = \min_{\alpha} \|A - \alpha I_n\| = \min_{\alpha} \max_{\|x\|=1} \|Ax - \alpha x\|."$$

The question of whether this result could hold in general is put in a somewhat different perspective by the following proposition.

PROPOSITION 2: For any A ,

$$\rho(A) = \max_{\|x\|=1} \min_{\alpha} \|Ax - \alpha x\|.$$

PROOF:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(A) &= \max_{x, y \text{ o.n.}} |(Ax, y)| \\ &= \max_{\|x\|=1} \max_{\substack{\|y\|=1 \\ (x, y)=0}} |(Ax, y)| \\ &= \max_{\|x\|=1} \|Ax - (Ax, x)x\| \\ &= \max_{\|x\|=1} \min_{\alpha} \|Ax - \alpha x\|. \end{aligned}$$

Certainly we have

$$\max_{\|x\|=1} \min_{\alpha} \|Ax - \alpha x\| \leq \min_{\alpha} \max_{\|x\|=1} \|Ax - \alpha x\|,$$

and the question of whether equality holds remains open.

Finally it should be noted that the theorem is false in general, even for convexoid A (A is convexoid if $W(A) = \mathcal{H}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$), as the following matrix shows. Let

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1+i & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1-i & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1+i & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1-i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Then the radius of the smallest circle containing $W(A)$ is $\sqrt{2}$, while $\rho(A) = \|A\| = 2$.

3. References

- [1] Parker, W. V., The characteristic roots of matrices, *Duke Math. J.* **12** (1945), 519-526.
- [2] Parker, W. V., Characteristic roots and field of values of a matrix, *Amer. Math. Soc. Bull.* **57** (1957), 103-108.
- [3] Goldberg, M., Tadmor, E., Zwas, G., The numerical radius and spectral matrices, *Linear and Multilinear Algebra* **2** (1975), 317-326.
- [4] Mirsky, L., Inequalities for normal and hermitian matrices, *Duke Math. J.* **14** (1957), 591-599.
- [5] Marcus, M., Robinson, H., Bilinear functionals on the Grassmannian manifold, *Linear and Multilinear Algebra* **3** (1975), 215-225.

(Paper 81B 1 & 2-460)