

The Complex Structured Singular Value  
Part 8 - Relating  $\mu$  and  $\inf_{D \in \mathbf{D}} \bar{\sigma}(D^{\frac{1}{2}} M D^{-\frac{1}{2}})$   
based on paper by A.Pacard and J.Doyle  
Marta Pietrzyk  
Będlewo, June 2014

We want to characterize the case when

$$\bar{\sigma}(M) = \inf_{D \in \mathbf{D}} \bar{\sigma}(D^{\frac{1}{2}} M D^{-\frac{1}{2}})$$

Let  $M \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  and let take its singular value decomposition

$$M = \sigma_1 U V^* + U_2 \Sigma_2 V_2^*,$$

where  $\sigma_1$  is the maximum singular value of  $M$  with multiplicity  $r$ ,  $U, V \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times r}$ ,  $U_2, V_2 \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times (n-r)}$ ,  $U^* U = V^* V = I_r$ ,  $U_2^* U_2 = V_2^* V_2 = I_{n-r}$ ,  $U^* U_2 = 0$ ,  $V^* V_2 = 0$  and  $\Sigma_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-r) \times (n-r)}$  is nonnegative and diagonal.

Let define

$$\mathbf{Z} := \{D - \tilde{D} : D, \tilde{D} \in \mathbf{D}\}.$$

Elements of  $\mathbf{Z}$  are of the form

$$\text{diag}[Z_1, \dots, Z_S, z_{S+1} I_{m_1}, \dots, z_{S+F-1} I_{m_{F-1}}, 0_{m_F}],$$

where for  $i \leq S$ ,  $Z_i = Z_i^* \in \mathbb{C}^{r_i \times r_i}$ , and for  $j \leq F-1$ ,  $z_{S+j} \in \mathbb{R}$ .

Let partition  $U$  and  $V$  compatibly with  $\Delta$  as

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} A_1 \\ \vdots \\ A_S \\ E_1 \\ \vdots \\ E_F \end{bmatrix}, V = \begin{bmatrix} B_1 \\ \vdots \\ B_S \\ H_1 \\ \vdots \\ H_F \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $A_i, B_i \in \mathbb{C}^{r_i \times r}$ ,  $E_i, H_i \in \mathbb{C}^{m_i \times r}$ .

Let define  $\nabla_M \subset \mathbf{Z}$  by

$$\nabla_M := \{\text{diag}[P_1^\eta, \dots, P_S^\eta, p_{S+1}^\eta I_{m_1}, \dots, p_{S+F-1}^\eta I_{m_{F-1}}, 0_{m_F}] : \eta \in \mathbb{C}^r, \|\eta\| = 1\},$$

where

$$P_i^\eta := A_i \eta \eta^* A_i^* - B_i \eta \eta^* B_i^*,$$

$$p_{S+j}^\eta := \eta^* (E_j^* E_j - H_j^* H_j) \eta.$$

**THEOREM 1.**  $\bar{\sigma}(M) = \inf_{D \in \mathbf{D}} \bar{\sigma}(D^{\frac{1}{2}} M D^{-\frac{1}{2}})$  if and only if  $0 \in \text{co}(\nabla_M)$ .

**THEOREM 2.** The following conditions are equivalent

- (1)  $0 \in \nabla_M$ ;
- (2) there exists  $\eta \in \mathbb{C}^r$ ,  $\|\eta\| = 1$  and  $Q \in \mathbf{Q}$  such that  $QU\eta = V\eta$ ;
- (3) there exists  $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^n$ ,  $\|\xi\| = 1$  and  $Q \in \mathbf{Q}$  such that  $QU\xi = \sigma_1 \xi$ ;
- (4)  $\sigma_1 = \bar{\sigma}(M) = \mu_\delta(M)$ .

DOWÓD. (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) If  $0 \in \nabla_M$ , for some  $\eta \in \mathbb{C}^r$ ,  $\|\eta\| = 1$  we have

$$(*) A_i \eta \eta^* A_i^* - B_i \eta \eta^* B_i^* = 0, i \leq S$$

$$(**) \eta^* (E_j^* E_j - H_j^* H_j) \eta = 0, j \leq F - 1.$$

Let denote  $A_i \eta = X = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_{r_i} \end{bmatrix}$  and  $B_i \eta = Y = \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ \vdots \\ y_{r_i} \end{bmatrix}$ . Using this notation, (\*) has

the following form  $XX^* = YY^*$ ,  $i \leq S$ . Thus  $|x_i|^2 = |y_i|^2$  for  $i \leq S$  and  $x_l \bar{x}_k = y_l \bar{y}_k$  for  $l, k \leq S$ . We may assume that  $x_1 \neq 0$ . Then  $x_k = \frac{\bar{y}_1}{\bar{x}_1} y_k$ , so for  $k \leq S$  there is a phase  $e^{k\theta_j}$  such that  $e^{k\theta_j} A_k \eta = B_k \eta$ .

(\*\*) means that for  $j \leq F - 1$ ,

$$\langle \eta, E_j^* E_j \eta \rangle = \langle \eta, H_j^* H_j \eta \rangle,$$

thus

$$\langle E_j \eta, E_j \eta \rangle = \langle H_j \eta, H_j \eta \rangle$$

and that is equivalent to  $\|E_j\| = \|H_j\|$ . So there exists a unitary matrix  $Q_j$  such that  $Q_j E_j \eta = H_j \eta$ . Finally, since  $\|U\eta\| = \|V\eta\|$  we must have  $\|E_F \eta\| = \|H_F \eta\|$ . This gives a unitary matrix  $Q_F$  such that  $Q_F E_F \eta = H_F \eta$ . Arranging the phases and  $Q_S$  in a block diagonal matrix gives (2).

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) Very similar to the proof (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2).

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3) Since  $M = \sigma_1 U V^* + U_2 \Sigma_2 V_2^*$ , we have  $Q M V \eta = \sigma_1 Q U \eta = \sigma_1 V \eta$ .  $\xi = V \eta$  satisfies (3).

(3)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) Since  $M = \sigma_1 U V^* + U_2 \Sigma_2 V_2^*$ ,  $Q M = \sigma_1 Q U V^* + Q U_2 \Sigma_2 V_2^*$ . Let denote  $U_2 = [U \ U_1]$ ,  $V_2 = [V \ V_1]$ ,  $\Sigma = \text{diag}[\sigma_1 I_r, \Sigma_2]$  and  $\tilde{\eta} := V_2^* \xi$ . Then  $U_2^* M = \Sigma V_2^*$ . From (3),  $\|M \xi\| = \sigma_1$ . Thus  $\sigma_1^2 = \|U_2^* M \xi\|^2 = \|\Sigma V_2^* \xi\|^2 = \|\Sigma \tilde{\eta}\|^2 = \sigma_1^2 |\eta_1|^2 + \dots + \sigma_n^2 |\eta_n|^2 \leq \sigma_1^2 \|\tilde{\eta}\|^2 = \sigma_1^2$ . This means that for every  $j$ ,  $\sigma_j = \sigma_1$  or  $\eta_j = 0$ . Thus  $\tilde{\eta} = [\eta \ 0]$  for some  $\eta \in \mathbb{C}^r$ . This implies  $V \eta = \xi$ . Then we have

$$Q U \eta = Q U V^* \xi = \frac{1}{\sigma_1} Q M \xi = \xi = V \eta.$$

(3)  $\Rightarrow$  (4)  $Q M \xi = \sigma_1 \xi$  implies that

$$\sigma_1 \geq \mu_\Delta(M) = \max_{Q \in \mathbf{Q}} \rho(QM) \geq \rho(QM) \geq \sigma_1.$$

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3) Since

$$\max_{Q \in \mathbf{Q}} \rho(QM) = m u_\Delta(M) = \sigma_1,$$

$\sigma_1$  is an eigenvalue of  $Q M$ , which gives (3). □

DEFINITION 1. We say that a block structure is  $\mu$ -simple if for all  $W \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ ,  $0 \in \text{co}(\nabla_W)$  implies  $0 \in \nabla_W$ .

THEOREM 3. Let block structure  $\Delta$  be  $\mu$ -simple. Then, for every  $M \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ ,

$$\mu_\Delta(M) = \inf_{D \in \mathbf{D}} \bar{\sigma}(D^{\frac{1}{2}} M D^{-\frac{1}{2}}).$$

Dowód. Let  $\beta = \inf_{D \in \mathbf{D}} \bar{\sigma}(D^{\frac{1}{2}}MD^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ . Let  $D_k$  be a sequence in  $\mathbf{D}$  such that

$$\bar{\sigma}(D^{\frac{1}{2}}MD^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \longrightarrow \beta, \text{ as } k \longrightarrow \infty.$$

Denote  $W_k = D^{\frac{1}{2}}MD^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ . Since the sequence  $W_k$  is bounded, it has a convergent subsequence with limit  $W$ . By continuity of  $\bar{\sigma}$  and  $\mu_{\Delta}$ ,  $\bar{\sigma}(w) = \beta$  and  $\mu_{Delta}(M) = \mu_{Delta}(W)$ . We claim that  $0 \in co(\nabla_W)$ . Suppose to the contrary that  $0 \notin co(\nabla_W)$ . Then, by Theorem 1., there exist  $D \in \mathbf{D}$  and  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $\bar{\sigma}(D^{\frac{1}{2}}WD^{-\frac{1}{2}}) = \beta - \epsilon$ . Choose  $k$  so that

$$\|W_k - W\| < \frac{\epsilon}{2\|D^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\|D^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|}.$$

Then

$$\|D^{\frac{1}{2}}(W_k - W)D^{-\frac{1}{2}}\| < \frac{\epsilon}{2},$$

which yields

$$\|D^{\frac{1}{2}}W_kD^{-\frac{1}{2}}\| < \beta - \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

This contradicts that  $\beta$  was the infimum, thus indeed  $0 \in co(\nabla_W)$ . But  $\Delta$  is  $\mu$ -simple, so  $0 \in \nabla_W$  and by Theorem 2.  $\bar{\sigma}(W) = \mu_{\delta}(W)$ . Finally we get  $\mu_{\delta}(M) = \beta$  as desired.

□