

# Joint $k$ -numerical ranges of operators

Jor-Ting Chan, Chi-Kwong Li, Yiu-Tung Poon

## Abstract

Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a complex Hilbert space and  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  the algebra of all bounded linear operators on  $\mathcal{H}$ . For a positive integer  $k$  less than the dimension of  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_m) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$ , the joint  $k$ -numerical range  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is the set of  $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) \in \mathbb{C}^m$  such that  $\alpha_i = \sum_{j=1}^k \langle A_i x_j, x_j \rangle$  for an orthonormal set  $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$  in  $\mathcal{H}$ . The geometrical properties of  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  and their relations with the algebraic properties of  $\{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$  are investigated in this paper. First, conditions for  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  to be convex are studied, and some results for finite dimensional operators are extended to the infinite dimensional case. An example of  $\mathbf{A}$  is constructed such that  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is not convex, but  $W_r(\mathbf{A})$  is convex for all positive integer  $r$  not equal to  $k$ . Second, descriptions are given for the closure of  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  and the closure of  $\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})$  in terms of the joint essential numerical range of  $\mathbf{A}$  for infinite dimensional operators  $A_1, \dots, A_m$ . These lead to characterizations of  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  or  $\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})$  to be closed. Moreover, it is shown that  $\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is closed whenever  $W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A})$  or  $\mathbf{conv} W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A})$  is. These results are used to study the connection between the geometric properties of  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  and algebraic properties of  $A_1, \dots, A_m$ . For instance,  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is a polyhedral set, i.e., the convex hull of a finite set, if and only if  $A_1, \dots, A_k$  have a common reducing subspace  $\mathbf{V}$  of finite dimension such that the compression of  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  on the subspace  $\mathbf{V}$  are diagonal operators  $D_1, \dots, D_m$  and  $W_k(\mathbf{A}) = W_k(D_1, \dots, D_m)$ . Characterization is also given to  $\mathbf{A}$  such that the closure of  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is polyhedral. For finite rank operators the following two conditions are equivalent: (1)  $\{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$  is a commuting family of normal operators. (2)  $W_k(A_1, \dots, A_m)$  is polyhedral for every positive integer  $k$  less than  $\dim \mathcal{H}$ . However, the two conditions are not equivalent for compact operators. Characterizations are given for compact operators  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  satisfying (1) and (2), respectively. Results are also obtained for general non-compact operators. Open problems and future research topics are presented.

Keywords: Commuting normal operators,  $k$ -numerical range, essential numerical range.

AMS Classification: 47A12, 15A60.

## 1 Introduction

Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a complex Hilbert space equipped with the inner product  $\langle x, y \rangle$ , and let  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  be the algebra of all bounded linear operators on  $\mathcal{H}$ . If  $\dim \mathcal{H} = n$  is finite, we identify  $\mathcal{H}$  with  $\mathbb{C}^n$ ,  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  with  $M_n$ , and  $\langle x, y \rangle = y^*x$ . The numerical range of  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  is defined as

$$W(A) = \{\langle Ax, x \rangle : x \text{ is a unit vector in } \mathcal{H}\},$$

which is a useful tool for studying operators and matrices; see [15, 16] and its references. For instance, for  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ ,  $W(A) = \{\mu\}$  if and only if  $A = \mu I$ ;  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  if and only if  $A = A^*$ ; if  $A$  is

normal then  $\mathbf{cl}(W(A)) = \mathbf{conv} \sigma(A)$ , the convex hull of the spectrum  $\sigma(A)$  of  $A$ . Here and in the sequel, we shall write  $\mathbf{cl} X$  and  $\mathbf{conv} X$  to denote the closure and convex hull of  $X$  respectively, for any subset  $X$  of a normed space.

Motivated by theory and applications, researchers consider different generalizations of the classical numerical range. For instance, for a positive integer  $k \leq \dim \mathcal{H}$ , Halmos [15] introduced the  $k$ -numerical range of  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  defined by

$$W_k(A) = \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^k \langle Ax_j, x_j \rangle : \{x_1, \dots, x_k\} \subseteq \mathcal{H} \text{ is an orthonormal set} \right\}.$$

Evidently,  $W_1(A)$  reduces to the classical numerical range  $W(A)$ . Researchers have extended the results on  $W(A)$  to  $W_k(A)$ , and showed that  $W_k(A)$  can provide additional information about the operator; see later sections, [2, 4, 5, 6, 15, 16, 21, 24, 26, 27] and their references. For instance, it is known that if  $A \in M_n$  is normal, then  $W(A)$  is a polygon equal to  $\mathbf{conv} \sigma(A)$ . But the converse is not true. Nevertheless, it was shown in [24] that  $A \in M_n$  is normal if and only if  $W_k(A)$  is a polygon for some  $k$  with  $|n - k/2| \leq 1$ .

In the study of multiple operators  $A_1, \dots, A_m$ , researchers consider the joint  $k$ -numerical range of  $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_m) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$  defined and denoted by

$$W_k(\mathbf{A}) = \left\{ \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^k \langle A_1 x_\ell, x_\ell \rangle, \dots, \sum_{\ell=1}^k \langle A_m x_\ell, x_\ell \rangle \right) : \{x_1, \dots, x_k\} \subseteq \mathcal{H} \text{ is an orthonormal set} \right\}$$

for  $k \leq \dim \mathcal{H}$ . When  $k = 1$ , we use the notation  $W(\mathbf{A})$ . For simplicity, we often write  $\langle \mathbf{A}x, x \rangle = (\langle A_1 x, x \rangle, \dots, \langle A_m x, x \rangle)$  for  $x \in \mathcal{H}$ . Then elements of  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  are of the form  $\sum_{\ell=1}^k \langle \mathbf{A}x_\ell, x_\ell \rangle$  for an orthonormal set  $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$  in  $\mathcal{H}$ . One may see some background for  $W(\mathbf{A})$  in [2, 4, 6, 21, 23, 17, 29] and their references. Useful information about  $\{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$  can be obtained from  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$ . For instance, it was shown in [23] that  $\{A_1, \dots, A_m\} \subseteq M_n$  is a commuting family of normal matrices if and only if there is  $k$  with  $|n/2 - k| \leq 1$  such that  $W_k(A_1, \dots, A_m)$  is a polyhedral set, i.e., the convex hull of a finite set in  $\mathbb{C}^m$ .

In this paper, we obtain additional results connecting the geometrical properties of  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  and the algebraic properties of  $\{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$  as well as showing that direct extensions of some results on  $W_k(A)$  for a single operator  $A$  to  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is impossible.

We begin by collecting some basic results in Section 2. In Section 3, we consider the convexity of  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$ . The celebrated Toeplitz-Hausdorff theorem asserts that  $W(A)$  is always convex. Berger extended the result to  $W_k(A)$  for any  $k \leq \dim \mathcal{H}$ ; for example, see [15]. However, for  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$ ,  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  may not be convex if  $m \geq 2$ . We will extend some results concerning the convexity of  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  for finite dimensional operators to the infinite dimensional case. An example of  $\mathbf{A}$  is constructed such that  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is not convex, but  $W_r(\mathbf{A})$  is convex for all positive integer  $r$  not equal to  $k$ . In particular, this shows that there are no implications between the convexity of  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  and

$W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A})$ . This is quite different from the other properties considered in the subsequent sections, namely, special properties of  $W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A})$  often induces similar properties on  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$ .

For infinite dimensional operator,  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  may not be closed. In Section 4, we determine the closure of  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  in terms of the joint essential numerical range of  $\mathbf{A}$  defined by

$$W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A}) = \cap \{\text{cl}(W_1(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{K})) : \mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})^m\}, \quad (1.1)$$

where  $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$  is the set of all compact operators in  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ . These lead to characterizations of  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  or  $\text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A})$  to be closed. Moreover, it is shown that  $\text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is closed whenever  $W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A})$  or  $\text{conv } W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A})$  is. The results extend those in [8, 19], and will be useful in the subsequent sections, which concern the interplay between the geometric properties of  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  and algebraic properties of  $A_1, \dots, A_m$ .

In section 5, we show that  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is a polyhedral set in  $\mathbb{C}^m$  if and only if  $A_1, \dots, A_k$  have a common reducing subspace  $\mathbf{V}$  of finite dimension such that the compression of  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  on the subspace  $\mathbf{V}$  are diagonal operators  $D_1, \dots, D_m$  and  $W_k(\mathbf{A}) = W_k(D_1, \dots, D_m)$ . This extends the result in [23]. Characterization is also given to  $\mathbf{A}$  such that the closure of  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is polyhedral.

For finite rank operators, one can show that the following two conditions are equivalent:

- (a)  $\{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$  is a commuting family of normal operators.
- (b)  $W_k(A_1, \dots, A_m)$  is polyhedral for every positive integer  $k < \dim \mathcal{H}$ .

This result is no longer true for compact operators. In Section 6, characterizations are given for compact operators  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  satisfying (a) and (b), respectively. Additional results concerning conditions (a) and (b) are obtained for general non-compact operators in Section 7.

In Section 8, we describe some related results, open problems and additional research topics.

In our discussion, we will use  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}), \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}), \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$  to denote the set of bounded linear operators, the set of self-adjoint operators, and the set of compact operators acting on  $\mathcal{H}$ . Let  $\mathcal{H}_1$  and  $\mathcal{H}_2$  be Hilbert spaces. A linear map  $X : \mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_2$  is an isometry if  $X^*X = I_{\mathcal{H}_1}$ . Denote by  $M_{m,n}$  and  $M_n$  the set of  $m \times n$  matrices and the set of  $n \times n$  matrices. We will use the convention that  $W_0(\mathbf{A}) = \{(0, \dots, 0)\}$ . Suppose  $\dim \mathcal{H} = n$  is finite. Then  $W_n(\mathbf{A}) = \{(\text{tr } A_1, \dots, \text{tr } A_m)\}$ , and  $W_k(\mathbf{A}) = (\text{tr } A_1, \dots, \text{tr } A_m) - W_{n-k}(\mathbf{A})$ . Unless it is specified otherwise, we always assume that  $k$  is a positive integer such that  $1 \leq k < \dim \mathcal{H}$  when  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is considered. We note that  $(a_1, \dots, a_m) \in W_k(\mathbf{A})$  if and only if any of the following holds.

- There is a rank  $k$  orthogonal projection  $P$  such that  $(a_1, \dots, a_m) = (\text{tr}(A_1P), \dots, \text{tr}(A_mP))$ .
- There is an isometry  $X : \mathbb{C}^k \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  such that  $(a_1, \dots, a_m) = (\text{tr}(X^*A_1X), \dots, \text{tr}(X^*A_mX))$ .

Clearly,  $X : \mathbb{C}^k \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is an isometry such that  $X^*AX = B$  if and only if there is an orthonormal basis  $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\} \cup \mathcal{B}_2$  of  $\mathcal{H}$  such that  $B = (\langle Ax_j, x_i \rangle)$ . In such a case, we will say that there is a unitary  $U \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  such that  $U^*AU = \begin{pmatrix} B & \star \\ \star & \star \end{pmatrix}$ . With this notation, we see that  $(a_1, \dots, a_m) \in W_k(\mathbf{A})$  if and only if the following holds.

- There is a unitary  $U \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  such that  $U^*A_jU = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{A}_j & \star \\ \star & \star \end{pmatrix}$  with  $\tilde{A}_j \in M_k$  such that  $\text{tr } \tilde{A}_j = a_j$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ .

In our study, it will be shown that if  $(a_1, \dots, a_m) \in W_k(\mathbf{A})$  has some special properties, then there will be a unitary  $U \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  such that  $U^*A_jU = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{A}_j & 0 \\ 0 & \star \end{pmatrix}$ . Thus,  $\text{span}\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$  is a reducing subspace for  $A_j$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ . In such a case, we will say that  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  have a common reducing space  $\mathcal{H}_1$  of  $\mathcal{H}$  of dimension  $k$  and  $X : \mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is an isometry such that  $(a_1, \dots, a_m) = (\text{tr}(X^*A_1X), \dots, \text{tr}(X^*A_mX))$ .

## 2 Basic properties

**Proposition 2.1.** *Let  $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_m) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$ . Then  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is bounded. If  $\dim \mathcal{H}$  is finite, then  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is closed.*

For any positive integer  $\ell$ , let  $I_\ell$  and  $0_\ell$  be the  $\ell \times \ell$  identity and zero matrices respectively.

**Example 2.2.** Let  $A = I_k \oplus 0_k \oplus \text{diag}(1, 1/2, 1/3, \dots)$ . It is easy to check that  $W_k(A) = [0, k]$  is closed, but  $W_{k+1}(A) = (0, k+1]$  is not.

In Section 4, we will consider the condition for  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  to be closed for  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$ .

Let  $A = H + iG \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ , where  $H = (A + A^*)/2$  and  $G = (A - A^*)/(2i)$  are self-adjoint. Then  $W(A) = W(H, G)$  if we identified  $\mathbb{C} = \mathbb{R}^2$ . If  $X : \mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is an isometry, then  $W(X^*AX) \subseteq W(A)$ . If  $U$  is unitary, then  $W(A) = W(U^*AU)$ . These properties have direct extensions to  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$ .

**Proposition 2.3.** *Let  $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_m) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$ . Suppose  $A_j = H_j + iG_j$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ , where  $H_j, G_j$  are self-adjoint. If we identify  $\mathbb{C}^m$  with  $\mathbb{R}^{2m}$ , then  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  can be identified with*

$$W_k(H_1, G_1, \dots, H_m, G_m) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{2m}.$$

By the above proposition, to understand the geometrical properties and topological properties of  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$ , one can focus on self-adjoint operators  $A_1, \dots, A_m$ .

**Proposition 2.4.** *Let  $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_m) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$ . Suppose  $X : \mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is an isometry, where  $\dim \mathcal{H}_1 \geq k$ . Then*

$$W_k(X^*A_1X, \dots, X^*A_mX) \subseteq W_k(A_1, \dots, A_m).$$

*In particular, if  $U \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  is unitary, then*

$$W_k(U^*A_1U, \dots, U^*A_mU) = W_k(\mathbf{A}).$$

Suppose  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ . Then  $W_k(\alpha A) = \alpha W_k(A)$  and  $W_k(A + \beta I) = W_k(A) + k\beta$ . We have the following extension.

**Proposition 2.5.** Let  $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_m) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$ .

(a) If  $(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m) \in \mathbb{C}^m$ , then  $W_k(A_1 + \mu_1 I, \dots, A_m + \mu_m I)$  equals

$$W_k(\mathbf{A}) + k(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m) = \{(a_1, \dots, a_m) + k(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m) : (a_1, \dots, a_m) \in W_k(\mathbf{A})\}.$$

(b) If  $T = (T_{ij})$  be an  $m \times p$  matrix, and  $(B_1, \dots, B_p) = (A_1, \dots, A_m)(T_{ij} I_{\mathcal{H}})$ , then

$$W_k(B_1, \dots, B_p) = \{(a_1, \dots, a_m)T : (a_1, \dots, a_m) \in W_k(\mathbf{A})\}.$$

(c) There are  $C_1, \dots, C_q \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^q$  such that  $\{C_1, \dots, C_q, I\}$  is linearly independent,  $R = (R_{ij}) \in M_{q,m}$  and  $(s_1, \dots, s_m) \in \mathbb{C}^m$  such that  $(A_1, \dots, A_m) = (C_1, \dots, C_q)(R_{ij} I_{\mathcal{H}}) + (s_1 I_{\mathcal{H}}, \dots, s_m I_{\mathcal{H}})$  and

$$W_k(\mathbf{A}) = \{(c_1, \dots, c_q)R : (c_1, \dots, c_q) \in W_k(C_1, \dots, C_q)\} + k(s_1, \dots, s_m).$$

Several remarks are in order.

- Proposition 2.5 asserts that if one applies a translation  $\mathbf{A} \mapsto \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{A} + (\mu_1 I, \dots, \mu_m I)$ , then  $W(\mathbf{B})$  is obtained from  $W(\mathbf{A})$  by the translation  $(a_1, \dots, a_m) \mapsto (a_1, \dots, a_m) + k(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m)$ ; if one applies a linear transform  $\mathbf{A} \mapsto \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{A}(T_{ij} I_{\mathcal{H}})$ , then  $W(\mathbf{B})$  is obtained from  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  by the same transformation  $(a_1, \dots, a_m) \mapsto (a_1, \dots, a_m)T$ . Hence, the study of the geometric properties  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  can be reduced to the study of  $W_k(C_1, \dots, C_q)$ , where  $\{C_1, \dots, C_q, I\}$  is a linearly independent set. These transformations will be used frequently in our subsequent discussion.
- In Proposition 2.5, suppose  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  are self-adjoint. Then  $W(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ . If  $(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$  in (a), then  $A_j + \mu_j I$  is self-adjoint for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ , and  $W_k(A_1 + \mu_1 I, \dots, A_m + \mu_m I) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ . If  $T$  is real in (b), then  $B_1, \dots, B_m$  are self-adjoint, and  $W_k(B_1, \dots, B_p) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ . In (c) the operators  $C_1, \dots, C_q$  can be chosen to be self-adjoint. The vector  $(s_1, \dots, s_m)$  and the matrix  $R$  can be chosen to be real.
- One can determine the minimum value  $q$  in Proposition 2.5 (c) in terms of the affine dimension of  $W(\mathbf{A})$ , which is defined as the minimum dimension of a real linear subspace  $\mathbf{V}$  of  $\mathbb{C}^m \cong \mathbb{R}^{2m}$  such that for a fixed row vectors  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}} \in \mathbb{C}^m$ ,

$$W_k(A_1, \dots, A_m) = W_k(H_1, G_1, \dots, H_m, G_m) \subseteq \mathbf{V} + \tilde{\mathbf{v}} = \{\mathbf{v} + \tilde{\mathbf{v}} : \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}\}.$$

In [20] (4.5), it was shown that for  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ , if  $\mathcal{H}$  is an orthogonal sum of the subspaces  $\mathcal{H}_1$  and  $\mathcal{H}_2$  and  $A = B \oplus C \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1) \oplus \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_2)$ , then

$$W_k(A) = \mathbf{conv} \cup \{W_{k_1}(B) + W_{k_2}(C) : 0 \leq k_j \leq \dim \mathcal{H}_j \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \text{ and } k_1 + k_2 = k\}. \quad (2.1)$$

We have the following generalization. The proof for general operators can be adapted from that of the finite dimensional case in [23, Theorem 4.4].

**Proposition 2.6.** Let  $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_m) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$  with  $A_j = A_{j1} \oplus \dots \oplus A_{jr} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1) \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_r)$ , where  $\mathcal{H}$  is an orthogonal sum of the subspaces  $\mathcal{H}_1, \dots, \mathcal{H}_r$ . Then

$$W_k(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq \mathbf{conv} \mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A}),$$

where

$$\mathcal{W} = \cup \{W_{k_1}(\mathbf{A}_1) + \dots + W_{k_r}(\mathbf{A}_r) : k_1 + \dots + k_r = k, 0 \leq k_j \leq \dim \mathcal{H}_j \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, r\}$$

with  $\mathbf{A}_\ell = (A_{1\ell}, \dots, A_{m\ell})$  for  $\ell = 1, \dots, r$ , and as a convention,  $W_0(\mathbf{B}) = \{(0, \dots, 0)\}$  for all  $\mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$ . In particular, the three sets are equal if  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is convex.

It is known and not hard to see that for  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ ,

$$\frac{1}{k+1}W_{k+1}(A) \subseteq \frac{1}{k}W_k(A). \quad (2.2)$$

We have the following extension in the absence of convexity.

**Proposition 2.7.** Let  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$ . Then

$$\frac{1}{k+1}W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq \frac{1}{k}\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A}) \quad \text{so that} \quad \frac{1}{k+1}\mathbf{conv} W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq \frac{1}{k}\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A}).$$

### 3 Convexity

To study the convexity of  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$ , we can focus on  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$  by Proposition 2.3. If  $\dim \mathcal{H} = 2$ , one can apply Proposition 2.5 (c) to show that  $W(A_1, \dots, A_m)$  is determined by  $W(\tilde{C}_1, \dots, \tilde{C}_q)$  with  $q \leq 3$  and  $\tilde{C}_1, \dots, \tilde{C}_q \in \{X, Y, Z\}$  with

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad Y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad Z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.1)$$

The matrices  $X, Y, Z$  are known as the Pauli's matrices in physics literature. It is known and easy to check that

$$W(X) = W(Y) = W(Z) = [-1, 1],$$

$$W(X, Y) = W(Y, Z) = W(Z, X) = \{(a, b) : a, b \in \mathbb{R}, a^2 + b^2 \leq 1\}$$

is the unit disk, and

$$W(X, Y, Z) = \{(a, b, c) : a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}, a^2 + b^2 + c^2 = 1\} \quad (3.2)$$

is the unit sphere. The above observations were used to study  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  for  $\mathbf{A} \in M_n^m$  in [21], where  $M_n^m$  is the set of all  $m$ -tuples of  $n \times n$  matrices. One can extend the results therein to infinite dimensional operators.

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_m) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$ .*

- (a) *Suppose  $\dim \mathcal{H} = 2$ . Then  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is convex if and only if the span of  $\{I, A_1, \dots, A_m\}$  has dimension at most 3.*
- (b) *Suppose  $\dim \mathcal{H} \geq 3$ . If the span of  $\{I, A_1, \dots, A_m\}$  has dimension at most 4, then  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is convex. In particular,  $W_k(A_1, A_2, A_3)$  is always convex.*
- (c) *Suppose  $\dim \mathcal{H} \geq 3$ . If the span of  $\{I, A_1, \dots, A_m\}$  has dimension at least 4, then there is  $A_0 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  such that  $W_k(A_0, A_1, \dots, A_m)$  is not convex.*

*Proof.* (a) In such a case,  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is an affine transform of  $W_k(C_1, C_2)$  for two  $C_1, C_2 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  by Proposition 2.5 (c), which is always convex.

(b) Suppose  $\dim \mathcal{H} \geq 3$ . If the span of  $\{I, A_1, \dots, A_m\}$  has dimension at most 4, then as in (a),  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is an affine transform of  $W_k(C_1, \dots, C_q)$  with  $q \leq 3$ . By the result in [1] (see also [2]),  $W_k(C_1, \dots, C_q)$  is convex, and so is  $W(\mathbf{A})$ .

(c) Suppose  $\text{span}\{I, A_1, \dots, A_m\}$  has dimension 4 or larger. By [21, Theorem 4.1], there is an isometry  $X : \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  such that  $\text{span}\{I_2, X^*A_1X, \dots, X^*A_mX\}$  has dimension 4. By renumbering the subscripts, we may assume that  $\{I_2, X^*A_1X, \dots, X^*A_3X\}$  is linear independent. Let  $P \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  be a rank  $k-1$  orthogonal projection such that  $A_0 = 2P + XX^* \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  is a rank  $k+1$  orthogonal projection. We claim that  $W_k(A_0, A_1, A_2, A_3)$  is not convex. To see this, consider the set

$$\mathcal{S} = W_k(A_0, \dots, A_3) \cap \{(2k-1, a_1, a_2, a_3) : a_1, a_2, a_3 \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

If  $(2k-1, a_1, a_2, a_3) \in \mathcal{S}$ , then there is an orthogonal set  $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$  such that  $\sum_{j=1}^k \langle A_0 x_j, x_j \rangle = 2k-1$ . Suppose the compression of  $A_0$  onto  $\text{span}\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$  is  $B_0 \in M_k$ , which has eigenvalues  $\beta_1 \geq \dots \geq \beta_k$ . Since  $A_0$  is unitarily similar to  $2I_{k-1} \oplus I_2 \oplus 0$ . By interlacing inequalities, we see that  $2 \geq \beta_j$  for  $j = 1, \dots, k-1$  and  $1 \geq \beta_k$ . Now,  $\sum_{j=1}^k \beta_j = 2k-1$ . So,  $\text{span}\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$  must contain all the eigenvectors of  $A_0$  corresponding to 2, and an eigenvector corresponding to the eigenvalue 1. Note that if  $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$  and  $\{y_1, \dots, y_k\}$  are orthonormal sets with the same linear span, then  $\sum_{j=1}^k \langle Ax_j, x_j \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^k \langle Ay_j, y_j \rangle$ , we may simply assume that  $x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}$  are eigenvectors of  $A_0$  corresponding to the eigenvalue 2, and  $x_k$  lies in the range space of  $XX^*$ . If  $(b_0, b_1, b_2, b_3) = (\text{tr}(PA_0), \text{tr}(PA_1), \text{tr}(PA_2), \text{tr}(PA_3))$ , then

$$(a_0, a_1, a_2, a_3) = (b_0, \dots, b_3) + (\langle A_0 x_k, x_k \rangle, \dots, \langle A_3 x_k, x_k \rangle).$$

Thus,

$$\mathcal{S} = (b_0, \dots, b_3) + W(I_2, X^*A_1X, X^*A_2X, X^*A_3X),$$

where  $W(X^*IX, X^*A_1X, X^*A_2X, X^*A_3X) = W(I_2, X^*A_1X, X^*A_2X, X^*A_3X)$  is not convex by (a). Hence,  $\mathcal{S}$  is not convex, and neither is  $W_k(A_0, \dots, A_3)$ .  $\square$

The next result extends Theorems 2.2 and 2.4 in [21]. We use 0 to denote the zero operator on some Hilbert space when confusion is unlikely.

**Proposition 3.2.** Let  $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_m) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$ . Suppose

(1)  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  consists of operators of the form  $aI + \begin{pmatrix} 0_k & R_1 \\ R_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ , or

(2)  $\dim \mathcal{H} \geq 2k$  and  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  consists of operators of the form  $R \oplus \alpha I$  with  $R \in M_k$ ,  $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ .

If there is a unitary  $U \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  such that  $U^* A_j U \in \mathcal{S}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ , then  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is convex.

*Proof.* We may consider  $W_k(H_1, G_1, \dots, H_m, G_m)$  with  $A_j = H_j + iG_j$  with  $H_j, G_j \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ . So, we may assume that  $A_1, \dots, A_m \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ .

If  $\mathcal{S}$  satisfies (1), we may assume that  $A_j = a_j I + \begin{pmatrix} 0_k & R_j \\ R_j^* & 0_{n-k} \end{pmatrix}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m$  so that  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m) \in W_k(\mathbf{A})$  if and only if there is a rank  $k$  orthogonal projection

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} Q_{11} & Q_{12} \\ Q_{21} & Q_{22} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \quad \text{with } Q_{11} \in M_k \quad (3.3)$$

satisfying  $\mu_j = \text{tr}(A_j Q) = k a_j + 2\text{Re}(\text{tr}(R_j Q_{21}))$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ . So,  $W_k(\mathbf{A}) = k(a_1, \dots, a_m) + T(\mathcal{Q})$ , where  $T$  is the real linear map  $X \mapsto 2(\text{Re}(\text{tr}(R_1 X)), \dots, \text{Re}(\text{tr}(R_m X)))$  and  $\mathcal{Q}$  is the set of the  $Q_{21}$  appeared as an  $(2, 1)$  block of a rank  $k$  orthogonal projection  $Q$  in the form (3.3). Note that  $Q_{21} \in \mathcal{Q}$  if and only if  $\|Q_{21}\| \leq 1$ . This follows from the fact that  $Q_{21} \in \mathcal{Q}$  if and only if there is a unitary  $U = U_1 \oplus U_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  with  $U_1 \in M_k$  and a nonnegative diagonal matrix  $D = \text{diag}(d_1, \dots, d_k)$  with  $1 \geq d_1 \geq \dots \geq d_k \geq 0$  such that

$$U^* Q U = \begin{pmatrix} D & \sqrt{D - D^2} & 0 \\ \sqrt{D - D^2} & I - D & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus,  $T(\mathcal{Q})$  is convex.

The proof for  $\mathcal{S}$  satisfying (2) is similar. Assume  $A_j = a_j I + (P_j \oplus 0)$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ . Then

$$W_k(\mathbf{A}) = k(a_1, \dots, a_m) + \tilde{T}(\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}),$$

where  $\tilde{T}$  is the real linear map  $X \mapsto (\text{tr}(P_1 X), \dots, \text{tr}(P_m X))$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$  is the set of  $Q_{11}$  appeared as the  $(1, 1)$  block of a rank  $k$  orthogonal projection of the form (3.3) so that  $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$  is the convex set of positive semidefinite contractions in  $M_k$ .  $\square$

For any nonnegative integer  $k$ , we present an example  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^4$  such that  $W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A})$  is not convex but  $W_r(\mathbf{A})$  is convex for all other positive integers  $r$  not larger than  $\dim \mathcal{H}$ . In particular, it shows that there are no implications between the convexity of  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  and  $W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A})$  for  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$  for  $m \geq 4$ .

**Example 3.3.** Let  $k$  be a nonnegative integer. Suppose  $\dim \mathcal{H} = N \geq 2(k+1)$ , where  $N$  could be infinity. Let  $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4)$  with  $A_1 = X \oplus 0_{N-2}$ ,  $A_2 = Y \oplus 0_{N-2}$ ,  $A_3 = Z \oplus 0_{N-2}$ , and



$A_4 = 0_2 \oplus I_k \oplus -I_{N-k-2}$ , where  $X, Y, Z$  are the Pauli's matrices defined in (3.1). Then  $W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A})$  is not convex.

(1) If  $r \leq k$ , then  $W_r(\mathbf{A})$  is convex and equals

$$\{(a, b, c, d) \in \mathbb{R}^4 : \xi = \sqrt{a^2 + b^2 + c^2} \leq 1, \xi + |d| \leq r\}.$$

(2) If  $k + 1 < r$  and  $2r$  is not larger than  $N$ , then  $W_r(\mathbf{A})$  is convex and equals

$$\{(a, b, c, d) \in \mathbb{R}^4 : \xi = \sqrt{a^2 + b^2 + c^2} \leq 1, \text{ and } -r \leq d - \xi \leq 2k - r + 1\}.$$

(3) If  $N$  is finite and  $r \geq N/2$ , then  $W_r(\mathbf{A}) = (0, 0, 0, 2k + 2 - N) - W_{N-r}(\mathbf{A})$  so that  $W_r(\mathbf{A})$  is convex except for  $r = N - k - 1$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\{e_1, \dots, e_{2k+2}\} \cup \mathcal{B}_0$  be an orthonormal basis for  $\mathcal{H}$  so that  $A_1, \dots, A_4$  have operator matrices of the said form.

First, we show that  $W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A})$  is not convex. Consider the set  $W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A}) \cap \{(a, b, c, k) : a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}\}$ . If  $(a, b, c, k) = \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \langle \mathbf{A}x_j, x_j \rangle$ , then  $k = \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \langle A_4 x_j, x_j \rangle$ . We may assume that  $(x_1, \dots, x_k) = (e_3, \dots, e_{k+2})$  and  $x_{k+1} \in \text{span}\{e_1, e_2\}$ . Then

$$W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A}) \cap \{(a, b, c, k) : a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}\} = \{(a, b, c, k) : a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}, a^2 + b^2 + c^2 = 1\}.$$

which is not convex. So,  $W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A})$  is not convex.

(1) We show that  $W_r(\mathbf{A})$  is convex if  $r \leq k$ . We prove the case when  $r = k$ , and the other cases are similar. By Proposition 2.6, it suffices to show that  $W_k(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{conv} \mathcal{W}$ , where

$$\mathcal{W} = \cup_{0 \leq \ell \leq k} (W_\ell(\mathbf{B}) + W_{k-\ell}(\mathbf{C})) \quad \text{with } \mathbf{B} = (X, Y, Z, 0_2) \text{ and } \mathbf{C} = (0, 0, 0, I_k \oplus -I_{N-k-2}).$$

If  $k = 0$ , then  $W_0(\mathbf{A}) = \{(0, 0, 0, 0)\}$  is convex. Suppose  $k = 1$ . Then

$$\mathcal{W} = W(X, Y, Z, 0_2) \cup W(0, 0, 0, [1] \oplus -I_{N-3})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{conv} \mathcal{W} &= \{t(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, 0) + (1-t)(0, 0, 0, \xi_4) \in \mathbb{R}^4 : \xi_1^2 + \xi_2^2 + \xi_3^2 = 1, |\xi_4| \leq 1\} \\ &= \{(a, b, c, d) \in \mathbb{R}^4 : \sqrt{a^2 + b^2 + c^2} + |d| \leq 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose  $k > 1$ . Then

$$W_2(\mathbf{B}) + W_{k-2}(\mathbf{C}) = \{(0, 0, 0, d_3) : d_3 \in [2 - k, k - 2]\} \text{ is a subset of}$$

$$W_0(\mathbf{B}) + W_k(\mathbf{C}) = \{(0, 0, 0, d_1) : d_1 \in [-k, k]\}, \text{ and}$$

$$W_1(\mathbf{B}) + W_{k-1}(\mathbf{C}) = \{(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, d_2) \in \mathbb{R}^4 : \xi_1^2 + \xi_2^2 + \xi_3^2 = 1, d_2 \in [1 - k, k - 1]\}.$$

As a result,  $\mathbf{conv} \mathcal{W}$  consists of elements  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (1-t)(0, 0, 0, d_1) + t(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, d_2)$  with

$$t \in [0, 1], d_1 \in [-k, k], d_2 \in [1 - k, k - 1], (\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \text{ is a unit vector,}$$

i.e.,  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (t\xi_1, t\xi_2, t\xi_3, d_t)$  such that  $(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$  is a unit vector and

$$d_t \in [(1-t)(-k) + t(1-k), (1-t)k + t(k-1)] = [-k+t, k-t].$$

So,

$$\mathbf{conv} \mathcal{W} = \{(a, b, c, d) \in \mathbb{R}^4 : a^2 + b^2 + c^2 \leq 1, \sqrt{a^2 + b^2 + c^2} + |d| \leq k\}.$$

We will show that  $\mathbf{conv} \mathcal{W} \subseteq W_k(\mathbf{A})$  in the following. For any  $(a, b, c, d) \in \mathbf{conv} \mathcal{W}$  with  $\sqrt{a^2 + b^2 + c^2} = t$ , let  $v \in \text{span}\{e_1, e_2\}$  be a unit vector such that  $t(v^*A_1v, v^*A_2v, v^*A_3v) = (a, b, c)$ . For  $s \in [0, \pi/2]$ , let  $Q_s$  be the rank  $k$  orthogonal projections with range space spanned by

$$\sqrt{t}v + \sqrt{1-t}(\cos s e_3 + \sin s e_{k+3}) \quad \text{and} \quad \cos s e_j + \sin s e_{k+j} \quad \text{for } j = 4, \dots, k+2.$$

Here if  $k = 1$ , we only have the first vector in the above list. Then

$$(\text{tr}(A_1Q_s), \dots, \text{tr}(A_4Q_s)) = (a, b, c, d_s) \in W_k(\mathbf{A}),$$

with  $d_s = ((1-t) + (k-1))\cos^2 s - ((1-t) + (k-1))\sin^2 s = (k-t)\cos 2s \in W_k(\mathbf{A})$  covering all values  $d$  with  $\sqrt{a^2 + b^2 + c^2} + |d| \leq k$ . Thus,  $W_k(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{conv} \mathcal{W}$  is convex.

(2) Suppose  $r > k+1$  and  $2r$  is not larger than  $N$ . By Proposition 3.2 (2) with  $A_4$  replaced by  $A_4 + I_N$ , and  $k$  replaced by  $r \geq k+2$ , we see that  $W_r(\mathbf{A})$  is convex. By Proposition 2.6,  $W_r(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{conv} \mathcal{W}$  with

$$\mathcal{W} = \cup_{0 \leq \ell \leq k} (W_\ell(\mathbf{B}) + W_{k-\ell}(\mathbf{C})) \quad \text{with } \mathbf{B} = (X, Y, Z, 0_2) \text{ and } \mathbf{C} = (0, 0, 0, I_k \oplus -I_{N-k-2}).$$

If  $k = 1$ , then

$$\mathcal{W} = W(X, Y, Z, 0) \cup W(0, 0, 0, [1] \oplus -I_{N-3})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{conv} \mathcal{W} &= \{t(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, 0) + (1-t)(0, 0, 0, \xi_4) \in \mathbb{R}^4 : \xi_1^2 + \xi_2^2 + \xi_3^2 = 1, |\xi_4| \leq 1\} \\ &= \{(a, b, c, d) \in \mathbb{R}^4 : \sqrt{a^2 + b^2 + c^2} + |d| \leq 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose  $k > 1$ . Then

$$W_2(\mathbf{B}) \oplus W_{r-2}(\mathbf{C}) = \{(0, 0, 0, d_3) : d_3 \in [-r+2, k - (r-k-2)]\},$$

$$W_0(\mathbf{B}) + W_r(\mathbf{C}) = \{(0, 0, 0, d_1) : d_1 \in [-r, k - (r-k)]\}, \text{ and}$$

$$W_1(\mathbf{B}) + W_{r-1}(\mathbf{C}) = \{(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, d_2) : \xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, d_2 \in \mathbb{R},$$

$$\xi_1^2 + \xi_2^2 + \xi_3^2 = 1, d_2 \in [-r+1, k - (r-k-1)]\}.$$

One readily gets the description of  $\mathbf{conv} \mathcal{W} = W_r(\mathbf{A})$ .

(3) The assertion follows from the fact that  $W_\ell(\mathbf{A}) = (\text{tr} A_1, \dots, \text{tr} A_4) - W_{N-\ell}(\mathbf{A})$  if  $N$  is finite.  $\square$

Note that when  $k = 1$ , the matrices  $A_1, \dots, A_4 \in M_4$  in Example 3.3 have the lowest dimension satisfying  $W(\mathbf{A})$  is convex and  $W_2(\mathbf{A})$  is not. For  $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_4) \in M_3^4$ , we have  $W(\mathbf{A}) = (\text{tr} A_1, \dots, \text{tr} A_4) - W_2(\mathbf{A})$  so that  $W(\mathbf{A})$  is convex if and only if  $W_2(\mathbf{A})$  is convex.

## 4 Closure of $W_k(\mathbf{A})$ and $\text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A})$

In the proof of Theorem 3.1, the set  $\mathcal{S}$  is the intersection of  $W(A_0, \dots, A_3)$  and a support plane  $\{(2k-1, a_1, a_2, a_3) : a_1, a_2, a_3 \in \mathbb{R}\}$  of  $\text{conv } W_k(A_0, \dots, A_3)$ . In the verification of Example 3.3, the set  $W(A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4) \cap \{(a, b, c, k) : a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}\}$  is the intersection of  $W(A_0, \dots, A_3)$  and a support plane of  $\text{conv } W_k(A_1, \dots, A_4)$ . In general, we can use the spectrum  $\sigma(X)$  of a self-adjoint operator  $X$  to help describe the support planes of  $\text{conv cl}(W_k(\mathbf{A})) = \text{cl}(\text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A}))$ , and then express  $\text{cl}(\text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A}))$  as the intersection of the half spaces. This result is useful for the study of the geometric feature of  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  and  $\text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A})$ .

To present the construction, we need some notations and a lemma. Denote by  $\sigma(X)$  the spectrum of  $X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ , For any  $A \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  and  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , define

$$\lambda_\ell(A) = \sup\{\|A - X\| : X \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \text{ has rank } \ell - 1\}.$$

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $A \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  where  $\dim \mathcal{H}$  is infinite. Then  $A$  is unitarily similar to  $A_1 \oplus A_2$ , for a diagonal operator  $A_1$  and one of  $A_1$  or  $A_2$  may be void, with one of the following holds:*

- (a) *For some finite  $\ell \geq 1$ ,  $A_1 = \text{diag}(\lambda_1(A), \dots, \lambda_\ell(A))$ ,  $\mu = \max \sigma(A_2) \leq \lambda_\ell(A_1)$  and  $\mu$  is not an eigenvalue of  $A_2$ ; hence  $\lambda_p(A) = \mu$  for all  $p > \ell$ .*
- (b) *The operator  $A_1 = \text{diag}(\lambda_1(A), \lambda_2(A), \dots)$  has infinite dimensional range and*

$$\mu = \max \sigma(A_2) \leq \inf\{\lambda_\ell(A_1) : \ell \geq 1\}.$$

One readily sees that for  $A \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ ,

$$\text{cl}(W_k(A)) = \left[ -\sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(-A), \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(A) \right].$$

For  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$ , we have the following.

**Proposition 4.2.** *Let  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  with  $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_m) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$ . Suppose  $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_m)$  is a real unit vector and  $A_{\mathbf{u}} = \sum_{j=1}^m u_j A_j$ . Then*

$$P_{\mathbf{u}}(k, \mathbf{A}) = \left\{ (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m) : \sum_{j=1}^m u_j \zeta_j \leq \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(A_{\mathbf{u}}) \right\} \quad (4.1)$$

*is a half space containing  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  and the boundary of  $P_{\mathbf{u}}(k, \mathbf{A})$*

$$\partial P_{\mathbf{u}}(k, \mathbf{A}) = \left\{ (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m) : \sum_{j=1}^m u_j \zeta_j = \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(A_{\mathbf{u}}) \right\}, \quad (4.2)$$

*is a support plane of  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$ . Consequently,*

$$\text{cl}(\text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A})) = \cap \{P_{\mathbf{u}}(k, \mathbf{A}) : \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^m \text{ a unit vector}\}.$$

In [8], we showed that  $\mathbf{cl}(W_k(A)) = \mathbf{conv} \mathcal{S}$ , where

$$\mathcal{S} = \bigcup_{0 \leq \ell \leq k} (W_\ell(A) + (k - \ell)W_{\text{ess}}(A)).$$

Equivalently, the extreme points of  $\mathbf{cl}(W_k(A))$  lie in  $\mathcal{S}$ . As a result,  $W_k(A)$  is closed if and only if  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq W_k(A)$ . Here, recall that we use the convention that  $W_0(A) = \{0\}$ . This extends the results of Lancaster [19] for a single operator  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ . Moreover, we showed in [8] that if  $W_{k+1}(A)$  is closed, then so is  $W_k(A)$ . The proofs therein depend on the convexity of  $W(A)$ .

In the following, we show that the results can be extended to  $\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})$  for  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$ , and the results will be useful for studying the polyhedral properties of  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  and  $\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})$  in later sections. We need the concept of the joint essential numerical of  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$  defined in (1.1). There are several equivalent characterizations of  $W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A})$ , see [22]. For our purpose, we will use the fact that a point  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m) \in \mathbb{C}^m$  belongs to  $W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A})$  if and only if there is a weakly null sequence of unit vectors (or, a sequence of orthonormal vectors)  $\{v_k\}$  in  $\mathcal{H}$  such that  $\langle A_j v_k, v_k \rangle \rightarrow \mu_j$  for  $1 \leq j \leq m$ . We will continue to use the convention that  $W_0(\mathbf{A}) = \{(0, \dots, 0)\}$  for any  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$ .

**Theorem 4.3.** *Let  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$ . Consider the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_1$ , which may be inseparable, with an orthonormal basis  $\{e_\boldsymbol{\mu} : \boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m) \in W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A})\}$ . Let  $(D_1, \dots, D_m)$  be the  $m$ -tuple of diagonal operators acting on  $\mathcal{H}_1$  by  $D_j e_\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mu_j e_\boldsymbol{\mu}$ , and  $\mathcal{H}_0 = \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{H}_1$  be the orthogonal sum of  $k$  copies of  $\mathcal{H}_1$ . Suppose  $\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = (\tilde{A}_1, \dots, \tilde{A}_m) \in (\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \oplus \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_0))^m$  with  $\tilde{A}_j = A_j \oplus (I_k \otimes D_j)$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ ,*

- For  $\ell = 1, \dots, k$ ,  $W_\ell(I_k \otimes D_1, \dots, I_k \otimes D_m) = \ell W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A})$ .
- The equality  $\mathbf{cl} W_k(\mathbf{A}) = W_k(\tilde{\mathbf{A}})$  holds.
- The set  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is closed if and only if  $W_k(\mathbf{A}) = W_k(\tilde{\mathbf{A}})$ , equivalently, every element in  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  has the form  $(\text{tr}(A_1 P), \dots, \text{tr}(A_m P)) + (k - (\text{tr} P))\boldsymbol{\xi}$  for a positive semidefinite contraction  $P$  with rank at most  $k$  and  $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A})$ .

*Proof.* By [22, Theorem 3.1],  $W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A})$  is convex and closed. Thus,  $W(D_1, \dots, D_m) = W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A})$ . Let  $\mathbf{D} = (I_k \otimes D_1, \dots, I_k \otimes D_m)$ . Then  $W(\mathbf{D}) = W(D_1, \dots, D_m)$ . Suppose  $\ell \in \{2, \dots, k\}$ . If  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in W(D_1, \dots, D_m)$ , then  $\ell \boldsymbol{\mu} \in \ell W(D_1, \dots, D_m) \subseteq W_\ell(\mathbf{D})$ . If  $\{x_1, \dots, x_\ell\}$  is an orthonormal set, and  $(a_1, \dots, a_m) \in W_\ell(\mathbf{D})$  with  $a_j = \sum_{i=1}^\ell \langle (I_k \otimes D_j)x_i, x_i \rangle$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ . Since

$$(\langle (I_k \otimes D_1)x_i, x_i \rangle, \dots, \langle (I_k \otimes D_m)x_i, x_i \rangle) \in W(\mathbf{D}) = W(D_1, \dots, D_m),$$

it follows that

$$(a_1, \dots, a_m) \in \{\boldsymbol{\xi}_1 + \dots + \boldsymbol{\xi}_\ell : \boldsymbol{\xi}_i \in W(D_1, \dots, D_m), i = 1, \dots, \ell\} = \ell W(D_1, \dots, D_m),$$

where the set equality holds because  $W(D_1, \dots, D_m)$  is closed and convex.

For the second assertion, we first show that  $\mathbf{cl}(W_k(\mathbf{A})) \subseteq W_k(\tilde{\mathbf{A}})$ . Let  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbf{cl}(W_k(\mathbf{A}))$ . There are orthonormal sets of vectors  $\{v_1^{(n)}, \dots, v_k^{(n)}\}$  in  $\mathcal{H}$  such that  $\sum_{j=1}^k \langle \mathbf{A}v_j^{(n)}, v_j^{(n)} \rangle \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\mu}$ . As the closed unit ball of  $\mathcal{H}$  is weakly sequentially compact, by passing to subsequences, we may assume that for each  $j$ ,  $v_j^{(n)} \rightarrow v_j$  weakly and  $\langle \mathbf{A}v_j^{(n)}, v_j^{(n)} \rangle \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\mu}_j$ , for  $v_j$  in the closed unit ball of  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_j \in \mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$ . There are three possibilities (see the proof of [7, Theorem 2.1] for detail),

(i)  $v_j = 0$  and  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_j \in W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A})$ ,

(ii)  $\|v_j\| = 1$ ,  $v_j^{(n)} \rightarrow v_j$  strongly and  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_j = \langle \mathbf{A}v_j, v_j \rangle \in W(\mathbf{A})$ ,

(iii)  $0 < \|v_j\| < 1$  and  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_j = \|v_j\|^2 \langle \mathbf{A} \frac{v_j}{\|v_j\|}, \frac{v_j}{\|v_j\|} \rangle + (1 - \|v_j\|^2) \boldsymbol{\xi}_j$  for some  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_j \in W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A})$  so that  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_j$  is a convex combination of points in  $W(\mathbf{A})$  and  $W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A})$ .

Taking any  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_j \in W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A})$  in (ii), we can always write  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_j = \langle \mathbf{A}v_j, v_j \rangle + (1 - \|v_j\|^2) \boldsymbol{\xi}_j$ . As in [20], consider the positive semidefinite operator  $H = \sum_{j=1}^k \langle \cdot, v_j \rangle v_j$ . Let  $d_1 \geq d_2 \geq \dots \geq d_k \geq 0$  be the  $k$  largest eigenvalues of  $H$ , and  $\{u_1, \dots, u_k\}$  an orthonormal set of corresponding eigenvectors. Then for each  $j$ ,

$$d_j = \langle H u_j, u_j \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^k |\langle u_j, v_i \rangle|^2 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^k |\langle u_j, v_i^{(n)} \rangle|^2 \leq \|u_j\|^2 = 1,$$

and  $d_1 + \dots + d_k = \text{tr}H = \sum_{j=1}^k \|v_j\|^2$ . We also have

$$\sum_{j=1}^k (1 - \|v_j\|^2) \boldsymbol{\xi}_j = (k - \sum_{j=1}^k d_j) \left( \frac{1 - \|v_1\|^2}{k - d_1 - \dots - d_k} \boldsymbol{\xi}_1 + \dots + \frac{1 - \|v_k\|^2}{k - d_1 - \dots - d_k} \boldsymbol{\xi}_k \right).$$

Since  $W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A})$  is convex, see for example [22],  $\sum_{j=1}^k (1 - \|v_j\|^2) \boldsymbol{\xi}_j = (k - \sum_{j=1}^k d_j) \boldsymbol{\xi}$  for some  $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A})$ . Thus,  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\text{tr}(A_1 H), \dots, \text{tr}(A_m H)) + (k - \text{tr}H) \boldsymbol{\xi}$ . Applying a suitable unitary similarity transformation to  $H, A_1, \dots, A_m$ , we may assume that  $H = T \oplus 0$  with  $T = \text{diag}(d_1, \dots, d_k)$ . Applying a suitable unitary similarity transform to  $\mathbf{D}$ , we may assume that the first  $k$  diagonal entries in  $\mathbf{D}$  are equal to  $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ . Let  $P = \begin{pmatrix} P_{11} & P_{12} \\ P_{21} & P_{22} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H}_0)$  be such that

$$P_{11} = T \oplus 0 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}), P_{22} = (I_k - T) \oplus 0 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_0) \text{ and } P_{12} = \sqrt{T - T^2} \oplus 0 = P_{21}^*.$$

Then  $P$  is a rank  $k$  orthogonal projection, and  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\text{tr}(\tilde{A}_1 P), \dots, \text{tr}(\tilde{A}_m P)) \in W_k(\tilde{\mathbf{A}})$ .

To prove the reverse inclusion, suppose  $P$  is a rank  $k$  orthogonal projection on  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H}_0)$  and  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\text{tr}(\tilde{A}_1 P), \dots, \text{tr}(\tilde{A}_m P)) \in W_k(\tilde{\mathbf{A}})$ . Let  $P = \begin{pmatrix} P_{11} & P_{12} \\ P_{21} & P_{22} \end{pmatrix}$  such that  $P_{11} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  and  $P_{22} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_0)$ . We will show that  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbf{cl}W_k(\mathbf{A})$ .

First, note that there is a unitary  $U = U_1 \oplus U_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H}_0)$  such that  $U_1^* P_{11} U_1 = T \oplus 0 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  with  $T = \text{diag}(d_1, \dots, d_k)$  and  $U_2^* P_{22} U_2 = (I - H) \oplus 0 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_0)$ . We may assume that  $U_1 =$

$I_{\mathcal{H}}, U_2 = I_{\mathcal{H}_0}$  by replacing  $X$  by  $U^*XU$  for all  $X \in \{P, \tilde{A}_1, \dots, \tilde{A}_m\}$ , where  $\tilde{A}_j = A_j \oplus \tilde{D}_j$ . Here note that  $\tilde{D}_j = U_2^*(I_k \otimes D_k)U_2$  is no longer of the form  $I_k \otimes D_j$ , for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ , but we still have  $W(\tilde{D}_1, \dots, \tilde{D}_m) = W(I_k \otimes D_1, \dots, I_k \otimes D_m) = W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A})$ . Suppose  $B_j$  is the leading  $k \times k$  submatrix of  $A_j$  and  $C_j$  is the leading  $k \times k$  submatrix of  $\tilde{D}_j$ . Then  $\mu_j = \text{tr}(B_j T) + \text{tr}(C_j(I_k - T))$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ . For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we can find a unitary  $V = I_k \oplus V_0 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  such that for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ ,

$$V^* A_j V = \begin{pmatrix} B_j & F_j & 0 \\ F_j^* & \star & \star \\ 0 & \star & \star \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $F_j$  is an  $k \times mk$  matrix because the  $(1, 2)$  block to  $A_j$  has rank

at most  $k$  for each  $j$ . Since the diagonal entries of  $(\tilde{D}_1, \dots, \tilde{D}_m)$  lies in  $W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A})$ , there is a unitary

$$W = I_{(m+1)k} \oplus W_0 \text{ such that for } j = 1, \dots, m, W^* V^* A_j V W = \begin{pmatrix} B_j & F_j & 0 \\ F_j^* & \star & \star \\ 0 & \star & L_j \end{pmatrix},$$

where the  $\ell_1$ -norm

between the vector of first  $k$  diagonal entries of  $L_j$  and those of  $C_j$  is bounded by  $\varepsilon$ . This can be

done because the  $m$ -tuples of diagonal entries of  $(C_1, \dots, C_m)$  lie in  $W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A})$ . Let  $\tilde{P} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{P}_{11} & \tilde{P}_{12} \\ \tilde{P}_{21} & \tilde{P}_{22} \end{pmatrix}$

with  $\tilde{P}_{11} = T \oplus 0_{mk}$ ,  $\tilde{P}_{22} = (I_k - T) \oplus 0$ , and  $\tilde{P}_{12} = \sqrt{T - T^2} \oplus 0 = \tilde{P}_{21}^*$ . Then

$$|\boldsymbol{\mu} - (\text{tr}(A_1 \tilde{P}), \dots, \text{tr}(A_m \tilde{P}))| = |(\text{tr}(\tilde{P}_{22}(C_1 \oplus 0 - L_1)), \dots, \text{tr}(\tilde{P}_{22}(C_m \oplus 0 - L_m)))| < \varepsilon.$$

So, the second assertion is valid.

For the third assertion, it is clear that  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is closed if and only if  $W_k(\mathbf{A}) = W_k(\tilde{\mathbf{A}})$  by the second assertion. Evidently, every element in  $W_k(\tilde{\mathbf{A}})$  has the form  $(\text{tr}(\tilde{A}_1 Q), \dots, \text{tr}(\tilde{A}_m Q))$  for a rank  $k$  orthogonal projection  $Q$ . We may assume that  $Q = \begin{pmatrix} X_1 X_1^* & X_1 X_2^* \\ X_2 X_1^* & X_2 X_2^* \end{pmatrix}$  where  $X_1 : \mathbb{C}^k \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  and  $X_2 : \mathbb{C}^k \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_0$  satisfy  $X_1^* X_1 + X_2^* X_2 = I_k$ . Then  $P = X_1 X_1^*$  is a positive semidefinite contraction in  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  with rank at most  $k$ . There is a unitary operator  $V \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_0)$  such that  $X_2 X_2^* = V F V^*$  with  $F = \text{diag}(f_1, \dots, f_k) \oplus 0$  such that  $\sum_{j=1}^k f_j = k - \text{tr} P$ . Since  $W(D_1, \dots, D_m) = W(I_k \otimes D_1, \dots, I_k \otimes D_m)$ , we see that

$$(\text{tr}((I_k \otimes D_1) X_2 X_2^*), \dots, \text{tr}((I_k \otimes D_m) X_2 X_2^*)) = \sum_{j=1}^k f_j \boldsymbol{\xi}_j$$

for some  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k \in W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A})$ . Now,  $W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A}) = W(D_1, \dots, D_m)$  is convex, it follows that

$$\sum_{j=1}^k f_j \boldsymbol{\xi}_j = \left( \sum_{j=1}^k f_j \right) \boldsymbol{\xi} = (k - \text{tr} P) \boldsymbol{\xi}$$

for some  $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A})$ . Thus,  $(\text{tr}(\tilde{A}_1 Q), \dots, \text{tr}(\tilde{A}_m Q))$  equals

$$(\text{tr}(A_1 P), \dots, \text{tr}(A_m P)) + (\text{tr}((I_k \otimes D_1) X_2 X_2^*), \dots, \text{tr}((I_k \otimes D_m) X_2 X_2^*)).$$

So, every element in  $W(\mathbf{A})$  has the asserted form.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.4.** Let  $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_m) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$ . Then

$$\mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})) = \mathbf{conv}(\mathbf{cl}(W_k(\mathbf{A}))) = \mathbf{conv} \mathcal{S},$$

where

$$\mathcal{S} = \cup_{0 \leq \ell \leq k} (W_\ell(\mathbf{A}) + (k - \ell)W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A})).$$

Consequently,  $\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is closed if and only if

$$W_\ell(\mathbf{A}) + (k - \ell)W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq \mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A}) \quad \text{for } \ell = 0, \dots, k - 1. \quad (4.3)$$

*Proof.* The equality  $\mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})) = \mathbf{conv}(\mathbf{cl}(W_k(\mathbf{A})))$  follows from the fact that  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is bounded in  $\mathbb{R}^m$  and Carathéodory's theorem.

For the second equality, we have  $\mathbf{conv}(\mathbf{cl}(W_k(\mathbf{A}))) = \mathbf{conv} W_k(\tilde{\mathbf{A}})$ , where  $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$  is the operator defined in Theorem 4.3. Using the construction there with  $\mathbf{D} = (D_1, \dots, D_m)$  and Proposition 2.6, we see that  $\mathbf{conv} W_k(\tilde{\mathbf{A}})$  is the convex hull of

$$\cup \{W_{r_1}(\mathbf{A}) + W_{r_2}(\mathbf{D}) + \dots + W_{r_{k+1}}(\mathbf{D}) : r_j \geq 0 \text{ for all } j \text{ and } r_1 + \dots + r_{k+1} = k\}.$$

As  $W(\mathbf{D}) = W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A})$  is convex, it is not hard to see that  $W_{r_2}(\mathbf{D}) + \dots + W_{r_{k+1}}(\mathbf{D}) = (k - r_1)W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A})$ . The result follows.  $\square$

If  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$  with  $m \leq 3$ , then  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is convex. In such a case,  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is closed if and only if  $W_\ell(\mathbf{A}) + (k - \ell)W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq W_k(\mathbf{A})$  for  $\ell = 0, \dots, k - 1$  by Theorem 4.4. Suppose  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$  with  $m > 3$ . If  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is closed, then  $\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is closed by Carathéodory's theorem. Hence (4.3) holds. However,  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  may not be closed even if  $\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is closed, as shown in Example 4.5, which is a modification of [22, Example 3.2]. In particular, Example 4.5 shows that there is  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})^4$  such that  $W(\mathbf{A})$  is not closed even if  $\mathbf{conv} W(\mathbf{A})$  is closed. It is interesting to note that for a single compact operator  $A \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$ ,  $W(A)$  is closed if and only if  $0 \in W(A)$  by Theorem 4.4 as  $W_{\text{ess}}(A) = \{0\}$ . For  $W(\mathbf{A})$  with  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})^m$ ,  $W(\mathbf{A})$  is closed if and only if  $W(\mathbf{A}) = W(\mathbf{A} \oplus (\mathbf{0}, \dots, \mathbf{0}))$  and  $\mathbf{conv} W(\mathbf{A})$  is closed if and only if  $\{(0, \dots, 0)\} \in W(\mathbf{A})$ .

**Example 4.5.** Let  $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_4)$  with  $A_1 = \text{diag}(1, 0, 1/3, 1/4, \dots)$ ,  $A_2 = \text{diag}(1, 0) \oplus 0$ ,

$$A_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \oplus 0 \quad \text{and} \quad A_4 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \oplus 0.$$

Then  $W(\mathbf{A})$  is not closed but  $\mathbf{conv} W(\mathbf{A})$  is closed.

*Proof.* Since  $W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A}) = \{(0, 0, 0, 0)\} \subseteq W(\mathbf{A})$ ,  $\mathbf{conv} W(\mathbf{A})$  is closed by Theorem 4.4. In [22] that it was shown that  $(1, 1, 0, 0)/2 \in W(\mathbf{A} \oplus (\mathbf{0}, \dots, \mathbf{0})) = \mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$ , but  $(1, 1, 0, 0)/2 \notin W(\mathbf{A})$ . Thus,  $W(\mathbf{A})$  is not closed.  $\square$

One may also wonder whether  $kW_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq W_k(\mathbf{A})$  alone would imply  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  or  $\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is closed. Example 4.5 shows that, unlike the single operator case,  $W(\mathbf{A})$  may not be closed even if  $W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq W(\mathbf{A})$ . This justifies our consideration of the convex hull  $\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})$ . Also, let

$A = 0_{k-2} \oplus \text{diag}(1, -1, -1/2, -1/3, \dots)$  with  $k \geq 2$ . Then  $kW_{\text{ess}}(A) = W_{\text{ess}}(A) = \{0\}$  and  $0 = \text{tr}(AP) \in W_k(A)$  if  $P = I_k \oplus 0$ . However,  $\sup W_k(A) = 1 \notin W_k(A)$  so that  $W_k(A) = \mathbf{conv} W_k(A)$  is not closed.

Note that there are no implication relations between the convexity of  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  and  $W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A})$  as shown in the last section. It is somewhat surprising that we have the following.

**Theorem 4.6.** *Let  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$ , and  $k$  be a positive integer. If  $m \leq 3$  and  $W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A})$  is closed, then so is  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$ . For  $m \geq 4$ , if  $\mathbf{conv} W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A})$  is closed (in particular, if  $W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A})$  is closed), then  $\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is closed.*

The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 4.6. Readers may skip the long technical proof and move to the next section directly.

*Proof of Theorem 4.6.* We only need to prove the second assertion for  $m \geq 1$ . The first assertion will then follow as  $W_\ell(\mathbf{A})$  is convex for any positive integer  $\ell$  if  $m \leq 3$ ; see [2].

To prove the second assertion, assume that  $\mathbf{conv} W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A})$  is closed. The set  $\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is closed if and only if every extreme point of  $\mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A}))$  lies inside  $\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})$ .

Let  $\boldsymbol{\nu} = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_m)$  be an extreme point of  $\mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A}))$ . By Theorem 4.4, there is  $r \in \{0, \dots, k\}$  and an orthonormal family  $\{z_1, \dots, z_r\} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$  such that

$$\boldsymbol{\nu} = \boldsymbol{\mu} + (k - r)\boldsymbol{\xi} \quad (4.4)$$

with

$$\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m) = \sum_{j=1}^r \langle \mathbf{A}z_j, z_j \rangle \in W_r(\mathbf{A}) \text{ and } \boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_m) \in W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A}).$$

We may assume that  $r$  is the **maximum number** in  $\{0, 1, \dots, k\}$  such that (4.4) holds.

If  $r = k$ , then  $\boldsymbol{\nu} \in W_k(\mathbf{A})$ , and we are done. So, assume that  $r < k$ . Then  $\boldsymbol{\nu} \notin W_k(\mathbf{A})$ . We will derive a contradiction by showing that  $\boldsymbol{\nu} \in W_k(\mathbf{A})$ .

Let  $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$  be a unit vector that such that

$$\partial P_{\mathbf{u}}(k, \mathbf{A}) = \left\{ (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m) : \sum_{j=1}^m u_j \zeta_j = \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(A_{\mathbf{u}}) \right\}$$

is a support plane of  $\mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A}))$  at  $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ . See Proposition 4.2. We can do the following.

**Reduction** *We may permute the entries of  $(u_1, \dots, u_m)$  and assume  $u_m \neq 0$ , and permute the components of  $(A_1, \dots, A_m)$  accordingly. Then replace  $(A_m, \nu_m)$  by  $(\sum_{j=1}^m u_j A_j, \sum_{j=1}^m u_j \nu_j)$ . After the replacement  $\boldsymbol{\nu}$  remains to be an extreme point of the set  $\mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A}))$ . Moreover,  $\boldsymbol{\nu} \in W_k(\mathbf{A})$  in the original problem if and only if the same conclusion holds for the modified  $\boldsymbol{\nu}$  and  $\mathbf{A}$ .*

After the replacement, we have  $(u_1, \dots, u_m) = (0, \dots, 0, 1)$  and

$$\mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})) \cap \partial P_{\mathbf{u}}(k, \mathbf{A}) = \left\{ (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m) \in \mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})) : \zeta_m = \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(A_m) \right\}.$$



It follows that

$$\langle A_m z_j, z_j \rangle \geq \xi_m \in W_{\text{ess}}(A_m) \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, r.$$

In particular,  $\lambda_1(A_m), \dots, \lambda_r(A_m)$  are the eigenvalues of the compression of  $A_m$  onto  $\text{span}\{z_1, \dots, z_r\}$ .

Applying a unitary transform, we may assume that

$$A_m z_j = \lambda_j(A_m) z_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, r,$$

and

$$\lambda_{r+1}(A_m) = \dots = \lambda_k(A_m) = \xi_m = \max W_{\text{ess}}(A_m).$$

Let  $r_1 = 0$  if  $\lambda_1(A_m) = \xi_m$ , and  $r_1 = \max\{j : \lambda_j(A_m) > \xi_m\}$  otherwise. The vectors  $z_1, \dots, z_{r_1}$  are uniquely determined up to a unitary transform. If  $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$  is an orthonormal family and  $\sum_{j=1}^k \langle \mathbf{A}x_j, x_j \rangle \in W_k(\mathbf{A}) \cap \partial P_{\mathbf{u}}(k, A)$ , we may assume that  $\langle A_m x_1, x_1 \rangle \geq \dots \geq \langle A_m x_k, x_k \rangle$ , and then further assume that  $(x_1, \dots, x_{r_1}) = (z_1, \dots, z_{r_1})$ . Similarly, we have  $W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq P_{\mathbf{u}}(k+1, \mathbf{A})$  with

$$P_{\mathbf{u}}(k+1, \mathbf{A}) = \left\{ (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m : \zeta_m \leq \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \lambda_j(A_m) \right\},$$

and every element in  $W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A}) \cap \partial P_{\mathbf{u}}(k+1, A)$  has the form  $\sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \langle \mathbf{A}x_j, x_j \rangle$ , where  $\{x_1, \dots, x_{k+1}\} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$  is an orthonormal family with  $(x_1, \dots, x_{r_1}) = (z_1, \dots, z_{r_1})$  and  $A_m x_j = \xi_m x_j$  for  $j > r_1$ .

Consider

$$\boldsymbol{\nu} + \boldsymbol{\xi} \in \text{cl}(\text{conv } W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A})) \cap \partial P_{\mathbf{u}}(k+1, \mathbf{A}) = \text{conv } W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A}) \cap \partial P_{\mathbf{u}}(k+1, \mathbf{A}).$$

It is a convex combination of finitely many extreme points of  $\text{conv } W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A})$  in  $\partial P_{\mathbf{u}}(k+1, \mathbf{A})$ . Since  $W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A})$  is closed, the extreme points of  $\text{conv } W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A})$  have the form  $\sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \langle \mathbf{A}x_j, x_j \rangle$  with  $\sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \langle A_m x_j, x_j \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \lambda_j(A_m)$ . We may assume that  $(x_1, \dots, x_{r_1}) = (z_1, \dots, z_{r_1})$ , and  $x_j \in N(A_m - \xi_m I)$ , the null space  $A_m - \xi_m I$ , for  $j = r_1 + 1, \dots, k+1$ . Hence,  $N(A_m - \xi_m I)$  has dimension at least  $k+1 - r_1$ .

Let  $\mathcal{H}_1 = \text{span}(\{z_1, \dots, z_{r_1}\} \cup N(A_m - \xi_m I))$  and  $\mathbf{B} = (B_1, \dots, B_m)$ , where  $B_j$  is the compression of  $A_j$  onto  $\mathcal{H}_1$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ .

By the previous argument, for  $\ell = k, k+1$ , every element in  $W_{\ell}(\mathbf{A}) \cap \partial P_{\mathbf{u}}(\ell, \mathbf{A})$  has the form  $\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \langle \mathbf{A}x_j, x_j \rangle$  with  $(x_1, \dots, x_{r_1}) = (z_1, \dots, z_{r_1})$  and  $x_j \in N(A_m - \xi_m I)$  for  $j > r_1$ . As a result, for  $\ell = k, k+1$ ,  $P_{\mathbf{u}}(\ell, \mathbf{B}) = P_{\mathbf{u}}(\ell, \mathbf{A})$ ,

$$W_{\ell}(\mathbf{B}) \cap \partial P_{\mathbf{u}}(\ell, \mathbf{B}) = W_{\ell}(\mathbf{A}) \cap \partial P_{\mathbf{u}}(\ell, \mathbf{A}),$$

and

$$\text{conv } W_{\ell}(\mathbf{B}) \cap \partial P_{\mathbf{u}}(\ell, \mathbf{B}) = \text{conv } W_{\ell}(\mathbf{A}) \cap \partial P_{\mathbf{u}}(\ell, \mathbf{A}). \quad (4.5)$$

If  $\boldsymbol{\nu} \in \text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{B})$ , then  $\boldsymbol{\nu} \in \text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A})$ . Since  $\boldsymbol{\nu}$  is an extreme point of  $\text{cl}(\text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A}))$ , it is also an extreme point of  $\text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A})$ . Then we get  $\boldsymbol{\nu} \in W_k(\mathbf{A})$ , which contradicts our assumption.

So,

$$\boldsymbol{\nu} \notin \text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{B}) \cap P_{\mathbf{u}}(k, \mathbf{B}) \subseteq \{(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{m-1}, \nu_m) : \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{m-1} \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

Since  $\boldsymbol{\nu}$  is an extreme point of  $\mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})) \cap \partial P_{\mathbf{u}}(k, \mathbf{A})$ , it follows that  $(\nu_1, \dots, \nu_{m-1})$  is an extreme point of the convex set

$$\{(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{m-1}) : (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{m-1}, \nu_m) \in \mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})) \cap \partial P_{\mathbf{u}}(k, \mathbf{A})\}.$$

So, there is a unit vector  $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_{m-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$  such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m-1} v_j \nu_j \geq \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} v_j \zeta_j$$

for any  $(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{m-1}, \nu_m) \in \mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})) \cap \partial P_{\mathbf{u}}(k, \mathbf{A})$ , which is the same as  $\mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{B})) \cap \partial P_{\mathbf{u}}(k, \mathbf{B})$  by (4.5). We may apply the **Reduction** argument to  $(B_1, \dots, B_{m-1})$  and assume that  $\mathbf{v} = (0, \dots, 0, 1)$ . As a result, for any orthonormal family  $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_1$  with  $(z_1, \dots, z_{r_1}) = (x_1, \dots, x_{r_1})$ , we have

$$\nu_{m-1} \geq \sum_{j=1}^k \langle A_{m-1} x_j, x_j \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^k \langle B_{m-1} x_j, x_j \rangle. \quad (4.6)$$

Let  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \sum_{j=1}^{r_1} \langle \mathbf{A} z_j, z_j \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{r_1} \langle \mathbf{B} z_j, z_j \rangle$ . Suppose  $\hat{\mathbf{A}} = (\hat{A}_1, \dots, \hat{A}_m)$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{B}} = (\hat{B}_1, \dots, \hat{B}_m)$  are such that for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ ,  $\hat{A}_j$  is the compression of  $A_j$  onto  $\{z_1, \dots, z_{r_1}\}^\perp$  in  $\mathcal{H}$ , and  $\hat{B}_j$  is the compression of  $B_j$  onto  $\{z_1, \dots, z_{r_1}\}^\perp$  in  $\mathcal{H}_1$ . Then for  $\ell = k, k+1$ ,

$$\mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_\ell(\mathbf{A})) \cap P_{\mathbf{u}}(\ell, \mathbf{A}) = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_{\ell-r_1}(\hat{\mathbf{A}})) \cap P_{\mathbf{u}}(\ell - r_1, \hat{\mathbf{A}})$$

and  $W_\ell(\mathbf{B}) \cap P_{\mathbf{u}}(\ell, \mathbf{B}) = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + W_{\ell-r_1}(\hat{\mathbf{B}})$ . We may do the following.

### Replacement

- Replace  $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, k, k+1)$  by  $(\hat{\mathbf{A}}, \hat{\mathbf{B}}, k - r_1, k + 1 - r_1)$ ,
- Replace  $\mathcal{H}$  by  $\{z_1, \dots, z_{r_1}\}^\perp$  in  $\mathcal{H}$ , and replace  $\mathcal{H}_1$  by  $\{z_1, \dots, z_{r_1}\}^\perp$  in  $\mathcal{H}_1$ .

After the replacement, we see that  $B_m = \xi_m I_{\mathcal{H}_1}$  and equation (4.6) becomes

$$\nu_{m-1} \geq \sum_{j=1}^k \langle A_{m-1} x_j, x_j \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^k \langle B_{m-1} x_j, x_j \rangle \quad (4.7)$$

for any orthonormal set  $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_1$ . To carry out the next reduction, we need the following properties.

- (I)  $\sum_{j=1}^r \langle A_{m-1} z_j, z_j \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^r \langle B_{m-1} z_j, z_j \rangle \geq \sum_{j=1}^r \lambda_j(B_{m-1})$ , and
- (II)  $\lambda_r(B_{m-1}) \geq \xi_{m-1}$ .

To prove (I), let  $\sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \langle \mathbf{A}y_j, y_j \rangle$  be an extreme point of the non-empty closed convex set

$$\mathbf{conv} W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A}) \cap P_{\mathbf{u}}(k+1, \mathbf{A})$$

that satisfies

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \langle A_{m-1}y_j, y_j \rangle = \max\{\zeta_{m-1} : (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{m-1}, (k+1)\xi_m) \in \mathbf{conv} W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A})\}, \quad (4.8)$$

where  $\{y_1, \dots, y_{k+1}\} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_1$  is an orthonormal set. Then since  $\nu + \xi \in \mathbf{conv} W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A}) \cap P_{\mathbf{u}}(k+1, \mathbf{A})$ ,  $\sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \langle A_{m-1}y_j, y_j \rangle \geq \nu_{m-1} + \xi_{m-1}$ . We have

$$\langle A_{m-1}y, y \rangle \geq \xi_{m-1} \quad \text{for every unit vector } y \in \text{span}\{y_1, \dots, y_{k+1}\}. \quad (4.9)$$

If (4.9) does not hold, we may apply a unitary transform to  $\{y_1, \dots, y_{k+1}\}$  and assume that  $\langle A_{m-1}y_{k+1}, y_{k+1} \rangle < \xi_{m-1}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^k \langle A_{m-1}y_j, y_j \rangle &= \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \langle A_{m-1}y_j, y_j \rangle - \langle A_{m-1}y_{k+1}, y_{k+1} \rangle \\ &> (\nu_{m-1} + \xi_{m-1}) - \xi_{m-1} = \nu_{m-1}, \end{aligned}$$

contradicting (4.7). If (I) does not hold, there is an orthonormal set  $\{x_1, \dots, x_r\}$  in  $\mathcal{H}_1$  such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^r \langle A_{m-1}x_j, x_j \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^r \langle B_{m-1}x_j, x_j \rangle > \sum_{j=1}^r \langle B_{m-1}z_j, z_j \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^r \langle A_{m-1}z_j, z_j \rangle.$$

Observe that  $\dim(\text{span}\{y_1, \dots, y_{k+1}\} \cap \{x_1, \dots, x_r\}^\perp) \geq k-r+1$ . By (4.9), for any orthonormal set  $\{x_{r+1}, \dots, x_k\} \subseteq \text{span}\{y_1, \dots, y_{k+1}\} \cap \{x_1, \dots, x_r\}^\perp$ , we have  $\langle Ax_j, x_j \rangle \geq \xi_{m-1}$  for  $j = r+1, \dots, k$ , so that

$$\sum_{j=1}^k \langle A_{m-1}x_j, x_j \rangle > \sum_{j=1}^r \langle A_{m-1}z_j, z_j \rangle + \sum_{j=r+1}^k \xi_{m-1} = \nu_{m-1},$$

contradicting (4.7). Assertion (I) is proved.

To prove (II), apply a unitary transform to  $\{z_1, \dots, z_r\}$  and assume that  $B_{m-1}z_j = \lambda_j(B_{m-1})z_j$  for  $j = 1, \dots, r$ . If (II) does not hold, then by (4.9) we have

$$\langle B_{m-1}x_j, x_j \rangle = \langle A_{m-1}x_j, x_j \rangle \geq \xi_{m-1}, \quad j = r, \dots, k,$$

for any orthonormal set  $\{x_r, \dots, x_k\} \subseteq \text{span}\{y_1, \dots, y_{k+1}\} \cap \{z_1, \dots, z_r\}^\perp$ , so that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \langle B_{m-1}z_j, z_j \rangle + \sum_{j=r}^k \langle B_{m-1}x_j, x_j \rangle \\ &> \left( \sum_{j=1}^r \langle B_{m-1}z_j, z_j \rangle - \xi_{m-1} \right) + (k-r+1)\xi_{m-1} = \nu_{m-1}, \end{aligned}$$

contradicting (4.7). Assertion (II) follows.

Let  $r_2 = 0$  if  $\lambda_1(B_{m-1}) = \langle B_{m-1}z_1, z_1 \rangle = \xi_{m-1}$ , and  $r_2 = \max\{j : \lambda_j(B) = \langle B_{m-1}z_j, z_j \rangle > \xi_{m-1}\}$  otherwise. As in the previous step, the vectors  $z_1, \dots, z_{r_2}$  are uniquely determined up to a unitary transform. The null space  $N(B_{m-1} - \xi_{m-1}I)$  is also large enough. Indeed for the orthonormal set  $\{y_1, \dots, y_{k+1}\} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_1$  in the proof above, we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \langle B_{m-1}y_j, y_j \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \lambda_j(B_{m-1})$$

so that the null space  $N(B_{m-1} - \xi_{m-1}I)$  has dimension at least  $k - r_2 + 1$ . Suppose  $\mathcal{H}_2$  is the subspace of  $\mathcal{H}_1$  spanned by  $\{z_1, \dots, z_{r_2}\} \cup N(B_{m-1} - \xi_{m-1}I)$ . Let  $\mathbf{C} = (C_1, \dots, C_m)$ , where  $C_j$  is the compression of  $A_j$  onto  $\mathcal{H}_2$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ .

If  $\nu \in \mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{C})$ , then  $\nu \in \mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})$ , and we get a contradiction. So,  $\nu \notin \mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{C})$  and is an extreme point of the closed convex set

$$\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})) \cap \left\{ (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m) : \zeta_{m-1} = \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(B_{m-1}), \zeta_m = k\xi_m \right\}.$$

Moreover, if  $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$  is an orthonormal set in  $\mathcal{H}_2$  such that  $\sum_{j=1}^k \langle \mathbf{A}x_j, x_j \rangle \in \mathbf{S}$ , then we have  $\sum_{j=1}^k \langle B_{m-1}x_j, x_j \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(B_{m-1})$ , and we may assume that  $(x_1, \dots, x_{r_2}) = (z_1, \dots, z_{r_2})$ . Thus, we may apply the **Reduction** and **Replacement** steps to  $(C_1, \dots, C_m)$  and assume that  $(C_{m-1}, C_m) = (\xi_{m-1}I_{\mathcal{H}_2}, \xi_m I_{\mathcal{H}_2})$ . Then identify an orthonormal set  $\{\tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_{k+1}\} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_2$  satisfying

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \langle A_{m-2}\tilde{y}_j, \tilde{y}_j \rangle = \max\{\zeta_{m-2} : (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{m-2}, (k+1)\xi_{m-1}, (k+1)\xi_m) \in W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A})\},$$

and repeat the arguments after (4.8) with  $(A_{m-1}, B_{m-1})$  replaced by  $(A_{m-2}, C_{m-2})$ .

Repeating the arguments, we will get in  $m - 1$  steps  $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, \dots, T_m) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{K})^m$  such that  $(T_2, \dots, T_m) = (\xi_2 I_{\mathcal{K}}, \dots, \xi_m I_{\mathcal{K}})$ , where  $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{H}_{m-1} \subseteq \dots \subseteq \mathcal{H}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{H}$  is a nested sequence of subspaces of  $\mathcal{H}$  such that

$$\nu_1 = \sum_{j=1}^r \langle T_1 z_j, z_j \rangle + (k - r)\xi_1,$$

and there is an orthonormal set  $\{\hat{y}_1, \dots, \hat{y}_{k+1}\} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{m-1}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu_1 + \xi_1 \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \langle T_1 \hat{y}_j, \hat{y}_j \rangle \\ &= \max\{\zeta_1 : (\zeta_1, (k+1)\xi_2, \dots, (k+1)\xi_m) \in W_{k+1}(\mathbf{T})\} \\ &= \max \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \langle T_1 x_j, x_j \rangle : \{x_1, \dots, x_{k+1}\} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{m-1} \text{ is an orthonormal set} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the arguments after (4.8), we see that  $\sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \langle T_1 \hat{y}_j, \hat{y}_j \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \lambda_j(T_1)$ . So, we may apply a unitary transform to  $\hat{y}_1, \dots, \hat{y}_{k+1}$  and assume that  $T_1 \hat{y}_j = \lambda_j(T_1) \hat{y}_j$  for  $j = 1, \dots, k+1$ , and  $\xi_1 = \lambda_{k+1}(T_1)$ . As a result,  $\sum_{j=1}^k \langle T_1 \hat{y}_j, \hat{y}_j \rangle = \nu_1$  so that

$$\nu = \sum_{j=1}^k \langle \mathbf{T} \hat{y}_j, \hat{y}_j \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^k \langle \mathbf{A} \hat{y}_j, \hat{y}_j \rangle \in W_k(\mathbf{A}),$$

which is the desired contradiction. The proof is complete.  $\square$

**Remark 4.7.** It is tempting to use an inductive argument on  $m$  in the proof of Theorem 4.6 instead of doing the tedious ‘‘Reduction and Replacement’’ arguments. However, as shown in the penultimate paragraph of the proof, if  $\nu \in \mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{C})$ , one can quickly arrive at the conclusion using an inductive argument. However, if  $\nu \notin \mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{C})$ , more care is needed in reducing the problem to the case with one fewer operator.

In general,  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is closed does not imply  $W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A})$  is closed. For example, if  $A = I_k \oplus 0_k \oplus \text{diag}(1, 1/2, 1/3, \dots)$ , then  $W_k(A) = [0, k]$  and  $W_{k+1}(A) = (0, k+1]$ . It is interesting to prove or disprove that  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is closed whenever  $W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A})$  is closed for  $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_m)$  with  $m > 3$ .

Note that by Theorem 4.6, if  $W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A})$  is convex and closed, then  $\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is closed.

## 5 Polyhedral properties

In this section, we determine  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$  such that  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  or  $\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is a polyhedral set, i.e., the convex hull of a finite set. It turns out that these conditions are equivalent, and also equivalent to that  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  have a common reducing subspace of finite dimension such that the compression of  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  onto the subspace are diagonal operators  $D_1, \dots, D_m$  and  $W_k(A_1, \dots, A_m) = W_k(D_1, \dots, D_m)$ . This extends the result in [23]. It is remarkable that even if  $\mathcal{H}$  is inseparable,  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is determined by the compression of  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  on a finite dimensional subspace if  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is polyhedral. We will obtain similar descriptions for  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$  such that  $\mathbf{cl}(W_k(\mathbf{A}))$  or  $\mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A}))$  is polyhedral. We begin with the following.

**Proposition 5.1.** *Suppose  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .*

- (a) *The set  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is a singleton if and only if  $A_j = \mu_j I$  for any  $j = 1, \dots, m$ .*
- (b) *The set  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is a subset of a line segment in  $\mathbb{C}^m$  if and only if there is  $H \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  and complex numbers  $a_1, \dots, a_m, b_1, \dots, b_m$  such that  $A_j = a_j I + b_j H$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ .*

*Proof.* (a) The sufficiency is clear. Conversely, suppose  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is a singleton. If  $A_1$  is not a scalar,  $W_k(A_1) = \{\mu : (\mu, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_m) \in W(\mathbf{A})\}$  is not a singleton, which is a contradiction. Applying the same argument to  $A_j$  for any  $j$ , the result follows.

(b) The sufficiency is clear. Conversely, suppose  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is a line segment. Then for any partial isometry  $X$  of finite rank,  $W_k(X^* A_1 X, \dots, X^* A_m X)$  is a line segment so that  $X^* A_j X =$

$a_j(X)I + b_j(X)H(X)$  for some scalar  $a_j(X), b_j(X)$  and Hermitian matrix  $H(X)$  depending on  $X$  by [23, Theorem 3.5]. Since this is true for any isometry, we conclude that  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  have the said structure.  $\square$

To facilitate our discussion, we present some definitions and notations. To describe the connections among the operators  $A_1, \dots, A_m$ , we often say that there is a unitary operator  $U = [U_1 \ U_2] \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  such that for each  $j = 1, \dots, m$ ,  $U^*A_jU = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11}^{(j)} & A_{12}^{(j)} \\ A_{21}^{(j)} & A_{22}^{(j)} \end{pmatrix}$ , where  $A_{rs} = U_r^*A_jU_s$  for  $r, s \in \{1, 2\}$  with some special properties. For example, denote by  $\mathcal{H}_1$  the range space of the partial isometry  $U_1$ .

1. The operator  $A_{21}^{(j)}$  is zero for each  $j$  means that  $\mathcal{H}_1$  is a common invariant subspace of  $A_1, \dots, A_m$ .
2. The operators  $A_{12}^{(j)}$  and  $A_{21}^{(j)}$  are zero for all  $j$ , i.e.,  $A_j = A_{11}^{(j)} \oplus A_{22}^{(j)}$ , means that  $\mathcal{H}_1$  is a common reducing subspace of  $A_1, \dots, A_m$ .
3. The  $m$ -tuple of operators  $(A_{11}^{(1)}, \dots, A_{11}^{(m)})$  is a (*common*) *compression* of  $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_m)$  onto the subspace  $\mathcal{H}_1$ .

Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a convex subset of  $\mathbb{R}^m$  (or  $\mathbb{C}^m$  identified as  $\mathbb{R}^{2m}$ ) and  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}$ . With respect to the standard inner product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ , a nonzero vector  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  defines a hyperplane

$$P(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}) = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^m : \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{x} \rangle = 0\}$$

and two half spaces  $H_+(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}) = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^m : \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{x} \rangle \geq 0\}$  and  $H_-(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}) = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^m : \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq 0\}$ .  $\mathbf{v}$  is called a normal vector of  $P(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x})$ . The hyperplane  $P(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x})$  is called a *supporting plane* of  $\mathcal{S}$  at  $\mathbf{x}$  if  $\mathcal{S}$  is a subset of either  $H_+(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x})$  or  $H_-(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x})$ . A boundary point  $\mathbf{x}$  of  $\mathcal{S}$  is a *conical point* of  $\mathcal{S}$  if there are  $m$  supporting planes of  $\mathcal{S}$  at  $\mathbf{x}$  with linearly independent normal vectors. Clearly every extreme point of a polyhedral set is a conical point.

**Theorem 5.2.** *Let  $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_m) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . The following conditions are equivalent.*

- (a)  $W_\ell(\mathbf{A})$  is polyhedral for all  $\ell = 1, \dots, k$ .
- (b)  $\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is polyhedral.
- (c) There is  $r \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $r \geq 2k$  and a unitary  $U \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  such that for each  $j = 1, \dots, m$ ,  $U^*A_jU = D_j \oplus B_j$ , where  $D_j \in M_r$  is a diagonal matrix, satisfying  $W_k(\mathbf{A}) = W_k(D_1, \dots, D_m)$ .

*Proof.* We may assume that  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$ . The implication (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b) is clear.

Suppose (b) holds so that  $\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is polyhedral with  $q$  vertices  $\boldsymbol{\nu}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\nu}_q \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . For each  $p = 1, \dots, q$ , there is an orthonormal set  $S_p = \{x_1^{(p)}, \dots, x_k^{(p)}\}$  such that  $\boldsymbol{\nu}_p = \sum_{j=1}^k \langle \mathbf{A}x_j^{(p)}, x_j^{(p)} \rangle$ .

Let  $V$  be any finite dimensional subspace of  $\mathcal{H}$  containing  $\text{span } S_p$  (for all  $p = 1, \dots, q$ ), and  $\tilde{A}_j$  be the compression of  $A_j$  onto  $V$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ . Then for  $\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = (\tilde{A}_1, \dots, \tilde{A}_m)$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\nu}_p \in \mathbf{conv } W_k(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}) \subseteq \mathbf{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A})$  so that  $\boldsymbol{\nu}_p$  is a conical point of  $\mathbf{conv } W_k(\tilde{\mathbf{A}})$ . By [23, Theorem 4.2],  $\text{span } S_p$  is a common reducing subspace for  $\tilde{A}_1, \dots, \tilde{A}_m$ . As this is true for any such subspace  $V$ ,  $\text{span } S_p$  is a common reducing subspace for  $A_1, \dots, A_m$ . Let  $W = \text{span}(S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_q)$ . It is clearly an invariant subspace for all  $A_1, \dots, A_m$ . But as they are self-adjoint,  $W$  is indeed a common reducing subspace. Now let  $\tilde{A}_j$  be the compression of  $A_j$  onto  $W$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ . We have

$$\mathbf{conv} \{\boldsymbol{\nu}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\nu}_q\} = \mathbf{conv} W_k(\tilde{A}_1, \dots, \tilde{A}_m) = \mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A}).$$

By [23, Theorem 5.1], there is a unitary  $\tilde{U}$  on  $W$  such that  $\tilde{U}^* \tilde{A}_j \tilde{U} = D_j \oplus B_j$ , where  $D_j \in M_{r_1}$  is a diagonal matrix for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ , and

$$W_k(D_1, \dots, D_m) = W_k(\tilde{A}_1, \dots, \tilde{A}_m) = \mathbf{conv} W_k(\tilde{A}_1, \dots, \tilde{A}_m).$$

The operator  $U = \tilde{U} \oplus I_{W^\perp}$  is unitary and satisfies our purpose.

Next, we show that  $D_j \in M_r$  can be chosen with  $r \geq 2k$ . To this end, let  $\tilde{V}$  be a subspace of dimension  $2k + r_1$  containing  $W$ . Suppose  $C_j$  is the compression of  $A_j$  to  $\tilde{V}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ . Then for  $\mathbf{C} = (C_1, \dots, C_m)$  and  $\mathbf{D} = (D_1, \dots, D_m)$ ,

$$W_k(\mathbf{D}) \subseteq W_k(\mathbf{C}) \subseteq W_k(\mathbf{A}) = W_k(\mathbf{D}).$$

By [23, Theorem 5.1] again, we can choose  $D_j \in M_r$  with  $r \geq 2k$ . Hence (b)  $\Rightarrow$  (c).

Now, suppose (c) holds. For every unit vector  $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \max\{\mathbf{u} \cdot \boldsymbol{\xi} : \boldsymbol{\xi} \in W_k(\mathbf{D})\} \\ &= \max\left\{\sum_{j=1}^m u_j \sum_{\ell=1}^k \langle D_j x_\ell, x_\ell \rangle : \{x_1, \dots, x_k\} \text{ is an o.n. set in } \mathcal{H}\right\} \\ &= \max\left\{\sum_{\ell=1}^k \left\langle \left(\sum_{j=1}^m u_j D_j\right) x_\ell, x_\ell \right\rangle : \{x_1, \dots, x_k\} \text{ is an o.n. set in } \mathcal{H}\right\} \end{aligned}$$

is the sum of the  $k$  largest eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{u}} = \sum_{j=1}^m u_j D_j$ . Similarly, if  $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{u}} = \sum_{j=1}^m u_j A_j$ , then  $\max\{\mathbf{u} \cdot \boldsymbol{\xi} : \boldsymbol{\xi} \in W_k(\mathbf{A})\} = \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{u}})$ . So,  $W_k(\mathbf{A}) = W_k(\mathbf{D})$  implies that  $\sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{u}}) = \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{u}})$ . Since  $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{u}}$  is unitarily similar to a direct sum of the form  $\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{u}} \oplus \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{u}}$ ,  $\lambda_j(\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{u}}) \geq \lambda_j(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{u}})$  for  $j = 1, \dots, k$ . We see that  $\lambda_j(\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{u}}) = \lambda_j(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{u}})$  is actually the  $j$ th largest eigenvalue of  $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{u}}$  for each  $j$ . It follows that for every  $\ell = 1, \dots, k$ ,

$$\max\{\mathbf{u} \cdot \boldsymbol{\xi} : \boldsymbol{\xi} \in W_\ell(\mathbf{A})\} = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \lambda_j(\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{u}}) = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \lambda_j(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{u}}) = \max\{\mathbf{u} \cdot \boldsymbol{\xi} : \boldsymbol{\xi} \in W_\ell(\mathbf{D})\}.$$

As this is true for all unit vectors  $\mathbf{u}$ ,  $\mathbf{conv} W_\ell(\mathbf{A})$  and  $W_\ell(\mathbf{D})$  have the same support plane in all directions. Also, as  $\mathbf{conv} W_\ell(\mathbf{A})$  is closed by Theorem 4.6, the two sets are equal. Thus,

$$W_\ell(\mathbf{D}) \subseteq W_\ell(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq \mathbf{conv} W_\ell(\mathbf{A}) = W_\ell(\mathbf{D}),$$

and so,  $W_\ell(\mathbf{A}) = W_\ell(\mathbf{D})$  is polyhedral. We have (c)  $\Rightarrow$  (a), and the proof is complete.  $\square$

We have an approximation result without assuming that  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  or  $\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is closed.

**Theorem 5.3.** *Let  $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_m) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . The following conditions are equivalent.*

- (a)  $\mathbf{cl} W_\ell(\mathbf{A})$  is polyhedral for all  $\ell = 1, \dots, k$ .
- (b)  $\mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A}))$  is polyhedral.
- (c) There exists  $r \geq 2k$  and for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  there is an isometry  $X_n : \mathbb{C}^r \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  such that  $\mathbf{D}_n = (X_n^* A_1 X_n, \dots, X_n^* A_m X_n)$  is an  $m$ -tuple of  $r \times r$  diagonal matrices satisfying

$$\mathbf{D}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{D} \quad \text{and} \quad W_k(\mathbf{D}_n) \rightarrow W_k(\mathbf{D}) = \mathbf{cl}(W_k(\mathbf{A})),$$

relative to the Hausdorff distance.

*Proof.* We may assume that  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$ . The implication (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b) is clear.

To prove (b)  $\Rightarrow$  (c), suppose (b) holds so that  $\mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A}))$  is polyhedral with  $q$  vertices  $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_q$ . By Theorem 4.4,  $\nu_j = \mu_j + (k - \ell_j)\xi_j$  with  $\ell_j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ ,  $\mu_j \in W_{\ell_j}(\mathbf{A})$  and  $\xi_j \in W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A})$ . For  $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , and  $p \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\mathbf{v}I_p = (v_1 I_p, \dots, v_m I_p)$ . Set  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}} = \mathbb{C}^p \oplus \mathcal{H}$  for  $p = mk - \ell_1 - \dots - \ell_p$ ,

$$\mathbf{Q} = (Q_1, \dots, Q_m) = \xi_1 I_{k-\ell_1} \oplus \dots \oplus \xi_q I_{k-\ell_q} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{Q} \oplus \mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{S}(\tilde{\mathcal{H}})^m.$$

Then clearly,  $\mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})) \subseteq \mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_k(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}))$ . On the other hand, it is not difficult to adapt the finite dimensional result [23, Theorem 4.4] to get

$$\begin{aligned} W_k(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}) &\subseteq \mathbf{conv} \bigcup_{\ell=0}^k [W_\ell(\mathbf{Q}) + W_{k-\ell}(\mathbf{A})] \\ &\subseteq \mathbf{conv} \bigcup_{\ell=0}^k [\ell W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A}) + W_{k-\ell}(\mathbf{A})] \subseteq \mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})). \end{aligned}$$

So,  $\mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})) = \mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_k(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}))$ . By construction,  $W_k(\tilde{\mathbf{A}})$  contains all the vertices of  $\mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_k(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}))$ . It follows that  $\mathbf{conv} W_k(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}) = \mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A}))$  is polyhedral. By Theorem 5.2,  $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$  is unitarily similar to  $\mathbf{D} \oplus \mathbf{B}$ , where  $\mathbf{D} = (D_1, \dots, D_m)$  is an  $m$ -tuple of diagonal matrices in  $M_r$  with  $r \geq 2k$ , and  $W_k(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}) = W_k(\mathbf{D})$ . Suppose  $D_j = \text{diag}(\xi_{j1}, \dots, \xi_{jr})$ . There is an orthonormal set  $\{u_1, \dots, u_r\}$  such that  $\tilde{A}_j u_\ell = \xi_{j\ell} u_\ell$ , for each  $j = 1, \dots, m$  and  $\ell = 1, \dots, r$ . Let  $u_\ell = \begin{pmatrix} v_\ell \\ w_\ell \end{pmatrix}$  according to the decomposition  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}} = \mathbb{C}^p \oplus \mathcal{H}$ . Then  $D_j v_\ell = \xi_{j\ell} v_\ell$  and  $A_j w_\ell = \xi_{j\ell} w_\ell$  for all  $j$  and  $\ell$ . Now, decompose  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$  as  $\text{span}\{v_1, \dots, v_r\} \oplus \text{span}\{w_1, \dots, w_r\} \oplus \tilde{H}_0$ , where  $\tilde{H}_0 = \{v_1, \dots, v_r, w_1, \dots, w_r\}^\perp$  in  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ . Using this space decomposition, we may assume that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_Q \oplus \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_A \oplus \tilde{\mathbf{B}}$$



such that  $W_k(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}) = W_k(\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_Q \oplus \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_A)$ , where  $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_Q$  is the compression of  $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$  onto  $\text{span}\{v_1, \dots, v_r\}$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_Q$  is the compression of  $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$  onto  $\text{span}\{w_1, \dots, w_r\}$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_Q \oplus \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_A$  is an  $m$ -tuple of diagonal matrices in  $M_{\tilde{r}}$  with  $\tilde{r} \geq r$ , and  $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$  is the compression of  $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$  onto  $\mathcal{H}_0$ . Actually, there is no harm to assume that  $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_Q = \mathbf{Q}$ ,  $\mathbf{A} = \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_A \oplus \tilde{\mathbf{B}}$  with  $\tilde{\mathbf{B}} = (\tilde{B}_1, \dots, \tilde{B}_m)$ , and we may reset  $r = \tilde{r}$ .

Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and let  $\{y_1, \dots, y_{r_1}\}$  and  $\{x_1, \dots, x_{r_2}\}$  be complete sets of orthonormal eigenvectors of  $\mathbf{Q}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_A$  respectively. Since  $\langle \mathbf{Q}y_1, y_1 \rangle \in W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A})$ ,  $\langle \mathbf{Q}y_1, y_1 \rangle \in W_{\text{ess}}(\tilde{\mathbf{B}})$  as well. We can find a unit vector  $x_{r_2+1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_{r_2}\}^\perp$  such that

$$\|\langle \mathbf{A}x_{r_2+1}, x_{r_2+1} \rangle - \langle \mathbf{Q}y_1, y_1 \rangle\|_2 = \|\langle \tilde{\mathbf{B}}x_{r_2+1}, x_{r_2+1} \rangle - \langle \mathbf{Q}y_1, y_1 \rangle\|_2 < 1/n.$$

Here  $\|\cdot\|_2$  denotes the usual Euclidean norm in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ . Let  $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_1$  be the compression of  $\mathbf{A}$  onto  $\mathcal{H}_1 = \{x_1, \dots, x_{r_2}, x_{r_2+1}, A_1x_{r_2+1}, \dots, A_mx_{r_2+1}\}^\perp$ . Then  $\langle \mathbf{Q}y_2, y_2 \rangle \in W_{\text{ess}}(\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_1)$ . So, there is a unit vector  $x_{r_2+2} \in \mathcal{H}_1$  such that  $\|\langle \mathbf{A}x_{r_2+2}, x_{r_2+2} \rangle - \langle \mathbf{Q}y_2, y_2 \rangle\|_2 < 1/n$ . Note that the compression of each  $A_j$  onto  $\text{span}\{x_1, \dots, x_{r_2+1}, x_{r_2+2}\}$  is diagonal. Inductively, we are able to find an orthonormal set  $\{x_1, \dots, x_{r_2+r_1}\}$  such that  $\|\langle \mathbf{A}x_{r_2+\ell}, x_{r_2+\ell} \rangle - \langle \mathbf{Q}y_\ell, y_\ell \rangle\|_2 < 1/n$  for all  $\ell = 1, \dots, r_1$ , and the compression of each  $A_j$  onto  $\text{span}\{x_1, \dots, x_{r_2+r_1}\}$  is diagonal. Denote the compression of  $\mathbf{A}$  onto  $\text{span}\{x_1, \dots, x_{r_2+r_1}\}$  as  $\mathbf{D}_n$ .

For each vertex  $\mu_p$  of  $\text{cl}(\text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A})) = W_k(\mathbf{Q} \oplus \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_A)$ ,

$$\mu_p = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \langle \mathbf{Q}z_j, z_j \rangle + \sum_{j=\ell+1}^{k-\ell} \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_A z_j,$$

where  $z_1, \dots, z_\ell \in \{y_1, \dots, y_{r_1}\}$  and  $z_{\ell+1}, \dots, z_k \in \{x_1, \dots, x_{r_2}\}$ . By suitably replacing those  $z_1, \dots, z_\ell \in \{y_1, \dots, y_{r_1}\}$ , it is easy to find a  $\nu_p \in W_k(\mathbf{D}_n)$  such that  $\|\mu_p - \nu_p\|_2 < k/n$ . Now each  $\mu \in \text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A})$  can be written as a convex combination  $\sum_{p=1}^q \lambda_p \mu_p$  of the vertices. Then  $\nu = \sum_{p=1}^q \lambda_p \nu_p$  is a point in  $W_k(\mathbf{D}_n)$  such that  $\|\mu - \nu\|_2 < k/n$ . As  $\mathbf{D}_n$  is a compression of  $\mathbf{A}$ ,  $W_k(\mathbf{D}_n) \subseteq W_k(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq \text{cl}(\text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A}))$ . The Hausdorff distance between the compact sets  $W_k(\mathbf{D}_n)$  and  $\text{cl}(\text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A}))$  is no more than  $k/n$ . So,  $W_k(\mathbf{D}_n) \rightarrow \text{cl}(\text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A}))$ . Moreover,

$$\text{cl}(\text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A})) \subseteq \text{cl}(\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} W_k(\mathbf{D}_n)) \subseteq \text{cl } W_k(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq \text{cl}(\text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A})),$$

and we get  $\text{cl } W_k(\mathbf{A}) = \text{cl}(\text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A}))$ . Finally, identifying  $\mathbf{D}_n$  with its matrix representation, then by considering a subsequence, we may assume that  $\mathbf{D}_n = (D_1^{(n)}, \dots, D_m^{(n)})$  converge to  $\mathbf{D} = (D_1, \dots, D_m)$ . Since we also have  $W_k(\mathbf{D}_n) \rightarrow W_k(\mathbf{D})$ ,  $\text{cl } W_k(\mathbf{A}) = W_k(\mathbf{D})$ . Condition (c) follows.

Now, if (c) holds, then  $\text{cl } W_k(\mathbf{A}) = W_k(\mathbf{D})$  is polyhedral. Condition (a) holds with  $\ell = k$ . For  $\ell < k$ , write for every unit vector  $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $A_{\mathbf{u}} = \sum_{j=1}^m u_j A_j$  and  $D_{\mathbf{u}} = \sum_{j=1}^m u_j D_j$ . Since  $\text{cl } W_k(\mathbf{A}) = W_k(\mathbf{D})$ , we get as in the proof of Theorem 5.2,  $\sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(A_{\mathbf{u}}) = \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(D_{\mathbf{u}})$ . Also, as  $D_{\mathbf{u}}$  is the limit of a sequence of principal submatrices of  $A_{\mathbf{u}}$ ,  $\lambda_j(D_{\mathbf{u}}) \leq \lambda_j(A_{\mathbf{u}})$  for  $j = 1, \dots, k$ , by Cauchy's interlacing theorem. Consequently, if  $\ell \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , then  $\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \lambda_j(A_{\mathbf{u}}) =$

$\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \lambda_j(D_{\mathbf{u}})$ . Since this is true for every unit vector  $\mathbf{u}$ ,  $\mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_{\ell}(\mathbf{A})) = W_{\ell}(\mathbf{D})$ . On the other hand,  $W_{\ell}(\mathbf{D}) \subseteq \mathbf{cl} W_{\ell}(\mathbf{A})$  as  $\mathbf{D}$  is a limit of an  $m$ -tuple of principal submatrices of  $\mathbf{A}$ . As above,

$$W_{\ell}(\mathbf{D}) \subseteq \mathbf{cl} W_{\ell}(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq \mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_{\ell}(\mathbf{A})) = W_{\ell}(\mathbf{D}).$$

Hence,  $\mathbf{cl} W_{\ell}(\mathbf{A}) = W_{\ell}(\mathbf{D})$  is polyhedral, and condition (a) holds.  $\square$

One readily see that every vertex  $(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m)$  of  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$ ,  $\mu_j$  is the sum of  $k$  approximate eigenvalue of  $A_j$ . Using the ideas in the proof of Theorems 5.2 and 5.3, we have the following result. Part (a) is an extension of the result in [26] for a single matrix, and part (b) is an extension of the result in [10].

**Theorem 5.4.** *Let  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .*

- (a) *If  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m) = (\text{tr}(X^* A_1 X), \dots, \text{tr}(X^* A_m X))$  is a conical point of  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$ , where  $X : \mathbb{C}^k \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is an isometry, then the range space of  $X$  is a reducing subspace of  $A_j$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ , i.e.,  $U^* A_j U = C_j \oplus B_j$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ , if  $U = [X | X^{\perp}]$ .*
- (b) *If  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m)$  is a conical point of  $\mathbf{cl}(W_k(\mathbf{A}))$  and not in  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$ , then there is a sequence of isometries  $X_{\ell} : \mathbb{C}^k \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  for  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  such that*

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} (\text{tr}(X_{\ell}^* A_1 X_{\ell}), \dots, \text{tr}(X_{\ell}^* A_m X_{\ell})) = \boldsymbol{\mu}.$$

*Proof.* We may assume that  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  are self-adjoint. (a) Suppose  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \sum_{j=1}^k \langle \mathbf{A} x_j, x_j \rangle \in W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is a conical point, where  $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$  is an orthonormal set. Consider the operator matrices  $A_j = \begin{pmatrix} C_j & Z_j \\ Z_j^* & B_j \end{pmatrix}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ , where  $C_j \in M_k$  is the compression of  $A_j$  onto the space spanned by  $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ . We will show that  $Z_j = 0$  for all  $j$  and the result will follow. Assume without loss of generality that  $Z_1 \neq 0$ , and by abuse of notation that the  $(1, 1)$  entry of  $Z_1$  is nonzero. Consider the leading principal submatrix  $T \in M_{k+1}$  of  $A_1 + iA_2$ . Then

$$\mu_1 + i\mu_2 \in W(T) \subseteq \{\xi_1 + i\xi_2 : (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_m) \in W(\mathbf{A})\}$$

so that  $\mu_1 + i\mu_2$  is a conical point of  $W(T)$ . By the result in [26],  $T = T_1 \oplus T_2$  with  $T_1 \in M_k$ , which is a contradiction.

(b) Suppose  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  is a conical point of  $\mathbf{cl} W_k(\mathbf{A})$ . Then  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  is an extreme point of  $\mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A}))$ . Thus,  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \boldsymbol{\nu} + (k - \ell)\boldsymbol{\xi}$  with  $\boldsymbol{\nu} \in W_{\ell}(\mathbf{A})$  and  $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A})$  for some  $\ell \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ . Let  $\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{A} \oplus \boldsymbol{\xi} I_{k-\ell}$ . Then  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  is a conical point of  $W_k(\tilde{\mathbf{A}})$ . Using (a) and an argument similar to the proof of Theorem 5.3, we get the conclusion.  $\square$

## 6 Compact operators

In [23, Theorem 3.3], it was shown that  $\{A_1, \dots, A_m\} \subseteq M_n$  is a commuting family of normal matrices if and only if  $W_k(A_1, \dots, A_m)$  is polyhedral for all  $k = 1, \dots, n - 1$ . In this section, we study conditions for compact operators  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  satisfying one of the following conditions.

(a)  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is polyhedral for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

(b)  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  are commuting normal operators.

One may see some results for the joint numerical range of compact operators in [3, 17] and their references. There have been considerable interests in the commutativity of compact self-adjoint (normal) operators in terms of different kinds of joint spectra. See for example [9], [12] and [25]. Our result gives an alternative from the joint numerical range viewpoint, and use the joint eigenvalues of operators defined as follows.

Let  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$ . A point  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m) \in \mathbb{C}^m$  is a *joint eigenvalue* of  $\mathbf{A}$  if there is a nonzero  $x \in \mathcal{H}$  such that  $A_j x = \mu_j x$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, m$ . The nonzero  $x$  is a common eigenvector corresponding to  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ . Define  $\Sigma_k(\mathbf{A})$  to be the set of all  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 + \dots + \boldsymbol{\mu}_k$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\mu}_k$  are joint eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{A}$  corresponding to  $k$  linearly independent common eigenvectors  $x_1, \dots, x_k$ . This set could be empty; indeed,  $\mathbf{A}$  may not have any joint eigenvalue at all. When  $k = 1$ ,  $\Sigma_1(\mathbf{A})$  reduces to the joint point spectrum of  $\mathbf{A}$ . Suppose  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\mu}_k$  are joint eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{A}$  corresponding to linearly independent common eigenvectors  $x_1, \dots, x_k$ . One may apply Gram-Schmidt process to  $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$  to obtain an orthonormal set  $\{u_1, \dots, u_k\}$ . Then the matrix  $B_j = (\langle A_j u_r, u_s \rangle) \in M_k$  is in upper triangular form, and  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_\ell = ((B_1)_{\ell\ell}, \dots, (B_m)_{\ell\ell})$  for  $\ell = 1, \dots, k$ . Thus,  $\langle \mathbf{A} u_\ell, u_\ell \rangle = \boldsymbol{\mu}_\ell$  for  $\ell = 1, \dots, k$  and  $\sum_{j=1}^k \boldsymbol{\mu}_j = \sum_{j=1}^m \langle \mathbf{A} u_j, u_j \rangle \in W_k(\mathbf{A})$ . As a result,  $\Sigma_k(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq W_k(\mathbf{A})$ . Evidently, conditions (a) – (c) in Theorem 5.2 are equivalent to the condition:

(d)  $W_k(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{conv} \Sigma_k(\mathbf{A})$  and  $\mathbf{conv} \Sigma_k(\mathbf{A})$  is polyhedral.

Suppose  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  are commuting compact normal operators in  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  and  $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_m)$ . As far as its  $k$ -numerical ranges are concerned, we may assume that  $\mathcal{H}$  is separable. By [12, Proposition 1], there is a unitary  $U$  such that

$$D_j = U^* A_j U = \text{diag}(d_j(1), d_j(2), \dots)$$

is a diagonal operator for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ . Let  $\mathbf{v}(\ell) = (d_1(\ell), d_2(\ell), \dots, d_m(\ell))$  for  $\ell \geq 1$ . Then for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\Sigma_k(\mathbf{A}) = \left\{ \sum_{\ell=1}^k \mathbf{v}(j_\ell) : 1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_k \right\}.$$

For  $k \geq 1$ , let  $\mathcal{P}_k$  be the set of rank  $k$  orthogonal projections in  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ , and  $\mathcal{D}_k = \{\text{diag } P : P \in \mathcal{P}_k\}$ . By [18, Theorem 13],  $\mathcal{D}_k$  consists of all  $(u_1, u_2, \dots)$  such that  $0 \leq u_j \leq 1$  for  $j = 1, \dots$  and  $\sum_{j=1}^\infty u_j = k$ . Then we have

$$W_k(\mathbf{A}) = \left\{ \left( \sum_{j=1}^\infty u_j d_1(j), \sum_{j=1}^\infty u_j d_2(j), \dots, \sum_{j=1}^\infty u_j d_m(j) \right) : (u_1, u_2, \dots) \in \mathcal{D}_k \right\}.$$

Suppose  $\dim \mathcal{H} = N$  is finite and  $1 \leq k \leq N$ . Let  $\mathbf{v} = (\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{k\text{-terms}}, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ . Then,

$$\mathcal{D}_k = \mathbf{conv} \{P\mathbf{v} : P \text{ is an } N \times N \text{ permutation matrix}\},$$

for example see [28]. Therefore, we have

$$W_k(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{conv} \Sigma_k(\mathbf{A}). \quad (6.1)$$

In fact, it is known that  $W_k(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{conv} \Sigma_k(\mathbf{A})$  for all  $k = 1, \dots, N-1$  if and only if  $\{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$  is a commuting family; see [23] and also [24, 27]. The result can be extended to compact operators as in the following.

**Theorem 6.1.** *Suppose  $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_m) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$  is an  $m$ -tuple of compact operators. Then  $\{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$  is a commuting family of normal operators if and only if*

$$W_k(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{conv} \Sigma_k(\mathbf{A}) \quad \text{for all } k \geq 1.$$

*Proof.* Suppose  $\{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$  is a commuting family of compact normal operators. Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $\mathcal{H}$  is separable,  $A_j = \text{diag}(d_j(1), d_j(2), \dots)$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m$  and  $\mathbf{v}(\ell) = (d_1(\ell), \dots, d_m(\ell)) \in \mathbb{C}^m$  for all  $\ell \geq 1$ . Let  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} u_j \mathbf{v}(j)$  be a point in  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$ , where  $(u_1, u_2, \dots) \in \mathcal{D}_k$ .

If  $u_j \neq 0$  for only finitely many  $j$ 's, then by (6.1),  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbf{conv} \Sigma_k(\mathbf{A})$ . Otherwise, choose  $N > k$  such that  $a = \sum_{j=N+1}^{\infty} u_j < 1$  and consider the sum  $\mathbf{u} = \sum_{j=N+1}^{\infty} (u_j/a) \mathbf{v}(j)$ . It is an infinite convex combination of the points  $\mathbf{v}(j)$ ,  $j = N+1, \dots$  in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ . By the result of [11], there exists  $\ell > 0$  such that  $\mathbf{u} = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \alpha_i \mathbf{v}(N+i)$  for some  $\alpha_i \geq 0$  satisfying  $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \alpha_i = 1$ . We have

$$\boldsymbol{\mu} = \sum_{j=1}^N u_j \mathbf{v}(j) + a \mathbf{u} = \sum_{j=1}^N u_j \mathbf{v}(j) + \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} a \alpha_i \mathbf{v}(N+i)$$

with

$$0 \leq u_j, a \alpha_i \leq 1 \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq j \leq N, 1 \leq i \leq \ell \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=1}^N u_j + \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} a \alpha_i = k.$$

By (6.1) again,  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbf{conv} \Sigma_k(\mathbf{A})$ .

Conversely, suppose  $W_k(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{conv} \Sigma_k(\mathbf{A})$  for all  $k \geq 1$ . Consider the first operator  $A_1$ . We have  $W_k(A_1) = \mathbf{conv} \Sigma_k(A_1)$  for all  $k$ . Write  $A_1 = H_1 + iG_1$  for self-adjoint  $H_1, G_1 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ . The compact self-adjoint  $H_1$  can be written as

$$H_1 = \sum_{j \geq 1} a_j I_{\mathcal{H}_j} + \sum_{\ell \geq 1} b_\ell I_{\mathcal{K}_\ell},$$

where  $a_j$ 's are the positive, and  $b_\ell$ 's the negative, eigenvalues of  $H_1$ . The eigenspaces  $\mathcal{H}_j$ 's and  $\mathcal{K}_\ell$ 's are mutually orthogonal with  $\dim \mathcal{H}_j = n_j$  and  $\dim \mathcal{K}_\ell = m_\ell$  all finite. Either sum can be empty, finite, or infinite. An empty sum is taken to be 0. We shall also assume that the eigenvalues are ordered as  $a_1 > a_2 > \dots$  and  $b_1 < b_2 < \dots$ . We shall show that  $\mathcal{H}_j$ 's and  $\mathcal{K}_\ell$ 's are all reducing subspaces of  $G_1$ . It follows that the null space of  $H_1$  is also a reducing subspace of  $G_1$ , and consequently,  $H_1$  and  $G_1$  commute, and  $A_1$  is normal.

Starting with  $a_1$ , let  $k = \dim \mathcal{H}_1 = n_1$ . Clearly,  $\max \operatorname{Re} W_k(A_1) = n_1 a_1$ . Take an extreme point  $\mu$  of  $\mathbf{cl} W_k(A_1)$  lying on the vertical line  $\operatorname{Re} z = n_1 a_1$ . Then  $\mu \in W_k(A_1)$ . For otherwise  $\mu = \mu_1 + (k - \ell)0 = \mu_1$  for  $\mu_1 \in W_\ell(A_1)$  with  $\ell < k$  (Theorem 4.4), and so  $\operatorname{Re} \mu = \operatorname{Re} \mu_1 < n_1 a_1$ , a contradiction. Hence  $\mu$  is an extreme point of  $W_k(A_1) = \mathbf{conv} \Sigma_k(A_1)$ . We have  $\mu \in \Sigma_k(A_1)$ . Then,  $\mu = \mu_1 + \dots + \mu_k$  for eigenvalues  $\mu_j$  of  $A_1$  corresponding to linearly independent (unit) eigenvectors  $x_1, \dots, x_k$  of  $A_1$ . Since  $\operatorname{Re} \mu_j = \langle H_1 x_j, x_j \rangle \leq a_1$  for all  $j$ ,  $\operatorname{Re} \mu = n_1 a_1$  implies all  $x_j \in \mathcal{H}_1$ . We have  $\operatorname{span}\{x_1, \dots, x_k\} = \mathcal{H}_1$ . As a linear span of eigenvectors,  $\mathcal{H}_1$  is invariant under  $A_1$ . It is also invariant under  $G_1 = -i(A_1 - H_1)$ . It is indeed a reducing subspace because  $G_1$  is self-adjoint.

If  $H_1$  has another positive eigenvalue  $a_2$ , then  $\mathcal{H}_2$  is also a reducing subspace of  $H_1$ . This time, we take  $k = n_1 + n_2$ . The same argument as above yields that  $\mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2$  is a invariant subspace of  $A_1$ . Consequently,  $\mathcal{H}_2$  is a reducing subspace of  $G_1$ . Successively, we get that all  $\mathcal{H}_j$ 's are reducing subspaces of  $G_1$ .

The same can be done for the negative eigenvalues and the corresponding eigenspaces. The only difference is to consider the left hand supporting line instead. For example, if  $b_1$  is the smallest negative eigenvalue of  $B$ , then for  $k = m_1 = \dim \mathcal{K}_1$ ,  $\min\{\operatorname{Re} \lambda : \lambda \in W_k(A)\} = m_1 b_1$ . By considering an extreme point of  $\mathbf{cl} W_k(A_1)$  lying on the vertical line  $\operatorname{Re} \lambda = n_1 b_1$ , we get that  $\mathcal{K}_1$ , and then similarly, all other  $\mathcal{K}_\ell$ 's, are reducing subspaces of  $G_1$ . As observed above,  $A_1$  is normal.

Similarly, all other  $A_2, \dots, A_m$  are normal. If  $A_j = H_j + iG_j$  for self-adjoint  $H_j$  and  $G_j$ , and if  $a + ib$  ( $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ ) is an eigenvalue of  $A_j$  with corresponding eigenvector  $x$ , then  $G_j x = ax$  and  $H_j x = bx$ . Thus we have  $W_k(H_1, G_1, \dots, H_m, G_m) = \mathbf{conv} \Sigma(H_1, G_1, \dots, H_m, G_m)$  for all  $k$ . For any two operators  $B, C \in \{H_1, G_1, \dots, H_m, G_m\}$ , we may apply the argument above to  $B + iC$  to conclude that  $B$  and  $C$  commute. It follows that the operators  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  commute.  $\square$

In contrast to the finite dimensional case, the following example shows that there are commuting compact self-adjoint operators  $H, G$  such that  $W_k(H, G) \equiv W_k(H + iG)$  is not polyhedral for all  $k$ .

**Example 6.2.** Let  $A_0 = -I + \operatorname{diag}(e^{i\pi/2}, e^{-i\pi/2}, e^{i\pi/3}, e^{-i\pi/3}, e^{i\pi/4}, e^{-i\pi/4}, \dots)$ , and for  $k \geq 1$   $A_k = \operatorname{diag}(i, -i, -1 + i, -1 - i) \oplus A_{k-1}$ . Then  $\mathbf{cl} W(A_0)$  is not polyhedral as it has a smooth extreme point at 0. For  $k \geq 1$ ,  $W_k(A_k)$  is not polyhedral because the extreme points  $(k - 1)i$  and  $(1 - k)i$  are smooth extreme points.

To determine a condition for  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  to be polyhedral for all  $k$ , recall the following notations. For  $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_m) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$ , let  $\mathbf{A} \oplus \mathbf{0}_\ell = (A_1 \oplus 0_\ell, \dots, A_m \oplus 0_\ell)$ , where  $0_\ell$  is the zero matrix in  $M_\ell$  if  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ . We also write  $0_\infty$  as the zero operator on some infinite dimensional Hilbert space.

**Theorem 6.3.** *Let  $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_m) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$  be an  $m$ -tuple of compact operators. Then for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,*

$$\mathbf{cl}(W_k(\mathbf{A})) = W_k(\mathbf{A} \oplus \mathbf{0}_k) = W_k(\mathbf{A} \oplus \mathbf{0}_\infty),$$

and hence

$$\mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})) = \mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A} \oplus \mathbf{0}_k) = \mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A} \oplus \mathbf{0}_\infty). \quad (6.2)$$

Consequently, the following conditions are equivalent.

- (a) For every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\mathbf{cl} W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is polyhedral.
- (b) For every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A}))$  is polyhedral.
- (c) The set  $\{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$  is a commuting family of normal operators, and  $\mathbf{conv} \Sigma_k(\mathbf{A} \oplus \mathbf{0}_\infty)$  is polyhedral for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

*Proof.* The first assertion follows from Theorem 4.3 and Theorem 4.4. One can readily adapt the proof of [23, Theorem 4.4] to the infinite dimensional operators and show that for every rank  $k$  orthogonal projection  $P = \begin{pmatrix} P_{11} & P_{12} \\ P_{21} & P_{22} \end{pmatrix}$  with  $P_{11}, P_{22} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ ,  $P_{11} \oplus P_{22}$  is a convex combination of orthogonal projections of the form  $Q_1 \oplus Q_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \oplus \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ , where  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$  are orthogonal projections of rank  $\ell$  and  $k - \ell$  with  $0 \leq \ell \leq k$ . Consequently,

$$W_k(\mathbf{A} \oplus \mathbf{0}_\infty) \subseteq \mathbf{conv} \bigcup_{0 \leq \ell \leq k} (W_\ell(\mathbf{A}) + W_{k-\ell}(\mathbf{0}_\infty)) = \mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})).$$

Thus,  $\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A} \oplus \mathbf{0}_k) \subseteq \mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A}))$  and (6.2) follows.

To prove the equivalence of conditions (a) – (c), we can focus on self-adjoint operators  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  because we can write  $A_\ell = H_\ell + iG_\ell$  for self-adjoint  $H_\ell$  and  $G_\ell$  so that

- (1)  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is polyhedral if and only if  $W_k(H_1, G_1, \dots, H_m, G_m)$  is, and
- (2)  $\{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$  is a commuting family of normal operators if and only if  $\{H_1, G_1, \dots, H_m, G_m\}$

is a commuting family by Fuglede's theorem.

The implication (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b) is clear. Suppose (b) holds. For notational simplicity, we let  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A} \oplus \mathbf{0}_\infty \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$ , and show that the components of  $\mathbf{A}$  commute using an argument similar to those in the proof of Theorem 6.1. Without loss of generality, we shall just show that  $A_1 A_2 = A_2 A_1$ . Now,  $\mathbf{conv} W_k(A_1, A_2)$ , as the projection of  $\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})$  onto  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , is polyhedral. Since  $A_1$  is self-adjoint and compact, it can be written as

$$A_1 = \sum_{j \geq 1} a_j I_{\mathcal{H}_j} + \sum_{\ell \geq 1} b_\ell I_{\mathcal{K}_\ell},$$

where  $a_j$ 's are the positive, and  $b_\ell$ 's the negative, eigenvalues of  $A_1$ , as in the proof of Theorem 6.1 We shall consider  $A = A_1 + iA_2$  and use [26, Theorem 1] to show that  $\mathcal{H}_j$ 's and  $\mathcal{K}_\ell$ 's are all reducing subspaces of  $A_2$ . It follows that the null space of  $A_1$  is also a reducing subspace of  $A_2$ , and consequently,  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  commute.

If  $A_1$  has at least one positive eigenvalue, we start with the largest eigenvalue  $a_1$  and let  $k = \dim \mathcal{H}_1 = n_1$ . For any unit vector  $y \in \mathcal{H}_1^\perp$ , let  $B = B_1 + iB_2$  be the compression of  $A = A_1 + iA_2$  onto the subspace  $\mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \text{span}\{y\}$ . Clearly,

$$\max\{\text{Re } \lambda : \lambda \in W_k(B)\} = n_1 a_1 = \max\{\text{Re } \lambda : \lambda \in W_k(A)\}.$$

Let  $\mu$  be an extreme point of  $\mathbf{cl} W_k(A)$  lying on the vertical line  $\text{Re } \lambda = n_1 a_1$ . Then as in the proof of Theorem 6.1,  $\mu \in W_k(A)$ . Suppose  $\mu = \sum_{j=1}^k \langle Ax_j, x_j \rangle$  for orthonormal vectors  $x_1, \dots, x_k$ . It is

easy to see that all  $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathcal{H}_1$  and so  $\mu \in W_k(B)$ . As  $W_k(B) \subseteq \mathbf{cl} W_k(A)$ , it follows that  $\mu$  is a conical point of  $W_k(B)$ . By [26, Theorem 1],  $\langle Bx, y \rangle = \langle By, x \rangle = 0$ , or,  $\langle Ax, y \rangle = \langle Ay, x \rangle = 0$ , for all  $x \in \mathcal{H}_1$ . As this is true for all  $y \in \mathcal{H}_1^\perp$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_1$  is a reducing subspace of  $A$ . It must also be a reducing subspace of  $A_2$ .

If  $A_1$  has another positive eigenvalue  $a_2$ , then we take  $k = n_1 + n_2$  and for any unit vector  $y \in (\mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2)^\perp$ , consider the compression of  $A$  onto  $\mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2 \oplus \text{span}\{y\}$ . The same argument as above yields that  $\mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2$  is a reducing subspace of  $A_2$ . Consequently,  $\mathcal{H}_2$  is a reducing subspace of  $A_2$ . Successively, we get that all  $\mathcal{H}_j$ 's are reducing subspaces of  $A_2$ . Similarly, every  $\mathcal{K}_\ell$  is also reducing for  $A$ . Thus, we have  $A_1 A_2 = A_2 A_1$ . Therefore,  $\{A_1 \oplus 0_\infty, \dots, A_m \oplus 0_\infty\}$ , and consequently  $\{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$ , are commuting families. Condition (c) holds.

Suppose (c) holds. Since  $\{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$  is a commuting family of normal operators, by Theorem 6.1,  $W_k(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{conv} \Sigma_k(\mathbf{A})$  is convex for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Now  $\{A_1 \oplus 0_\infty, \dots, A_m \oplus 0_\infty\}$  is also a commuting family of normal operators. Therefore,  $W_k(\mathbf{A} \oplus \mathbf{0}_\infty) = \mathbf{conv} \Sigma_k(\mathbf{A} \oplus \mathbf{0}_\infty)$  is polyhedral for each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . By (6.2),  $\mathbf{cl} W_k(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})) = W_k(\mathbf{A} \oplus \mathbf{0}_\infty)$  is also polyhedral. Hence, condition (a) holds.  $\square$

For finite rank operators, the result resembles that of the finite dimensional case.

**Proposition 6.4.** *Let  $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_m) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$  be an  $m$ -tuple of finite rank operators. The following conditions are equivalent.*

- (a)  $\{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$  is a commuting family of normal operators, equivalently, there is a unitary operator  $U$  such that  $U^* A_j U$  is a diagonal operator for each  $j$ .
- (b)  $W_k(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{cl}(W_k(\mathbf{A}))$  is polyhedral for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .
- (c) There is  $k \geq r$  such that  $\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is polyhedral, where  $r$  is the dimension of the sum of the range spaces of  $A_1, \dots, A_m$ .

*Proof.* Suppose (a) holds. We may assume that  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  are real diagonal operators, each has finite rank. Then  $\Sigma_k(\mathbf{A})$  is a finite set. By Theorem 6.1,  $W_k(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{conv} \Sigma_k(\mathbf{A})$  is polyhedral. Hence  $\mathbf{cl} W_k(\mathbf{A}) = W_k(\mathbf{A})$ .

The implication (b)  $\Rightarrow$  (c) is clear.

Suppose (c) holds. Then we may assume that  $A_j = B_j \oplus 0_\infty$  with  $B_j \in M_r$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ . We may further assume that all  $B_j$ 's are Hermitian. Let  $C_j = B_j \oplus 0_{2k-r}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ ,  $\mathbf{B} = (B_1, \dots, B_m)$  and  $\mathbf{C} = (C_1, \dots, C_m)$ . By (6.2), we have

$$\mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})) = \mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{0}_k) \subseteq \mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{C}) \subseteq \mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A}).$$

Therefore,  $\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{C}) = \mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is polyhedral. For every  $1 \leq i < j \leq m$ ,  $W_k(C_i, C_j) = \mathbf{conv} W_k(C_i, C_j)$  is a polygon in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . Since  $C_i, C_j \in M_{2k}$ , by Theorem [23, Theorem 3.3],  $C_i C_j = C_j C_i$ , which implies that  $A_i A_j = A_j A_i$ . Hence, (a) holds.  $\square$

## 7 General operators

For any compact convex subset  $\mathcal{S}$  of  $\mathbb{C}^m$ , one can construct diagonal operators  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  with orthonormal basis  $\{e_\mu : \mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m) \in \mathcal{S}\}$  and  $A_j e_\mu = (\mu_j/k)e_\mu$  such that  $W_k(I_k \otimes A_1, \dots, I_k \otimes A_m) = \mathcal{S}$ . (Here and in the following, when we say  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  is an  $m$ -tuple of diagonal operators, we always assume that they are diagonal operators relative to a fixed orthonormal basis.) Thus, there are a lot of flexibility in constructing commuting normal operators  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$  with prescribed  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$ . Nevertheless, one can use the geometrical properties of  $W_k(A_1, \dots, A_m)$  to get useful information of  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  as in Proposition 5.1 and Theorem 5.2, and additional results were obtained for compact operators in the last section. However, the situation for general operators are more complicated as one would expect. For example, Theorem 6.3 is not true if the operators  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  are not compact. As a counterexample, we exhibit a nonnormal operator whose  $k$ -numerical range is a triangle for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**Example 7.1.** Let  $A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \oplus [I_\infty \otimes \text{diag}(1, \omega, \omega^2)]$  with  $\omega = e^{i2\pi/3}$ . It is not difficult to see that  $W_k(A) = \text{conv}\{k, k\omega, k\omega^2\}$  is the triangular region with vertices  $k, k\omega, k\omega^2$ . However  $A$  is not normal because of the first summand.

Despite the above example, we will obtain some results on  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  if  $W_k(A_1, \dots, A_m)$  is polyhedral for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**Theorem 7.2.** Let  $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_m) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$ . The following conditions are equivalent.

- (a)  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is polyhedral for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .
- (b)  $\text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is polyhedral for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .
- (c) There is a unitary  $U \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  such that  $U^* A_j U = D_j \oplus C_j$ , where  $D_j = \text{diag}(d_1^{(j)}, d_2^{(j)}, \dots)$  and  $W_k(\mathbf{A}) = W_k(D_1, \dots, D_m)$  is polyhedral for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

*Proof.* We may assume that  $(A_1, \dots, A_m) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$ . The implications (c)  $\Rightarrow$  (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b) are clear.

Suppose (b) holds. By Theorem 5.2, we get for each  $k$  an orthonormal set of common reducing eigenvectors  $S_k = \{x_1^{(k)}, \dots, x_{n_k}^{(k)}\}$  of  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  such that  $W_k(\mathbf{A}) = W_k(D_1^{(k)}, \dots, D_m^{(k)})$ , where  $D_j^{(k)}$  are the compressions of  $A_j$  onto  $\text{span } S_k$ . We may assume that  $S_k \subseteq S_{k+1}$  by arguing as follows. If  $x_1^{(k+1)}$  is orthogonal to  $S_k$ , then  $S_k \cup \{x_1^{(k+1)}\}$  is an orthonormal basis of  $\text{span } S_k \cup \{x_1^{(k+1)}\}$ . If  $x_1^{(k+1)}$  is not orthogonal to some of the vectors in  $S_k$ , say,  $x_1^{(k)}, \dots, x_\ell^{(k)}$  for  $\ell \leq n_k$ , then they are all eigenvectors corresponding to the same eigenvalue of  $A_j$  for each  $j$ . It is because eigenvectors corresponding to distinct eigenvalues are orthogonal. Delete  $x_1^{(k+1)}$  if  $x_1^{(k+1)} \in \text{span } S_k$ ; otherwise replace it by a unit vector  $x$  in  $\text{span}\{x_1^{(k)}, \dots, x_\ell^{(k)}, x_1^{(k+1)}\}$  so that  $S_k \cup \{x\}$  is an orthonormal basis of  $\text{span } S_k \cup \{x_1^{(k+1)}\}$ . This  $x$  is also a reducing eigenvector of each  $A_j$  corresponding to the same



eigenvalue as  $x_1^{(k+1)}$ . Then either  $S_k$  or  $S_k \cup \{x\}$  is an orthonormal basis of  $\text{span } S_k \cup \{x_1^{(k+1)}\}$ . Going through all other vectors in  $S_{k+1}$ , we get an orthonormal set  $S'_{k+1}$  containing  $S_k$  such that  $\text{span } S'_{k+1} = \text{span } S_k \cup S_{k+1}$ . Note that  $S'_{k+1}$  contains all vectors in  $S_{k+1}$  that are orthogonal to  $S_k$ , and for a vector that is not orthogonal to  $S_k$ , it is either deleted or replaced. A vector that is deleted can be regarded as replaced by an eigenvector in  $S_k$  corresponding to the same eigenvalue. With the previous notations, if  $x_1^{(k+1)}, \dots, x_r^{(k+1)}$  belong to  $\text{span } \{x_1^{(k)}, \dots, x_\ell^{(k)}\}$  so that they are deleted, then  $r \leq \ell$ . There are always enough vectors for replacement. Renaming  $S'_{k+1}$  as  $S_{k+1}$ , then we still have  $W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A}) = W_{k+1}(D_1^{(k+1)}, \dots, D_m^{(k+1)})$ . Thus we may assume that the sets  $S_k$  are increasing. It follows that  $S = \bigcup_k S_k$  is an orthonormal set of common reducing eigenvectors of  $A_1, \dots, A_m$ . If  $D_j$  is the compression of  $A_j$  onto  $\text{span } S$ , then  $W_k(\mathbf{A}) = W_k(D_1, \dots, D_m)$  is polyhedral for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Hence, condition (c) holds.  $\square$

**Theorem 7.3.** *Suppose  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$ . The following are equivalent.*

- (a)  $\text{cl } W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is polyhedral for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .
- (b)  $\text{cl}(\text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A}))$  is polyhedral for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .
- (c) *There exists an  $m$ -tuple of diagonal operators  $\mathbf{D}$  of the form  $(R_1 \oplus S_1, \dots, R_m \oplus S_m)$ , where  $\mathbf{R} = (R_1, \dots, R_m)$  is the compression of  $\mathbf{A}$  on a separable reducing subspace of  $\mathcal{H}$ , and  $\mathbf{S} = (S_1, \dots, S_m)$  is an  $m$ -tuple of diagonal operators whose diagonal entries are extreme points of  $W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A})$ , such that*

$$\text{cl } W_k(\mathbf{A}) = W_k(\mathbf{D}) \quad \text{is polyhedral for every } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

*Proof.* We may assume that  $(A_1, \dots, A_m) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$ . The implications (c)  $\Rightarrow$  (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b) are clear.

Suppose (b) holds. For each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\mathbf{v}_1^k, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{n_k}^k$  be the vertices of  $\text{cl}(\text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A}))$ . For each vertex  $\mathbf{v}_j^k$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq n_k$ , by Theorem 4.4, there exist  $0 \leq \ell \leq k$ ,  $\mathbf{w}_j^\ell \in W_\ell(\mathbf{A})$  and  $\mathbf{d}_j^\ell \in W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A})$  such that  $\mathbf{v}_j^k = \mathbf{w}_j^\ell + (k - \ell)\mathbf{d}_j^\ell$ . Let

$$\mathbf{S} = \bigoplus_{k \geq 1} \bigoplus_{1 \leq j \leq n_k} \mathbf{d}_j^k I_\infty.$$

Then for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A} \oplus \mathbf{S}) = \text{cl } W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is polyhedral for each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . By Theorem 7.2,  $\mathbf{A} \oplus \mathbf{S}$  is unitarily similar to  $\mathbf{D} \oplus \mathbf{C}$  for an  $m$ -tuple of diagonal operators  $\mathbf{D}$  such that  $W_k(\mathbf{A} \oplus \mathbf{S}) = W_k(\mathbf{D})$  for each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $\mathcal{S} = \{(x_j, y_j)\}$  be an orthonormal set of common reducing eigenvectors of  $\mathbf{A} \oplus \mathbf{S}$  corresponding to the diagonal entries of  $\mathbf{D}$ . Then  $\mathcal{S}$  is at most countably infinite. If  $y_j = 0$ , then  $x_j$  is a common reducing eigenvector of  $\mathbf{A}$ . Let  $\mathcal{S}_1 = \{x_j : (x_j, 0) \in \mathcal{S}\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{S}_1$  is orthonormal. Extending  $\mathcal{S}_1$  to an orthonormal basis of  $\mathcal{H}$ , we have a unitary  $U$  in  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  and  $m$ -tuple of  $\mathbf{R} = (R_1, \dots, R_m)$  of diagonal operators acting on a separable subspace of  $\mathcal{H}$  such that  $U^* A_j U = R_j \oplus B_j$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ . Note that the common eigenvalue  $\mathbf{d}_j$  corresponding to each  $x_j \in \mathcal{S}_1$  is included in  $\mathbf{R}$ . Also, it is easy to show that it suffices to use the extreme points of  $W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A})$  to construct the diagonal operator  $\mathbf{D}$ . Then  $\mathbf{R}$  and  $\mathbf{S}$  satisfy condition (c).  $\square$

One may wonder whether  $\mathbf{R}$  or  $\mathbf{S}$  in Theorem 7.3 can be replaced by finite dimensional operators. By Proposition 2.7, for any  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$

$$\frac{1}{k+1}W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq \mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} \frac{1}{k}W_k(\mathbf{A})) \quad \text{if } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Hence,

$$\mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} \frac{1}{k}W_k(\mathbf{A})) \rightarrow W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A}) \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

One may ask whether  $\mathbf{cl}(W_k(\mathbf{A}))$  is polyhedral for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  will imply that  $W_{\text{ess}}(\mathbf{A})$  is polyhedral, and hence the distinct diagonal entries of  $\mathbf{S}$  form a finite set. The following example shows that the answers for the above questions are both negative.

**Example 7.4.** Let  $D_1 = \text{diag}(1, e^{i\pi/2}, e^{-i\pi/2}, e^{i\pi/3}, e^{-i\pi/3}, \dots)$ ,  $D_2 = (1) \oplus \text{diag}(1+1, 1+1/2, 1+1/3, \dots)$ ,  $A_1 = D_1 \otimes I_\infty$  and  $A = A_1 \oplus D_2$ . Then  $W_{\text{ess}}(A) = \mathbf{conv}\{1, e^{i\pi/2}, e^{-i\pi/2}, e^{i\pi/3}, e^{-i\pi/3}, \dots\}$  is not polyhedral. On the other hand, it is easy to see that  $W_1(A) = \mathbf{conv}(W_1(A_1) \cup W_1(D_2))$  is polyhedral. For  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have  $\frac{1}{k}W_k(A_1) = W_{\text{ess}}(A) = \mathbf{conv}\{1, e^{i\pi/2}, e^{-i\pi/2}, e^{i\pi/3}, e^{-i\pi/3}, \dots\}$ , and  $\frac{1}{k}W_k(D_2)$  is a line segment on the real axis of the form  $[1, 1+r]$  for some  $r > 0$ . One may use [23, Theorem 4.4] and mathematical induction to show that  $\frac{1}{k}W_k(A)$  has only finitely many extreme points.

Theorems 7.2 and 4.3 characterize  $\mathbf{A}$  such that  $\mathcal{S}_k(\mathbf{A})$  is polyhedral for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , where  $\mathcal{S}_k(\mathbf{A})$  is  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$ ,  $\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A})$ ,  $\mathbf{cl} W_k(\mathbf{A})$ , or  $\mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv} W_k(\mathbf{A}))$ . In all cases, the condition depends on the behavior of the compression of  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  on a certain separable subspace of  $\mathcal{H}$ . Even if  $\mathcal{H}$  is separable, Example 7.1 shows that it is not easy to determine whether  $\{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$  is a commuting normal family using the geometrical structure of  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . We are only able to obtain a result for some special families of  $\{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$ , which can be deduced from the following.

**Proposition 7.5.** *Let  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  have a finite spectrum. Then  $A$  is normal if any one of the following conditions holds.*

- (a) *For each  $\lambda \in \sigma(A)$  there is  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $W_k(A)$  is polyhedral with a conical point  $\lambda + \sum_{j=2}^k \mu_j \in \Sigma_k(A)$ .*
- (b) *For each  $\lambda \in \sigma(A)$  there is  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\mathbf{cl} W_k(A)$  is polyhedral with a conical point  $\lambda + \sum_{j=2}^\ell \mu_j + (k-\ell)\xi$ , where  $1 \leq \ell \leq k$ ,  $\lambda + \sum_{j=2}^\ell \mu_j \in \Sigma_\ell(A)$  and  $\xi \in W_{\text{ess}}(A)$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  has a finite spectrum and (a) holds. Let  $\lambda \in \sigma(A)$  and  $W_k(A)$  be polyhedral with a vertex of the form  $\sum_{j=1}^k \mu_j \in \Sigma_k(A)$ , where  $\mu_1 = \lambda$ . We will show that  $A$  is unitarily similar to  $\lambda I \oplus B$  such that  $\lambda \notin \sigma(B)$ . By Theorem 5.2,  $A$  is unitarily similar to  $D \oplus B$  for a diagonal matrix  $D \in M_r$  such that  $W(A) = W(D)$ . In particular, we may assume that  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m$  are diagonal entries of  $D$ . If  $\lambda \notin \sigma(B)$ , then we are done. Otherwise, assume that  $\lambda \in \sigma(B)$ . We may assume that the first column (of the operator matrix) of  $B$  has the form  $(\lambda, 0, \dots)^t$ . We claim

that the first row  $B$  is of the form  $(\lambda, 0, \dots)$ . If not, we may assume that the  $(1, 2)$  entry of  $B$  is  $\gamma \neq 0$ . Consider the leading principal submatrix  $T \in M_{r+2}$  of  $D \oplus B$ . Then the  $(r+1, r+2)$  entry of  $T$  is  $\gamma$ . Note that

$$W_k(D) \subseteq W_k(T) \subseteq W_k(A) = W_k(D).$$

We can find  $k$  diagonal entries of  $T$  including the  $(r+1, r+1)$  entry, which is  $\lambda$ , summing up to  $\sum_{j=1}^k \mu_j$  is a vertex of  $W_k(T)$ . By Theorem 5.4 (a), the  $(r+1, r+2)$  entry of  $T$  is zero, which is a contradiction. So, if  $\lambda \in \sigma(B)$ , then  $\sigma$  is a reducing eigenvalue of  $B$ . As a result,  $B = \lambda I \oplus B_1$  such that  $\lambda \notin \sigma(B_1)$ . Repeating this argument for every element in  $\sigma(A)$ , we see that  $\mathcal{H}$  is a direct sum of the eigenspaces of  $A$ . Thus,  $A$  is normal.

Next, suppose (b) holds. Let  $\lambda \in \sigma(A)$ , and  $\mathbf{cl} W_k(A)$  is polyhedral with a conical point  $\lambda + \sum_{j=2}^{\ell} \mu_j + (k - \ell)\xi$ . By Theorem 5.3 and its proof, we see that  $\mathbf{cl} W_{\ell}(A)$  is polyhedral with  $\lambda + \sum_{j=2}^{\ell} \mu_j$  as a conical point. We may use the argument in the preceding paragraph to show that  $\lambda$  is a reducing eigenvalue of  $A$ . Since this is true for all  $\lambda \in \sigma(A)$ , we see that  $A$  is normal.  $\square$

In Proposition 7.5 (a) and (b), one cannot just require  $W_k(A)$  to be polyhedral for  $k \leq \ell$  for a finite value  $\ell$  using the information of  $\sigma(A)$ . For example, suppose  $\sigma(A) = \{1, w, w^2\}$  with  $w = e^{i2\pi/3}$ . For any  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , we can let  $A = [I_{\ell} \otimes \text{diag}(1, w, w^2)] \oplus \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  to be the non-normal operator such that  $W_k(A) = \mathbf{conv}\{k, kw, kw^2\}$  is a polygon for all  $k = 1, \dots, \ell$ , but  $W_{k+1}(A)$  is not.

**Corollary 7.6.** *Let  $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_m) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$  be an  $m$ -tuple of self-adjoint operators. Then  $\{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$  is a commuting family if for all choices of  $1 \leq p < q \leq m$ ,  $A = A_p + iA_q$  has a finite spectrum satisfying conditions (a) or (b) of Proposition 7.5.*

The following example shows that Corollary 7.6 will fail if one only assumes that  $A_1, A_2$  are self-adjoint operators, where  $A_1, A_2$  have finite spectrum, and for any eigenvalues  $\lambda_j \in \sigma(A_j)$  for  $j = 1, 2$ , there is  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $W_k(A_1 + iA_2)$  is polyhedral with a vertex of the form  $(\lambda_1 + i\lambda_2) + \sum_{j=2}^k \mu_j \in \Sigma_k(A_1 + iA_2)$ .

**Example 7.7.** Let  $A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \oplus (I_{\infty} \otimes D_1)$  and  $A_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \oplus (I_{\infty} \otimes D_2)$  with  $D_1 = \text{diag}(1, 1, -1, -1)$ ,  $D_2 = \text{diag}(1, -1, 1, -1)$ . Then  $A_1 A_2 \neq A_2 A_1$ ,  $\sigma(A_1) = \sigma(A_2) = \{1, -1\}$ . Let  $A = A_1 + iA_2$ . Then for every  $k \geq 1$ ,  $W_k(A)$  is the square with vertices  $\{k(1+i), k(1-i), k(-1+i), k(-1-i)\}$ . Note that  $0 \in \sigma(A_1 + iA_2)$  but a point  $\sum_{j=1}^k \mu_j$  is a vertex of  $W_k(A)$  if and only if  $\mu_1 = \dots = \mu_k \in \{1+i, 1-i, -1+i, -1-i\}$ .

## 8 Open problems and related results

There are many interesting problems and related results in connection to our study. We list some of them in the following.

- In connection to Proposition 2.7, it is interesting to prove or disprove that  $W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A})/(k+1) \subseteq W_k(\mathbf{A})/k$ .
- In connection to Theorem 4.3 and Theorem 4.6, it is interesting to prove or disprove that  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is closed whenever  $W_{k+1}(\mathbf{A})$  is closed.
- In connection to Example 4.5, it is interesting to construct an example  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^n$  such that  $\text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is closed, but  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  is not for  $k > 1$ .

For any real vector  $c = (c_1, \dots, c_k)$  one can define the joint  $c$ -numerical range of  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$  as the collection of  $(a_1, \dots, a_m) \in \mathbb{C}^m$  such that  $a_j = \sum_{i=1}^k c_i \langle A_j x_i, x_i \rangle$  for an orthonormal set  $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ . One may see [20, 24] for some background of the  $c$ -numerical range for a single operator. Some of our results can be readily extended to the setting of the joint  $c$ -numerical ranges. For example, if  $c = (c_1, \dots, c_k)$  has distinct entries, then  $W_c(\mathbf{A})$  has a conical boundary point  $(a_1, \dots, a_m)$  will imply that there is a unitary  $U \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  such that  $U^* A_j U = D_j \oplus B_j$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ , where  $D_j \in M_k$  is a diagonal matrix satisfying  $(\text{tr}(CD_1), \dots, \text{tr}(CD_m)) = (a_1, \dots, a_m)$  with  $C = \text{diag}(c_1, \dots, c_k)$ . It would be interesting to extend other results to  $W_c(\mathbf{A})$ . For example, it was shown in [24] for  $c = (c_1, \dots, c_n)$  with entries arranged in descending order and  $c_k > c_{k+1}$ , where  $|n/2 - k| \leq 1$ , then  $A \in \mathbf{M}_n$  satisfies  $W_c(A)$  is polyhedral if and only if  $A$  is normal. One can readily show that  $W_c(\mathbf{A})$  is polyhedral for  $(c_1, \dots, c_n)$  satisfying the above condition and  $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_m) \in M_n^m$  if and only if  $\{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$  is a commuting family of normal matrices; it follows that  $W_d(\mathbf{A})$  is polyhedral for all  $d = (d_1, \dots, d_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . It would be interesting to extend the results to  $W_c(\mathbf{A})$  for  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$  or  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})^m$ .

In [10], the authors studied special boundary points of  $W(\mathbf{A})$  such as conical points, bare points, or points with some extreme norm properties. We have extended their result for conical points to  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$ . It is interesting to extend other results in the paper to  $W_k(\mathbf{A})$  or  $W_c(\mathbf{A})$ .

## No conflict of interest statement

On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author states that there is no conflict of interest.

## Acknowledgement

Li is an affiliate member of the Institute for Quantum Computing, University of Waterloo; his research was partially supported by the Simons Foundation Grant 851334. The authors would like to thank the anonymous referee for some helpful comments.

## References

- [1] Y.H. Au-Yeung and Y.T. Poon, A remark on the convexity and positive definiteness concerning Hermitian matrices, *Southeast Asian Bull. Math.* 3 (1979), 85–92.
- [2] Y.H. Au-Yeung and N.K. Tsing, An extension of the Hausdorff-Toeplitz theorem on the numerical range, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 89 (1983), 215–218.
- [3] G. De Barra, J.R. Giles and B. Sims, On the numerical range of compact operators on Hilbert spaces, *J. London Math. Soc.* 5 (1972), 704–706.
- [4] P. Binding, D. R. Farenick, and C.K. Li, A dilation and norm in several variable operator theory, *Canad. J. Math.* 47 (1995), 449–461.
- [5] J.C. Bourin, Compressions and pinchings, *J. of Operator Theory*, 50 (2003), 211–220.
- [6] J.J. Buoni and B.L. Wadwa, On joint numerical ranges, *Pacific J. Math.* 77 (1978), 303–306.
- [7] J.T. Chan, A note on the boundary of the joint numerical range, *Linear Multilinear Algebra* 66 (2018), 821–826.
- [8] J.T. Chan, C.K. Li and Y.T. Poon, Closedness of the  $k$ -numerical range, *Linear Multilinear Algebra* (2020), <https://doi.org/10.1080/03081087.2020.1790483>.
- [9] M. Cho, Joint spectra of commuting normal operators on Banach spaces, *Glasgow Math. J.* 30 (1988) 339–345.
- [10] M. Cho and M. Takaguchi, Boundary points of joint numerical ranges, *Pacific. J. Math.* 95 (1981), 27–35.
- [11] W.D. Cook and R.J. Webster, Carathéodory Theorem, *Canad. Math. Bulletin* 15 (1972), 293.
- [12] G. Greiner and W.J. Ricker, Commutativity of compact selfadjoint operators, *Studia Math.* 112 (1995), 109–125.
- [13] K. Fan and G. Pall, Imbedding conditions for Hermitian and normal matrices. *Canadian J. Math.* 9 (1957), 298–304.
- [14] P.A. Fillmore, J.G. Stampfli, and J.P. Williams, On the essential numerical range, the essential spectrum and a problem of Halmos, *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)*, 33 (1973), 172–192.
- [15] P.R. Halmos, *A Hilbert Space Problem Book*, 2nd ed., Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 19, Springer-Verlag, New-York, 1982.
- [16] R.A. Horn and C.R. Johnson, *Topics in Matrix Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991.

- [17] P. Juneja, On extreme points of the joint numerical ranges of commuting normal operators, *Pacific J. Math.* 67 (1976), 473-476.
- [18] R.V. Kadison, The Pythagorean Theorem: II. The infinite discrete case, *PNAS* 99 (2002), 5217-5222.
- [19] J.S. Lancaster, The boundary of the numerical range, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 49 (1975), 393-398.
- [20] C.K. Li and Y.T. Poon, Some results on the  $c$ -numerical range, in *Five decades as a mathematician and educator*, 247–258, World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 1995.
- [21] C.K. Li and Y.T. Poon, Convexity of the joint numerical range, *SIAM J. Matrix Analysis Appl.* 21 (2000), 668-678.
- [22] C.K. Li and Y.T. Poon, The joint essential numerical range of operators: convexity and related results, *Studia Math.* 194 (2009), 91-104.
- [23] C.K. Li, Y.T. Poon and Y. Wang, Joint numerical ranges and commutativity of matrices, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 491 (2020), no. 1, 124310.
- [24] C.K. Li, C.H. Sung, and N.K. Tsing,  $c$ -Convex matrices: Characterizations, inclusion relations and normality, *Linear Multilinear Algebra* 25 (1989), 275-287.
- [25] T. Mao, Y. Qiao and P. Wang, Comutativity of normal compact operators via projective spectrum, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 146 (2018), 1165-1172.
- [26] M. Marcus and I. Filippenko, Nondifferentiable boundary points of the higher numerical range, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 21 (1978), 217–232.
- [27] M. Marcus, M. Moyls and I. Filippenko, Normality and the higher numerical range, *Canad. J. Math.* 30 (1978), 419-430.
- [28] A. W. Marshall and I. Olkin, *Inequalities: theory of majorization and its applications*, volume 143. Springer, 1979.
- [29] V. Müller and Y. Tomilov, Joint numerical ranges and compressions of powers of operators, *J. London Math. Soc.* 99 (2019), 127-152.

[Chan] jtchan@hku.hk

[Li] Department of Mathematics, The College of William & Mary, Williamsburg, VA 13185, USA.  
ckli@math.wm.edu

[Poon] Department of Mathematics, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011, USA. ytpoon@iastate.edu