

# THE ULTIMATE UPPER BOUND ON THE INJECTIVITY RADIUS OF THE STIEFEL MANIFOLD\*

P.-A. ABSIL<sup>†</sup> AND SIMON MATAIGNE<sup>†</sup>

**Abstract.** We exhibit conjugate points on the Stiefel manifold endowed with any member of the family of Riemannian metrics introduced by Hüper et al. (2021). This family contains the well-known canonical and Euclidean metrics. An upper bound on the injectivity radius of the Stiefel manifold in the considered metric is then obtained as the minimum between the length of the geodesic along which the points are conjugate and the length of certain geodesic loops. Numerical experiments support the conjecture that the obtained upper bound is in fact equal to the injectivity radius.

**Key words.** Stiefel manifold, canonical metric, Euclidean metric, conjugate points, geodesic loops, injectivity radius

**MSC codes.** 15B10, 15B57, 65F99, 53C22, 53C30

**1. Introduction.** The *injectivity radius* of a complete Riemannian manifold is the largest  $r$  such that every geodesic of length less than or equal to  $r$  is a shortest curve between its endpoints. Equivalent definitions can be found in Riemannian geometry textbooks such as [15, 32].

The knowledge of the injectivity radius is an asset in several computational problems on manifolds. If, between two given points, one finds a geodesic whose length is less than or equal to the injectivity radius, then the length of the geodesic gives the Riemannian distance between the two points. The injectivity radius also defines the largest ball on which geodesic normal coordinates may be used. The injectivity radius is involved, e.g., in optimization [1, 5, 8, 20, 34], consensus [36], statistics [4, 6, 19], and data fitting [2, 18].

The *Stiefel manifold* of orthonormal  $p$ -frames in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , denoted by  $\text{St}(n, p)$ , is one of the most classical matrix manifolds [16, 3, 10]. It appears in numerous applications; see for example [37, 38, 9, 12, 14, 26, 35]. In particular, the endpoint geodesic problem on the Stiefel manifold has attracted a growing interest; see [40, 35] and references therein.

It may thus seem paradoxical that the injectivity radius of the Stiefel manifold remains unknown. This has to do with the fact that the cut locus of Riemannian manifolds can have an intricate structure [22].

In this paper, we report the discovery of conjugate points on the Stiefel manifold for all members of the one-parameter ( $\beta > 0$ ) family of Riemannian metrics (3.8) introduced by Hüper et al. [21], which includes the well-known canonical ( $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$ ) and Euclidean ( $\beta = 1$ ) metrics defined by Edelman et al. [16]. The length of the geodesic along which the points are conjugate gives an upper bound on the injectivity radius, specifically  $t_\beta^r \sqrt{2}$  where  $t_\beta^r$  is the smallest positive root of  $\frac{\sin t}{t} + \frac{1-\beta}{\beta} \cos t$ . For a range of values of  $\beta$  (see (7.3)), this bound is further improved by considering the length of geodesic loops generated by Givens rotations. The resulting  $\beta$ -dependent upper bound on the injectivity radius is given in Theorem 7.1. In particular, for the canonical metric, the upper bound is  $t^r \sqrt{2} \approx 0.91326189159122\pi$ , where  $t^r$  is the

\*Submitted to the editors March 7, 2024.

**Funding:** This work was supported by the Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique-FNRS under Grant no T.0001.23. Simon Mataigne is a Research Fellow of the FNRS.

<sup>†</sup>ICTEAM Institute, UCLouvain, B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium (pa.absil@uclouvain.be, simon.mataigne@uclouvain.be, <http://sites.uclouvain.be/absil/>).

smallest positive root of  $\frac{\sin t}{t} + \cos t$ . For the Euclidean metric, the upper bound is  $\pi$ .

As for the word “ultimate” in the title of this paper, it is meant to convey that, according to numerical experiments, the obtained upper bound appears to be *equal* to the injectivity radius for all  $\beta$  (Conjecture 8.1).

The paper is organized as follows. After background information on the injectivity radius of Riemannian manifolds (Section 2) and the Stiefel manifold (Section 3), Section 4 proves linear algebra lemmas that lead in Section 5 to an upper bound on the conjugate radius. Together with upper bounds on the length of geodesic loops (Section 6), this produces an upper bound on the injectivity radius (Section 7). The conjecture that the upper bound is equal to the injectivity radius is supported by numerical experiments in Section 8.

**2. The injectivity radius of a complete Riemannian manifold.** This section gives a concise overview, based on [32, 13], of the concept of injectivity radius. The necessary background in Riemannian geometry (e.g., tangent spaces, induced norm, induced distance, geodesics, and minimal geodesics, also called minimizing geodesics) can be found in introductory textbooks such as [15].

Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a complete Riemannian manifold with Riemannian metric  $g$  and induced distance  $d$ . Let  $U_x\mathcal{M} = \{\xi \in T_x\mathcal{M} \mid \|\xi\|_x = 1\}$  denote the unit tangent space at  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ . The *exponential map* at  $x$  is

$$\text{Exp}_x : T_x\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M} : \xi \mapsto \gamma_\xi(1),$$

where  $\gamma_\xi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  is the geodesic of  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfying  $\gamma(0) = x$  and  $\gamma'(0) = \xi$ . It is customary to write  $\text{Exp}(\xi)$  instead of  $\text{Exp}_x(\xi)$  when it is clear that  $\xi$  belongs to  $T_x\mathcal{M}$ .

The *cut time* of  $\gamma_\xi$  is

$$t_c(\xi) := \sup\{t > 0 \mid d(x, \gamma_\xi(t)) = t\}.$$

When  $t_c(\xi) < \infty$ , it is the last value of  $t$  such that  $\gamma_\xi|_{[0,t]}$  is minimal; see [32, III.4.1]. In other words, it is the time beyond which  $\gamma_\xi$  ceases to be minimal. In that case,  $t_c(\xi)\xi$ , resp.  $\gamma_\xi(t_c(\xi))$ , is called the *tangent cut point*, resp. *cut point*, of  $x$  along  $\gamma_\xi$ . The sets  $\tilde{C}_x := \{t_c(\xi)\xi \mid \xi \in U_x\mathcal{M}, t_c(\xi) < +\infty\}$  and  $C_x := \{\gamma_\xi(t_c(\xi)) \mid \xi \in U_x\mathcal{M}, t_c(\xi) < +\infty\}$  are termed the *tangent cut locus* and *cut locus* of  $x$ , respectively. A point  $\text{Exp}_x(t\xi)$  is said to be *conjugate* to  $x$  along the geodesic  $t \mapsto \text{Exp}_x(t\xi)$  if  $t\xi$  is a critical point of  $\text{Exp}_x$ , i.e.,  $D\text{Exp}_x(t\xi)$  is singular.

**THEOREM 2.1** (Lemma 5.2 in [13]).  *$t_c$  is the cut time of  $\gamma_\xi$  if and only if the following holds for  $T = t_c$  and for no smaller value of  $T$ :*

(a)  $\gamma_\xi(T)$  is a conjugate point of  $x$  along  $\gamma_\xi$ ;

**or** (nonexclusive)

(b) there exists  $\zeta \in U_x\mathcal{M}$ ,  $\zeta \neq \xi$ , such that  $\gamma_\xi(T) = \gamma_\zeta(T)$ .

The cut locus  $C_x$  is closed [13, Proposition 5.4]. The *injectivity radius* of  $x$  is

$$\text{inj}_{\mathcal{M}}(x) := d(x, C_x) = \min\{t_c(\xi) \mid \xi \in U_x\mathcal{M}\}.$$

Equivalently,  $\text{inj}_{\mathcal{M}}(x)$  is the largest  $r$  such that  $\text{Exp}_x$  is a diffeomorphism of the open ball of radius  $r$  in  $T_x\mathcal{M}$  onto its image [13, Definition 5.5].

The *conjugate radius* of  $x$ ,  $\text{conj}_{\mathcal{M}}(x)$ , is the supremum of the radius of open balls centered at the origin of the tangent space  $T_x\mathcal{M}$  which contain no critical point of the exponential map  $\text{Exp}_x : T_x\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ .

It is known (see, e.g., [39, (1.9)] for the explicit statement, which follows from the work of Klingenberg [24]) that

$$(2.1) \quad \text{inj}_{\mathcal{M}}(x) = \min\left\{\frac{1}{2}\ell_{\mathcal{M}}(x), \text{conj}_{\mathcal{M}}(x)\right\},$$

where  $\ell_{\mathcal{M}}(x)$  is the length of a shortest nontrivial geodesic loop at  $x$ . Finally, the *injectivity radius* of  $\mathcal{M}$  is

$$\text{inj}_{\mathcal{M}} := \inf\{\text{inj}_{\mathcal{M}}(x) \mid x \in \mathcal{M}\}.$$

**3. Background on the Stiefel manifold.** In this section, we review the fundamentals of the Stiefel manifold and its family of Riemannian metrics introduced in [21], with an emphasis on the Riemannian submersion structure that induces the metrics. We chiefly follow the notation of [40]. Background on manifolds and Lie groups can be found, e.g., in [25].

For  $1 \leq p \leq n$  with  $n \geq 2$ ,<sup>1</sup> the Stiefel manifold of orthonormal  $p$ -frames in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is

$$(3.1) \quad \text{St}(n, p) := \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \mid X^{\top} X = I_p\},$$

where  $I_p$  is the identity matrix of size  $p$ . It is a submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ ; see, e.g., [3, §3.3.2]. Its tangent space at  $X \in \text{St}(n, p)$  is

$$\text{T}_X \text{St}(n, p) = \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \mid X^{\top} \xi + \xi^{\top} X = 0\}.$$

The orthogonal group is denoted by

$$\text{O}(n) := \{Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \mid Q^{\top} Q = I_n\},$$

its connected component containing  $I_n$  is the special orthogonal group denoted by  $\text{SO}(n)$ , and the set of skew-symmetric matrices of size  $p$  is denoted by

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{skew}}(p) := \{A \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p} \mid A^{\top} = -A\}.$$

Let  $X_{\perp}$  be such that  $\begin{bmatrix} X & X_{\perp} \end{bmatrix}$  belongs to  $\text{O}(n)$ . Then

$$(3.2) \quad \text{T}_X \text{St}(n, p) = \{XA + X_{\perp}H \mid A \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{skew}}(p), H \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-p) \times p}\}.$$

In the rest of this section, we restrict to  $p \leq n - 1$ . However, in later sections, we sometimes refer to the metrics (3.8) and (3.16) for  $p = n$ ; this amounts to ignoring their  $H$ -term.

**3.1. A Riemannian-submersion route to the noncanonical metrics.** Let  $\beta > 0$  and let us embark on a development that induces on the Stiefel manifold a Riemannian metric (*metric* for short), (3.8), parameterized by  $\beta$ . In this section 3.1, we exclude  $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$  to avoid a division by zero in (3.3); the case  $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$  (the canonical metric) is addressed in Section 3.2.

Consider the Lie group action

$$\tau : (\text{O}(n) \times \text{O}(p)) \times \text{St}(n, p) \rightarrow \text{St}(n, p) : ((Q, V), X) \mapsto QXV^{\top} =: \tau_X(Q, V).$$

<sup>1</sup>This excludes the uninteresting case  $p = n = 1$  where  $\text{St}(n, p) = \{-1, 1\}$ .

Let  $I_{n \times p} = \begin{bmatrix} I_p \\ 0_{(n-p) \times p} \end{bmatrix}$ . The stabilizer of  $I_{n \times p}$  is

$$\tau_{I_{n,p}}^{-1}(I_{n,p}) = \left\{ \left( \begin{bmatrix} V & 0 \\ 0 & W \end{bmatrix}, V \right) \mid V \in O(p), W \in O(n-p) \right\} =: O(n-p) \times O(p).$$

Hence, as an application of [7, Proposition A.2], the submanifold  $\text{St}(n, p)$  is diffeomorphic to the quotient manifold  $(O(n) \times O(p))/(O(n-p) \times O(p))$ :

$$\text{St}(n, p) \simeq (O(n) \times O(p))/(O(n-p) \times O(p)).$$

As in [21], consider on  $O(n) \times O(p)$  the Riemannian metric  $\bar{g}$  defined by

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \bar{g}_{(Q,V)}((Q\Omega_a, V\Psi_a), (Q\Omega_b, V\Psi_b)) &:= \frac{1}{2} \text{trace}(\Omega_a^\top \Omega_b) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{2\beta}{1-2\beta} \text{trace}(\Psi_a^\top \Psi_b) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \text{trace}(\Omega_a^\top \Omega_b) + \frac{1}{2\alpha} \text{trace}(\Psi_a^\top \Psi_b), \end{aligned}$$

where we have defined

$$(3.4) \quad \alpha := \frac{1}{2\beta} - 1, \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad \beta = \frac{1/2}{\alpha + 1},$$

to recover the parameterization used in [21]. (The  $\beta$  parameterization, also used in [29], simplifies several expressions, notably the Stiefel metric (3.8).) Observe that, in this Section 3.1, the range of  $\alpha$  is  $(-1, \infty) \setminus \{0\}$ . The factor of  $\frac{1}{2}$  in (3.3) has been introduced so that, notably, the length of the induced geodesic loops on  $\text{St}(n, p=1)$ , which is the unit sphere, have length  $2\pi$  instead of the odd-looking  $2\sqrt{2}\pi$ . The Lie algebra of the stabilizer  $\tau_{I_{n,p}}^{-1}(I_{n,p})$  is

$$\mathfrak{k} = \left\{ \left( \begin{bmatrix} \Psi & 0 \\ 0 & C \end{bmatrix}, \Psi \right) \mid \Psi \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{skew}}(p), C \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{skew}}(n-p) \right\}.$$

Its complement with respect to  $\bar{g}$  is found to be

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathfrak{m} &= \left\{ \left( \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{1}{\alpha} \tilde{\Psi} & -\tilde{B}^\top \\ \tilde{B} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \tilde{\Psi} \right) \mid \tilde{\Psi} \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{skew}}(p), \tilde{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-p) \times p} \right\} \\ &= \left\{ \left( \begin{bmatrix} 2\beta\Psi & -B^\top \\ B & 0 \end{bmatrix}, -(1-2\beta)\Psi \right) \mid \Psi \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{skew}}(p), B \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-p) \times p} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Consider the map  $\varphi = \tau_{I_{n,p}}$ , i.e.,

$$\varphi : (O(n) \times O(p)) \rightarrow \text{St}(n, p) : (Q, V) \mapsto QI_{n \times p}V^\top.$$

In the vocabulary of principal fiber bundles, the domain of  $\varphi$  is termed the *total space* and its co-domain the *base space*. The *fiber* above  $(Q, V)$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(Q, V)) &= (Q, V)\varphi^{-1}(I_{n \times p}) \\ &= \left\{ \left( Q \begin{bmatrix} R_1 & 0 \\ 0 & R_2 \end{bmatrix}, VR_1 \right) \mid R_1 \in O(p), R_2 \in O(n-p) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

At  $(Q, V)$ , the tangent space to the fiber (the *vertical space*) is  $(Q, V)\mathfrak{k}$  and its orthogonal complement (the *horizontal space*) is  $(Q, V)\mathfrak{m}$ .

Let  $D\varphi(a; b)$  denote the derivative of  $\varphi$  at  $a$  along  $b$ . When  $b$  is a horizontal direction, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} D\varphi\left((Q, V); \left(\begin{bmatrix} 2\beta\Psi & -B^\top \\ B & 0 \end{bmatrix}, -(1-2\beta)\Psi\right)\right) \\ = Q \begin{bmatrix} 2\beta\Psi & -B^\top \\ B & 0 \end{bmatrix} I_{n \times p} V^\top + Q I_{n \times p} (1-2\beta)\Psi V^\top = Q \begin{bmatrix} \Psi \\ B \end{bmatrix} V^\top. \end{aligned}$$

A classical result in Riemannian submersion theory (see, e.g., [30, §7.44]) is that, for all  $\xi \in T_X \text{St}(n, p)$  and all  $(Q, V)$  in the fiber  $\varphi^{-1}(X)$ , there is a unique  $\bar{\xi}_{(Q, V)}$  in the horizontal space  $(Q, V)\mathfrak{m}$  such that  $D\varphi\left((Q, V); \bar{\xi}_{(Q, V)}\right) = \xi$ . This  $\bar{\xi}_{(Q, V)}$  is termed the *horizontal lift* of  $\xi$  at  $(Q, V)$ . Expressing  $\xi$  as

$$\xi = Q \begin{bmatrix} V^\top A \\ H \end{bmatrix} = Q \begin{bmatrix} V^\top AV \\ HV \end{bmatrix} V^\top,$$

one readily obtains

$$(3.6) \quad \bar{\xi}_{(Q, V)} = \left( Q \begin{bmatrix} 2\beta V^\top AV & -V^\top H^\top \\ HV & 0 \end{bmatrix}, -(1-2\beta)VV^\top AV \right).$$

The following invariance holds: given  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$  in  $T_X \text{St}(n, p)$ , the inner product  $\bar{g}_{(Q, V)}(\bar{\xi}_{(Q, V)}, \bar{\zeta}_{(Q, V)})$  does not depend on the choice of  $(Q, V)$  in the fiber  $\varphi^{-1}(X)$ , i.e.

$$(3.7) \quad \bar{g}_{(Q, V)}(\bar{\xi}_{(Q, V)}, \bar{\zeta}_{(Q, V)}) = \bar{g}_{(\tilde{Q}, \tilde{V})}(\bar{\xi}_{(\tilde{Q}, \tilde{V})}, \bar{\zeta}_{(\tilde{Q}, \tilde{V})}) \quad \text{for all } (Q, V), (\tilde{Q}, \tilde{V}) \in \varphi^{-1}(X).$$

Hence  $\bar{g}$  induces a well-defined Riemannian metric  $g$  on  $\text{St}(n, p)$ . Taking into account that each fiber contains a point where the second component,  $V$ , is the identity, we obtain the following expression for  $g$ : for all  $\xi_a = Q \begin{bmatrix} A_a \\ H_a \end{bmatrix}$  and  $\xi_b = Q \begin{bmatrix} A_b \\ H_b \end{bmatrix}$

$$(3.8) \quad g_{Q I_{n \times p}}(\xi_a, \xi_b) := \bar{g}_{(Q, I_p)}(\bar{\xi}_{a(Q, I_p)}, \bar{\xi}_{b(Q, I_p)}) = \beta \text{trace}(A_a^\top A_b) + \text{trace}(H_a^\top H_b).$$

The map  $\varphi$  from  $O(n) \times O(p)$  to  $\text{St}(n, p)$ , respectively endowed with the metrics  $\bar{g}$  and  $g$ , is termed a *Riemannian submersion*. In the rest of the paper, the notation  $\text{St}_\beta(n, p)$  is sometimes used to recall that the Riemannian metric (3.8) depends on  $\beta$ . Observe that (3.8) is the metric considered in [40, (5)].

The invariance (3.7) is not coincidental. The metric  $\bar{g}$  is bi-invariant, hence in particular the action of  $O(n-p) \times O(p)$  on  $O(n) \times O(p)$  by right multiplication is isometric, and the invariance result follows from [17, Theorem 23.14] using [17, Corollary 23.10].

The geodesic in  $O(n) \times O(p)$  (endowed with the metric  $\bar{g}$ ) starting at  $(Q, V)$  with initial velocity  $(Q\Omega, V\Psi)$  is  $t \mapsto \exp_{(Q, V)}(t(Q\Omega, V\Psi))$  with

$$\exp_{(Q, V)}(Q\Omega, V\Psi) = (Q \exp_{\mathfrak{m}}(\Omega), V \exp_{\mathfrak{m}}(\Psi)),$$

where  $\exp$  in the left-hand side is the Riemannian exponential in the total space  $O(n) \times O(p)$  and  $\exp_{\mathfrak{m}}$  denotes the matrix exponential; this follows from the bi-invariance of  $\bar{g}$  (see [30, Proposition 11.9(6)]). Observe that  $\beta$  does not affect the geodesics in  $O(n) \times O(p)$ , but it affects the notion of horizontality in view of (3.5).

The Riemannian submersion route to the metric (3.8) offers an appreciable benefit: the theory establishes that the geodesics in the codomain  $\text{St}_\beta(n, p)$  of the Riemannian submersion  $\varphi$  are the images of the horizontal geodesics in the domain  $\text{O}(n) \times \text{O}(p)$  of  $\varphi$  (see [30, Corollary 7.46] or [11, Corollary 4.3]). Hence, given  $X \in \text{St}(n, p)$  and  $\xi \in \text{T}_X \text{St}(n, p)$ , regardless of the choice of  $(Q, V)$  in the fiber  $\varphi^{-1}(X)$ , the exponential on  $\text{St}(n, p)$  endowed with the metric  $g$  (3.8) is given by

$$(3.9) \quad \text{Exp}_X \xi = \varphi \left( \exp_{(Q, V)}(\bar{\xi}_{(Q, V)}) \right) = Q \exp_{\text{m}}(\Omega) I_{n \times p} \exp_{\text{m}}(-\Psi) V^\top,$$

where  $\bar{\xi}_{(Q, V)} = (Q\Omega, V\Psi)$ . This yields the expression

$$(3.10) \quad \text{Exp}_{QI_{n \times p}} \left( Q \begin{bmatrix} A \\ H \end{bmatrix} \right) = Q \exp_{\text{m}} \begin{bmatrix} 2\beta A & -H^\top \\ H & 0 \end{bmatrix} I_{n \times p} \exp_{\text{m}}((1 - 2\beta)A),$$

which is seen to be equivalent to [40, (10)]. (It was also possible to obtain (3.10) by applying [17, Proposition 23.27] on  $(\text{O}(n) \times \text{O}(p))/(\text{O}(n-p) \times \text{O}(p))$ , which is a naturally reductive homogeneous space in view of [17, Proposition 23.29].)

Observe from (3.10) that the geodesics at  $QI_{n \times p}$  are the geodesics at  $I_{n \times p}$  multiplied on the left by  $Q$ . It follows that the injectivity radius is the same at every point of  $\text{St}(n, p)$ . In the rest of the paper, we single out the point  $I_{n \times p}$ .

As for the derivative of the Riemannian exponential, which is involved in the definition of conjugate points, (3.9) yields the relation

$$\text{DExp}_X(\xi; \check{\xi}) = \text{D}\varphi \left( \exp_{(Q, V)}(\bar{\xi}_{(Q, V)}); \text{D}\exp_{(Q, V)}(\bar{\xi}_{(Q, V)}; \check{\xi}_{(Q, V)}) \right),$$

where  $\varphi(Q, V) = X$ . We will only need the following consequence, which we state in a way that only invokes basic concepts of matrix theory, analysis and differential geometry:

**PROPOSITION 3.1.** *Let the Stiefel manifold  $\text{St}(n, p)$  be endowed with the Riemannian metric (3.8) with  $\beta \neq \frac{1}{2}$ . Let  $X \in \text{St}(n, p)$ ,  $Q \in \text{O}(n)$  such that  $QI_{n \times p} = X$ ,  $\xi \in \text{T}_X \text{St}(n, p)$  and  $\check{\xi} \in \text{T}_\xi \text{T}_X \text{St}(n, p) \simeq \text{T}_X \text{St}(n, p)$ . Represent  $\xi$  and  $\check{\xi}$  as in (3.2), namely*

$$\xi = Q \begin{bmatrix} A \\ H \end{bmatrix}, \quad \check{\xi} = Q \begin{bmatrix} \check{A} \\ \check{H} \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $A, \check{A} \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{skew}}(p)$  and  $H, \check{H} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-p) \times p}$ . Following (3.6), let

$$\Omega := \begin{bmatrix} 2\beta A & -H^\top \\ H & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Psi := -(1 - 2\beta)A, \quad \check{\Omega} := \begin{bmatrix} 2\beta \check{A} & -\check{H}^\top \\ \check{H} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \check{\Psi} := -(1 - 2\beta)\check{A}.$$

Then  $\text{DExp}_X(\xi; \check{\xi}) = 0$  if and only if

$$(3.11) \quad \left. \frac{\text{d}}{\text{d}\epsilon} \right|_{\epsilon=0} \exp_{\text{m}}(t\Omega + \epsilon\check{\Omega}) I_{n \times p} \exp_{\text{m}}(-t\Psi - \epsilon\check{\Psi}) = 0.$$

**3.2. The canonical case.** The canonical metric on the Stiefel manifold [16] is  $g$  (3.8) with  $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$ . In view of (3.4),  $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$  corresponds to  $\alpha = 0$ , for which  $\bar{g}$  (3.3) is no longer a bona-fide metric. The necessary facts for the canonical metric can be obtained by taking the limit as  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ . However, to err on the side of caution, we review a Riemannian submersion structure that induces the canonical metric.

We opt for a fairly detailed overview of this Riemannian submersion structure (which is not mentioned in [3] and only briefly considered in [10, Example 9.36]) because it was instrumental in our discovery of conjugate points. With the exception of Proposition 3.2, the ingredients can already be found in [16, §2.3.1], [21], and [17, §23.7].

Consider the Lie group action

$$\sigma : \mathrm{O}(n) \times \mathrm{St}(n, p) \rightarrow \mathrm{St}(n, p) : (Q, X) \mapsto QX =: \sigma_X(Q).$$

The stabilizer of  $I_{n \times p}$  is

$$\sigma_{I_{n,p}}^{-1}(I_{n,p}) = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & W \end{bmatrix} \mid W \in \mathrm{O}(n-p) \right\} =: \mathrm{O}(n-p).$$

Hence, as an application of [7, Proposition A.2], the submanifold  $\mathrm{St}(n, p)$  is diffeomorphic to the quotient manifold  $\mathrm{O}(n)/\mathrm{O}(n-p)$ :

$$\mathrm{St}(n, p) \simeq \mathrm{O}(n)/\mathrm{O}(n-p).$$

As in [21], consider on  $\mathrm{O}(n)$  the Riemannian metric  $\bar{g}$  defined by

$$(3.12) \quad \bar{g}_Q(Q\Omega_a, Q\Omega_b) := \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{trace}(\Omega_a^\top \Omega_b).$$

The Lie algebra of the stabilizer  $\tau_{I_{n,p}}^{-1}(I_{n,p})$  is

$$\mathfrak{k} = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & C \end{bmatrix} \mid C \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{skew}}(n-p) \right\}.$$

Its complement with respect to  $\bar{g}$  is

$$(3.13) \quad \mathfrak{m} = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \Psi & -B^\top \\ B & 0 \end{bmatrix} \mid B \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-p) \times p} \right\}.$$

Consider the map  $\varphi = \sigma_{I_{n,p}}$ , i.e.,

$$(3.14) \quad \varphi : \mathrm{O}(n) \rightarrow \mathrm{St}(n, p) : Q \mapsto QI_{n \times p}.$$

The fiber above  $Q$  is

$$\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(Q)) = Q\varphi^{-1}(I_{n \times p}) = \left\{ Q \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & R_2 \end{bmatrix} \mid R_2 \in \mathrm{O}(n-p) \right\}.$$

At  $Q$ , the tangent space to the fiber (the *vertical space*) is  $Q\mathfrak{k}$  and its orthogonal complement (the *horizontal space*) is  $Q\mathfrak{m}$ .

The horizontal lift of

$$\xi = Q \begin{bmatrix} A \\ H \end{bmatrix}$$

is

$$(3.15) \quad \bar{\xi}_Q = Q \begin{bmatrix} A & -H^\top \\ H & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The metric  $\bar{g}$  induces a well-defined Riemannian metric  $g$  on  $\text{St}(n, p)$ : for all  $\xi_a = Q \begin{bmatrix} A_a \\ H_a \end{bmatrix}$  and  $\xi_b = Q \begin{bmatrix} A_b \\ H_b \end{bmatrix}$ ,

$$(3.16) \quad g_{QI_{n \times p}}(\xi_a, \xi_b) := \bar{g}_Q(\bar{\xi}_{aQ}, \bar{\xi}_{bQ}) = \frac{1}{2} \text{trace}(A_a^\top A_b) + \text{trace}(H_a^\top H_b).$$

The map  $\varphi$  from  $O(n)$  to  $\text{St}(n, p)$ , respectively endowed with the metrics  $\bar{g}$  and  $g$ , is a Riemannian submersion. This yields the expression

$$(3.17) \quad \text{Exp}_{QI_{n \times p}} \left( Q \begin{bmatrix} A \\ H \end{bmatrix} \right) = Q \exp_m \begin{bmatrix} A & -H^\top \\ H & 0 \end{bmatrix} I_{n \times p},$$

which is indeed (3.10) with  $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$ .

Regarding the derivative of the Riemannian exponential, we have:

**PROPOSITION 3.2.** *Let the Stiefel manifold  $\text{St}(n, p)$  be endowed with the canonical metric, (3.16), i.e., (3.8) with  $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$ . Let  $X \in \text{St}(n, p)$ ,  $Q \in O(n)$  such that  $QI_{n \times p} = X$ ,  $\xi \in T_X \text{St}(n, p)$  and  $\check{\xi} \in T_\xi T_X \text{St}(n, p) \simeq T_X \text{St}(n, p)$ . Represent  $\xi$  and  $\check{\xi}$  as in (3.2), namely*

$$\xi = Q \begin{bmatrix} A \\ H \end{bmatrix}, \quad \check{\xi} = Q \begin{bmatrix} \check{A} \\ \check{H} \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $A, \check{A} \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{skew}}(p)$  and  $H, \check{H} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-p) \times p}$ . Following (3.15), let

$$\Omega := \begin{bmatrix} A & -H^\top \\ H & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \check{\Omega} := \begin{bmatrix} \check{A} & -\check{H}^\top \\ \check{H} & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then  $D \text{Exp}_X(\xi; \check{\xi}) = 0$  if and only if

$$(3.18) \quad \left. \frac{d}{d\epsilon} \right|_{\epsilon=0} \exp_m(t\Omega + \epsilon\check{\Omega}) I_{n \times p} = 0.$$

**4. Preparatory lemmas.** The next technical result emerged from insight gathered in [31, §5.2.1] and further numerical experiments. It gives a nontrivial solution to (3.18).

**LEMMA 4.1.** *Given a positive integer  $m$ , let  $I_m$  denote the identity matrix of size  $m$ ,  $D \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$  nonzero, and  $w \in \mathbb{R}$ . Further let*

$$\Omega := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -I_m \\ I_m & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \check{\Omega} := \begin{bmatrix} -wD & D \\ D & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then

$$(4.1) \quad \left. \frac{d}{d\epsilon} \right|_{\epsilon=0} \exp_m(t\Omega + \epsilon\check{\Omega}) I_{2m \times m} = 0$$

if and only if

$$(4.2a) \quad \frac{\sin t}{t} + \cos t = 0$$

and

$$(4.2b) \quad w = \frac{2}{t}.$$

In other words, the first  $m$  columns of the derivative of the matrix exponential at  $t\Omega$  along  $\check{\Omega}$  are zero if and only if (4.2) holds.

*Proof.* It is readily seen that neither (4.1) nor (4.2) hold when  $t = 0$ . It remains to consider the case  $t \neq 0$ , which gives us license to divide by  $t$  in forthcoming developments.

According to a classical formula for the derivative of the matrix exponential, long known in the physics literature [23] (or see [28]),

$$(4.3) \quad \left. \frac{d}{d\epsilon} \right|_{\epsilon=0} \exp_m(t\Omega + \epsilon\check{\Omega}) = \int_0^1 \exp_m((1-\sigma)t\Omega)\check{\Omega}\exp_m(\sigma t\Omega)d\sigma.$$

In view of the formula (which follows from [17, §2.1])

$$(4.4) \quad \exp_m(\sigma t\Omega) = \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\sigma t)I_m & -\sin(\sigma t)I_m \\ \sin(\sigma t)I_m & \cos(\sigma t)I_m \end{bmatrix},$$

the top-left  $m \times m$  block of (4.3) expands as

$$\int_0^1 (-w \cos(1-\sigma)t \cos \sigma t - \sin(1-\sigma)t \cos \sigma t + \cos(1-\sigma)t \sin \sigma t) d\sigma D,$$

which, by product-to-sum trigonometric identities, is equal to

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 (-w \cos(1-2\sigma)t - w \cos t - \sin t - \sin(1-2\sigma)t + \sin t - \sin(1-2\sigma)t) d\sigma D.$$

This further simplifies to

$$(4.5) \quad -\frac{w}{2} \left( \frac{\sin t}{t} + \cos t \right) D.$$

As for the bottom-left  $m \times m$  block of (4.3), it expands as

$$\int_0^1 (-w \sin(1-\sigma)t \cos \sigma t + \cos(1-\sigma)t \cos \sigma t + \sin(1-\sigma)t \sin \sigma t) d\sigma D,$$

which, by a similar route, reduces to

$$(4.6) \quad \frac{1}{2} \left( -w + \frac{2}{t} \right) \sin t D.$$

Recall that  $D$  is nonzero. The first  $m$  columns of (4.3) are thus zero if and only if both (4.5) and (4.6) equal zero, i.e., (4.2) holds.  $\square$

The next generalization readily follows. It gives a nontrivial solution to (3.11) for  $\beta \neq 1$ , i.e.,  $\alpha \neq -\frac{1}{2}$ .

LEMMA 4.2. *Let  $m$ ,  $D$ ,  $\Omega$  and  $\check{\Omega}$  be as in Lemma 4.1. Further let  $\alpha \neq -\frac{1}{2}$ ,*

$$\Psi := 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \check{\Psi} := \alpha w D.$$

*Then*

$$\left. \frac{d}{d\epsilon} \right|_{\epsilon=0} \exp_m(t\Omega + \epsilon\check{\Omega}) I_{2m \times m} \exp_m(-t\Psi - \epsilon\check{\Psi}) = 0$$

*if and only if*

$$(4.7a) \quad \frac{\sin t}{t} + (1 + 2\alpha) \cos t = 0$$

*and*

$$(4.7b) \quad w = \frac{2}{1 + 2\alpha} \frac{1}{t}.$$

*Proof.* The case  $t = 0$  goes as in the proof of Lemma 4.1. For the case  $t \neq 0$ , by the product rule,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{d\epsilon} \Big|_{\epsilon=0} \exp_m(t\Omega + \epsilon\check{\Omega}) I_{2m \times m} \exp_m(-t\Psi - \epsilon\check{\Psi}) \\ = \frac{d}{d\epsilon} \Big|_{\epsilon=0} \exp_m(t\Omega + \epsilon\check{\Omega}) I_{2m \times m} - \exp_m(t\Omega) I_{2m \times m} \check{\Psi}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.1 gives an expression for the first term and, using (4.4) for the second term, the whole expression is found to reduce to

$$\left[ \begin{array}{c} -\frac{w}{2} \left( \frac{\sin t}{t} + \cos t + 2\alpha \cos t \right) D \\ \frac{1}{2} \left( -w + \frac{2}{t} - 2\alpha w \right) \sin t D \end{array} \right].$$

This is zero if and only if (4.7) holds.  $\square$

The following final preparatory lemma can be interpreted as the limit of the latter when  $\alpha \rightarrow -\frac{1}{2}$ . It gives a nontrivial solution to (3.11) for the remaining case:  $\beta = 1$ , i.e.,  $\alpha = -\frac{1}{2}$ .

LEMMA 4.3. *Let  $m$ ,  $D$ ,  $\Omega$ , and  $\Psi$  be as in Lemma 4.2. Now let  $\alpha = -\frac{1}{2}$ ,*

$$\check{\Omega} := \begin{bmatrix} D & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \check{\Psi} := \alpha D.$$

Then

$$\frac{d}{d\epsilon} \Big|_{\epsilon=0} \exp_m(t\Omega + \epsilon\check{\Omega}) I_{2m \times m} \exp_m(-t\Psi - \epsilon\check{\Psi}) = 0$$

if and only if

$$(4.8) \quad \frac{\sin t}{t} = 0.$$

Observe that the smallest positive solution of (4.8) is  $\pi$ .

*Proof.* The case  $t = 0$  goes as in the previous proofs. For the case  $t \neq 0$ , proceeding as in the previous results, one obtains that

$$\frac{d}{d\epsilon} \Big|_{\epsilon=0} \exp_m(t\Omega + \epsilon\check{\Omega}) I_{2m \times m} \exp_m(-t\Psi - \epsilon\check{\Psi}) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{t} \sin t D \\ \frac{1}{2} \sin t D \end{bmatrix},$$

and the result follows.  $\square$

**5. Conjugate points.** Consider the Stiefel manifold (3.1) endowed with the metric  $g$  (3.8). In this section, we restrict to the case  $2 \leq p \leq n - 2$ , where the preparatory lemmas of Section 4 can be leveraged to find conjugate points. Specifically, we combine Proposition 3.1 and Proposition 3.2 with the lemmas of Section 4 to obtain conjugate points on the Stiefel manifold. The length of the geodesic along which those points are conjugate is therefore an upper bound on the conjugate radius of the Stiefel manifold.

THEOREM 5.1. *Let  $2 \leq p \leq n - 2$  and consider  $\text{St}_\beta(n, p)$ , the Stiefel manifold (3.1) endowed with the Riemannian metric  $g$  (3.8) parameterized by  $\beta > 0$ . Let  $\alpha = \frac{1}{2\beta} - 1$  as in (3.4). Let  $t_\beta^r$  denote the smallest positive solution of (4.7a), namely*

$$t_\beta^r := \min\{t > 0 \mid \frac{\sin t}{t} + (1 + 2\alpha) \cos t = 0\}.$$

Let  $Q \in O(n)$  and consider  $\xi = Q \begin{bmatrix} A \\ H \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{T}_{QI_{n \times p}} \text{St}(n, p)$  with

$$A := 0_{p \times p} \quad \text{and} \quad H := \begin{bmatrix} I_2 & 0_{2 \times (p-2)} \\ 0_{(n-p-2) \times 2} & 0_{(n-p-2) \times (p-2)} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let  $\gamma$  denote the geodesic starting at  $QI_{n \times p}$  in the direction of  $\xi$ , namely, in view of (3.10),  $\gamma(t) = Q \exp_{\mathfrak{m}}(t\Omega) I_{n \times p} \exp_{\mathfrak{m}}(-t\Psi) = \exp_{\mathfrak{m}}(t\Omega) I_{n \times p}$  where

$$\Omega := \begin{bmatrix} 2\beta A & -H^\top \\ H & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi := -(1 - 2\beta)A = 0_{p \times p}.$$

Then  $\gamma(0) = QI_{n \times p}$  and  $\gamma(t_\beta^r)$  are conjugate along  $\gamma$ .

Furthermore, the length (in the sense of (3.8)) of  $\gamma$  between  $t = 0$  and  $t = t_\beta^r$  is  $t_\beta^r \sqrt{2}$ . Thus

$$(5.1) \quad \text{conj}_{\text{St}_\beta(n, p)} \leq t_\beta^r \sqrt{2}.$$

*Proof.* Observe that  $\Omega$  is the  $\Omega$  matrix of the lemmas of Section 4 after padding with zeros and permutation. The conjugacy result follows by combining Proposition 3.1 or Proposition 3.2 with Lemma 4.2 (in the non-Euclidean noncanonical case, i.e.,  $\alpha \notin \{-\frac{1}{2}, 0\}$  or equivalently  $\beta \notin \{1, \frac{1}{2}\}$ ), Lemma 4.3 (in the Euclidean case, i.e.,  $\alpha = -\frac{1}{2}$  or equivalently  $\beta = 1$ ), and Lemma 4.1 (in the canonical case, i.e.,  $\alpha = 0$  or equivalently  $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$ .)

The length of  $\gamma$  between  $t = 0$  and  $t = t_\beta^r$  is  $t_\beta^r \|\xi\|_{QI_{n \times p}}$  with  $\|\xi\|_{QI_{n \times p}}^2 = g_{QI_{n \times p}}(\xi, \xi) = \text{trace}(H^\top H) = \|H\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 = 2$ .

The bound on the conjugate radius is then direct.  $\square$

**6. Geodesic loops.** In view of (2.1), upper bounds on the length of the shortest nontrivial geodesic loops also yield upper bounds on the injectivity radius.

We continue to consider  $\text{St}_\beta(n, p)$ , the Stiefel manifold (3.1) endowed with the metric  $g$  (3.8) parameterized by  $\beta > 0$ .

When  $p = 1$ , regardless of  $\beta$ , the Stiefel manifold reduces to the unit sphere as a Riemannian submanifold of the Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Every geodesic loop has length  $2\pi$ . Hence  $\ell_{\text{St}_\beta(n, 1)}(X) = 2\pi$  for all  $X$ .

When  $p = n \geq 2$ , the Stiefel manifold reduces to the orthogonal group  $O(n)$  endowed with the Frobenius metric scaled by  $\beta$ . The shortest geodesics correspond to Givens rotations, and their length is  $\sqrt{2\beta} 2\pi$ . (The result readily follows from Theorem 6.1 below since, when  $p = n$ , the Frobenius metric scaled by  $\beta$  is the canonical metric scaled by  $2\beta$ .) Hence  $\ell_{\text{St}_\beta(n, n)}(X) = \sqrt{2\beta} 2\pi$  for all  $X$ .

When  $2 \leq p \leq n-1$  and  $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$  (canonical metric), it is known that  $\ell_{\text{St}_{\frac{1}{2}}(n, p)}(X) = 2\pi$  for all  $X$  [31, p. 94]. We give a more detailed proof for completeness.

**THEOREM 6.1** ([31]). *On  $\text{St}_\beta(n, p)$  with  $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$  and  $p \geq 2$ , the shortest geodesic loops have length  $2\pi$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $[0, 1] \ni t \mapsto \text{Exp}_{I_{n \times p}}(t \begin{bmatrix} A \\ H \end{bmatrix})$  be a nontrivial geodesic loop. In view of (3.17),  $I_{n \times p} = \exp_{\mathfrak{m}} \begin{bmatrix} A & -H^\top \\ H & 0 \end{bmatrix} I_{n \times p}$ . In particular,  $e_1 = \exp_{\mathfrak{m}} \begin{bmatrix} A & -H^\top \\ H & 0 \end{bmatrix} e_1$ . Let  $\begin{bmatrix} A & -H^\top \\ H & 0 \end{bmatrix} = S\Lambda S^*$  be an eigenvalue decomposition. The matrix is skew-symmetric, hence  $\Lambda = \text{diag}(i\theta_1, \dots, i\theta_n)$  where the nonzero  $i\theta$ 's appear in complex conjugate pairs. Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be the set of indices of the nonzero components of  $S^*e_1$ . We have

$e_1 = S \exp_m(\Lambda) S^* e_1$ , hence  $S^* e_1 = \exp_m(\Lambda) S^* e_1$ , thus  $e^{i\theta_k} = 1$  for all  $k \in \mathcal{K}$ . Furthermore, since the geodesic loop is nontrivial, it holds that  $\begin{bmatrix} A & -H^\top \\ H & 0 \end{bmatrix} e_1 \neq 0$ , thus there is  $k \in \mathcal{K}$  such that  $\theta_k \neq 0$ . Consequently, the length of the geodesic loop (in the canonical metric) is  $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} A & -H^\top \\ H & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\|_F = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n \theta_j^2} \geq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \sqrt{(2\pi)^2 + (-2\pi)^2} = 2\pi$ . Finally, since there exist geodesic loops of length  $2\pi$ , it follows that  $2\pi$  is the length of the shortest geodesic loops.  $\square$

Consider the remaining case,  $2 \leq p \leq n-1$  and  $\beta \neq \frac{1}{2}$  (noncanonical metrics). To our knowledge, the shortest geodesic loops are unknown. However, some geodesic loops are known, yielding an upper bound. Let  $E_{i,j}$  denote the matrix of size  $n \times p$  with 1 at position  $(i, j)$  and zeros elsewhere. In view of (3.10), the geodesic at  $I_{n \times p}$  along  $\xi = 2\pi(E_{2,1} - E_{1,2})$  makes a loop in unit time, and its length according to (3.8) is  $\sqrt{8\beta\pi^2} = \sqrt{2\beta} 2\pi$ . Likewise, the geodesic at  $I_{n \times p}$  along  $\xi = 2\pi E_{n,1}$  makes a loop in unit time, and its length according to (3.8) is  $2\pi$ . Hence

$$(6.1) \quad \ell_{\text{St}_\beta(n,p)}(X) \leq \min\{\sqrt{2\beta}, 1\} 2\pi.$$

**7. Upper bounds on the injectivity radius.** We can now exploit the knowledge on  $\text{conj}_{\text{St}_\beta(n,p)}$  and  $\ell_{\text{St}_\beta(n,p)}$  gathered respectively in Section 5 and 6 in order to produce an upper bound on the injectivity radius of the Stiefel manifold  $\text{St}_\beta(n, p)$ .

**7.1. Case  $p = 1$  or  $p \geq n-1$ .** As already mentioned, when  $p = 1$ , regardless of  $\beta$ , the Stiefel manifold reduces to the unit sphere as a Riemannian submanifold of the Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . The injectivity radius is  $\pi$ ; see, e.g., [13, §1.6].

When  $p = n$ , the Stiefel manifold reduces to the orthogonal group  $O(n)$  endowed with the Frobenius metric scaled by  $\beta$ . The injectivity radius is  $\sqrt{2\beta}\pi$ . (This can be deduced from [27, Corollary 2.1].)

When  $p = n-1$  and  $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$  (canonical metric), since the fibers of  $\varphi$  (3.14) in  $SO(n)$  are singletons, the injectivity radius of the Stiefel manifold is the same as the injectivity radius of  $O(n)$ , namely  $\pi$ .

Finally, when  $p = n-1$  and  $\beta \neq \frac{1}{2}$  (noncanonical metrics) with  $p \geq 2$  (the case  $p = 1$  has already been handled above), in view of (6.1) and (2.1), we have

$$(7.1) \quad \text{inj}_{\text{St}(n,n-1)} \leq \min\{\sqrt{2\beta}, 1\} \pi.$$

**7.2. Case  $2 \leq p \leq n-2$ .**

**THEOREM 7.1.** *Let  $2 \leq p \leq n-2$  and consider  $\text{St}_\beta(n, p)$ , the Stiefel manifold (3.1) endowed with the Riemannian metric  $g$  (3.8) parameterized by  $\beta > 0$ . Let  $\alpha = \frac{1}{2\beta} - 1$  as in (3.4). Let  $t_\beta^r$  denote the smallest positive solution of (4.7a), namely*

$$t_\beta^r = \min\{t > 0 \mid \frac{\sin t}{t} + (1 + 2\alpha) \cos t = 0\}.$$

Then

$$(7.2) \quad \text{inj}_{\text{St}_\beta(n,p)} \leq \min\{\sqrt{2\beta} \pi, \pi, t_\beta^r \sqrt{2}\} =: \hat{\imath}_\beta.$$

*Proof.* Combine (2.1) with (5.1) and (6.1).  $\square$

Let  $\beta_1 \approx 0.34689870829737$  denote the smallest zero of  $\frac{\sin(\sqrt{\beta}\pi)}{\sqrt{\beta}\pi} + \frac{1-\beta}{\beta} \cos(\sqrt{\beta}\pi)$  and let  $\beta_2 = \left(1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} \tan \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{-1} \approx 0.62839259859361$ . An analysis of  $\hat{\imath}_\beta$  shows that

it is an increasing function of  $\beta$  on its domain  $\beta > 0$ , smooth everywhere except at  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$ , and

$$(7.3) \quad \hat{i}_\beta = \begin{cases} \sqrt{2\beta} \pi & \text{if } \beta \leq \beta_1, \\ t_\beta^r \sqrt{2} & \text{if } \beta_1 \leq \beta \leq \beta_2, \\ \pi & \text{if } \beta_2 \leq \beta. \end{cases}$$

**7.3. Resulting bounds for the canonical and Euclidean metrics.** For the canonical and Euclidean metrics, Section 7.1 and Theorem 7.1 yield the following bounds on the injectivity radius of the Stiefel manifold.

**COROLLARY 7.2.** *For the Stiefel manifold (3.1) with  $2 \leq p \leq n - 2$ :*

1. *In the canonical metric (namely (3.8) with  $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$ , i.e.,  $\alpha = 0$ ), we have*

$$\text{inj}_{\text{St}(n,p)} \leq t^r \sqrt{2} \approx 0.91326189159122 \pi,$$

*where  $t^r$  is the smallest positive solution of  $\frac{\sin t}{t} + \cos t = 0$ .*

2. *In the Euclidean metric (namely (3.8) with  $\beta = 1$ , i.e.,  $\alpha = -\frac{1}{2}$ ), we have*

$$\text{inj}_{\text{St}(n,p)} \leq \pi,$$

*as  $\pi$  is the smallest positive solution of  $\frac{\sin t}{t} = 0$ .*

*For  $p = n - 1$ , we have  $\text{inj}_{\text{St}(n,n-1)} = \pi$  in the canonical metric and  $\text{inj}_{\text{St}(n,n-1)} \leq \pi$  in the Euclidean metric. For  $p = 1$  (with  $n \geq 2$ ),  $\text{inj}_{\text{St}(n,1)} = \pi$ .*

*Proof.* For the canonical case with  $2 \leq p \leq n - 2$ , it is readily seen that the term  $t_\beta^r \sqrt{2}$  achieves the minimum in (7.2). For the Euclidean case with  $2 \leq p \leq n - 2$ , one obtains  $t_\beta^r = \pi$ , and the result follows from (7.2). The case  $p = n - 1$  with  $p \geq 2$  in the Euclidean metric follows from (7.1). The case  $p = n - 1$  in the canonical metric and the case  $p = 1$  were mentioned in Section 7.1.  $\square$

**8. Numerical investigation.** This section presents numerical experiments based on an algorithm (Algorithm 8.1) that takes as input  $\rho > 0$  and has the following properties. If  $\rho \leq \text{inj}_{\text{St}_\beta(n,p)}$ , then it does not return, i.e., it loops forever. If  $\rho > \text{inj}_{\text{St}_\beta(n,p)}$  and  $\beta \leq \frac{1}{2}$  (resp.  $\beta > \frac{1}{2}$ ), then it is known (resp. highly suspected) to return with probability 1; however, it returns after an amount of time that is expected to grow as the dimensions increase and as  $\rho$  gets close to  $\text{inj}_{\text{St}_\beta(n,p)}$ . Experiments in low dimensions support the conjecture that the upper bounds on the injectivity radius obtained in Section 7 are equalities.

Let  $\mathcal{G}$  denote the domain of  $\varphi$ , namely the Lie group  $\text{O}(n) \times \text{O}(p)$  endowed with the metric (3.3) in the noncanonical case (Section 3.1) and the Lie group  $\text{O}(n)$  endowed with the metric (3.12) in the canonical case (Section 3.2). Let  $E$  denote the identity element of  $\mathcal{G}$  and let  $d_{\mathcal{G}}$  denote the distance on  $\mathcal{G}$ . Recall from Section 3 that the geodesics on  $\mathcal{G}$  have a simple expression in terms of the matrix exponential. Hence minimal geodesics on  $\mathcal{G}$ , and thus also  $d_{\mathcal{G}}$ , between any two points on  $\mathcal{G}$  are readily<sup>2</sup> computed by means of the matrix logarithm.

When Algorithm 8.1 returns, it is because it has found a  $\xi$  in the unit tangent space  $U_{I_{n \times p}} \text{St}_\beta(n,p)$  together with a curve between  $I_{n \times p}$  and  $\text{Exp}_{I_{n \times p}}(\rho \xi)$  of length

<sup>2</sup>In fact, systematically returning a skew-symmetric matrix logarithm entails some subtlety. Details can be found in the publicly available code and will be discussed further in a forthcoming project around `SkewLinearAlgebra.jl` (<https://juliapackages.com/p/skewlinearalgebra>).

---

**Algorithm 8.1** Certificate that  $\rho > \text{inj}_{\text{St}_\beta(n,p)}$

---

**Require:**  $n > p > 0; \beta > 0$

- 1: **Input:**  $\rho > 0$
  - 2: **loop**
  - 3:   Draw  $\xi$  from a continuous distribution on the unit tangent space  $\text{U}_{I_{n \times p}} \text{St}(n, p)$ ;
  - 4:    $U \leftarrow \text{Exp}_{I_{n \times p}}(\rho \xi)$  as in (3.10);
  - 5:   Draw  $G$  from a continuous distribution on  $\varphi^{-1}(U)$ ;
  - 6:   Choose  $\Xi \in \text{T}_E \mathcal{G}$  in  $\log_E(G)$ .
  - 7:    $L_\Xi \leftarrow \text{length of } [0, 1] \ni t \mapsto \varphi(\exp_E(t \Xi))$ .
  - 8:   **if**  $L_\Xi < \rho$  **then**
  - 9:     **RETURN**
  - 10:   **end if**
  - 11:   (Optional) Run a few steps of a descent algorithm, initialized at  $G$ , to search for a smaller  $L_\Xi$  and **RETURN** if the obtained  $L_\Xi < \rho$ .
  - 12: **end loop**
- 

strictly smaller than  $\rho$ . Hence, when it returns, Algorithm 8.1 provides a certificate (up to floating point errors and inaccuracies in the computation of matrix logarithms) that  $\rho > \text{inj}_{\text{St}_\beta(n,p)}$ .

Furthermore, if  $\rho > \text{inj}_{\text{St}_\beta(n,p)}$  and the total space  $\mathcal{G}$  is Riemannian ( $\alpha \geq 0$ , i.e.,  $\beta \leq \frac{1}{2}$ ), then Algorithm 8.1 returns with probability 1, as we now explain. Letting  $\beta \leq \frac{1}{2}$ , note the following facts: (i) every minimal geodesic from  $I_{n \times p}$  to  $\text{Exp}_{I_{n \times p}}(\rho \xi)$  admits a horizontal lift starting at the identity element  $E$  which realizes the distance in  $\mathcal{G}$  between  $E$  and the fiber  $\varphi^{-1}(\text{Exp}_{I_{n \times p}}(\rho \xi))$ ; (ii) the distance is continuous; (iii)  $\varphi$  maps curves of  $\mathcal{G}$  to curves of  $\text{St}(n, p)$  of (nonstrictly) shorter length, (iv)  $\text{Exp}$  is continuous. Further let  $\rho > \text{inj}_{\text{St}_\beta(n,p)}$ . Then, by points (i)–(iii), there is  $\xi$  in  $\text{U}_{I_{n \times p}} \text{St}_\beta(n, p)$  such that lines 4–10 of Algorithm 8.1 return with nonzero probability. It follows by point (iv) that there is a neighborhood in  $\text{U}_{I_{n \times p}} \text{St}_\beta(n, p)$  such that, for all  $\xi$  in the neighborhood, lines 4–10 of Algorithm 8.1 return with probability bounded away from zero. Since line 3 draws  $\xi$  in the neighborhood with nonzero probability, it follows that Algorithm 8.1 returns with probability 1 (under the above assumption that  $\rho > \text{inj}_{\text{St}_\beta(n,p)}$  with  $\beta \leq \frac{1}{2}$ ).

If the total space  $\mathcal{G}$  is not Riemannian ( $\alpha < 0$ , i.e.,  $\beta > \frac{1}{2}$ ), then point (i) above no longer holds. We suspect that Algorithm 8.1 still returns with probability 1 when  $\rho > \text{inj}_{\text{St}_\beta(n,p)}$ , but proof attempts are thwarted by the discontinuity of the matrix logarithm at cut points of  $\mathcal{G}$ .

In line 6 of Algorithm 8.1, the choice is unique unless  $G$  belongs to the cut locus of  $E$  in  $\mathcal{G}$ .

In line 7 of Algorithm 8.1, the length is computed in closed form as follows. In the noncanonical case, where  $\mathcal{G} = \text{O}(n) \times \text{O}(p)$ , one obtains  $L_\Xi^2 = \beta \|\Omega_{11} - \Psi\|_F^2 + \|\Omega_{21}\|_F^2$ , where  $\Xi = (\Omega, \Psi)$  and  $\Omega = \begin{bmatrix} \Omega_{11} & \Omega_{12} \\ \Omega_{21} & \Omega_{22} \end{bmatrix}$  with  $\Omega_{11}$  of size  $p \times p$ . In the canonical case, where  $\mathcal{G} = \text{O}(n)$ , one obtains  $L_\Xi^2 = \frac{1}{2} \|\Xi_{11}\|_F^2 + \|\Xi_{21}\|_F^2$ , where  $\Xi = \begin{bmatrix} \Xi_{11} & \Xi_{12} \\ \Xi_{21} & \Xi_{22} \end{bmatrix}$  with  $\Xi_{11}$  of size  $p \times p$ .

Assume that the total space  $\mathcal{G}$  is Riemannian ( $\alpha \geq 0$ , i.e.,  $\beta \leq \frac{1}{2}$ ). Then, in view of [19, (5.6)], the condition in line 8 of Algorithm 8.1 can be replaced by  $d_{\mathcal{G}}(E, G) < \rho$ . However, the discussion above indicates that computing  $L_\Xi$  is not more expensive than computing  $d_{\mathcal{G}}(E, G)$ . Moreover,  $L_\Xi \leq d_{\mathcal{G}}(E, G)$ , hence the replacement can only

increase the average time needed by Algorithm 8.1 to return.

Line 11 offers an opportunity to design algorithm instances that return in less time on average. We have not used this opportunity in the experiments reported here.




FIG. 1. Numerical experiments using Algorithm 8.1 for values of  $\beta$  going from 0.1 to 1.5, spaced by 0.05. For each value of  $\beta$ , we ran an experiment for  $\rho = \hat{i}_\beta$  and  $\rho = \hat{i}_\beta + 0.07$ , where  $\hat{i}_\beta$  is the upper bound defined in (7.2). The plot reports a black dot if Algorithm 8.1 reached a prescribed iteration limit (as large as possible, subject to the figure being generated within reasonable time), and a white dot if Algorithm 8.1 returned. This figure was produced with  $(n, p) = (4, 2)$ . We obtained the same figure for other values of  $n$  and  $p$  with  $2 \leq p \leq n - 2$ .




FIG. 2. Numerical experiments using Algorithm 8.1 with  $(n, p) = (4, 2)$  and  $\beta = 0.5$  for  $\rho = \hat{i}_\beta + \delta$  where  $\delta \in \{1, 0.1, 0.01, 0.001, 0.0001\}$ . The plot reports the number of iterations required by Algorithm 8.1 to return, as observed in representative runs. (In view of the random nature of Algorithm 8.1, the values differ between runs.) The purpose of this figure is to show how a typical return time evolves as the upper dot located above  $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$  in Figure 1 is brought closer to the line.

Figures 1 and 2, as well as other figures available together with the code<sup>3</sup> that produced them, support the following conjecture.

*Conjecture 8.1.* (7.1) and (7.2) hold with an equality.

Although the experiments strikingly corroborate Conjecture 8.1, they do not qualify as a proof for several reasons: only a few pairs  $(n, p)$  are considered; only finitely many points in the  $(\beta, \rho)$  space are tested; though we suspect it, when  $\beta > \frac{1}{2}$ , there is no proof that Algorithm 8.1 eventually returns whenever  $\rho > \text{inj}_{\text{St}_\beta(n, p)}$ ; the time budget may have been chosen too small for some of the sampled  $(\beta, \rho)$ 's, leading to the incorrect belief that Algorithm 8.1 does not return for those  $(\beta, \rho)$ 's; the accuracy of several operations in Algorithm 8.1 depends on the floating point accuracy and on the tolerance set in the algorithms that compute the matrix exponential and logarithm.

Nevertheless, it is tempting to bet that the upper bounds (7.1) and (7.2) will never be improved.

**9. Concluding remarks.** The first few days of March 2024 have seen an intense activity around the Stiefel manifold. First, the eprint [41] was submitted, proving that,

<sup>3</sup><https://github.com/smataigne/InjectivityStiefel.jl>. Figures of the type of Figure 2 vary between runs due to the two “Draw” instructions in Algorithm 8.1. For the same reason, any of the white dots in figures of the type of Figure 1 may turn to black, but this all the more unlikely that the prescribed iteration limit is large. On the other hand, if any of the black dots turns to white, then either Conjecture 8.1 is disproved, or the reason has to be found in the inaccuracies in the execution of the steps of Algorithm 8.1.

whenever  $2 \leq p \leq n - 2$ , the supremum of the sectional curvature of  $\text{St}(n, p)$  with the canonical metric (i.e., (3.8) with  $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$ ) is  $5/4$ . As shown in [41, v2, Corollary 10], it follows that  $\text{inj}_{\text{St}_{\beta=\frac{1}{2}}(n,p)} \geq \sqrt{\frac{4}{5}}\pi \approx 0.89442719099991\pi$ .

A few hours later, the first eprint (see arXiv:2403.02079) of the present work was submitted. Combining [41, v2, Corollary 10] with Corollary 7.2 yields the following bounds on the injectivity radius of the Stiefel manifold with the canonical metric:

$$0.894\pi < \sqrt{\frac{4}{5}}\pi \leq \text{inj}_{\text{St}_{\beta=\frac{1}{2}}(n,p)} \leq t_{\beta=\frac{1}{2}}^r \sqrt{2} < 0.914\pi$$

for  $2 \leq p \leq n - 2$ , where  $t_{\beta=\frac{1}{2}}^r$  is the first positive solution of  $\frac{\sin t}{t} + \cos t = 0$ . Moreover, according to Conjecture 8.1, the injectivity radius is believed to be equal to the endpoint  $t_{\beta=\frac{1}{2}}^r \sqrt{2}$  of the interval.

Two days later, the eprint [33] was submitted, giving explicit expressions for all Jacobi fields along a specific geodesic of  $\text{St}_{\beta=\frac{1}{2}}(n = 4, p = 2)$ . These expressions indicate that, when  $(n, p) = (4, 2)$  and  $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$ , the conjugate points given by Theorem 5.1 are first conjugate points (which, in view of Theorem 2.1, has to be the case if Conjecture 8.1 holds), and that their multiplicity is 1.

One can expect that more is to come, as the Riemannian geometries of the Stiefel manifold still hold many secrets.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] P.-A. ABSIL, C. G. BAKER, AND K. A. GALLIVAN, *Trust-region methods on Riemannian manifolds*, Foundations of Computational Mathematics, 7 (2007), pp. 303–330, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10208-005-0179-9>.
- [2] P.-A. ABSIL, P.-Y. GOUSENBOURGER, P. STRIEWSKI, AND B. WIRTH, *Differentiable piecewise-Bézier surfaces on Riemannian manifolds*, SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences, 9 (2016), pp. 1788–1828, <https://doi.org/10.1137/16M1057978>.
- [3] P.-A. ABSIL, R. MAHONY, AND R. SEPULCHRE, *Optimization Algorithms on Matrix Manifolds*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2008, <http://press.princeton.edu/titles/8586.html>.
- [4] B. AFSARI, *Riemannian  $L^p$  center of mass: existence, uniqueness, and convexity*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society, 139 (2011), pp. 655–673, <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0002-9939-2010-10541-5>.
- [5] B. AFSARI, R. TRON, AND R. VIDAL, *On the convergence of gradient descent for finding the Riemannian center of mass*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 51 (2013), pp. 2230–2260, <https://doi.org/10.1137/12086282X>.
- [6] M. ARNAUDON AND F. NIELSEN, *On approximating the Riemannian 1-center*, Computational Geometry, 46 (2013), pp. 93–104, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comgeo.2012.04.007>.
- [7] T. BENDOKAT, R. ZIMMERMANN, AND P.-A. ABSIL, *A Grassmann manifold handbook: basic geometry and computational aspects*, Advances in Computational Mathematics, 50 (2024), pp. 1–51, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10444-023-10090-8>.
- [8] S. BONNABEL, *Stochastic gradient descent on Riemannian manifolds*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 58 (2013), pp. 2217–2229, <https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2013.2254619>.
- [9] J. BOULANGER, S. SAID, N. LE BIHAN, AND J. H. MANTON, *Filtering from observations on stiefel manifolds*, Signal Processing, 122 (2016), pp. 52–64, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sigpro.2015.11.012>.
- [10] N. BOUMAL, *An introduction to optimization on smooth manifolds*, Cambridge University Press, 2023, <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009166164>, <https://www.nicolasboumal.net/book>.
- [11] E. CAPIONO, M. A. JAVALOYES, AND P. PICCIONE, *Maslov index in semi-Riemannian submersions*, Annals of Global Analysis and Geometry, 38 (2010), pp. 57–75, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10455-010-9200-x>.
- [12] R. CHAKRABORTY AND B. C. VEMURI, *Statistics on the Stiefel manifold: Theory and applications*, The Annals of Statistics, 47 (2019), pp. 415–438, <https://doi.org/10.1214/18-AOS1692>, <https://doi.org/10.1214/18-AOS1692>.

- [13] J. CHEEGER AND D. G. EBIN, *Comparison Theorems in Riemannian Geometry*, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1975. North-Holland Mathematical Library, Vol. 9.
- [14] S. CHEN, S. MA, A. MAN-CHO SO, AND T. ZHANG, *Proximal gradient method for nonsmooth optimization over the Stiefel manifold*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 30 (2020), pp. 210–239, <https://doi.org/10.1137/18M122457X>.
- [15] M. P. DO CARMO, *Riemannian geometry*, Mathematics: Theory & Applications, Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 1992. Translated from the second Portuguese edition by Francis Flaherty.
- [16] A. EDELMAN, T. A. ARIAS, AND S. T. SMITH, *The geometry of algorithms with orthogonality constraints*, SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications, 20 (1998), pp. 303–353, <https://doi.org/10.1137/S0895479895290954>.
- [17] J. GALLIER AND J. QUAINANCE, *Differential geometry and Lie groups—a computational perspective*, vol. 12 of Geometry and Computing, Springer, Cham, 2020, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46040-2>.
- [18] P.-Y. GOUSENBOURGER, E. MASSART, AND P.-A. ABSIL, *Data fitting on manifolds with composite Bézier-like curves and blended cubic splines*, Journal of Mathematical Imaging and Vision, 61 (2018), pp. 645–671, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10851-018-0865-2>.
- [19] N. GUIGUI, N. MIOLANE, AND X. PENNEC, *Introduction to Riemannian geometry and geometric statistics: From basic theory to implementation with Geomstats*, Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning, 16 (2023), pp. 329–493, <https://doi.org/10.1561/22000000098>.
- [20] S. HOSSEINI AND A. USCHMAJEV, *A Riemannian gradient sampling algorithm for nonsmooth optimization on manifolds*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 27 (2017), pp. 173–189, <https://doi.org/10.1137/16M1069298>.
- [21] K. HÜPER, I. MARKINA, AND F. SILVA LEITE, *A Lagrangian approach to extremal curves on Stiefel manifolds*, Journal of Geometric Mechanics, 13 (2021), pp. 55–72, <https://doi.org/10.3934/jgm.2020031>.
- [22] J.-I. ITOH AND M. TANAKA, *The dimension of a cut locus on a smooth Riemannian manifold*, Tohoku Mathematical Journal, Second Series, 50 (1998), pp. 571–575, <https://doi.org/10.2748/tmj/1178224899>.
- [23] R. KARPLUS AND J. SCHWINGER, *A note on saturation in microwave spectroscopy*, Physical Review, 73 (1948), pp. 1020–1026, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.73.1020>.
- [24] W. KLINGENBERG, *Riemannian Geometry*, vol. 1 of de Gruyter Studies in Mathematics, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 1982.
- [25] J. M. LEE, *Introduction to smooth manifolds*, vol. 218 of Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003.
- [26] S. LI, K. JIA, Y. WEN, T. LIU, AND D. TAO, *Orthogonal deep neural networks*, IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, 43 (2021), pp. 1352–1368, <https://doi.org/10.1109/TPAMI.2019.2948352>.
- [27] S. MATAIGNE, *Bounds on the geodesic distances on the stiefel manifold*, master’s thesis, Ecole polytechnique de Louvain, 2023, <http://hdl.handle.net/2078.1/thesis:40523>.
- [28] R. MATHIAS, *Evaluating the Frechet derivative of the matrix exponential*, Numer. Math., 63 (1992), pp. 213–226, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01385857>.
- [29] D. NGUYEN, *Curvatures of Stiefel manifolds with deformation metrics*, 2021, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.01834>.
- [30] B. O’NEILL, *Semi-Riemannian Geometry*, vol. 103 of Pure and Applied Mathematics, Academic Press Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers], New York, 1983.
- [31] Q. RENTMEESTERS, *Algorithms for data fitting on some common homogeneous spaces*, PhD thesis, UCLouvain, July 2013, <http://hdl.handle.net/2078.1/132587>.
- [32] T. SAKAI, *Riemannian Geometry*, vol. 149 of Translations of Mathematical Monographs, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1996. Translated from the 1992 Japanese original by the author.
- [33] J. STOYE AND R. ZIMMERMANN, *On the injectivity radius of the Stiefel manifold: Numerical investigations and an explicit construction of a cut point at short distance*, 2024, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.03782>.
- [34] Y. SUN, N. FLAMMARION, AND M. FAZEL, *Escaping from saddle points on Riemannian manifolds*, in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d’Alché-Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett, eds., vol. 32, Curran Associates, Inc., 2019, [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2019/file/24e01830d213d75deb99c22b9cd91ddd-Paper.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2019/file/24e01830d213d75deb99c22b9cd91ddd-Paper.pdf).
- [35] M. SUTTI, *Shooting methods for computing geodesics on the Stiefel manifold*, 2023, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.03585>.

- [36] R. TRON, B. AFSARI, AND R. VIDAL, *Riemannian consensus for manifolds with bounded curvature*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 58 (2013), pp. 921–934, <https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2012.2225533>.
- [37] P. TURAGA, A. VEERARAGHAVAN, A. SRIVASTAVA, AND R. CHELLAPPA, *Statistical computations on Grassmann and Stiefel manifolds for image and video-based recognition*, Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, IEEE Transactions on, 33 (2011), pp. 2273–2286, <https://doi.org/10.1109/TPAMI.2011.52>.
- [38] Z. WEN AND W. YIN, *A feasible method for optimization with orthogonality constraints*, Math. Program., (2012), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-012-0584-1>.
- [39] S. XU, *Local estimate on convexity radius and decay of injectivity radius in a Riemannian manifold*, Communications in Contemporary Mathematics, 20 (2018), p. 1750060, <https://doi.org/10.1142/s0219199717500602>. arXiv:1704.03269v2.
- [40] R. ZIMMERMANN AND K. HÜPER, *Computing the Riemannian logarithm on the Stiefel manifold: Metrics, methods, and performance*, SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications, 43 (2022), pp. 953–980, <https://doi.org/10.1137/21M1425426>.
- [41] R. ZIMMERMANN AND J. STOYE, *High curvature means low-rank: On the sectional curvature of Grassmann and Stiefel manifolds and the underlying matrix trace inequalities*, 2024, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.01879>.