

Stability and invariant norms of arbitrary sets of 2×2 matrices

Vladimir Yu. Protasov ^{*}, Asiyat Musaeva [†]

Abstract

Invariant norms, also called Barabanov norms, are defined in \mathbb{R}^d for any compact family \mathcal{A} of $d \times d$ matrices. They correspond to the linear switching system, which is a differential equation $\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) = A(t)\mathbf{x}(t)$, where $A(t) \in \mathcal{A}$ for each t . The invariant norm identifies the trajectories $\mathbf{x}(t)$ of the fastest asymptotic growth as $t \rightarrow +\infty$. It also solves the stability problem. This norm is difficult to construct even for a pair of matrices. We show that in case $d = 2$ the invariant norm can be found explicitly for every compact matrix family \mathcal{A} . If \mathcal{A} does not contain a dominant matrix with a real spectrum, then this norm is always unique (up to a multiplier) and is C^1 , otherwise, there may be infinitely many norms. All of them can be found and classified.

Key words: *Compact set of matrices, Barabanov norm, continuous time linear switching system, stability, matrix ball*

AMS 2020 subject classification *15A60, 15A16, 93D20, 52A10*

1. Introduction

Invariant or *Barabanov* norm in \mathbb{R}^d is defined for an arbitrary irreducible compact set \mathcal{A} of $d \times d$ matrices. It describes the asymptotic behaviour of trajectories of a linear differential equation with the matrix $A(t)$ chosen from \mathcal{A} at every moment t . Very little is known about the properties of this norm: when it is unique, smooth, strictly convex, etc? Apart from some trivial cases, there are a few examples when it can be explicitly constructed. In this paper we prove that for 2×2 matrices, this problem admits a complete solution. We classify all Barabanov's norms, prove a uniqueness criterion (up to normalization), and present an algorithm for their construction. We shall see that for generic sets of matrices, this norm is unique and its sphere is a C^1 curve described by one periodic trajectory of the corresponding differential equation. Only one special case when the set contains a matrix with a “real dominance” (all definitions are given

^{*}DISIM, University of L'Aquila, Italy; e-mail: vladimir.protasov@univaq.it

[†]Moscow State University, Russia e-mail: asya.musaeva2001@mail.ru

below) provides a rich variety of invariant norms, including cases of non-uniqueness. Moreover, every norm in \mathbb{R}^2 is a Barabanov norm for a suitable matrix set \mathcal{A} . Geometrically this means that for every convex body G symmetric about the origin, there exists a compact set of matrices whose Barabanov norm has the unit ball G .

It should be stressed, however, that the two-dimensional case is quite special and most of results of this work are not extended, at least directly, to higher dimensions.

Linear switching systems. The invariant norm corresponds to a linear switching systems. We give all definitions in general dimension d and then focus on the case $d = 2$. A *continuous time linear switching system* corresponding to a given compact set \mathcal{A} of real $d \times d$ matrices is a linear ODE:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{x}(t) = A(t)\mathbf{x}(t), \\ \mathbf{x}(0) = \mathbf{x}_0, \\ A(t) \in \mathcal{A}, t \in [0, +\infty). \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

The family \mathcal{A} is called a *control set*, $A(\cdot) : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is an arbitrary measurable matrix function with values in \mathcal{A} called *switching law*, the solution $\mathbf{x} : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is a *trajectory* of the system. The maximal asymptotic growth of trajectories, over all switching laws $A(\cdot)$ and all initial points \mathbf{x}_0 , is characterized by the Lyapunov exponent $\sigma(\mathcal{A})$. This is the infimum of numbers σ such that for every trajectory $\mathbf{x}(\cdot)$, there is a constant $C = C(\mathbf{x})$ for which $\|\mathbf{x}(t)\| \leq C e^{\sigma t}$, $t \geq 0$.

Stability and the Barabanov norms. The system is (asymptotically) stable if all its trajectories tend to zero. The stability is equivalent to that $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) < 0$, see [22]. The Lyapunov exponent does not change after replacing a set \mathcal{A} by its convex hull $\text{co}(\mathcal{A})$. A *shift* of the set \mathcal{A} by a number α is $\mathcal{A} - \alpha I = \{A - \alpha I : A \in \mathcal{A}\}$, where I is the identity matrix. Every trajectory of the system \mathcal{A} can be written as $\mathbf{x}(t) = e^{\alpha t} \mathbf{x}_\alpha(t)$, where \mathbf{x}_α is the trajectory of the shifted family $\mathcal{A} - \alpha I$ corresponding to the same switching law and to the same \mathbf{x}_0 . Therefore, $\sigma(\mathcal{A} - \alpha I) = \sigma(\mathcal{A}) - \alpha$. In particular, after the shift by $\alpha = \sigma(\mathcal{A})$ the Lyapunov exponent becomes zero. That is why we often assume that $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = 0$, i.e., that we passed from the original family \mathcal{A} to $\mathcal{A} - \sigma I$. We never consider the matrix σI if it belongs to \mathcal{A} . Indeed, after the shift by σ it becomes the zero matrix and every its trajectory is constant. Hence, it does not influence the other trajectories and does not change the Lyapunov exponent. In particular, if we say that in case $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = 0$ the system does not contain degenerate matrices, we do not count the zero matrix.

A norm $f(\mathbf{x})$ in \mathbb{R}^d is called *invariant* or *Barabanov* for a compact matrix set \mathcal{A} , if every trajectory of system (1) satisfies $f(\mathbf{x}(t)) \leq e^{\sigma t} f(\mathbf{x}_0)$, $t \geq 0$, and for every \mathbf{x}_0 , there exists an *extremal trajectory* $\bar{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)$ of the system with the control set $\text{co}(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\bar{\mathbf{x}}(0) = \mathbf{x}_0$ and $f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t)) = e^{\sigma t} f(\mathbf{x}_0)$, $t \geq 0$. Thus, the extremal trajectories pass through every point and they are trajectories of the maximal growth. If $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = 0$, which can be assumed after the shift $\mathcal{A} \mapsto \mathcal{A} - \sigma I$, then the definition of the Barabanov norm can be formulated as follows: for every trajectory $\mathbf{x}(\cdot)$, the norm $f(\mathbf{x}(t))$ is non-increasing in t and for every point \mathbf{x}_0 , there exists an extremal trajectory $\bar{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)$ (corresponding to the control set $\text{co}(\mathcal{A})$) starting at \mathbf{x}_0 , for which $f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t)) \equiv f(\mathbf{x}_0)$.

In case $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = 0$ there exists an equivalent geometrical definition of invariant norm. Let G be the unit ball of a norm f and $S = \partial G$ be its unit sphere. Then f is Barabanov if and only if for every $\mathbf{x} \in S$, we have: 1) for each $A \in \mathcal{A}$, the vector $A\mathbf{x}$ starting at \mathbf{x} is either tangent to S

or directed inside S and 2) the set of tangent vectors $A\mathbf{x}$ is nonempty. Here “directed inside” means that $\mathbf{x} + \lambda A\mathbf{x} \in \text{int}G$ for small $\lambda > 0$; “tangent to S ” means that the distance from the point $\mathbf{x} + \lambda A\mathbf{x}$ to S is $o(\lambda)$ as $\lambda \rightarrow +0$. In particular, the zero vector is tangent to S .

For all shifts $\mathcal{A} - \alpha I$, the Barabanov norm is the same. Therefore, it suffices to consider those norms only for $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = 0$. The sets \mathcal{A} and $\text{co}(\mathcal{A})$ have the same Barabanov norm.

The family \mathcal{A} is called *irreducible* if its matrices do not share a common invariant subspace. It was proved in [3] that a compact irreducible set of matrices always possesses an invariant norm. This norm may not be unique. Here and below we mean the uniqueness up to multiplication by a constant.

Barabanov norms have been intensively studied in the literature, not only for system (1) but also for discrete time systems, when the ODE is replaced by the difference equation $\mathbf{x}(k+1) = A(k)\mathbf{x}(k)$. For such systems, the invariant norms are well understood, see, for instance [6, 13, 23]. For most of discrete time systems with a finite set of matrices, these norms are unique [26] and have a simple structure: they are either piecewise-linear or piecewise-quadratic [14, 20]. The situation for continuous time systems (1) is more complicated, see [7, 8, 15, 21] and references therein. As a rule, nothing is known on the invariant norms except for their existence. In the works [7, 8] several important properties of Barabanov’s norms in dimensions $d = 2, 3$ have been obtained under additional assumptions. In some works the invariant norms have been approximated by simpler norms, such as piecewise-linear, etc. [5, 12].

We are going to see that in the two-dimensional case the invariant norms can be found, constructed and completely classified for every compact set of matrices.

The case of 2×2 matrices. Stability and invariant norms in dimension $d = 2$ has been studied in great detail [1, 4, 10, 11, 16, 21, 27]. While for discrete time systems, the 2D case is not much simpler than the higher dimensions [6, 13], in continuous time the planar case is indeed special. For example, the stability of sets of 2×2 matrices can efficiently be decided. For sets of two matrices, this was done in [2, 11, 21, 28] by the search of the “worst trajectory” and by the tools of Lie algebra [19], see also [1, 16, 27, 29, 30]. For arbitrary finite sets of matrices, this was done in [24].

In all aforementioned works the finiteness of the control set \mathcal{A} was significant. All suggested methods used an exhaustion of \mathcal{A} . A question arises can the stability problem be solved explicitly for an arbitrary compact set \mathcal{A} ? In Theorem 3 we prove a criterion of stability for arbitrary compact family of 2×2 matrices. The invariant norm issue for planar continuous time systems has also been addressed only for finite matrix sets [7, 8, 21, 24]. We discuss this issue in Section 6. In Section 4 of this paper we obtain a complete solution. Moreover, we show that the set of all possible invariant norms is wide: every norm in \mathbb{R}^2 is Barabanov for a suitable set \mathcal{A} .

The main results. We solve the stability problem and find the Barabanov norms for arbitrary compact set of 2×2 matrices. The stability is addressed in Section 3, here we describe the result on the invariant norms.

A matrix $A \in \text{co}(\mathcal{A})$ (different from σI), is called *dominant* if the largest real part of its eigenvalues is equal to $\sigma(\mathcal{A})$. In this case the trajectory $\mathbf{x}(t) = e^{tA}\mathbf{x}_0$ generated by the stationary switching law $A(t) \equiv A$, has the maximal growth unless \mathbf{x}_0 belongs to an invariant subspace of A corresponding to eigenvalues with smaller real parts. For 2×2 matrices, there are two possible cases of dominance: *real*, if A has real eigenvalues, and *complex* otherwise. The matrix σI , if it belongs to \mathcal{A} , is not considered and is not counted as dominant.

Our main result asserts that for an arbitrary compact set of 2×2 matrices, there are three possible cases for the Barabanov norm:

1) If the system does not have a matrix with real dominance, then its Barabanov norm is unique and its unit sphere S coincides with one period of a certain periodic trajectory of the system $\mathcal{A} - \sigma I$. This trajectory can be explicitly computed.

2) If the system has a matrix A with complex dominance, then its Barabanov norm is quadratic, the unit sphere is an ellipse described by the trajectory of the matrix $A - \sigma I$.

3) If the system has a real dominance, then there may be infinitely many Barabanov's norms. Their complete variety is given in Theorem 5. The unit sphere of Barabanov's norm is never described by one dominant trajectory. Every convex curve symmetric about the origin can be a unit sphere of the Barabanov norm of a suitable system with a real dominance.

Note that the dominance (real or complex) may be decided without the convex hull of \mathcal{A} . Theorem 4 proven in Section 4 asserts that if $\text{co}(\mathcal{A})$ contains a dominant matrix, then so does \mathcal{A} .

Other results. The criterion of stability given by Theorem 3 makes it possible to decide between the cases $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) < 0$ and $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) \geq 0$. Applying bisection in the shift of the set \mathcal{A} , one can compute the Lyapunov exponent $\sigma(\mathcal{A})$ with an arbitrary precision. After this the invariant norm can be constructed algorithmically. The construction is rather simple in the case when the set \mathcal{A} has no real dominance (Section 2). Otherwise, it is more technically difficult due to a wide set of invariant norms. The algorithm is given in subsection 4.3.

The uniqueness issue for the invariant norms is solved in Section 4. Theorem 6 gives the corresponding criterion.

Section 7 deals with applications. The first one concerns the stability of a matrix ball $\mathcal{A} = \{A : \|A - A_0\|_F \leq r\}$, where $\|\cdot\|_F$ is the Frobenius norm. The second problem is the stability of the system (1) with the control set given approximately, with possible noise.

Notation. If the converse is not stated we always deal with an irreducible compact set \mathcal{A} of 2×2 matrices. The unit ball of the Barabanov norm is denoted by G and the unit sphere (actually, a closed convex curve symmetric about the origin) by S . We use the standard terminology for lines of support for S and for left and right tangent lines. For all but countably many points of S , the line of support is unique and coincides with the tangent line (and hence, with the left and right tangents). We call a matrix Hurwitz if all its eigenvalues have negative real parts.

2. The Barabanov norms for systems without real dominance

In this section we consider sets \mathcal{A} for which none of the matrices from $\text{co}(\mathcal{A})$ has a real dominance, i.e., has an eigenvalue equal to the Lyapunov exponent $\sigma(\mathcal{A})$ of the system (1). This means that none of the stationary switching laws $A(t) \equiv A$ generated by one matrix $A \in \text{co}(\mathcal{A})$ with a real leading eigenvalue provides the maximal asymptotic growth. We are going to see that in this case there exists a unique Barabanov norm. This norm is generated by a periodic trajectory. This unique extremal trajectory may have infinitely many switching points and can be obtained explicitly as a solution of a certain linear differential equation. On the other hand, there is one particular case when this extremal trajectory has no switching points at all. This is the case of complex dominance, with which we begin our analysis. In this case the unique Barabanov norm is quadratic and its unit ball is an ellipse.

2.1. Systems with complex dominance

We begin with the following simple observation:

Proposition 1 *If $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = 0$ and the convex hull $\text{co}(\mathcal{A})$ contains a matrix with a purely imaginary spectrum, then all such matrices from $\text{co}(\mathcal{A})$ are proportional, at least one of them belongs to \mathcal{A} and a unique Barabanov norm of \mathcal{A} is quadratic.*

Proof. Every 2×2 -matrix with an imaginary spectrum is similar to a rotation by $\frac{\pi}{2}$ multiplied by a number. Passing to the corresponding basis we obtain a matrix A , for which all trajectories $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = A\mathbf{x}$ are concentric circles. A Barabanov norm of \mathcal{A} is non-increasing along those trajectories, hence, it is constant since the trajectories are periodic. Thus, the Barabanov norm is proportional to the Euclidean one and therefore, it is unique up to normalization. If there is another operator $A' \in \text{co}(\mathcal{A})$ with an imaginary spectrum, then it also generates a Barabanov norm, which is Euclidean in another basis. The uniqueness implies that those two bases are similar by means of an orthogonal transformation. Hence, A' is also proportional to a rotation by $\frac{\pi}{2}$. Thus, all matrices from $\text{co}(\mathcal{A})$ with an imaginary spectrum are proportional. Assume that none of them belongs to \mathcal{A} . In this case, the matrix A is a convex combination of some $A_1, \dots, A_N \in \mathcal{A}$. For every \mathbf{x} from the unit circle S , all the vectors $A_1\mathbf{x}, \dots, A_N\mathbf{x}$ starting at \mathbf{x} are either tangent to S or directed inside S . Their convex combination $A\mathbf{x}$ is tangent to S , hence, all $A_i\mathbf{x}$ are also tangent. Thus, $A_i\mathbf{x} \perp \mathbf{x}$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2$, consequently, A_i is proportional to the rotation by $\frac{\pi}{2}$, which is a contradiction. □

Thus, in the case of complex dominance, the unique Barabanov norm is affinely similar to the Euclidean one, its invariant sphere is an ellipse $S = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \mathbf{x}^T M \mathbf{x} = 1\}$, where $M \succ 0$, i.e., M a positive definite matrix. It is easy to characterize the families with the complex dominance and to find S .

Theorem 1 *A family \mathcal{A} has a complex dominance if and only if there exists a matrix $A_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ with eigenvalues $\alpha \pm \beta i$ such that $\beta \neq 0$ and the system of linear matrix inequalities $A^T M + M A \preceq \alpha I$, $A \in \mathcal{A}$, possesses a solution $M \succ 0$. In this case $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = \alpha$, A_0 is dominant, the Barabanov norm is unique and is equal to $f(\mathbf{x}) = \sqrt{\mathbf{x}^T M \mathbf{x}}$.*

Proof. After the shift of the system $\mathcal{A} \mapsto \mathcal{A} - \alpha I$ it can be assumed that $\alpha = 0$. It is well-known that the system $A^T M + M A \preceq 0$, $A \in \mathcal{A}$, is equivalent to that the norm $f(\mathbf{x}) = \sqrt{\mathbf{x}^T M \mathbf{x}}$ is non-increasing along any trajectory [17]. Therefore, $\sigma \leq 0$. On the other hand $\sigma(A_0) = 0$, consequently $\sigma \geq 0$. Thus, $\sigma = 0$, and it remains to refer to Proposition 1. □

2.2. Systems without real dominance

A vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is called *feasible* if there is no matrix $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and number $\lambda \geq 0$ such that $A\mathbf{x} = \lambda\mathbf{x}$. Thus, \mathbf{x} is not an eigenvector of a matrix from \mathcal{A} with a nonnegative eigenvalue. Consider the set of images $\{A\mathbf{x} : A \in \mathcal{A}\}$. If it contains a vector \mathbf{y} such that the (oriented)

angle between \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} belongs to the interval $(0, \pi)$, then we take the vector for which this angle is minimal (it exists under our assumptions) and, among them, the vector \mathbf{y} with the maximal length. The matrix $A \in \mathcal{A}$ for which $A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}$ will be denoted by $A_{\mathbf{x}}^{(\ell)}$ and called the *leading left matrix*. If there are several such matrices, then we take any of them. This matrix is well defined whenever \mathbf{x} is feasible and there is $A \in \mathcal{A}$ such that the angle between \mathbf{x} and the image $A\mathbf{x}$ belongs to $(0, \pi)$. Similarly we define the *leading right matrix* $A_{\mathbf{x}}^{(r)}$, for which the image makes the maximal angle with \mathbf{x} on the interval $(-\pi, 0)$. We usually omit the subscript \mathbf{x} keeping in mind that $A^{(\ell)}$ and $A^{(r)}$ depend on \mathbf{x} . The rays starting at the point \mathbf{x} and co-directed to $A^{(\ell)}\mathbf{x}$ and $A^{(r)}\mathbf{x}$ will be denoted by $a_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $b_{\mathbf{x}}$ respectively. These are the *leading left* and *leading right directions*.

For infeasible \mathbf{x} , the leading directions are not defined, for feasible \mathbf{x} at least one of them is defined. Otherwise, $A\mathbf{x}$ is collinear to \mathbf{x} for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$, hence \mathcal{A} is reducible.

The *leading left trajectory* is the solution of ODE $\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) = A^{(\ell)}(t)\mathbf{x}(t)$ on a segment $[t_0, t_1]$ with some initial condition $\mathbf{x}(t_0) = \mathbf{x}_0 \neq 0$, where $A^{(\ell)}(t)$ is the operator $A^{(\ell)}$ associated to $\mathbf{x}(t)$. It is assumed that all $A^{(\ell)}(t)$ are well-defined for all $t \in [t_0, t_1]$. This trajectory goes around the origin in the positive direction (counterclockwise). The same is for the leading right trajectory $\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) = A^{(r)}(t)\mathbf{x}(t)$.

Theorem 2 *Suppose $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = 0$ and the system does not have real dominance (i.e., $\text{co}(\mathcal{A})$ does not contain degenerate matrices); then the Barabanov norm is unique and its unit sphere S is described by one period of a periodic leading trajectory, either left or right.*

Moreover, if the system does not have a complex dominance, then its extremal trajectory is unique and coincides with the leading trajectory. In case of the left leading trajectory, we have: at every point $\mathbf{x} \in S$, the ray $a_{\mathbf{x}}$ is tangent to S and $b_{\mathbf{x}}$ is directed inside it. In case of the right trajectory, it is vice versa.

Remark 1 Theorem 2 can be formulated without involving the convex hull of \mathcal{A} . Theorem 4 below asserts that if $\text{co}(\mathcal{A})$ contains a dominant matrix, then so does \mathcal{A} , unless \mathcal{A} has a complex dominance.

Proof of Theorem 2 is realized in four steps:

1. For every $\mathbf{x} \in S$, either one of the vectors $a_{\mathbf{x}}, b_{\mathbf{x}}$ is not defined or the angle between $a_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $b_{\mathbf{x}}$ is less than π .

Otherwise, the ray $\{\lambda\mathbf{x} : \lambda \geq 1\}$ intersects the segment connecting points $\mathbf{x} + A^{(\ell)}\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{x} + A^{(r)}\mathbf{x}$. This means that there exists a convex combination of those ends which is co-directed to \mathbf{x} and hence, the corresponding convex combination A of the matrices $A^{(\ell)}$ and $A^{(r)}$ has a real non-negative eigenvalue. If it is zero, then A is degenerate, if it is positive, then $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) > 0$. The contradiction completes the proof of step 1.

2. The set of points $\mathbf{x} \in S$ at which both $a_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $b_{\mathbf{x}}$ are tangent to S is either empty or finite. We call such points *switching*. On every open arc $\gamma \subset S$ connecting neighbouring switching points, either all $a_{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{x} \in \gamma$, are tangents and all $b_{\mathbf{x}}$ are not, or vice versa. This arc is a C^1 curve.

Indeed, as it is shown in step 1, the angle between $a_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $b_{\mathbf{x}}$ is less than π . Since this angle continuously depends on \mathbf{x} , it follows by the compactness that, for all $\mathbf{x} \in S$, where both $a_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $b_{\mathbf{x}}$ exist, this angle does not exceed $\pi - \varepsilon$, where $\varepsilon > 0$. If at some point \mathbf{x} both those rays tangent S , then \mathbf{x} is a corner point of S with the adjacent angle between one-side tangents at

least ε . Since the sum of all adjacent angles at the corner points of a convex curve does not exceed 2π , it follows that the total number of corner points \mathbf{x} does not exceed $2\pi/\varepsilon$. On every arc between neighbouring points, the set of points \mathbf{x} with tangent $a_{\mathbf{x}}$ is closed and the same is true for $b_{\mathbf{x}}$. If a connected set is split into two closed sets, then one of them is empty. Thus, every arc has one direction of tangent rays ($a_{\mathbf{x}}$ or $b_{\mathbf{x}}$). Since those rays depend continuously on \mathbf{x} , it follows that the arc is C^1 .

Thus, S admits a finite partition by switching points, each interval has one direction of tangents: either $a_{\mathbf{x}}$ or $b_{\mathbf{x}}$. Now we are going to prove that this partition is actually trivial and all tangents have the same direction on the entire curve S .

3. *Either all the rays $a_{\mathbf{x}}$, $\mathbf{x} \in S$, touch S and all $b_{\mathbf{x}}$ do not, or vice versa.*

Assume the contrary: there are several arcs of the partition by switching points. After concatenation of arcs corresponding to the same direction ($a_{\mathbf{x}}$ or $b_{\mathbf{x}}$) it can be assumed that neighbouring arcs have opposite directions of tangent vectors. Let an arc $\mathbf{x}_1\mathbf{x}_2$ (the enumeration is counterclockwise) has tangents $a_{\mathbf{x}}$ and the next arc $\mathbf{x}_2\mathbf{x}_3$ has tangents $b_{\mathbf{x}}$. Since each arc is C^1 , it follows that the right tangents (that are opposite to $a_{\mathbf{x}}$) tend to $b_{\mathbf{x}_2}$ as $\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}_2$ along the arc $\mathbf{x}_1\mathbf{x}_2$. Therefore, $a_{\mathbf{x}}$ tends to $-b_{\mathbf{x}_2}$ as $\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}_2$ along the arc $\mathbf{x}_1\mathbf{x}_2$. On the other hand, by the continuity of $a_{\mathbf{x}}$ in \mathbf{x} , the ray $a_{\mathbf{x}}$ tends to $-a_{\mathbf{x}_2}$ as $\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}_2$. Thus, $a_{\mathbf{x}_2} = -b_{\mathbf{x}_2}$, which is impossible due to item 1).

4. *One of the two trajectories $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = A^{(l)}\mathbf{x}$ or $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = A^{(r)}\mathbf{x}$ starting from an arbitrary point of S is periodic and coincides with S . The other one is either non defined or converges to zero.*

This follows directly from item 3): if, say, all $a_{\mathbf{x}}$ are tangent to S , then S is a periodic trajectory of the equation $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = A^{(l)}(t)\mathbf{x}$.

□

Now we can make the main conclusion for general systems, without the condition $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = 0$.

Corollary 1 *A system without real dominance always possesses a unique Barabanov norm. The unit sphere S of this norm is a C^1 curve.*

If, in addition, it does not have a complex dominance, then it possesses a unique extremal trajectory $\bar{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)$. It corresponds to a periodic switching law and the curve $e^{-\sigma t}\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t)$, $t \in T$, where T is the period, describes S .

Proof. By the corresponding shift $\mathcal{A} \mapsto \mathcal{A} - \sigma I$ we pass to the case $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = 0$ and imply Theorem 2. The uniqueness follows immediately, the C^1 regularity follows from the continuity of $a_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $b_{\mathbf{x}}$ with respect to \mathbf{x} .

□

Remark 2 Theorem 2 can be put into practice by finding the left and right leading trajectories of \mathcal{A} . Finding $a_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $b_{\mathbf{x}}$ for each \mathbf{x} we write the differential equations $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = A^{(l)}\mathbf{x}$ and $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = A^{(r)}\mathbf{x}$ with an arbitrary initial point \mathbf{x}_0 , from which we compute the leading trajectories. If $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = 0$ and there is no real dominance, then one of those trajectories is periodic and defines the unit sphere S of the Barabanov norm.

2.3. Positive systems always have real dominance

A system is called positive if \mathcal{A} consists of *Metzler matrices*, whose off-diagonal elements are all nonnegative. All trajectories of a positive system started in the positive quadrant \mathbb{R}_+^2 never leave this quadrant [10, 21]. A positive system cannot have periodic trajectories making rotations around the origin. Otherwise such a trajectory contains some positive vector $\mathbf{x}(t_1)$ and hence $\mathbf{x}(t)$ are also nonnegative for all $t > t_1$. Thus, we have

Corollary 2 *A positive planar system always has real dominance.*

Proof. After a proper shift we assume that $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = 0$. Theorem 2 implies that either $\text{co}(\mathcal{A})$ contains a degenerate matrix, which is dominant, or it has a periodic trajectory. The latter is impossible for a positive system. □

Corollary 2 immediately implies Theorem 3.3 from [10], which states that *a positive planar system with all stationary trajectories converging to zero is stable*. Indeed, this system has a dominant trajectory which also has to converge to zero. This means that the system is stable.

3. Stability

We call a leading trajectory $\mathbf{x}(\cdot)$ *round* if the vector $\mathbf{x}(t)$ makes a rotation about the origin. In this case $\mathbf{x}(T) = \lambda \mathbf{x}(0)$ for some $\lambda \geq 0$, $T > 0$, and the switching law is periodic with the period T (we always take the minimal period). If $\lambda = 1$, then the trajectory is periodic; if $\lambda < 1$ ($\lambda > 1$) it is *decreasing* (respectively, *increasing*). Due to the central symmetry, we can consider only the half of the period: $\mathbf{x}(T/2) = -\sqrt{\lambda} \mathbf{x}(0)$. Every system can have at most two round leading trajectories (left and right) but may not have them at all.

Theorem 3 *An irreducible family \mathcal{A} is stable if and only if $\text{co}(\mathcal{A})$ does not contain matrices with a nonnegative eigenvalue and the both round leading trajectories are decreasing, whenever they exist. In this case an arbitrary point $\mathbf{x}_0 \neq 0$ can be chosen as a starting point of these trajectories.*

Proof. The necessity is obvious: if a leading trajectory is non-decreasing, then it does not converge to zero, so, the system is unstable; the same is true if $\text{co}(\mathcal{A})$ contains a non-Hurwitz matrix. To prove the sufficiency we assume the contrary: the system is unstable. If $\sigma = 0$, then Theorem 2 implies that at least one of the leading trajectories is well-defined and periodic, which contradicts to the assumption. If $\sigma > 0$, then we consider the shifted family $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{A} - \sigma I$. It does not contain degenerate matrices, otherwise $\text{co}(\mathcal{A})$ contains a matrix with the eigenvalue σ . Hence, by Theorem 2, the system $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ possesses a periodic leading trajectory $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)$ (say, left trajectory), which coincides with the unit sphere of Barabanov's norm. Consequently, the trajectory $\mathbf{x}(t) = e^{\sigma t} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(t)$ of the system \mathcal{A} increases to infinity as $t \rightarrow +\infty$. Hence, if so does the leading trajectory of \mathcal{A} , provided that it makes a rotation. If it is not, then the direction of the vector $\mathbf{x}(t)$ tends to some direction \mathbf{x}_∞ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$, in which case the operator $A^{(\ell)}$ corresponding to this direction has a nonnegative leading eigenvector. □

Thus, if we can check that none of the operators from $\text{co}(\mathcal{A})$ has a nonnegative eigenvalue, then the stability decision is reduced to construction of the leading trajectory. To this end we realize the following:

Algorithm for deciding stability. We are given a compact irreducible family of 2×2 matrices \mathcal{A} . The problem is to decide whether $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) < 0$.

Take arbitrary $\mathbf{x}_0 \neq 0$ and solve the ODE $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = A^{(\ell)}\mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{x}(0) = \mathbf{x}_0$. Four cases are possible:

1) At some point $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}(t)$ of the trajectory, the ray starting at \mathbf{x} in the direction $-A^{(\ell)}\mathbf{x}(t)$ opposite to the leading direction intersects the open interval $(-\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_0)$. In this case $\sigma > 0$;

2) At some point $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}(t)$ of the trajectory, the ray starting at \mathbf{x} in the leading direction $A^{(\ell)}\mathbf{x}(t)$ intersects the open interval $(-\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_0)$. In this case the round trajectory is either not defined or decreasing.

3) The trajectory $\mathbf{x}(t)$ approaches to some direction \mathbf{x}_∞ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$, in which case \mathcal{A} contains an operator with a nonnegative eigenvalue and hence $\sigma \geq 0$.

4) The trajectory comes to the opposite direction $\mathbf{x}(t) = -\nu\mathbf{x}_0$. If, $\mu \geq 1$, then $\sigma \geq 0$, otherwise, the trajectory decreases.

Then we do the same for the ODE $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = A^{(r)}\mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{x}(0) = \mathbf{x}_0$. If for each ODE the round trajectory either decreases or does not exist (the cases 2 and 4), then the system is stable; otherwise it is not.

4. Barabanov norms for general matrix families

In this section we always assume that $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = 0$. Theorem 2 proved in Section 2 gives a complete description of Barabanov's norms when all matrices of $\text{co}(\mathcal{A})$ are non-degenerate. In this case the sphere S is defined by a periodic leading trajectory. The presence of degenerate matrices changes the situation completely and admits a rich variety of invariant norms. To attack this case, we begin with the structure of arcs of S corresponding to nondegenerate matrices.

4.1. Auxiliary results

Lemma 1 *Suppose an open arc of the curve S between points \mathbf{x}_1 and \mathbf{x}_2 does not intersect kernels of operators from $\text{co}(\mathcal{A})$. Then this arc is a union of two leading trajectories starting at some point $\mathbf{s} \in S$ and going to \mathbf{x}_1 and \mathbf{x}_2 respectively. One of those trajectories can be empty, in which case \mathbf{s} coincides with \mathbf{x}_1 or with \mathbf{x}_2 .*

Proof. Moving both points $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2$ slightly inside the arc we obtain an embedded closed arc $\mathbf{x}'_1\mathbf{x}'_2$. If we prove the statement for this arc, then it will follow for the original open arc by the limit passage. The remainder of the proof is the same as the proof Theorem 2. First, we show that for every \mathbf{x} on the arc $\mathbf{x}'_1\mathbf{x}'_2$, the angle between the leading rays is less than π . Otherwise, it is equal to π and hence, \mathbf{x} belongs to the kernel of a convex combination of operators $A^{(l)}, A^{(r)}$. Then we prove that the arc $\mathbf{x}'_1\mathbf{x}'_2$ contains only finite number of switching points between the leading vectors. Moreover, a switching point cannot be ingoing from both sides. Hence, concatenating all neighbouring parts with the same directions of leading vectors, we obtain at most one switching point, which has two outgoing trajectories.

□

The point \mathbf{s} will be referred to as a *source* for the arc $\mathbf{x}_1\mathbf{x}_2$. Lemma 1 asserts that every arc which does not have interior points on the kernels of operators from $\text{co}(\mathcal{A})$ contains a unique source, possibly coinciding with an end of the arc. For constructing an invariant norm, we need an inverse problem: under which conditions does the arc $\mathbf{x}_1\mathbf{x}_2$ composed of two leading trajectories exist? More precisely, let ℓ_1, ℓ_2 be rays starting at the origin and the angle between them does not exceed π (the angle is oriented, the enumeration is counterclockwise). For given points $\mathbf{x}_i \in \ell_i \setminus \{0\}$, $i = 1, 2$, one needs to determine whether there exists a source point \mathbf{s} and two leading trajectories going to \mathbf{x}_1 and \mathbf{x}_2 respectively?

To formulate the criterion we need some further notation. Assume the left leading trajectory goes from a point $\mathbf{z}_1 \in \ell_1$ to $\mathbf{x}_2 \in \ell_2$. Denote $k_1 = \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_2\|}{\|\mathbf{z}_1\|}$. The right leading trajectory goes from $\mathbf{z}_2 \in \ell_2$ to $\mathbf{x}_1 \in \ell_1$. Denote $k_2 = \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_1\|}{\|\mathbf{z}_2\|}$. Finally, let $m = \min \{\ln k_1, -\ln k_2\}$ and $M = \max \{\ln k_1, -\ln k_2\}$.

Lemma 2 *Let $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = 0$, ℓ_1, ℓ_2 be rays starting at the origin, the angle between them does not exceed π and does not contain the kernels of operators from $\text{co}(\mathcal{A})$ different from ℓ_1, ℓ_2 . Suppose there exists both (left and right) leading trajectories connecting points of those rays; then for given $\mathbf{x}_i \in \ell_i$, $i = 1, 2$, there are two trajectories with a common source leading to \mathbf{x}_1 and \mathbf{x}_2 respectively if and only if*

$$m \leq \ln \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_2\|}{\|\mathbf{x}_1\|} \leq M, \quad (2)$$

where m, M are defined above.

Proof. The source point \mathbf{s} exists if and only if the leading trajectories $\mathbf{z}_1\mathbf{x}_2$ (from ℓ_1 to ℓ_2) and $\mathbf{z}_2\mathbf{x}_1$ (from ℓ_2 to ℓ_1) intersect. This happens when either $\|\mathbf{x}_1\| \leq \|\mathbf{z}_1\|$, $\|\mathbf{x}_2\| \leq \|\mathbf{z}_2\|$ or conversely: $\|\mathbf{x}_1\| \geq \|\mathbf{z}_1\|$, $\|\mathbf{x}_2\| \geq \|\mathbf{z}_2\|$. In the former case we have $\frac{\|\mathbf{x}_2\|}{\|\mathbf{x}_1\|} \geq \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_2\|}{\|\mathbf{z}_1\|} = k_1$ and $\frac{\|\mathbf{x}_2\|}{\|\mathbf{x}_1\|} \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{z}_2\|}{\|\mathbf{x}_1\|} = \frac{1}{k_2}$. Thus, $\frac{\|\mathbf{x}_2\|}{\|\mathbf{x}_1\|} \in [k_1, \frac{1}{k_2}]$. This is possible when $k_1 \leq \frac{1}{k_2}$. Similarly, the latter case means that $\frac{\|\mathbf{x}_2\|}{\|\mathbf{x}_1\|} \in [\frac{1}{k_2}, k_1]$, which is equivalent to (2). □

Lemma 3 *If $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = 0$ and there is a degenerate matrix $A \in \text{co}(\mathcal{A})$, then its second eigenvalue is negative.*

Proof. The second eigenvalue cannot be positive; if it is zero, then either $A = 0$, this case is excluded, or the equation $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = A\mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{x}(0) = \mathbf{x}_0$, has a solution $\mathbf{x}(t) = \mathbf{x}_0 + tA\mathbf{x}_0$, which is unbounded whenever $\mathbf{x}_0 \notin \text{Ker } A$. This contradicts to the existence of the invariant norm. □

Denote by $\alpha_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\beta_{\mathbf{x}}$ respectively the left and right tangents to S at the point $\mathbf{x} \in S$.

Proposition 2 *Suppose an operator $A \in \text{co}(\mathcal{A})$ is degenerate and its kernel meets S at a point \mathbf{x}_0 ; then the line passing through \mathbf{x}_0 parallel to $\text{Im } A$ is a line of support for S .*

Proof. Assume the converse: S contains a point \mathbf{y} separated from the origin by the line ℓ . Draw a line ℓ' parallel to ℓ through \mathbf{y} . Denote by \mathbf{y}' the point where ℓ' meets the line $O\mathbf{x}$. Clearly,

$|O\mathbf{x}'| > |O\mathbf{x}_0|$, hence, \mathbf{y}' lies outside S . The trajectory $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = A\mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{x}(0) = \mathbf{x}_0$ approaches to \mathbf{y}' along the line ℓ' as $t \rightarrow +\infty$. Therefore, $\mathbf{x}(t)$ leaves the body bounded by S , which contradicts to the definition of Barabanov's norm. □

Lemma 4 *Suppose under the assumptions of Lemma 1, we have $\mathbf{s} \neq \mathbf{x}_1$ and $\mathbf{x}_1 \in \text{Ker } A$ for some $A \in \text{co}(\mathcal{A})$; then the ray $\beta_{\mathbf{x}} = b_{\mathbf{x}}$, which defines the trajectory from \mathbf{s} to \mathbf{x}_1 , tends to $-\alpha_{\mathbf{x}_1}$ as $\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}_1$. Moreover, there exists $A' \in \text{co}(\mathcal{A})$ with the kernel containing \mathbf{x}_1 and image parallel to $\alpha_{\mathbf{x}_1}$.*

Proof. The right tangent $\beta_{\mathbf{x}}$ tends to $-\alpha_{\mathbf{x}_1}$ as $\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}_1$. Let ℓ be the line passing through \mathbf{x}_1 parallel to the image of A . By Proposition 2, ℓ is a line of support for S . If $\alpha_{\mathbf{x}_1}$ lies on ℓ , then everything is proved. Otherwise, the vector $\mathbf{z} = \lim_{\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}_1} A^{(r)}(\mathbf{x})$ has the same direction as $-\alpha_{\mathbf{x}_1}$ and hence, is directed outside S . If $\mathbf{z} \neq 0$, then $\mathbf{z} = A^{(r)}\mathbf{x}_1$ and it cannot go outside S . Therefore, $\mathbf{z} = 0$. Thus, the operator $A' = \lim_{\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}_1} A^{(r)}(\mathbf{x})$ is degenerate, its kernel contains \mathbf{x}_1 and its image contains the limit direction of the vectors $A^{(r)}\mathbf{x}$, which is parallel to $\lim_{\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}_1} b_{\mathbf{x}} = -\alpha_{\mathbf{x}_1}$. □

Let A_1, A_2 be two degenerate operators with negative second eigenvalues and with a common image $L \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ but with different kernels K_1, K_2 . The convex hull $\{(1-\lambda)A_1 + \lambda A_2 : \lambda \in [0, 1]\}$ is called a *reverse pencil* $\mathcal{P}[A_1, A_2]$. An arbitrary segment $[\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2]$ with ends on K_1, K_2 and parallel to L is called a *reverse segment*. Then for every $\mathbf{x} \in [\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2]$, the images $A_1\mathbf{x}, A_2\mathbf{x}$ are parallel to L and have opposite directions. The trajectories of the systems $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = A_1\mathbf{x}$ and $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = A_2\mathbf{x}$ starting at an arbitrary point $\mathbf{x}_0 \in [\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2]$ fill half-intervals $[\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_1)$ and $[\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_2)$ respectively. This implies the following simple fact:

Lemma 5 *If a family \mathcal{A} with $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = 0$ contains two degenerate operators A_1, A_2 with a common image, then the pencil $\mathcal{P}[A_1, A_2]$ lies in $\text{co}(\mathcal{A})$ and S contains a reverse segment with ends on the kernels.*

Our main auxiliary result states that the leading trajectory on S may change its direction only on the reverse intervals unless \mathcal{A} has a complex dominance (the ellipsoidal case).

Lemma 6 *If there is a point \mathbf{x} for which $a_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $b_{\mathbf{x}}$ are collinear and have opposite directions, then $\sigma \geq 0$. If $\sigma = 0$, then either \mathcal{A} has a complex dominance or $\text{co}(\mathcal{A})$ contains a reverse pencil. In the latter case \mathbf{x} is an interior point of the reverse segment on S .*

The proof is in Appendix.

If $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = 0$ and $\text{co}(\mathcal{A})$ contains a degenerate operator, whether so does \mathcal{A} ? In general, the answer is negative: if a matrix A has an imaginary spectrum, i.e., defines an ellipsoidal rotation, then so does $-A$ and the family $\mathcal{A} = \{A, -A\}$ satisfies $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = 0$ and $\text{co}(\mathcal{A})$ contains the zero matrix. It turns out, however, that apart from this case, the answer is affirmative.

Theorem 4 *Suppose $\text{co}(\mathcal{A})$ contains a dominant matrix (with real or complex dominance); then so does the set of extreme points of \mathcal{A} .*

The theorem immediately follows from a more general fact below:

Proposition 3 *If $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = 0$ and $\text{co}(\mathcal{A})$ contains a degenerate matrix A , which is not in \mathcal{A} , then one of the three following conditions are satisfied:*

- 1) \mathcal{A} has complex dominance;
- 2) A belongs to a reverse pencil $\mathcal{P}[A_1, A_2]$;
- 3) A is a linear combination of two degenerate operators from \mathcal{A} with the same kernel.

The proof is in Appendix.

4.2. The structure of Barabanov's norms

Now we can give a complete classification of all Barabanov norms for a set of $d \times d$ matrices \mathcal{A} . As usual we assume that \mathcal{A} is irreducible and $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = 0$. The unit sphere S of an invariant norm f is parametrized by the angle γ (the *argument* of a point $\mathbf{x} \in S$) between the vector \mathbf{x} and the OX axis. Due to the symmetry, we consider only the upper half-sphere $S_+ = \{\mathbf{x}(\gamma) : \gamma \in [0, \pi]\}$, where $\mathbf{x}(\pi) = -\mathbf{x}(0)$. The angle between the vector $\mathbf{x}(\gamma)$ and the left tangent to S at the point \mathbf{x} is denoted as $\varphi(\gamma)$, Fig. 1.




Figure 1: Parametrization of the curve S_+

We consider the function $g(\gamma) = \ln \|\mathbf{x}(\gamma)\|$ (the norm is Euclidean). Clearly, $g(\cdot)$ is Lipschitz continuous on $[0, \pi]$ and it defines S in a unique way.

Lemma 7 *The derivative $g'(\gamma)$ exists for almost all γ (in the Lebesgue measure on $[0, \pi]$) and is equal to $\cot \varphi(\gamma)$.*

Proof. Since the set of corner points of S is at most countable, it has a tangent at $\mathbf{x}(\gamma)$ for almost all γ . For a small δ , consider the triangle with vertices $O, \mathbf{x}(\gamma), \mathbf{x}(\gamma + \delta)$. Applying the sine law and taking into account that the angles at the vertices $\mathbf{x}(\gamma), \mathbf{x}(\gamma + \delta)$ are close to $\pi - \varphi(\gamma)$ and $\varphi(\gamma) - \delta$ respectively, we get

$$g(\gamma + \delta) - g(\gamma) = \ln \frac{\|\mathbf{x}(\gamma + \delta)\|}{\|\mathbf{x}(\gamma)\|} = \ln \frac{\sin \varphi(\gamma)}{\sin(\varphi(\gamma) - \delta)} + o(\delta) = \delta \cot \varphi(\gamma) + o(\delta) \quad \text{as } \delta \rightarrow +0,$$

from which the lemma follows. □

Note that if \mathbf{x} belongs to the kernel of some operator $A \in \text{co}(\mathcal{A})$, then $\mathbf{x} + \text{Im}(A)$ is a line of support of S (Proposition 2). Since S has at most a countable set of corner points and at all other points the line of support is unique, we obtain:

Proposition 4 Denote by S' the set of points $\mathbf{x} \in S_+$ such that \mathbf{x} belongs to the kernel of some $A_{\mathbf{x}} \in \text{co}(\mathcal{A})$. Then for almost all points of S' the angle between \mathbf{x} and $\text{Im}(A_{\mathbf{x}})$, where $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}(\gamma)$, is equal to $\varphi(\gamma)$.

The curve S_+ is a disjoint union of four sets (in what follows we identify the number $\gamma \in [0, \pi]$ and the point $\mathbf{x}(\gamma) \in S_+$):

1) The reverse open intervals. We denote by R the set of those intervals.

2) The set D of points which belong to the kernels of operators from \mathcal{A} and do not lie on the reverse intervals. For each $\mathbf{x}(\gamma) \in D$, the line $\{\lambda \mathbf{x} : \lambda \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is the kernel of some $A \in \mathcal{A}$. By Proposition 2, $\mathbf{x} + \text{Im}(A)$ is a line of support for S .

3) The set of points, which are neither from reverse intervals nor from D . This set is open in S_+ (as a complement to the closed set) and hence, is a disjoint union of open intervals. Denote the set of those intervals by P . This set is countable. Each interval $p_j \in P$ does not intersect kernels of operators from \mathcal{A} and therefore, admit two leading trajectories (Lemma 1). The set of intervals with a unique extreme trajectory (when the second trajectory is empty and the source point \mathbf{s} coincides with one of the ends of the interval) is denoted as $H \subset P$. Let $Q = R \cup H$. This set is finite or countable, we enumerate its elements: the i th interval is q_j (clearly, this set is not ordered on the segment $[0, \pi]$).

Fig. 2 shows different types of arcs of the curve S . The reverse interval r_1 belongs to R ; the operators of the corresponding pencil have a common kernel UV , their images run from the line OU to OV . The arcs q_1 and q_2 are the leading trajectories going from a common source C , they form an interval $p_1 \in P$. The arc h_1 belongs to H , it is a leading trajectory going from the source U . The arc d_1 is a part of the set D , every point of d_1 belongs to the kernel of an operator from \mathcal{A} .




Figure 2: The invariant sphere S

Without loss of generality, with possible change of the coordinates, it can be assumed that $\mathbf{x}(0)$ does not belong to the open set $Q \cup P$.

For every interval $q = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$, we denote $\Delta(q) = g(\gamma_2) - g(\gamma_1)$. For each $q_i \in Q$, the value $\Delta(q_i)$ is well-defined and easily found; for $p_j \in P$, the value $\Delta(p_j)$ is arbitrary from the

segment $[m_j, M_j]$, where the values m_j, M_j are defined in Lemma 2 under the names m, M . Inequality (2) implies that $\Delta(p_j) \in [m_j, M_j]$.

Theorem 5 *Let \mathcal{A} be a family of operators in \mathbb{R}^2 with $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = 0$ and S be its invariant sphere. Then for every $\gamma \in [0, \pi]$ which is either an element of D or an end of an interval from R, Q or P , we have*

$$g(\gamma) = g(0) + \int_{[0, \gamma] \cap D} \cot \varphi(\tau) d\tau + \sum_{q_j \in Q, q_i \subset [0, \gamma]} \Delta(q_i) + \sum_{p_j \in P, p_j \subset [0, \gamma]} \Delta(p_j). \quad (3)$$

For given numbers $s_j \in [m_j, M_j]$, there exists an invariant sphere S with $\Delta(p_j) = s_j, p_j \in P$, if and only if

$$\sum_{p_j \in P} s_j = - \int_D \cot \varphi(\tau) d\tau - \sum_{q_j \in Q} \Delta(q_j). \quad (4)$$

where $\varphi(\tau)$ is the angle between the vector $\mathbf{x}(\tau)$ and the image of the corresponding matrix A whose kernel contains \mathbf{x} . For every such sequence $\{s_i\}$, the invariant sphere S is unique up to normalization.

Proof. The function $g(\tau)$ is Lipschitz and hence, absolutely continuous on $[0, \pi]$. Therefore, it is a primitive of its derivative, which is equal to $\cot \varphi(\tau)$ (Lemma 7). For almost all points $\tau \in D$, there exists a tangent line to S at the point $\mathbf{x}(\tau)$, hence, it is parallel to the image of the corresponding matrix A (Proposition 2). Hence, for almost all $\tau \in D$, the angle between $\mathbf{x}(\tau)$ and $\text{Im}(A)$ is equal to $\varphi(\tau)$. □

4.3. Construction and the uniqueness

Theorem 5 is constructive, it allows us to obtain the Barabanov norm algorithmically.

Algorithm. To construct a norm one needs first to find $\sigma(\mathcal{A})$. This can be done by bisection with the comparison to zero (i.e., deciding the stability) in each step. Then we shift the family so that $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = 0$. Find all degenerate operators in $\text{co}(\mathcal{A})$. If there are none, then one of the leading trajectories (left or right) of \mathcal{A} is periodic and its period describes the invariant sphere S (Theorem 2). Otherwise, we find the set of reverse pencils (it corresponds to the set R of reverse intervals). This gives us the directions of all reverse segments on S . Thus, we know $\Delta(q_i)$ for all $q_i \in R$. Then we find all intervals $p_i \subset [0, \pi]$ that are not intersected by kernels of operators from \mathcal{A} and construct the leading trajectories for each of them. We denote those intervals having one leading trajectory by h_j and compute $\Delta(h_j)$. This gives the term $\sum_{q_j \in Q, q_i \subset [0, \gamma]} \Delta(q_i)$ in the sum (3). For other intervals p_j we find two leading trajectories and construct the arcs of S by the numbers $\{s_i\}$ satisfying (4). Thus, we evaluate the term $\sum_{p_j \in P, p_i \subset [0, \gamma]} \Delta(p_i)$.

Finally, for all degenerate operators from \mathcal{A} whose kernels do not intersect the intervals from Q and P , we find the angle φ between the kernel and the image. The set $D = [0, \pi] \setminus (Q \cup P)$ is filled by the kernels of those operators and parametrized by the angle γ . For almost all $\gamma \in D$, the angle φ is uniquely defined, hence the integral in (3) is well-defined and computed for all γ . Thus, we find $g(\gamma)$, which completes the construction of S .

The construction implies that every set of numbers $\{s_i \in [m_j, M_j]\}$ satisfying (4) generates a unique Barabanov norm. Hence, \mathcal{A} possesses a unique Barabanov norm if this sequence is unique.

Theorem 6 *The Barabanov norm of a family \mathcal{A} is unique if and only if one of the following conditions is satisfied:*

- 1) \mathcal{A} has at most one degenerate operator;
 - 2) the set P has at most one element;
 - 3) the right hand side of equality (4) is equal either to $\sum_i M_i$ or to $\sum_i m_i$.
- Otherwise there are infinitely many Barabanov norms.

Proof. The uniqueness of the Barabanov norm is equivalent to the uniqueness of the feasible sequence $\{s_i\}$. It is certainly unique in cases 2) and 3). The case 1) is simply reduced to the case 2) by the choice of coordinates. If \mathcal{A} does not contain degenerate operators, then the uniqueness follows by Theorem 2; if it has a unique degenerate operator, then we choose the axis OX passing through its kernel, after which the set P becomes one-element (the only interval is the entire $[0, \pi]$). Conversely, if the sum $\sum_i s_i$ contains at least two terms and it is strictly between $\sum_i M_i$ and $\sum_i m_i$, then there exist two indices (call them 1 and 2) such that $s_1 < M_1$ and $s_2 > m_2$. Replacing them by $s_1 + \varepsilon$ and $s_2 - \varepsilon$ we obtain a new feasible sequence, whenever $\varepsilon > 0$ is small enough. □

5. Each norm in \mathbb{R}^d is Barabanov for a suitable set of matrices

The following result will be established not only for $d = 2$ but in arbitrary dimension d .

Theorem 7 *Every norm in \mathbb{R}^d is a Barabanov norm for a suitable family of linear operators. If the unit ball is a polyhedron with $2n$ facets, then there is the corresponding family of n operators.*

Proof. Let G be the unit ball of this norm and $S = \partial G$. For an arbitrary $\mathbf{x} \in S$, we denote by $V_{\mathbf{x}}$ the hyperplane parallel to the plane of support of S at the point \mathbf{x} . If this plane is not unique we choose one of them. Then the operator $A_{\mathbf{x}}$ is defined by the equalities $A_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}) = 0$, $A_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{y}) = -\mathbf{y}$ for all $\mathbf{y} \in V_{\mathbf{x}}$. Let us show that the family $\mathcal{A} = \{A_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathbf{x} \in S\}$ has the Barabanov norm with the unit sphere S . Indeed, for $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{x}$, the vector $0 = A_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{z}$ is tangent to S and for every other $\mathbf{z} \in S$, the vector $\mathbf{z} + A_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{z}$ is directed inside S . To show this we write $\mathbf{z} = \gamma\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}$ for some $\gamma \in [-1, 1]$, $\mathbf{y} \in V_{\mathbf{x}}$. Then for a small $t > 0$, we have $\mathbf{z} + tA_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{z} = \gamma\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y} - t\mathbf{y} = (1-t)\mathbf{z} + t\gamma\mathbf{x} \in G$ since both \mathbf{z} and $\gamma\mathbf{x}$ belong to G .

If G is a polyhedron, then we enumerate the pairs of its opposite facets by $1, \dots, n$ and to the i th pair associate an interior point \mathbf{x}_i of one of those two facets. Then the n operators $A_{\mathbf{x}_i}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, defined as above have G is a unit ball of the invariant norm. □

Now we turn back to the case $d = 2$. The system \mathcal{A} constructed in Theorem 7 consists of degenerate operators \mathcal{A} . This is unavoidable: there are norms in \mathbb{R}^2 that cannot be invariant for families of nondegenerate operators with $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = 0$. The following proposition states that every non-smooth norm possesses this property.

Proposition 5 *Let $G \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a unit ball of the Barabanov norm of a family \mathcal{A} with $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = 0$. Then every arc on the sphere S connecting two corner points intersects an image of some degenerate operator from $\text{co}(\mathcal{A})$.*

Proof. Consider a closed arc connecting two corner points $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2$. If it does not intersect kernels of operators from $\text{co}(\mathcal{A})$, then we can apply Lemma 1 and conclude that this arc consists of two leading trajectories going from a point \mathbf{s} to \mathbf{x}_1 and \mathbf{x}_2 . At least one of them, say, $\mathbf{s}\mathbf{x}_1$ is nontrivial, it ends with an outgoing tangent vector $A\mathbf{x}_1$. However, if \mathbf{x}_1 is a corner point, it follows that this vector is directed outside G , which is impossible. \square

Remark 3 After Proposition 5 a natural question arises if every smooth norm is invariant for a suitable set of *nondegenerate* matrices? The answer is still negative. To see this, consider a strictly convex body G with some corner points. Every family \mathcal{A} for which G is an invariant body includes degenerate operators. The polar G^* , which does not have corner points, is an invariant body for the set of adjacent operators \mathcal{A}^* , see [25]. Clearly, \mathcal{A}^* also includes degenerate operators.

Moreover, there are smooth strictly convex bodies that are not invariant bodies of families of nondegenerate operators.

6. Finite families and matrix polytopes

If $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$ is finite, then $\text{co}(\mathcal{A})$ is a polytope in the space of 2×2 matrices with vertices from \mathcal{A} . In this case every leading trajectory consists of finitely many arcs, each corresponds to one matrix. The *switching point* \mathbf{x} between the arcs corresponding to matrices A_i and A_j is characterized by the property that the vectors $A_i\mathbf{x}$ and $A_j\mathbf{x}$ are co-directed, i.e., $(A_i - \lambda A_j)\mathbf{x} = 0$, where $\lambda \geq 0$ (the case $\lambda = +\infty$ is allowed and means that $A_j\mathbf{x} = 0$). Hence, to construct the leading trajectory one needs to solve the equation $\det(A_i - \lambda A_j) = 0$ for all pairs (i, j) and thus find all switching points \mathbf{x}_{ij} , which define the whole trajectory. We start with an arbitrary point $\mathbf{x}_0 \neq 0$ and go along the left leading trajectory. Assume $A_{\mathbf{x}_0}^{(\ell)} = A_1$. Then we go along the trajectory $e^{tA_1}\mathbf{x}_0$ to the closes switching point with the first index $i = 1$. Let it be \mathbf{x}_{1j} . Then we switch to the trajectory $e^{tA_j}\mathbf{x}_{1j}$ to the closest switching point with the first index j , etc. In total there will be at most $m(m+1)$ switching points.

In the structure of the Barabanov norm given by Theorem 5, the set D is finite and hence, can be neglected: the integral over this set is equal to zero. The sets of intervals P and Q are finite. The formula (3) becomes

$$g(\gamma) = g(0) + \sum_{q_i \in [0, \gamma]} \Delta(q_i) + \sum_{p_j \in [0, \gamma]} \Delta(p_j). \quad (5)$$

The existence of the invariant sphere S with parameters $\Delta(p_j) = s_j \in [m_1, M_i]$, $p_j \in P$, is equivalent to the condition

$$\sum_{p_j \in P} s_i = - \sum_{q_j \in Q} \Delta(q_j), \quad (6)$$

where all summations are finite.

7. Examples and applications

7.1. Stability of a matrix ball

Consider a the control set $\mathcal{A}(A_0, r) = \{A : \|A - A_0\|_F \leq r\}$ being a ball in the space of 2×2 matrices centered at a given matrix A_0 . Here $\|X\| = \text{tr}(X^T X) = (\sum_{i,j} |X_{ij}|^2)^{1/2}$ is the Frobenius norm. Thus, one needs to decide the stability of the system $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = A(t)\mathbf{x}$, where for each t , $A(t)$ is an arbitrary matrix on the distance of at most r from A_0 .

The matrix A_0 is assumed to be Hurwitz, so, $\mathcal{A}(A_0, 0)$ is stable. Clearly, for every $r > 0$, the set \mathcal{A} is convex and irreducible. The remaining assumption that no matrix from \mathcal{A} possess a nonnegative eigenvector is solved by the following simple lemma. The norm of all vectors below is Euclidean.

Lemma 8 *The ball $\mathcal{A}(A_0, r)$ contains a matrix with a nonnegative eigenvalue if and only if there exists \mathbf{x} such that $\|\mathbf{x}\| = 1$ and the distance from $A_0\mathbf{x}$ to the ray $\{\lambda\mathbf{x} : \lambda \geq 0\}$ does not exceed r .*

Proof. Let $A \in \mathcal{A}(A_0, r)$ be such that $A\mathbf{x} = \lambda\mathbf{x}$, $\lambda \geq 0$; then $\|A_0\mathbf{x} - \lambda\mathbf{x}\| = \|(A - A_0)\mathbf{x}\| \leq \|A - A_0\|_F \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq r$. Hence, the distance from $A_0\mathbf{x}$ to the ray $\ell = \{\lambda\mathbf{x} : \lambda \geq 0\}$ does not exceed r . Conversely, if this distance does not exceed r , then taking $\lambda \geq 0$ such that $\|A_0\mathbf{x} - \lambda\mathbf{x}\| \leq r$ and $A = A_0 - \mathbf{y}\mathbf{x}^T$, where $\mathbf{y} = A_0\mathbf{x} - \lambda\mathbf{x}$, we see that $\|A - A_0\|_F = \|\mathbf{y}\mathbf{x}^T\|_F = \|\mathbf{y}\| \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq r$ and $A\mathbf{x} = (A_0 - \mathbf{y}\mathbf{x}^T)\mathbf{x} = A_0\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y} = \lambda\mathbf{x}$. □

Note that the conditions of Lemma 8 is elementary verified by denoting $\mathbf{x} = (\cos s, \sin s)^T$ and finding the minimal distance from $A_0\mathbf{x}$ to the ray $\{\lambda\mathbf{x} : \lambda \geq 0\}$ over all s . The point of minimum s is evaluated in an explicit form. Let $\sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2$ be the singular values of A_0 (we hope that this standard notation will not be confused with the Lyapunov exponent).

Lemma 9 *The ball $\mathcal{A}(A_0, r)$ contains a degenerate matrix if and only if r does not exceed the minimal singular value $\sigma_1(A_0)$. If $\sigma_1(A_0) = r$, then a unique degenerate matrix in that ball is $A_0 - r\mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}^T$, where \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} are unit eigenvectors of the matrices $A_0^T A_0$ and $A_0 A_0^T$ respectively corresponding to the eigenvalue r^2 .*

Proof. If $A\mathbf{x} = 0$, $\|\mathbf{x}\| = 1$, then $\|A_0\mathbf{x}\| = \|(A_0 - A)\mathbf{x}\| \leq r$, hence, $\sigma_1(A_0) \leq r$. If $\sigma_1(A_0) = r$, then the only unit vector \mathbf{x} satisfying the inequality $\|A_0\mathbf{x}\| = r$ is the corresponding eigenvector of $A_0 A_0^T$. Then as in the proof of Lemma 8 we conclude that $A\mathbf{x} = 0$ and $\|A - A_0\| \leq r$ if and only if $A = A_0 - r\mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}^T$. □

Now we can apply Theorem 3. For each \mathbf{x} , the set $\mathbf{x} + A\mathbf{x}$, $A \in \mathcal{A}$, is a disc of radius $r \|\mathbf{x}\|$ centered at the point $\mathbf{x} + A_0\mathbf{x}$. Denote this disc by $B_{\mathbf{x}}(r)$, see Fig. 3. Then, both $a_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $b_{\mathbf{x}}$ are tangents to $B_{\mathbf{x}}(r)$, provided that they lie in the corresponding half-spaces with respect to \mathbf{x} . If the angle between those tangents contains the origin, then $a_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $b_{\mathbf{x}}$ are both well-defined, otherwise only one of them is defined being the ‘‘highest’’ tangent, which makes the smallest angle with the vector \mathbf{x} . The corresponding left round leading trajectory is found by the ODE $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = A^{(\ell)}\mathbf{x}$, with $A^{(\ell)} = A_0 + r\mathbf{z}\mathbf{z}^T$, where \mathbf{z} is the vector from the center of $B_{\mathbf{x}}(r)$ to the point of tangency.




Figure 3: Barabanov's norm for a matrix ball. The vector $A\mathbf{x}$ touches $B_{\mathbf{x}}(r)$ and S .

In fact, one can use an arbitrary vector field $F(\mathbf{x})$ which at every \mathbf{x} is directed along $a_{\mathbf{x}}$; then the solution of ODE $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = A^{(\ell)}\mathbf{x}$ describes the left leading trajectory. The same can be said on the right trajectory.

To construct the Barabanov norm we again assume that $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = 0$ after a proper shift, where $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(A_0, r)$, and invoke Lemma 9.

Theorem 8 *Consider the ball $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(A_0, r)$ and assume that $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = 0$; then $r \leq \sigma_1(A_0)$. If this inequality is strict, then all matrices from \mathcal{A} are nondegenerate, the Barabanov norm is unique and described by the periodic leading left (or right) trajectory.*

If $r = \sigma_1(A_0)$, then the only degenerate operator is $A_0 - r\mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}^T$, where \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} are unit eigenvectors of the matrices $A_0^T A_0$ and $A_0 A_0^T$ respectively corresponding to the eigenvalue r^2 , the Barabanov norm is described by the leading left (or right) trajectory from $\mathbf{x}(0) = \mathbf{v}$ to $\mathbf{x}(+\infty) = -\mathbf{v}$ and by its symmetric trajectory about the origin.

Proof. If $r < \sigma_1(A_0)$, then \mathcal{A} contains no degenerate matrices (Lemma 9, and S coincides with the leading periodic trajectory (Theorem 2). If $r = \sigma_1(A_0)$, then \mathcal{A} contains a unique degenerate matrix with kernel generated by the vector \mathbf{v} . Now the result follows from Lemma 1 with $\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{v}$. \square

Applying now Theorem 7, we obtain

Corollary 3 *The Barabanov norm of a matrix ball is always unique.*

Remark 4 It is not difficult to write an analytical expression for the tangents to the ball $B_{\mathbf{x}}(r)$ from the point \mathbf{x} . This way we get an ODE, whose solution describes a unit sphere S . From this equation one can conclude that S is in general not an ellipse, although can look similar to it (Fig. 3).

7.2. Stability of linear switching systems with a noisy data

Infinite control sets naturally appear when the matrices of the system are not given precisely but with possible deviation. At each moment t the deviation can be an arbitrary matrix from a given compact “noise set” \mathcal{D} . Consider a finite control set $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$; then the noisy linear switching system is

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = (A(t) + \Delta(t))\mathbf{x}, \quad A(t) \in \{A_1, \dots, A_m\}, \Delta \in \mathcal{D}.$$

If $m = 1$ and \mathcal{D} is a Frobenius ball, then we have the system from the previous subsection. The case of general m is considered similarly. In Theorem 8, the leading rays $a_{\mathbf{x}}, b_{\mathbf{x}}$ are chosen from $2m$ tangents drawn from the point \mathbf{x} to the equal discs of radius r centered at the points $\mathbf{x} + A_i\mathbf{x}$, $i = 1, \dots, m$.

If \mathcal{D} is a matrix polyhedron, then so is $\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{D}$, hence the problem is reduced to the control set with a finite number of matrices (vertices of this polytope). This is the case, for instance, if \mathcal{D} is given by elementwise constraints: $|\Delta_{ij}| \leq \varepsilon_{ij}$, $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$.

For example, \mathcal{D} can be a ball of radius r in the operator L_∞ -norm in \mathbb{R}^2 , i.e., $\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty = \max\{|x_1|, |x_2|\}$, each set $\mathbf{x} + (A_i + \mathcal{D})\mathbf{x}$ is a square of radius $r\|\mathbf{x}\|$.

7.3. Numerical example

The following matrix:

$$A_0 = \begin{pmatrix} -0.2 & -1 \\ 1 & -0.5 \end{pmatrix}$$

is Hurwitz, $\sigma(A_0) = -0.35$. We compute the radius R of the minimal unstable Frobenius ball with center A_0 . The computation is done by bisection in r . For $r = 0$, we have the one point




Figure 4: The leading trajectory for the matrix ball of radius $r = 0.4$

“ball” A_0 , which is clearly stable. For $r = 0.4$ we construct left and right an extremal trajectories. Fig. 4 shows the left trajectory. By Theorem 8, at every point \mathbf{x} , the leading vector $A^{(\ell)}(t)\mathbf{x}$ is

directed along the tangent from \mathbf{x} to the ball $B_{\mathbf{x}}(r)$. This trajectory is found from the differential equation $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = A^{(l)}(t)\mathbf{x}(t)$, we see that it increases after one rotation. Hence, $\mathcal{A}(A_0, 0.4)$ is unstable. Drawing the unique leading trajectory for $r = 0.1$ we see that it decreases, hence, by Theorem 3, the ball $\mathcal{A}(A_0, 0.1)$ is stable (Fig. 5). The bisection in r on the segment $r \in [0.1, 0.4]$




Figure 5: The leading trajectory for the matrix ball of radius $r = 0.1$

after 12 iterations gives the value $0.3475\dots$ which approximates R with precision 10^{-4} . The left leading trajectory for the ball $\mathcal{A}(A_0, R)$ cycles and gives the sphere S of a unique Barabanov norm (Corollary c.50). It is drawn in Fig. 3.

Remark 5 Note that S is a solution of a nonlinear ODE, and it is not ellipse (Remark 4). Also observe that $R = 0.3475\dots < 0.35 = |\sigma(A_0)|$. Thus, in this example, the radius of the minimal unstable ball is less than the modulus of the Lyapunov exponent of its center A_0 .

Appendix

Proof of Lemma 6. We have $A^{(r)}\mathbf{x} = -sA^{(l)}\mathbf{x}$ with $s > 0$. In the basis $\mathbf{e}_1 = \mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{e}_2 = A^{(l)}\mathbf{x}$, we have

$$A^{(l)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a \\ 1 & b \end{pmatrix}; \quad A^{(r)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & c \\ -s & b \end{pmatrix}.$$

Consider the following matrix:

$$A_s = \frac{1}{s+1} A^{(r)} + \frac{s}{s+1} A^{(l)} = \frac{1}{s+1} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a + sb \\ 0 & b + sd \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since A_s is degenerate and belongs to $\text{co}(\mathcal{A})$, it follows that $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) \geq 0$, which proves the first claim. Now assume that $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = 0$. If $a + sb \neq 0$, then one can slightly perturb s so that the determinant of the matrix $\frac{1}{s+1} A^{(r)} + \frac{s}{s+1} A^{(l)}$ becomes negative. In this case one of the eigenvalues is positive and hence $\sigma > 0$. Thus, $a + sb = 0$, hence

$$A^{(l)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a \\ 1 & b \end{pmatrix}; \quad A^{(r)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -sa \\ -s & b \end{pmatrix}.$$

Assume first that $a \neq 0$. In this case $a < 0$, otherwise $\det A^{(l)} < 0$, which again contradicts the Hurwitz property of the matrix $A^{(l)}$. By the same reason the traces of $A^{(l)}, A^{(r)}$ are non-positive, hence $b \leq 0, d \leq 0$.

If $b = 0$, then the eigenvalues of $A^{(l)}$ are $\pm i\sqrt{|a|}$. Therefore, $A^{(l)}$ defines an ellipsoidal rotation and we arrive at the ellipsoidal case. The same happens if $d = 0$.

Thus, it can be assumed that $b < 0, d < 0$. Consider now two cases for the coefficient a .

1). $a \neq 0$. In this case the pair $\{A^{(l)}, A^{(r)}\}$ is irreducible. Indeed, if they share a common real eigenvector, then the same eigenvector is associated to the matrix A_s , whose eigenvectors are \mathbf{e}_1 and \mathbf{e}_2 . None of them is an eigenvector of $A^{(l)}$ when $a \neq 0$. Therefore, this pair possesses a Barabanov norm. Let us remember that $\sigma\{A^{(l)}, A^{(r)}\} = 0$. A unit sphere of the Barabanov norm of two matrices is composed with arcs of trajectories of the two equations $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = A^{(l)}\mathbf{x}$ and $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = A^{(r)}\mathbf{x}$; and every switching point \mathbf{v} between those arcs satisfy $(A^{(r)} - \lambda A^{(l)})\mathbf{v} = 0$, where λ is found from the equation $\det(A^{(r)} - \lambda A^{(l)}) = 0$. In our case this equation reads $a(\lambda + s)^2 = 0$. Hence, $\lambda = -s$ and the solution \mathbf{v} is unique up to normalization. Hence, if there are switching points, then they are $\pm\mathbf{v}$. We see that the arc of S connecting those points \mathbf{v} and $-\mathbf{v}$ satisfies one equation, say $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = A^{(l)}\mathbf{x}$. Therefore, $-\mathbf{v} = e^{tA^{(l)}}\mathbf{v}$. This is possible only if $A^{(l)}$ is an ellipsoidal rotation (the proof is trivial). Thus, the case $a \neq 0$ is impossible.

2). $a = 0$. In this case $A^{(l)}, A^{(r)}$ are degenerate, have a common image parallel to \mathbf{e}_2 and kernels given by the equations $x_1 + bx_2 = 0$ and $x_1 - \frac{b}{s}x_2 = 0$. These kernels are different since $b < 0$ and $-\frac{b}{s} > 0$.

Thus, $A^{(l)}, A^{(r)}$ belongs to one pencil. It remains to show that S contains a segment parallel to \mathbf{e}_2 bounded by the kernels. This is simple, because for every point $\mathbf{x} \in S$ between those kernels, the whole segment bounded by them and passing through \mathbf{x} parallel to \mathbf{e}_2 belong to the Barabanov unit ball. Hence, this segment is contained in S . □

Proof of Proposition 3. If A is not an extreme point in $\text{co}(\mathcal{A})$, then $A = \frac{1}{2}(A_1 + A_2)$ for some $A_1, A_2 \in \text{co}(\mathcal{A})$. Let $\mathbf{x} \in \text{Ker}(A)$. Then $A_1\mathbf{x} + A_2\mathbf{x} = 0$. If $A_1\mathbf{x} \neq 0$, then by Lemma 6, A belongs to some pencil $\mathcal{P}[A_1, A_2]$ and \mathbf{x} is an interior point of the segment $[\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2]$. This implies that the operators generating this pencil are extreme, i.e., belong to \mathcal{A} . If $A_1\mathbf{x} = 0$, then we consider the set of operators $\mathcal{Q} \in \text{co}(\mathcal{A})$ with the same kernel containing \mathbf{x} . The images of those operators are lines of support for G at the point \mathbf{x} , see Proposition 2. Let ℓ_1, ℓ_2 are the extreme lines among them. Denote by \mathcal{Q}_i the set of operators from \mathcal{Q} with the image parallel to ℓ_i $i = 1, 2$. Each \mathcal{Q}_i is a segment (in the space of matrices) of a line passing through the origin. Let A_i be the end of this segment most distant from the origin. Then, A_i is an extreme point of $\text{co}(\mathcal{A})$, i.e., $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$, and A is a linear combination of A_1, A_2 . □

Acknowledgements. The research is performed with the support of the Theoretical Physics and Mathematics Advancement Foundation “BASIS”.

References

- [1] M. Balde and U. Boscain, *Stability of planar switched systems: the nondiagonalizable case*, Commun. Pure Appl. Anal. 7 (2008), 1—21.

- [2] M. Balde, U. Boscain and P. Mason *A note on stability conditions for planar switched systems*, *Internat. J. Control* 82 (2009), no 10, 1882—1888.
- [3] N.E Barabanov, *Absolute characteristic exponent of a class of linear nonstationary systems of differential equations*, *Siberian Math. J.* 29 (1988), no 4, 521—530.
- [4] M. Benaim, S. Le Borgne, F. Malrieu and P. Zitt, *On the stability of planar randomly switched systems*, *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 24 (2014), no 1, 292—311.
- [5] F. Blanchini, S. Miani, *A new class of universal Lyapunov functions for the control of uncertain linear systems*, *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 44 (1999), no 3, 641—647.
- [6] S. Cong, *Stability analysis for planar discrete-time linear switching systems via bounding joint spectral radius*, *Systems Control Lett.* 96 (2016), 7—10.
- [7] Y. Chitour, M. Gaye and P. Mason, *Geometric and asymptotic properties associated with linear switched systems*, *J. Differential Equations* 259 (2015), no 11, 5582—5616.
- [8] M. Gaye, Y. Chitour and P. Mason, *Properties of Barabanov norms and extremal trajectories associated with continuous-time linear switched systems*, 52nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, Firenze, Italy (2013), 716—721,
- [9] J. C. Geromel and P. Colaneri, *Stability and stabilization of continuous-time switched linear systems*, *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 45 (2006), no 5, 1915—1930.
- [10] L. Gurvits, R. Shorten, and O. Mason, *On the stability of switched positive linear systems*, *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 52 (2007), 1099—1103.
- [11] L. Greco, F. Tocchini and M. Innocenti *A geometry-based algorithm for the stability of planar switching systems*, *Internat. J. Systems Sci.* 37 (2006), no 11, 747—761.
- [12] N. Guglielmi, L. Laglia and V. Protasov, *Polytope Lyapunov functions for stable and for stabilizable LSS*, *Found. Comput. Math.* 17 (2017), no 2, 567—623.
- [13] N. Guglielmi, M. Zennaro, *Finding extremal complex polytope norms for families of real matrices*, *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 31 (2009), no 2, 602—620.
- [14] N. Guglielmi and M. Zennaro. *Canonical construction of polytope Barabanov norms and antinorms for sets of matrices*, *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.* 36 (2015), No. 2, 634—655.
- [15] L. Gurvits and A. Olshevsky, *On the NP-Hardness of checking matrix polytope stability and continuous-time switching stability*, *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 54 (2009), no 2, 337—341.
- [16] D. Holchman, M. Margaliot, *Stability analysis of second-order switched homogeneous systems*, *SIAM J. Contr. Optim.*, 41 (2003), no 5, 1609—1625.
- [17] D. Liberzon, *Switching in systems and control*, *Systems & Control: Foundations and Applications*. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2003.

- [18] M. Margaliot, *Necessary and sufficient conditions for absolute stability: the case of second-order systems*, IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. I: Fundamental Theory and Applications, 50 (2003), no 2, 227–234.
- [19] M. Margaliot and G. Langholz, *Necessary and sufficient conditions for absolute stability: the case of second-order systems*, IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems I: Fundamental Theory and Applications, 50 (2003), no. 2, 227–234.
- [20] T. Mejstrik and V. Protasov, *Elliptic polytopes and invariant norms of linear operators*, Calcolo 60 (2023), 56.
- [21] R. Teichner, M. Margaliot, *Explicit construction of a Barabanov norm for a class of positive planar discrete-time linear switched systems*, Automatica 48 (2012), 95–101.
- [22] A. P. Molchanov and Y. S. Pyatnitskiy. *Criteria of asymptotic stability of differential and difference inclusions encountered in control theory*, Syst. Cont. Lett., 13 (1989), no 1, 59–64.
- [23] I.D. Moris, *An irreducible linear switching system whose unique Barabanov norm is not strictly convex*, arXiv: 2301.09942v1.
- [24] A.M. Musaeva *Construction of invariant Lyapunov norms for planar switching systems*, Sbornik: Mathematics, 2023, Volume 214, Issue 9, Pages 1212–1240
- [25] A.M. Musaeva *Duality of invariant norms in continuous time dynamical systems*, Mathematical Notes, to appear (2024).
- [26] V.Yu. Protasov, *The Barabanov norm is generically unique, simple, and easily computed*, SIAM J. Control Optim. 60 (2022), no 4, 2246—2267.
- [27] D.V. Shatov, *Stability of a certain class of second order switched systems*, IFAC conference on technology, culture, and international stability TECIS 2021 (Moscow 2021), IFAC-PapersOnLine 54:13 (2021), 425–430.
- [28] S. Tripathi, N. Agarwal *Stability of bimodal planar linear switched systems*, European J. Control 70 (2023), 100767
- [29] X. Yang, H.K. Lam, L. Wu, *Necessary and sufficient stability condition for second-order switched systems: a phase function approach*, Internat. J. Control, 92 (2019), 926–939.
- [30] Y. Yue Yang, C. Xiang, T.H. Lee, *Sufficient and necessary conditions for the stability of second-order switched linear systems under arbitrary switching*, International Journal of Control, 85 (2012), no 12, 1977–1995.