

CONVERGENCE ESTIMATES FOR THE MAGNUS EXPANSION IE. FINITE DIMENSIONAL BANACH ALGEBRAS

GYULA LAKOS

ABSTRACT. We review and provide simplified proofs related to the Magnus expansion, and improve convergence estimates. Observations and improvements concerning the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff expansion are also made.

In this Part IE, we consider the case of finite dimensional Banach algebras. We show that Magnus expansion is convergent (and works in logarithmic sense) if the cumulative norm $< 2 + \varepsilon_n$, where ε_n is a positive number depending on the dimension n of the Banach algebra. We also show concrete finite-dimensional counterexamples of multiple Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff type for any cumulative norm > 2 (necessarily of possibly great dimension).

INTRODUCTION

This paper is a direct continuation of Part I [5]. Here we will consider finite dimensional Banach algebras but which are not far from the extremal case of Part I.

Introduction to the setting of finite dimensional Banach algebras. Since its inception, Magnus [7], finite dimensional normed algebras, which are automatically Banach algebras, play a prominent role in the study and applications of the Magnus expansion, cf. Blanes, Casas, Oteo, Ros [1]. In the case of operators on Hilbert spaces, finitely dimensionality is not a strong restriction with respect to the convergence radius in terms of the cumulative norm: The counterexamples by Schäffer [16] (indirectly), Vinokurov [19], Moan [10], and the convergence results of Moan, Niesen [11], Casas [2] show that the critical case for the convergence of the Magnus expansion for Hilbert space operators is the cumulative norm π , and it is represented by concrete counterexamples over 2×2 real matrices. (See Part II [6] for a detailed discussion.) In the case of general, possibly infinite dimensional Banach algebras, results of Moan, Oteo [12] and Part I [5] show that the critical convergence radius in terms of the cumulative norm is 2, and counterexamples for convergence with cumulative norm 2 must need to be somewhat wild. It is not immediately clear that how finite dimensionality affects these results; but, as it turns out, positively. An ease in the finite dimensional case that issues of convergence do not depend on the choice of the norm, as all norms are equivalent. Selecting among the convergent or divergent measures in terms of the possible norms is a different matter, however.

Outline of content. In Section 1, we start with considering the “Minimal Examples”, which are counterexamples to the convergence of the BCH expansion in the setting of 2×2 upper triangular matrix algebras; these are of cumulative norm $\pi + \varepsilon$. Next, we exhibit examples of multiple Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff type for divergence with cumulative norm $2\frac{n}{n-1}$ in some $n \times n$ matrix algebras (which are, of course, of

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 46H30, Secondary: 16W80.

Key words and phrases. Magnus expansion, Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff expansion, convergence estimates, resolvent method.

dimension $d = n^2$), where $n \geq 2$. Although examples are sometimes results of lucky choices, here will explain how these latter finite dimensional counterexamples relate to the infinite dimensional ones of Part I [5]. In Section 2, we show that Magnus expansion is convergent and works in logarithmic sense if the cumulative norm $< 2 + \varepsilon_n$, where ε_n is a positive number depending on the (real) dimension n of the Banach algebra. This section draws heavily on the resolvent method introduced in the formal case by Mielnik, Plebański [9], and developed further in Part I [5]. Interestingly, methods of discrete geometry are used; notably, we use the estimates of Rogers [14] on packing densities of centrally convex bodies.

Acknowledgements. The author is grateful to Fernando Casas and Kurusch Ebrahimi-Fard for organizing venues for furthering research, and also to Pierre-Louis Giscard, Ilya Kuprov, and Stefano Pozza for inspiring conversations.

1. DIVERGENCE FOR FINITE DIMENSIONAL BANACH ALGEBRAS

Here we will see how the higher dimensionality leads to divergent Magnus series with measures of cumulative norm approaching 2 from above.

1.A. Low dimensional counterexamples.

Real and complex algebras of low dimension can be classified, cf. Study [18], Scheffers [17], Kobayashi, Shirayanagi, Takahasi, Tsukada [4]. It is trivial that if the dimension d of the unital algebra \mathfrak{A} is 1 or 2, then the algebra is commutative. Recall that in the commutative case the Magnus series is trivially convergent; the logarithmic version of Magnus formula holds if the cumulative norm is $< \pi$, and beyond that it may or may not hold (compare, say, \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{C}). It is still easy to see that if the dimension d of the unital algebra \mathfrak{A} is 3, then the algebra is either commutative or isomorphic to the algebra of upper triangular matrices.

Now, upper triangular matrices already lead to some divergent Magnus series:

Lemma 1.1. *Assume that $-\pi \leq \alpha \leq \pi$ and $\varepsilon \neq 0$. Let*

$$M_1^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\pi - \alpha}{2} & -\frac{\pi + \alpha}{2} \varepsilon \\ & -\frac{\pi - \alpha}{2} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad M_2^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\pi + \alpha}{2} & \frac{\pi - \alpha}{2} \varepsilon \\ & -\frac{\pi + \alpha}{2} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then the Magnus (BCH) series of the ordered measure $M_1^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]} \mathbf{1}_{[0,1)} \cdot M_2^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]} \mathbf{1}_{[1,2)}$ is not absolutely convergent.

Proof. If the series $k \mapsto \mu_{k, \mathbb{R}} \left(M_1^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]} \mathbf{1}_{[0,1)} \cdot M_2^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]} \mathbf{1}_{[1,2)} \right)$ were absolute convergent, then so would be $k \mapsto \mu_{k, \mathbb{R}} \left(i \cdot (M_1^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]} \mathbf{1}_{[0,1)} \cdot M_2^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]} \mathbf{1}_{[1,2)}) \right)$ in the complex(ified) algebra. Assume that $M^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]}$ is the absolute convergent sum of the Magnus series. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \exp M^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]} &= \exp \left(i \cdot (M_1^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]} \mathbf{1}_{[0,1)} \cdot M_2^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]} \mathbf{1}_{[1,2)}) \right) = \\ &= \exp(iM_1^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]}) \exp(iM_2^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]}) = \begin{cases} \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -\frac{\varepsilon(\pi^2 + \alpha^2)(1 + e^{-i\alpha})}{\pi^2 - \alpha^2} \\ & -1 \end{bmatrix} & \text{for } -\pi < \alpha < \pi, \\ \begin{bmatrix} -1 & \pm \pi i \varepsilon \\ & -1 \end{bmatrix} & \text{for } \alpha = \pm \pi. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

In any case, the result is not diagonalizable, not even in the larger algebra of 2×2 complex matrices. It implies that $M^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]}$ must have Jordan form $\begin{bmatrix} a & 1 \\ & a \end{bmatrix}$ in the larger algebra of 2×2 complex matrices with $a \in 2\pi i (\mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2})$. This, however, contradicts to the fact that the terms of the Magnus (BCH) series should be traceless in the larger algebra of 2×2 complex matrices. (The first term is known, and the other ones are sums of commutators. Or, alternatively, this also follows directly from considering the homomorphisms given by the diagonal positions.) \square

In the previous proof, instead of ‘‘proper analysis’’, only linear algebra was used. The following lemma, of more analytical nature, indicates the oscillatory nature of the coefficients:

Lemma 1.2. *In the previous lemma, for the terms of the Magnus expansion, $k \geq 1$,*

$$\mu_{k,R} \left(M_1^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]} \mathbf{1}_{[0,1)} \cdot M_2^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]} \mathbf{1}_{[1,2)} \right) = \begin{bmatrix} \pi & \\ & -\pi \end{bmatrix} \cdot \delta_{k,1} +$$

$$+ \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ & 0 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{cases} (-1)^{\frac{k}{2}} \cdot -\frac{2(\pi^2 + \alpha^2)(1 + \cos \alpha)\varepsilon}{\pi^2 - \alpha^2} + O(2^{-k}) & \text{for } k \text{ even, } -\pi < \alpha < \pi, \\ (-1)^{\frac{k+1}{2}} \cdot -\frac{2(\pi^2 + \alpha^2)(\sin \alpha)\varepsilon}{\pi^2 - \alpha^2} + O(2^{-k}) & \text{for } k \text{ odd, } -\pi < \alpha < \pi, \\ O(2^{-k}) & \text{for } k \text{ even, } \alpha = \pm\pi, \\ \pm(-1)^{\frac{k-1}{2}} 2\pi\varepsilon + O(2^{-k}) & \text{for } k \text{ odd, } \alpha = \pm\pi. \end{cases}$$

In particular, the terms of the Magnus expansion limit to $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & \pm c_{\text{odd}}^{[\alpha]} \varepsilon \\ & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & \pm c_{\text{even}}^{[\alpha]} \varepsilon \\ & 0 \end{bmatrix}$

where $c_{\text{odd}}^{[\alpha]}, c_{\text{even}}^{[\alpha]} \geq 0$, but at least one of them is nonzero.

Proof. Let

$$M^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]}(t) = \begin{cases} \begin{bmatrix} \pi t & \frac{t\varepsilon \pi ((\pi^2 + \alpha^2) (\cosh(t\pi) - e^{-t\alpha}) - 2\alpha\pi \sinh(t\pi))}{(\pi^2 - \alpha^2) \sinh(t\pi)} \\ & -\pi t \end{bmatrix} & \text{for } -\pi < \alpha < \pi, \\ \begin{bmatrix} \pi t & \mp \pi t \varepsilon (\beta(\pm 2\pi t)) \\ & -\pi t \end{bmatrix} & \text{for } \alpha = \pm\pi; \end{cases}$$

where we used the abbreviation $\beta(x) = \frac{x}{e^x - 1}$. Then $M^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]}(t)$ is meromorphic in t with possible poles in $i\mathbb{Z}$, and it can be checked that

$$\exp M^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]}(t) = \exp_{\mathbb{R}} \left(t \cdot (M_1^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]} \mathbf{1}_{[0,1)} \cdot M_2^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]} \mathbf{1}_{[1,2)}) \right).$$

In fact, $M^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]}(t)$ extends to $t = 0$ holomorphically with $M^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]}(0) = \text{Id}_2$, and the exponential identity above also holds there. As the continuation of \log is unique near the identity,

$$M^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]}(t) = \log \exp_{\mathbb{R}} \left(t \cdot (M_1^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]} \mathbf{1}_{[0,1)} \cdot M_2^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]} \mathbf{1}_{[1,2)}) \right) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} t^k \mu_{k,R} \left(M_1^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]} \mathbf{1}_{[0,1)} \cdot M_2^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]} \mathbf{1}_{[1,2)} \right)$$

holds for $t \sim 0$. Now, $(M^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]}(t))_{1,2}$ has residue

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{(\pi^2 + \alpha^2)\varepsilon (i)(1 + e^{-i\alpha})}{\pi^2 - \alpha^2} && \text{at } t = i \text{ for } -\pi < \alpha < \pi, \\ & \frac{(\pi^2 + \alpha^2)\varepsilon (-i)(1 + e^{i\alpha})}{\pi^2 - \alpha^2} && \text{at } t = -i \text{ for } -\pi < \alpha < \pi, \\ & \pm \pi\varepsilon && \text{at } t = i \text{ for } \alpha = \pm\pi, \\ & \pm \pi\varepsilon && \text{at } t = -i \text{ for } \alpha = \pm\pi. \end{aligned}$$

Then the residues at $t = \pm i$ give the macroscopic contributions in the power series, the residues at $t = \pm 2i$ give $O(2^{-k})$, and the rest is altogether even smaller. \square

Example 1.3. In the (proof of) the previous lemma, the cases $\alpha = 0$ (the ‘‘balanced cases’’) and $\alpha = \pm\pi$ (the ‘‘totally unbalanced cases’’) are particularly instructive.

Here we find for $t \sim 0$, or even for $|t| < 1$, or even just symbolically in t ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} t^k \mu_{k,R} \left(M_1^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]} \mathbf{1}_{[0,1)} \cdot M_2^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]} \mathbf{1}_{[1,2)} \right) &= \begin{cases} \begin{bmatrix} \pi t & \varepsilon \pi t \tanh\left(\frac{\pi}{2}t\right) \\ & -\pi t \end{bmatrix} & \text{for } \alpha = 0, \\ \begin{bmatrix} \pi t & \mp \pi t \varepsilon (\beta(\pm 2\pi t)) \\ & -\pi t \end{bmatrix} & \text{for } \alpha = \pm\pi \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \begin{bmatrix} \pi t & \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} -4(-1)^j (1 - 2^{-2j}) \zeta(2j) \varepsilon t^{2j} \\ & -\pi t \end{bmatrix} & \text{for } \alpha = 0, \\ \begin{bmatrix} \pi t & \mp \pi \varepsilon t + \pi^2 \varepsilon t^2 \pm \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (-1)^j 2\pi \zeta(2j) \varepsilon t^{2j+1} \\ & -\pi t \end{bmatrix} & \text{for } \alpha = \pm\pi. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

(One may recall that as $1 < 2j \nearrow +\infty$, one has $\zeta(2j) \searrow 1$, and even $(1 - 2^{-2j})\zeta(2j) \searrow 1$.)

The example(s) above are also instructive in illustrating that in the few cases when the Magnus expansion of ϕ is explicitly known, it comes typically not from the direct evaluation of the iterated integrals but from the knowledge of $\log(\exp_{\mathbb{R}}(t \cdot \phi))$ for $t \sim 0$.

Lemma 1.4. *Assume that the algebra of 2×2 (real or complex) upper triangular matrices*

is endowed by an algebra norm $\|\cdot\|$ such that $\left\| \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \\ & -1 \end{bmatrix} \right\| = 1$. Then

$$\|M_1^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]}\| + \|M_2^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]}\| \leq \pi + \pi|\varepsilon| \left\| \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\|.$$

In the totally unbalanced cases,

$$\|M_1^{[-\pi, \varepsilon]}\| = \pi, \quad \|M_2^{[-\pi, \varepsilon]}\| = \pi|\varepsilon| \left\| \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\|,$$

and

$$\|M_1^{[\pi, \varepsilon]}\| = \pi|\varepsilon| \left\| \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\|, \quad \|M_2^{[\pi, \varepsilon]}\| = \pi.$$

Proof. These are trivial norm estimates. \square

The main point is,

Theorem 1.5. *Assume that the algebra of 2×2 (real or complex) upper triangular matrices is endowed by an $\|\cdot\|_{\ell^p}$ norm with $1 \leq p \leq +\infty$, or even just with any algebra norm $\|\cdot\|$ such that $\left\| \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \\ & -1 \end{bmatrix} \right\| = 1$. Let $r > 0$ and $\delta > 0$. Then*

(a) *There exist an example of type Lemma 1.1 such that $\|M_1^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]}\| : \|M_2^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]}\| = r$ and $\|M_1^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]}\| + \|M_2^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]}\| < \pi + \delta$.*

(b) *There exist a counterexample of BCH type $M_1 \mathbf{1}_{[0,1)}, M_2 \mathbf{1}_{[1,2)}$ to the convergence of the Magnus expansion such that $\|M_1\| : \|M_2\| = r$ and $\|M_1\| + \|M_2\| = \pi + \delta$, and the coefficients of the Magnus expansion are unbounded.*

Proof. (a) We can choose a small $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $r \in \left[\varepsilon \left\| \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\|, \varepsilon^{-1} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\|^{-1} \right]$

and $\pi \varepsilon \left\| \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\| < \delta$. According the previous lemma, the first relation implies that as we pass from one totally unbalanced case to the other, the norm ratio r will be realized. The second relation implies that the cumulative norm is still small.

(b) We can linearly upscale (a). \square

Remark 1.6. The $\|\cdot\|_{\ell^p}$ norms with $p = 1, 2, +\infty$ can be computed relatively explicitly. For example, regarding the cumulative norm

$$\|M_1^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]}\|_{\ell^p} + \|M_2^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]}\|_{\ell^p} = \pi + \pi|\varepsilon| \quad \text{if } p = 1, \infty;$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \|M_1^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]}\|_{\ell^2} + \|M_2^{[\alpha, \varepsilon]}\|_{\ell^2} = \\ & = \frac{1}{2}\pi|\varepsilon| + \sqrt{\left(\frac{\pi - \alpha}{2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\pi + \alpha}{2}\right)^2 \frac{|\varepsilon|^2}{4}} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{\pi + \alpha}{2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\pi - \alpha}{2}\right)^2 \frac{|\varepsilon|^2}{4}} \\ & \leq \pi + \pi|\varepsilon|. \quad \triangle \end{aligned}$$

Remark 1.7. The counterexamples in the previous theorem fit to the line of Wei [20] in using the argument of parabolicity (but we use it in a slightly more sophisticated way), of Michel [8] in finding a whole range of balanced and unbalanced counterexamples (but we consider a different setting), and of Vinokurov [19] in finding relatively simple counterexamples (but we use an even simpler algebra and exhibit a bigger range of counterexamples). \triangle

I prefer to think about the construction of Lemma 1.1 as the ‘‘Minimal Examples’’. This is not about any mathematical minimality property but that the construction realizes counterexamples in a quite minimal setting. There are variants of it, but one cannot go below cumulative norm π :

Theorem 1.8. *Assume that \mathfrak{A} is the algebra of the 2×2 upper triangular matrices (real or complex), endowed by a Banach algebra norm $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{A}}$. Assume that ϕ is a continuous \mathfrak{A} -valued measure of cumulative norm $\leq \pi$. Then the Magnus series of ϕ is (absolute) convergent.*

Proof. Using standard Neumann series arguments, it is easy to see that the absolute value of the diagonal elements is dominated by the norm. More precisely, if $X \in \mathfrak{A}$, then $|(X)_{1,1}| \leq |X|_{\mathfrak{A}}$ and $|(X)_{2,2}| \leq |X|_{\mathfrak{A}}$. If $\int |\phi|_{\mathfrak{A}} < \pi$, then in the complex(ified) setting for $t \in D(0, 1 + \varepsilon)$, $M(t) = \log \exp_{\mathbb{R}}(t \cdot \phi)$ exists as one can apply the definition

$\log A = \int_{\lambda \in [0,1]} \frac{A-1}{\lambda+(1-\lambda)A} d\lambda$ based on the critical behavior in the diagonals. The power series expansion of $M(t)$ around $t = 0$ gives the convergent Magnus expansion for $t = 1$. In fact, the same applies even if $\int |\phi|_{\mathfrak{A}} = \pi$ but $|\int(\phi)_{1,1}| < \pi$ and $|\int(\phi)_{2,2}| < \pi$. Let us now consider the measure $\tilde{\phi}$ such that $\phi = \frac{1}{2}(\int(\phi)_{1,1} + \int(\phi)_{2,2}) \cdot \text{Id}_2 + \tilde{\phi}$. I. e. $\tilde{\phi}$ is the traceless modification of ϕ . The Magnus expansion of $\tilde{\phi}$ is equiconvergent to the Magnus expansion of ϕ . This traceless modification is convergent as the integrated modified diagonals get off from the boundary of $D(0, \pi)$ except if $C = \int(\phi)_{1,1} = -\int(\phi)_{2,2}$ with $|C| = \int |\phi|_{\mathfrak{A}} = \pi$. It is sufficient to consider this latter case. Reparametrizing the measure ϕ in terms of variation, and multiplying it a complex unit vector, we can assume that ϕ is supported on $[0, \pi)$ and $\phi = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}_{[0,\pi)} & \mathbf{c} \\ & -\mathbf{1}_{[0,\pi)} \end{bmatrix}$ and $|\psi|_{\mathfrak{A}} = \mathbf{1}_{[0,\pi)}$. Now, \mathbf{c} may be essentially constant i. e. a scalar times $\mathbf{1}_{[0,\pi)}$. In this case the Magnus expansion is convergent. If this is not so, then there are elements $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & a \\ & -1 \end{bmatrix}$ and $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & b \\ & -1 \end{bmatrix}$ of unit norm such that $a \neq b$. But then the norm of $n \begin{bmatrix} 0 & (b-a) \\ & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \left(\begin{bmatrix} 1 & a \\ & -1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & b \\ & -1 \end{bmatrix} \right)^n - \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \\ & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ would be bounded by 2, which is an absurdum. \square

If dimension 4 is allowed for an algebra \mathfrak{A} , then there are already counterexamples to cumulative π with respect to the convergence of the Magnus expansion. Indeed, in the case of real 2×2 matrices with the ℓ^2 operator norm the Moan–Schäffer example (see Schäffer [16], Moan [10], Moan, Niesen [11]) or the Magnus critical example (see Part II [6] for a detailed discussion) are like that.

Taking $\oplus \mathbb{R}$ and the joint maximum norm, we can always increase the dimension of the Banach algebras while leaving the cumulative norm of the counterexample the same. However, we have promised a series of counterexamples with cumulative norm $\searrow 2$.

1.B. Higher dimensional counterexamples.

Let us start with a particular example, which we will generalize.

Example 1.9. Here we will construct an example for the divergence of Magnus expansion which is of mBCH type, using 5×5 real matrices of cumulative norm $5 \cdot \frac{2}{5-1} = \frac{5}{2}$. We will use the matrices

$$M_1^{(5)} = \frac{2}{4} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ & 0 & & & \\ & & 0 & & \\ & & & 0 & \\ & & & & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad M_2^{(5)} = \frac{2}{4} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & & \\ -1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ & & 0 & & \\ & & & 0 & \\ & & & & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad M_3^{(5)} = \frac{2}{4} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & & \\ & 0 & & & \\ -1 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ & & & 0 & \\ & & & & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$M_4^{(5)} = \frac{2}{4} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & & \\ & 0 & & & \\ & & 0 & & \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 1 \\ & & & & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad M_5^{(5)} = \frac{2}{4} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & & \\ & 0 & & & \\ & & 0 & & \\ & & & 0 & \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The measure we will consider is $\psi_5 = M_1^{(5)} \mathbf{1}_{[0,1)} \cdot M_2^{(5)} \mathbf{1}_{[1,2)} \cdot M_3^{(5)} \mathbf{1}_{[2,3)} \cdot M_4^{(5)} \mathbf{1}_{[3,4)} \cdot M_5^{(5)} \mathbf{1}_{[4,5)}$. For the matrices we will use the ℓ^1 operator norm $\|\cdot\|_{\ell^1}$. Then the cumulative norm of ψ_5 is

$$\int \|\psi_5\|_{\ell^1} = \|M_1^{(5)}\|_{\ell^1} + \dots + \|M_5^{(5)}\|_{\ell^1} = 5 \cdot \frac{2}{4} = \frac{5}{2}.$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \exp_{\mathbb{R}}(\psi_5) &= (\exp M_1^{(5)}) \dots (\exp M_5^{(5)}) = (\text{Id}_5 + M_1^{(5)}) \dots (\text{Id}_5 + M_5^{(5)}) \\
 &= \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{33}{32} & \frac{41}{32} & -\frac{21}{32} & \frac{9}{32} & \frac{27}{16} \\ -\frac{27}{16} & -\frac{3}{16} & -\frac{7}{16} & \frac{3}{16} & \frac{9}{8} \\ -\frac{9}{8} & -\frac{9}{8} & \frac{3}{8} & \frac{1}{8} & \frac{3}{4} \\ -\frac{3}{4} & -\frac{3}{4} & -\frac{3}{4} & \frac{3}{4} & \frac{1}{2} \\ -\frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -7 & -\sqrt{15} & 5 & -2 \\ -1 & -2 & 2\sqrt{15} & 5 & -1 \\ 1 & 8 & 0 & 5 & 0 \\ -1 & -2 & -2\sqrt{15} & 5 & 1 \\ 1 & -7 & \sqrt{15} & 5 & 2 \end{bmatrix} \\
 &\cdot \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{61}{64} & -\frac{5\sqrt{15}}{64} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{5\sqrt{15}}{64} & \frac{61}{64} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}}_{=F_5} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -7 & -\sqrt{15} & 5 & -2 \\ -1 & -2 & 2\sqrt{15} & 5 & -1 \\ 1 & 8 & 0 & 5 & 0 \\ -1 & -2 & -2\sqrt{15} & 5 & 1 \\ 1 & -7 & \sqrt{15} & 5 & 2 \end{bmatrix}^{-1}
 \end{aligned}$$

informs us about the real Jordan form F_5 of $\exp_{\mathbb{R}}(\psi_5)$. We see that the geometric multiplicity of the eigenvalue -1 is 1, therefore it cannot be the exponential of a real matrix M . (The eigenvalue -1 is not forbidden for the exponential of a real matrix but its geometric multiplicity should be even.) On the other hand, the sum M of the Magnus series should be exactly a matrix like that. \diamond

That will be our general strategy: we will consider measures of real matrices with time-ordered exponential with eigenvalue -1 of geometric multiplicity 1. In order to establish this behaviour we, in fact, do not have to deal with the Jordan form, a simple rank computation for $\exp_{\mathbb{R}}(\phi) + \text{Id}$ is sufficient.

Now, we start the general construction. Let $Q_s^{(n)}$ be the $n \times n$ real matrix such that its elements (i th row, j th column) are given by

$$\left(Q_u^{(n)} \right)_{i,j} = \delta_{i,u} \text{sgn}(j - u)$$

(where the Kronecker's delta notation is used).

Lemma 1.10. *For any $1 \leq k \leq n$, and any scalar s ,*

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\exp sQ_1^{(n)}) \dots (\exp sQ_k^{(n)}) &= (\text{Id}_n + sQ_1^{(n)}) \dots (\text{Id}_n + sQ_k^{(n)}) = \\
 &= \left[\begin{array}{c|c} A^{(k)}(s) + B^{(k)}(s) & C^{(k,n-k)}(s) \\ \hline 0_{(n-k) \times k} & \text{Id}_{n-k} \end{array} \right];
 \end{aligned}$$

such that $A^{(k)}(s)$ is a $k \times k$ matrix whose elements (i th row, j th column) are given by

$$\left(A^{(k)}(s) \right)_{i,j} = \begin{cases} (s+1)^{j-i+1} - (s+1)^{j-i-1} & \text{if } i < j, \\ s+1 & \text{if } i = j, \\ 0 & \text{if } i > j; \end{cases}$$

$B^{(k)}(s)$ is a $k \times k$ matrix whose elements (i th row, j th column) are given by

$$\left(B^{(k)}(s)\right)_{i,j} = (s+1)^{k-i} - (s+1)^{k-i+1};$$

$C^{(k,n-k)}(s)$ is a $k \times (n-k)$ matrix whose elements (i th row, j th column) are given by

$$\left(C^{(k,n-k)}(s)\right)_{i,j} = -(s+1)^{k-i} + (s+1)^{k-i+1}.$$

(The elements $B^{(k)}(s)$ and $C^{(k,n-k)}(s)$ depend only on the row number.)

Proof. One can prove this by induction in k . □

Lemma 1.11. (a) For any $1 \leq n$, and any scalar s ,

$$P^{(n)}(s) := (\exp sQ_1^{(n)}) \dots (\exp sQ_n^{(n)}) = (\text{Id}_n + sQ_1^{(n)}) \dots (\text{Id}_n + sQ_n^{(n)}) = A^{(n)}(s) + B^{(n)}(s)$$

(b) If $s+1 \neq \pm 1$, then the eigenvalues of product matrix $P^{(n)}(s)$ have geometric multiplicity at most 1. If $s=0$, then $\lambda = s+1 = 1$ has geometric multiplicity n ; if $s=2$, then $\lambda = s+1 = -1$ has geometric multiplicity $n-1$.

(c) If $s = 2 + \frac{2}{n-1}$, then -1 is an eigenvalue of $P^{(n)}(s)$.

Proof. (a) This is an immediate consequence of the previous lemma.

(b) Let us consider the matrix $P^{(n)}(s) - \lambda \text{Id}_n = (A^{(n)}(s) - \lambda \text{Id}_n) + B^{(n)}(s)$.

If $\lambda \neq s+1$, then $(A^{(n)}(s) - \lambda \text{Id}_n)$ is an invertible triangular matrix of full rank, while $B^{(n)}(s)$ is rank 0 or 1. Therefore the rank of the sum is $n-1$ or n .

If $\lambda = s+1 \neq -1$, then (we also know that $s+1 \neq 1$) we have $(s+1)^2 - 1 \neq 0$, thus the column space $(A^{(n)}(s) - \lambda \text{Id}_n)$ contains the column vectors whose last entry is 0, and $(A^{(n)}(s) - \lambda \text{Id}_n)$ also has a 0 column. Meanwhile the columns of $B^{(n)}(s)$ are uniformly a column vector, whose last entry is $1 - (s+1) = -s \neq 0$. Then it is easy to see that the columns of $(A^{(n)}(s) - \lambda \text{Id}_n) + B^{(n)}(s)$ must be independent.

The special cases $\lambda = s+1 = \pm 1$ can be checked directly.

(c) using (a) one can check that the column vector with uniform entries 1 is an eigenvector with eigenvalue -1 . □

Now it is clear what to do, set $M_k^{(n)} = \frac{2}{n-1} Q_k^{(n)}$, and

$$\psi_n = M_1^{(n)} \mathbf{1}_{[0,1)} \dots M_k^{(n)} \mathbf{1}_{[k-1,k)} \dots M_n^{(n)} \mathbf{1}_{[n-1,n)}.$$

Then we obtain

Theorem 1.12. Let $n \geq 2$. The cumulative norm of ψ_n in the ℓ^1 operator norm $\|\cdot\|_{\ell^1}$ of $n \times n$ matrices is

$$\int \|\psi_n\|_{\ell^1} = \frac{2n}{n-1},$$

while the Magnus expansion of ψ_n is not absolutely convergent.

Proof. The statements about the cumulative norms are straightforward. As -1 is an eigenvalue of geometric multiplicity 1 of $\exp_{\mathbb{R}}(\psi_n)$, it cannot be an exponential of a real matrix. Meanwhile, the sum M of the Magnus series should be a matrix like that. □

Remark 1.13. One can see that the eigenvalues of $\exp_{\mathbb{R}}(\psi_n)$ are on the unit circle, with the only nontrivial Jordan block $\begin{bmatrix} -1 & 1 \\ & -1 \end{bmatrix}$ in complex form (corresponding to column vectors of arithmetic progressions).

Indeed, one can argue as follows. Let \mathbf{v} be the column vector of length n containing only entries 1. Then the matrix $\text{Id}_n - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top$ defines a positive semidefinite quadratic form S_n on \mathbb{R}^n , but it descends to a positive definite quadratic form \tilde{S}_n on the factor space $\mathbb{R}^n/\mathbb{R}\mathbf{v} = \tilde{\mathbb{R}}^n$. Then $P_n = \exp_{\mathbb{R}}(\psi_n)$ leaves S_n invariant, and it also descends to linear map \tilde{P}_n on $\tilde{\mathbb{R}}^n$, which is therefore orthogonal with respect to \tilde{S}_n . Thus the eigenvalues of \tilde{P}_n are unit complex numbers with trivial Jordan blocks. Getting back to \mathbb{R}^n , can gives one extra eigenvalue from $\mathbb{R}\mathbf{v}$ which we know to be -1 , and it can give only one extra nontrivial Jordan block, which must be as indicated because the effect of P_n is easy to check on column vectors of arithmetic progressions. \triangle

For $d \geq 3$, let $C_{\mathbb{K}}^{\{\{d\}\}}$ denote the infimum of the cumulative norms of \mathfrak{A} valued ordered measures whose Magnus expansion is not absolutely convergent and \mathfrak{A} is a d dimensional Banach algebra over \mathbb{K} . We know that $C_{\mathbb{K}}^{\{\{3\}\}} = \pi$, and $C_{\mathbb{K}}^{\{\{d\}\}}$ is (possibly not strictly) decreasing in d , but ≥ 2 . By Theorem 1.12, for dimension $d = n^2$ ($n \geq 2$), the continuous measure ψ_n provides a counterexample to the convergence of the Magnus expansion. Thus, for $d \geq 4$,

$$(1) \quad C_{\mathbb{R}}^{\{\{d\}\}} \leq 2 + \frac{2}{[\sqrt{d}] - 1}.$$

(Meanwhile, $C_{\mathbb{R}}^{\{\{d\}\}} \geq C_{\mathbb{C}}^{\{\{d\}\}} \geq C_{\mathbb{R}}^{\{\{2d\}\}}$ is trivial.)

Note, however, that the cumulative of ψ_2 is 4 and the cumulative of ψ_3 is 3. So, these counterexamples get lower cumulative norms than π only for dimensions $d \geq 9$.

For $4 \leq \dim_{\mathbb{K}} \mathfrak{A} \leq 8$, it would be interesting to see counterexamples with cumulative norm less than π , if they exist. In particular, most prominently, it is not clear how far one can go when \mathfrak{A} is isomorphic to the algebra of real 2×2 matrices (allowing other norms than the ℓ^2 operator norm).

1.C. Relationship to the free L^1 mBCH counterexamples.

In Part I [5] we have considered counterexamples of mBCH type for the convergence of the Magnus expansion. There, the tautological measure $2 \cdot Z_{[0,1]}^1$ was replaced by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\psi}_n = & \log \exp_{\mathbb{R}}(2 \cdot Z_{[0, \frac{1}{n}]}^1) \mathbf{1}_{[0,1)} \cdots \\ & \cdots \log \exp_{\mathbb{R}}(2 \cdot Z_{[\frac{k-1}{n}, \frac{k}{n}]}^1) \mathbf{1}_{[k-1, k)} \cdots \log \exp_{\mathbb{R}}(2 \cdot Z_{[\frac{n-1}{n}, \frac{n}{n}]}^1) \mathbf{1}_{[n-1, n)} \end{aligned}$$

(with $n \geq 2$). In that the cumulative norm of the measure increases only slightly, but the time-ordered exponentials will be the same in $F^{1, \text{loc}}([0, 1))$ but not lying in $F^1([0, 1))$. These counterexample can be understood in the algebra finitely generated by the $\log \exp_{\mathbb{R}}(2 \cdot Z_{[\frac{k-1}{n}, \frac{k}{n}]}^1)$ but which is, nevertheless infinite dimensional and not particularly manageable. Also, the cumulative norm $\int |\hat{\psi}_n| = n\Theta(\frac{2}{n}) = 2 + \frac{2}{n} + O(\frac{1}{n^2})$ and the cumulative norm $\int \|\psi_n\|_{\ell^1} = 2 + \frac{2}{n-1}$ are quite comparable. According to these, the counterexamples ψ_n compare preferably to the $\hat{\psi}_n$.

Here we would like to argue that the ψ_n and $\hat{\psi}_n$ closely related to each other. The point is that ψ_n can be obtained from $\hat{\psi}_n$ by “reducing” the algebra $F^1([0, 1))$. Although the following discussion can be made completely precise, for the sake of ease, we keep it informal. In particular, we will sometimes pretend that $F^1([0, 1))$ is the superposition of elements $X_{t_1} \dots X_{t_k}$ with $t_i \in [0, 1)$, even if this is not so simple. The precise idea is

that $F^1([0, 1])$ can be subjected to contractive homomorphisms but which can be set up so that the terms of the Magnus series are kept seen relatively large.

The first thing one can do is to replace $X_{t_1} \dots X_{t_k}$ by $\mathbf{a}^{\text{asc}(t_1, \dots, t_k)} \mathbf{d}^{\text{des}(t_1, \dots, t_k)} X_{t_1, t_2}$, i. e. the internal structure of the expression gets ignored, only the number of ascents and descents get recorded. Actually, it is sufficient to have $\mathbf{a} \equiv 1$ and $\mathbf{d} \equiv -1$ here; this setup still keeps the size of the terms of the Magnus expansion. This leads to an “abstract composition kernel approach”. What can make this more down-to-earth is to consider it as a representation. We have the representation space generated by superpositions of Y_t ($t \in [0, 1]$), where the representation rule is $X_{t_1} Y_{t_2} = Y_{t_1}$ for $t_1 < t_2$ and $X_{t_1} Y_{t_2} = -Y_{t_1}$ for $t_1 > t_2$. If the superpositions of Y_t is coded as an L^1 function $f(t)$, then the effect of $Z_{[a,b]}$ on $f(t)$ leads to $\tilde{f}(t)$ where

$$\tilde{f}(t) = \int_{s \in [0,1]} \underbrace{\chi_{[a,b]}(t) \operatorname{sgn}(s-t)}_{=K_{[a,b]}(s,t)} f(s) ds.$$

Thus $Z_{[a,b]}$ gets represented by kernel $K_{[a,b]}(s, t)$ (L^1 in s , L^∞ in t). This representation is still quite strange, and indeed, there is no loss in norm with respect to terms of the Magnus expansion.

What one can make the situation tamer is the introduction of additional eliminating relations $X_{t_1} X_{t_2} = 0$ for $t_1, t_2 \in [\frac{k-1}{n}, \frac{k}{n})$. This *will* improve the convergence of the Magnus expansion but hopefully not so much. This is compatible to the representation process of the previous paragraph. It leads to the kernels $K_{[a,b]}^{[1/n]}(s, t)$ where the values on the squares $[\frac{k-1}{n}, \frac{k}{n}) \times [\frac{k-1}{n}, \frac{k}{n})$ are killed. Then, the image of the time-ordered exponential of $2 \cdot Z_{[0,1]}^1$, and of $\hat{\psi}_n$ and the computations with the latter one can be viewed in terms of kernels which are linear combinations of characteristic functions of $[\frac{k-1}{n}, \frac{k}{n}) \times [\frac{l-1}{n}, \frac{l}{n})$. I. e. in terms of $n \times n$ matrices. Indeed, this is exactly the process how ψ_n was obtained from $\hat{\psi}_n$.

2. CONVERGENCE FOR FINITE DIMENSIONAL BANACH ALGEBRAS

We recall certain estimates due to Rogers, which are standard material. Let us consider any centrally symmetric compact convex body H in the n -dimensional space \mathbb{R}^n . Let $\vartheta(H)$ be the infimum of the covering density of \mathbb{R}^n by translates of H ; and let $\vartheta_L(H)$ be the same with respect to lattice coverings. Then, by Rogers [14], for $n \geq 3$,

$$\begin{aligned} (2) \quad \vartheta(H) &\leq \vartheta_L(H) \leq \min_{0 < \eta < 1/n} (1 + \eta)^n (1 + n \log(1/\eta)) \\ &= -n W_{-1}(-\frac{1}{n}) \left(1 - \frac{1}{n W_{-1}(-\frac{1}{n})}\right)^{n+1} \\ (3) \quad &< \left(1 + \frac{1}{n \log n}\right)^n (1 + n \log(n \log n)) \\ (4) \quad &< n \log n + n \log \log n + 2n + 1 \\ (5) \quad &< n \log n + n \log \log n + 5n. \end{aligned}$$

Here (2) is the proper result of [14] (which is expressed explicitly using the Lambert W_{-1} function); (3) reflects the choice $\eta = \frac{1}{n \log n}$; and while, for example, (4) is still true, (5) is the much quoted estimate; see G. Fejes Tóth [3] for more on this. The main point is that there is a dimension-dependent but otherwise universal quantity ϑ_n (which can be

chosen as any expression on the RHS), which is nearly linear in n , estimating the minimal translative covering densities from above. Moreover, as it is explained in Rogers, Zong [15], if $0 < r < 1$, then H can be covered by at most $(1 + r^{-1})^n \vartheta(H) \leq (1 + r^{-1})^n \vartheta_n$ translates of rH (i. e. by homothetical copies of H with ratio r). For a recent review on these topics, see Naszódi [13].

Theorem 2.1. *Assume that \mathfrak{A} is Banach algebra of finite real dimension n . Assume that ϕ is an ordered measure of cumulative norm $\int |\phi| = \omega$. Let $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. Then*

$$(6) \quad |\mu_{2,R}(\phi)| = \left| \int_{t_1, t_2 \in [0,1]} \lambda^{\text{asc}(t_1, t_2)} (\lambda - 1)^{\text{des}(t_1, t_2)} \phi(t_1) \phi(t_2) \right| \\ \leq \frac{\omega^2}{2} \left(1 - \frac{2^{1-n}}{n} \left(\frac{1 - \frac{2}{n}}{e} \right) \frac{1}{\vartheta_n} \min(\lambda, 1 - \lambda) \right).$$

Proof. The measure ϕ can be approximated by measures of mBCH type. Therefore it is sufficient to prove the statement in the case

$$\phi = u_1 \mathbf{1}_{[\tau_0, \tau_1)} \cdots u_k \mathbf{1}_{[\tau_{k-1}, \tau_k)}$$

such that $u_i \in \mathfrak{A}$, $|u_i| = 1$, $0 = \tau_0 < \tau_1 < \dots < \tau_k = \omega$. We also write $\phi(t) = u(t) \mathbf{1}_{[0, \omega)}$, where $u(t)$ is the corresponding piecewise constant function.

Let us apply the argument of Rogers, Zong [15] where H is the closed unit ball K of $\mathfrak{A} \simeq \mathbb{R}^n$. Then K can be covered by at most $s = (1 + r^{-1})^n \vartheta_n$ many copies of rK , say $K_1, \dots, K_{[s]}$. Let $L_1 = K \cap K_1$, and $L_i = (K \cap K_i) \setminus (K_1 \cup \dots \cup K_{i-1})$. Let N_i be the union of those $[\tau_{p-1}, \tau_p)$ such that $u_p \in L_i$. (I. e., formally, $N_i = u^{-1}(L_i)$.) Let v_i be the Lebesgue measure of N_i . Clearly, $v_1 + \dots + v_s = \omega$. We cut N_i into a lower part N_i^- and lower part N_i^+ , each of them of Lebesgue measure $v_i/2$. Let $P_i^- : [0, v_i/2) \rightarrow N_i^-$ and $P_i^+ : [0, v_i/2) \rightarrow N_i^+$ be the corresponding monotone increasing measure preserving transformations. It is easy to see that $P_i^+(q) - P_i^-(q) \geq v_i/2$ for any q . On the other hand, $|u(P_i^+(q)) - u(P_i^-(q))| \leq 2r$, by the construction of $L_i \subset K_i$.

One can write

$$\mu_{2,R}(\phi) = \int_{t_1, t_2 \in [0, \omega]} \lambda^{\text{asc}(t_1, t_2)} (\lambda - 1)^{\text{des}(t_1, t_2)} u(t_1) u(t_2) dt_1 dt_2 \\ = \sum_i \int_{q \in [0, v_i/2), t_2 \in [0, \omega]} \lambda^{\text{asc}(P_i^-(q), t_2)} (\lambda - 1)^{\text{des}(P_i^-(q), t_2)} u(P_i^-(q)) u(t_2) + \\ + \lambda^{\text{asc}(P_i^+(q), t_2)} (\lambda - 1)^{\text{des}(P_i^+(q), t_2)} u(P_i^-(q)) u(t_2) dq dt_2.$$

The norm of $(\lambda^{\text{asc}(t_{11}, t_2)} (\lambda - 1)^{\text{des}(t_{11}, t_2)} u(t_{11}) + \lambda^{\text{asc}(t_{12}, t_2)} (\lambda - 1)^{\text{des}(t_{12}, t_2)} u(t_{12})) u(t_2)$ can be estimated $(\lambda^{\text{asc}(t_{11}, t_2)} (1 - \lambda)^{\text{des}(t_{11}, t_2)} \cdot 1 + \lambda^{\text{asc}(t_{12}, t_2)} (1 - \lambda)^{\text{des}(t_{12}, t_2)} \cdot 1) \cdot 1$, but this leads only to the trivial estimate

$$|\mu_{2,R}(\phi)| \leq \frac{1}{2} \omega^2.$$

However, when $t_{11} < t_2 < t_{12}$ or $t_{12} < t_2 < t_{11}$ holds, then there is gain, as a component $\min(\lambda, 1 - \lambda) \cdot 2$ in the estimate can be replaced by $\min(\lambda, 1 - \lambda) \cdot |u(t_{11}) - u(t_{12})|$. This is a gain $\min(\lambda, 1 - \lambda) \cdot (2 - |u(t_{11}) - u(t_{12})|)$ in the estimate. Therefore, we have a better overall estimate

$$(7) \quad |\mu_{2,R}(\phi)| \leq \frac{\omega^2}{2} - \sum_i \min(\lambda, 1 - \lambda) \cdot (2 - 2r) \cdot \left(\frac{v_i}{2} \right)^2.$$

The inequality between the arithmetic and square means implies that $\sum (v_i)^2 \geq \frac{\omega^2}{[s]} \geq \frac{\omega^2}{s}$. Therefore (7) implies

$$(8) \quad |\mu_{2,R}(\phi)| \leq \frac{\omega^2}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1-r}{s} \min(\lambda, 1-\lambda) \right).$$

In the previous argument the value of $0 < r < 1$ (and thus s) was unfixed. Now r can be optimized to $r = \frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{n^2 + 6n + 1} - n - 1 \right)$, but, for the sake of simplicity, we take $r = 1 - \frac{2}{n}$. With this latter choice,

$$\frac{1-r}{s} \frac{1}{\vartheta_n} = \frac{2^{1-n}}{n} \left(\frac{n-2}{n-1} \right)^n \frac{1}{\vartheta_n} > \frac{2^{1-n}}{n} \left(\frac{1-\frac{2}{n}}{e} \right) \frac{1}{\vartheta_n}.$$

Putting this into (8), we obtain (6). \square

From Part I [5] we may recall: For $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, the convergence radius of $\Theta^{(\lambda)}(x)$ around $x = 0$ is

$$C_\infty^{(\lambda)} = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } \lambda = \frac{1}{2}, \\ \frac{2 \operatorname{artanh}(1-2\lambda)}{1-2\lambda} = \frac{\log \frac{1-\lambda}{\lambda}}{1-2\lambda} & \text{if } \lambda \in (0, 1) \setminus \{\frac{1}{2}\}, \\ +\infty & \text{if } \lambda \in \{0, 1\}. \end{cases}$$

This is a strictly convex, nonnegative function in $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, symmetric for $\lambda \mapsto 1 - \lambda$; its minimum is $C_\infty^{(1/2)} = 2$. In particular, in $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, it yields a $[2, +\infty]$ -valued strictly convex continuous function.

For $d \geq 3$, let Λ_d be the number such that $0 < \Lambda_d \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $C_\infty^{(\Lambda_d)} = C_\mathbb{R}^{\{\{d\}\}}$. We know that Λ_d is increasing in d but $\leq \frac{1}{2}$. Then

$$\Lambda_d \geq \Lambda_3 = 0.0588740902\dots > \frac{1}{17}.$$

For a better appreciation, asymptotically,

Lemma 2.2. For $d \geq 25$,

$$(9) \quad \Lambda_d \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{3}{\lfloor \sqrt{d} \rfloor - 1}} \right).$$

Proof. Let $\tilde{\Lambda}_d$ denote the RHS of (9). It is sufficient to prove that $C_\infty^{(\tilde{\Lambda}_d)} \geq C_\mathbb{R}^{\{\{d\}\}}$. In turn, by (1), for that, it is sufficient to prove that $C_\infty^{(\tilde{\Lambda}_d)} \geq 2 + \frac{2}{\lfloor \sqrt{d} \rfloor - 1}$. On the other hand, it is not hard to prove that $C_\infty^{(\lambda)} \geq 2 + \frac{8}{3}(\lambda - 1/2)^2$, leading to the desired result. \square

In general, however, the estimate $\Lambda_d > \frac{1}{17}$ may be convenient. Now we can state

Theorem 2.3. Assume that \mathfrak{A} is Banach algebra of finite real dimension n , and ϕ is an \mathfrak{A} valued ordered measure such that

$$(10) \quad \int |\phi| < \frac{2}{1 - \left(\frac{2^{-2-n}}{n} \left(\frac{1-\frac{2}{n}}{e} \right) \Lambda_n \right)}.$$

Then ψ is M -controlled, in particular, its Magnus expansion convergent, and the logarithmic Magnus formula holds.

Proof. Assume that ϕ is subject to (10). Assume $\int |\phi| \geq 2$. Let us decompose $\phi = \phi_1 \cdot \phi_2 \cdot \phi_3$, where $\int |\phi_1| = 1$ and $\int |\phi_2| = 2$. Let $\lambda \in [\Lambda_n, 1 - \Lambda_n]$. By Theorem 2.1,

$$\Theta^{(\lambda)}(\phi_1) \leq \Theta^{(\lambda)}(1) - \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2^{1-n}}{n} \left(\frac{1 - \frac{2}{n}}{e} \right) \frac{\Lambda_n}{\vartheta_n} \right)}_{r:=}$$

That means that ϕ_1 has delay

$$1 - \left(\Theta^{(\lambda)} \right)^{-1} (\Theta^{(\lambda)}(1) - r) \geq 1 - \left(\Theta^{(1/2)} \right)^{-1} (\Theta^{(1/2)}(1) - r) \equiv \frac{r}{4-r}.$$

(See the ‘‘Delay estimate reduction principle’’ of Part I.) The same applies to ϕ_2 , consequently $\phi_1 \cdot \phi_2$ collects delay at least $\frac{2r}{4-r}$. Thus the resolvent expansion will be convergent (thus the resolvent $\mathcal{R}^{(\lambda)}(\exp_{\mathbb{R}} \phi)$ exists) as long as $\int |\phi_3| < \frac{2r}{4-r}$, i. e. if $\int |\phi| < 2 + \frac{2r}{4-r} = \frac{2}{1-\frac{1}{4}r}$. But that was exactly our assumption. $\mathcal{R}^{(\lambda)}(\exp_{\mathbb{R}} \phi)$ also exists if $\int |\phi| < 2$. More generally, the statement about the existence of the resolvent for $\lambda \in [\Lambda_n, 1 - \Lambda_n]$ also holds if ϕ is replaced by $t \cdot \phi$ where t is from the closed complex unit disk.

Now, we claim, in general,

$$(11) \quad \frac{2}{1 - \frac{1}{4}r} \leq C_{\mathbb{R}}^{\{\{n\}\}}.$$

Indeed, otherwise, $\frac{2}{1 - \frac{1}{4}r} > C_{\mathbb{R}}^{\{\{n\}\}}$, and we could chose an $\delta > 0$ such that

$$C_{\mathbb{R}}^{\{\{n\}\}} < \frac{2}{1 - \frac{1}{4}r(1 - \delta)}.$$

We also know that

$$C_{\mathbb{R}}^{\{\{n\}\}} = C_{\infty}^{(\Lambda_n)} < C_{\infty}^{(\Lambda_n(1-\delta))}.$$

Finally, we could choose a counterexample ψ to the convergence of the Magnus expansion such that

$$(12) \quad \int |\psi| < \frac{2}{1 - \frac{1}{4}r(1 - \delta)}$$

and

$$(13) \quad \int |\psi| < C_{\infty}^{(\Lambda_n(1-\delta))}.$$

Repeating the arguments of the previous paragraph, (12) causes $\mathcal{R}^{(\lambda)}(\exp_{\mathbb{R}}(t \cdot \psi))$ to exist for $\lambda \in [\Lambda_n(1 - \delta), 1 - \Lambda_n(1 - \delta)]$ and $t \in D(0, 1)$; while (13) causes $\mathcal{R}^{(\lambda)}(\exp_{\mathbb{R}}(t \cdot \psi))$ to exist for $\lambda \in [0, \Lambda_n(1 - \delta))$ and $\lambda \in (1 - \Lambda_n(1 - \delta), 1]$. Ultimately, ψ is M -controlled, and its Magnus expansion is convergent; this is a contradiction.

Returning to the main statement now, (11) implies

$$\int |\phi| \leq C_{\mathbb{R}}^{\{\{n\}\}} \equiv C_{\infty}^{(\Lambda_n)}.$$

This, in turn, implies that $\mathcal{R}^{(\lambda)}(\exp_{\mathbb{R}}(t \cdot \phi))$ to exist for $\lambda \in [0, \Lambda_n)$ and $\lambda \in (1 - \Lambda_n, 1]$. Ultimately, ϕ is M -controlled. \square

If we ignore M -controlledness and the logarithmic issues, and we concentrate on the convergence of the Magnus expansion, then the previous theorem says

$$(14) \quad C_{\mathbb{R}}^{\{\{n\}\}} \geq \frac{2}{1 - \left(\frac{2^{-2-n}}{n} \left(\frac{1 - \frac{2}{n}}{e} \right) \frac{\Lambda_n}{\vartheta_n} \right)}.$$

Note, however, that there is a huge gap between (1) and (14), which would be interesting to close.

One can improve upon the cumulative convergence radius $C_2 = 2.89847930\dots$ of the BCH expansion by similar arguments.

REFERENCES

- [1] Blanes, S.; Casas, F.; Oteo, J. A.; Ros, J.: The Magnus expansion and some of its applications. *Phys. Rep.* **470** (2009), 151–238.
- [2] Casas, Fernando: Sufficient conditions for the convergence of the Magnus expansion. *J. Phys. A* **40** (2007), 15001–15017.
- [3] Fejes Tóth, Gábor: A note on covering by convex bodies. *Can. Math. Bull.* **52** (2009), 361–365.
- [4] Kobayashi, Yuji; Shirayanagi, Kiyoshi; Takahasi, Sin-Ei; Tsukada, Makoto: A complete classification of three-dimensional algebras over \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{C} — 温故知新 [OnKoChiShin] (visiting old, learn new). *Asian-European Journal of Mathematics* **14** (2021), 2150131 (25 pages).
- [5] Lakos, Gyula: *Convergence estimates for the Magnus expansion I. Banach algebras*. arXiv:1709.01791
- [6] Lakos, Gyula: *Convergence estimates for the Magnus expansion II. C^* -algebras*. arXiv:1910.03328
- [7] Magnus, Wilhelm: On the exponential solution of differential equations for a linear operator. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **7** (1954), 649–673.
- [8] Michel, Jean: Bases des algèbres de Lie et série de Hausdorff. *Séminaire Dubreil. Algèbre*, **27** n.1 (1973-1974), exp. n. 6, 1-9 (1974).
- [9] Mielnik, Bogdan; Plebański, Jerzy: Combinatorial approach to Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff exponents. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Sect. A (N.S.)* **12** (1970), 215–254.
- [10] Moan, Per Christian: *On backward error analysis and Nekhoroshev stability in the numerical analysis of conservative systems of ODEs*. PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 2002.
- [11] Moan, Per Christian; Niesen, Jitse: Convergence of the Magnus series. *Found. Comput. Math.* **8** (2008), 291–301.
- [12] Moan, P. C.; Oteo, J. A.: Convergence of the exponential Lie series. *J. Math. Phys.* **42** (2001), 501–508.
- [13] Naszódi, Márton: Flavors of translative coverings. In: *New Trends in Intuitive Geometry*. Springer Verlag, New York, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2018. Pages 335–358.
- [14] Rogers, C. A.: A note on coverings. *Mathematika* **4** (1957), 1–6.
- [15] Rogers C. A.; Zong C.: Covering convex bodies by translates of convex bodies. *Mathematika* **44** (1997), 215–218.
- [16] Schäffer, Juan Jorge: On Floquet’s theorem in Hilbert spaces. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **70** (1964), 243–245.
- [17] Scheffers, Georg: Zurückführung complexer Zahlensysteme auf typische Formen. *Math. Ann.* **39** (1891), 293–390.
- [18] Study, E.: Über Systeme complexer Zahlen und ihre Anwendung in der Theorie der Transformationsgruppen. *Monatsh. Math. Physik* **1** (1890), 283–354.
- [19] Vinokurov, V. A.: Logarithm of the solution of a linear differential equation, the Hausdorff formula and conservation laws. (In Russian) *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **319** (1991), 792–797; translation in *Soviet Math. Dokl.* **44** (1992), 200–205.
- [20] Wei, James: Note on the global validity of the Baker-Hausdorff and Magnus theorems. *J. Math. Phys.* **4** (1963), 1337–1341.

ALFRÉD RÉNYI INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, REÁLTANODA UTCA 13-15, BUDAPEST, H-1053, HUNGARY

Email address: lakos@renyi.hu