

# A relaxation scheme for computation of the joint spectral radius of matrix sets

Victor Kozyakin<sup>a\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Institute for Information Transmission Problems*

*Russian Academy of Sciences*

*Bolshoj Karetny lane 19, Moscow 127994 GSP-4, Russia*

*(Received 00 Month 200x; in final form 00 Month 200x)*

The problem of computation of the joint (generalized) spectral radius of matrix sets has been discussed in a number of publications. In the paper an iteration procedure is considered that allows to build numerically Barabanov norms for the irreducible matrix sets and simultaneously to compute the joint spectral radius of these sets.

**Keywords:** infinite matrix products, generalized spectral radius, joint spectral radius, extremal norms, Barabanov norms, irreducibility, numerical algorithms

**AMS Subject Classification:** 15A18; 15A60; 65F15

## 1. Introduction

Let  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_r\}$  be a set of real  $m \times m$  matrices. As usual, for  $n \geq 1$ , let us denote by  $\mathcal{A}^n$  the set of all  $n$ -products of matrices from  $\mathcal{A}$ ;  $\mathcal{A}^0 = I$ . For each  $n \geq 1$ , define the quantity

$$\bar{\rho}_n(\mathcal{A}) = \max_{A_{i_j} \in \mathcal{A}} \rho(A_{i_n} \cdots A_{i_2} A_{i_1}),$$

where maximum is taken over all possible products of  $n$  matrices from the set  $\mathcal{A}$ , and  $\rho(\cdot)$  denotes the spectral radius of a matrix, that is the maximal magnitude of its eigenvalues. The limit

$$\bar{\rho}(\mathcal{A}) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\bar{\rho}_n(\mathcal{A}))^{1/n}$$

is called *the generalized spectral radius* of the matrix set  $\mathcal{A}$  [9, 10].

Similarly, given a norm  $\|\cdot\|$  in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , for each  $n \geq 1$ , define the quantity

$$\hat{\rho}_n(\mathcal{A}) = \max_{A_{i_j} \in \mathcal{A}} \|A_{i_n} \cdots A_{i_2} A_{i_1}\|,$$

where  $\|A\|$ , for a matrix  $A$ , is the matrix norm generated by the vector norm  $\|\cdot\|$  in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , that is  $\|A\| = \sup_{\|x\|=1} \|Ax\|$ . Then the limit

$$\hat{\rho}(\mathcal{A}) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\hat{\rho}_n(\mathcal{A}))^{1/n}$$

---

\*Email: kozyakin@iitp.ru

does not depend on the choice of the norm  $\|\cdot\|$  and is called *the joint spectral radius* of the matrix set  $\mathcal{A}$  [29].

For matrix sets  $\mathcal{A}$  consisting of a finite amount of matrices, as is our case, the quantities  $\bar{\rho}(\mathcal{A})$  and  $\hat{\rho}(\mathcal{A})$  coincide with each other [5] and their common value is denoted as

$$\rho(\mathcal{A}) = \bar{\rho}(\mathcal{A}) = \hat{\rho}(\mathcal{A}),$$

while the quantities  $\bar{\rho}_n(\mathcal{A})$  and  $\hat{\rho}_n(\mathcal{A})$  form lower and upper bounds, respectively, for the joint/generalized spectral radius:

$$\bar{\rho}_n(\mathcal{A}) \leq \bar{\rho}(\mathcal{A}) = \hat{\rho}(\mathcal{A}) \leq \hat{\rho}_n(\mathcal{A}), \quad \forall n \geq 0.$$

This last formula may serve as a basis for a posteriori estimating the accuracy of computation of  $\rho(\mathcal{A})$ . The first algorithms of a kind in the context of control theory problems have been suggested in [6], for linear inclusions in [1], and for problems of wavelet theory in [8, 9, 11]. Later the computational efficiency of these algorithms was essentially improved in [13, 22]. Unfortunately, the common feature of all such algorithms is that they do not provide any bounds for the number of computational steps required to get desired accuracy of approximation of  $\rho(\mathcal{A})$ .

Some works suggest different formulas to compute  $\rho(\mathcal{A})$ . So, in [7] it is shown that

$$\rho(\mathcal{A}) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{A_{i_j} \in \mathcal{A}} |\text{tr}(A_{i_n} \cdots A_{i_2} A_{i_1})|^{1/n},$$

where, as usual,  $\text{tr}(\cdot)$  denotes the trace of a matrix.

Given a norm  $\|\cdot\|$  in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , denote

$$\|\mathcal{A}\| = \max_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \|A\|.$$

Then the spectral radius of the matrix set  $\mathcal{A}$  can be defined by the equality

$$\rho(\mathcal{A}) = \inf_{\|\cdot\|} \|\mathcal{A}\|, \tag{1}$$

where infimum is taken over all norms in  $\mathbb{R}^m$  [12, 29]. For irreducible matrix sets,<sup>1</sup> the infimum in (1) is attained, and for such matrix sets there are norms  $\|\cdot\|$  in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , called *extremal norms*, for which

$$\|\mathcal{A}\| \leq \rho(\mathcal{A}). \tag{2}$$

In analysis of the joint spectral radius ideas suggested by N.E. Barabanov [1–3] play an important role. These ideas have got further development in a variety of publications among which we would like to distinguish [31].

**THEOREM 1.1** (N.E. Barabanov). *Let the matrix set  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_r\}$  be irreducible. Then the quantity  $\rho$  is the joint (generalized) spectral radius of the set  $\mathcal{A}$  iff there is a norm  $\|\cdot\|$  in  $\mathbb{R}^m$  such that*

$$\rho\|x\| \equiv \max_i \|A_i x\|. \tag{3}$$

---

<sup>1</sup>A matrix set  $\mathcal{A}$  is called *irreducible*, if the matrices from  $\mathcal{A}$  have no common invariant subspaces except  $\{0\}$  and  $\mathbb{R}^m$ . In [18–20] such a matrix set was called quasi-controllable.

Throughout the paper a norm satisfying (3) will be called a *Barabanov norm* corresponding to the matrix set  $\mathcal{A}$ . Note that Barabanov norms are not unique.

Similarly, [26, Thm 3.3], [28] the value of  $\rho$  equals to  $\rho(\mathcal{A})$  if and only if for some central-symmetric convex body<sup>1</sup>  $S$  the following equality holds

$$\rho S = \text{conv} \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^r A_i S \right), \quad (4)$$

where  $\text{conv}(\cdot)$  denotes the convex hull of a set. As is noted in [26], the relation (4) was proved by A.N. Dranishnikov and S.V. Konyagin, so it is natural to call the central-symmetric set  $S$  the *Dranishnikov-Konyagin-Protasov set*. The set  $S$  can be treated as the unit ball of some norm  $\|\cdot\|$  in  $\mathbb{R}^m$  (recently this norm is usually called the *Protasov norm*). As Barabanov norms as Protasov norms are the extremal norms, that is they satisfy the inequality (2). In [24, 25, 32] it is shown that Barabanov and Protasov norms are dual to each other.

Remark that formulas (2), (3) and (4) define the joint or generalized spectral radius for a matrix set in an apparently computationally nonconstructive manner. In spite of that, namely such formulas underlie quite a number of theoretical constructions (see, e.g., [4, 16, 17, 23, 31, 32]) and algorithms [27] for computation of  $\rho(\mathcal{A})$ .

Different approaches for constructing Barabanov norms to analyze properties of the joint (generalized) spectral radius are discussed, e.g., in [14, 15] and [30, Section 6.6].

In [21] the so-called max-relaxation algorithm was proposed for computation of the joint spectral radius of matrix sets. In the paper an alternative iteration procedure, a linear relaxation procedure, is introduced that allows to build numerically Barabanov norms for the irreducible matrix sets and simultaneously to compute the joint spectral radius of these sets.

The paper organized as follows. In Introduction we give basic definitions and present the motivation of the work. In Section 2 the iteration procedure is introduced. This procedure is called the linear relaxation procedure since in it the next approximation to the Barabanov norm is constructed as the linear combination of the current approximation and some auxiliary norm. Section 3 is devoted to the proof of convergence of the iteration procedure. In Section 4 we briefly describe the so-called max-relaxation iteration scheme for computation of the joint spectral radius. At last, in concluding Section 5 we present results of numerical tests and discuss some shortcomings of the proposed approach.

## 2. Linear relaxation iteration scheme

Let  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_r\}$  be an irreducible set of real  $m \times m$  matrices,  $\|\cdot\|_0$  be a norm in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , and  $e \neq 0$  be an arbitrary element from  $\mathbb{R}^m$  satisfying  $\|e\|_0 = 1$ .

Let  $\lambda^-$  and  $\lambda^+$  be fixed but otherwise arbitrary numbers satisfying the condition

$$0 < \lambda^- \leq \lambda^+ < 1.$$

These numbers will play the role of boundaries for parameters of the linear relaxation scheme below. Define recursively the sequence of the norms  $\|\cdot\|_n$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , according to the following rules:

---

<sup>1</sup>The set is called body if it contains at least one interior point.

LR<sub>1</sub>: if the norm  $\|\cdot\|_n$  has been already defined compute the quantities

$$\rho_n^+ = \max_{x \neq 0} \frac{\max_i \|A_i x\|_n}{\|x\|_n}, \quad \rho_n^- = \min_{x \neq 0} \frac{\max_i \|A_i x\|_n}{\|x\|_n}, \quad \gamma_n = \max_i \|A_i e\|_n; \quad (5)$$

LR<sub>2</sub>: choose an arbitrary number  $\lambda_n \in [\lambda^-, \lambda^+]$  and define the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{n+1}$ :

$$\|x\|_{n+1} = \lambda_n \|x\|_n + (1 - \lambda_n) \gamma_n^{-1} \max_i \|A_i x\|_n. \quad (6)$$

The iteration procedure (5), (6) will be referred to as the linear relaxation procedure (*the LR-procedure*) since in it the next approximation  $\|x\|_{n+1}$  to the Barabanov norm is constructed as the linear combination of the current approximation  $\|x\|_n$  and some auxiliary norm.

As we will see in Section 3.1  $\rho_n^- \leq \rho \leq \rho_n^+$  for any  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ , and so the quantities  $\{\rho_n^-\}$  form lower bounds for the joint spectral radius  $\rho$  of the matrix set  $\mathcal{A}$ , while the quantities  $\{\rho_n^+\}$  form upper bounds for  $\rho$ .

Remark that the norm (6) is correctly defined for any choice of  $\gamma_n$  because due to irreducibility of the matrix set  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_r\}$  for any  $x \neq 0$  the vectors  $A_1 x, \dots, A_r x$  do not vanish simultaneously, and then  $\rho_n^- > 0$  as well as  $\gamma_n \geq \rho_n^- \|e\|_n > 0$ .

Before we start proving that the LR-procedure converges to some Barabanov norm and that the quantities  $\rho_n^\pm$  converge to the joint spectral radius  $\rho$  of the matrix set  $\mathcal{A}$  make two remarks.

*Remark 1.* The norms  $\|\cdot\|_n$  satisfy the normalization conditions  $\|e\|_n \equiv 1$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , which can be derived by induction from (6). Then by (5)

$$\gamma_n = \frac{\max_i \|A_i e\|_n}{\|e\|_n}$$

and therefore

$$\gamma_n \in [\rho_n^-, \rho_n^+], \quad n = 0, 1, \dots \quad (7)$$

*Remark 2.* Instead of the iteration procedure (5), (6) one can consider the following, formally more general, procedure in which the quantities  $\gamma_n$  are chosen arbitrarily if only they satisfy the inclusions (7), and the obtained norms are normalized forcibly:

LR'<sub>1</sub>: provided that the norm  $\|\cdot\|_n$  has been already found compute the quantities

$$\rho_n^+ = \max_{x \neq 0} \frac{\max_i \|A_i x\|_n}{\|x\|_n}, \quad \rho_n^- = \min_{x \neq 0} \frac{\max_i \|A_i x\|_n}{\|x\|_n} \quad (8)$$

LR'<sub>2</sub>: choose arbitrary numbers  $\lambda_n \in [\lambda^-, \lambda^+]$ ,  $\gamma_n \in [\rho_n^-, \rho_n^+]$  and build first the auxiliary norm  $\|\cdot\|_{n+1}^\circ$ :

$$\|x\|_{n+1}^\circ = \lambda_n \|x\|_n + (1 - \lambda_n) \gamma_n^{-1} \max_i \|A_i x\|_n,$$

and then define the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{n+1}$  in such a way that the normalization condition  $\|e\|_{n+1} = 1$  be satisfied:

$$\|x\|_{n+1} = \|x\|_{n+1}^\circ / \|e\|_{n+1}^\circ. \quad (9)$$

In fact, if to write down formulas for recalculation of the norms  $\|x\|_{n+1}$  via  $\|x\|_n$  and to represent them in the form similar to (6):

$$\|x\|_{n+1} = \lambda'_n \|x\|_n + (1 - \lambda'_n)(\gamma'_n)^{-1} \max_i \|A_i x\|_n,$$

then one can find that the corresponding quantities  $\lambda'_n$  will be uniformly separated from zero and unity while the quantity  $\gamma'_n$  will be equal to the quantity  $\gamma_n$  defined by (5). The corresponding calculations are not complicated but cumbersome and because are omitted.

So, consideration of the iteration procedures of the form (8), (9) gives nothing new, and such procedures are not studied in what follows.

### 3. Proof of the main result

Clearly, to prove that the iteration procedure (5), (6) converges to some Barabanov norm  $\|\cdot\|^*$  (and that the quantities  $\rho_n^\pm$  converge to the joint spectral radius  $\rho$  of the matrix set  $\mathcal{A}$ ) it suffices to prove Assertions A1, A2 and A3:

A1: the sequences  $\{\rho_n^+\}$  and  $\{\rho_n^-\}$  are convergent;

A2: the limits of the sequences  $\{\rho_n^+\}$  and  $\{\rho_n^-\}$  coincide:

$$\rho = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_n^+ = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_n^-;$$

A3: the norms  $\|\cdot\|_n$  converge pointwise to a limit  $\|\cdot\|^*$ .

Properties of the iteration procedure (5), (6) needed to prove Assertions A1, A2 and A3 are established below.

#### 3.1 Relations between $\rho_n^\pm$ and $\rho$

LEMMA 3.1. Let  $\alpha, \beta$  be numbers such that in some norm  $\|\cdot\|$  the inequalities

$$\alpha \|x\| \leq \max_{A_i \in \mathcal{A}} \|A_i x\| \leq \beta \|x\|,$$

hold. Then  $\alpha \leq \rho \leq \beta$ , where  $\rho$  is the joint spectral radius of the matrix set  $\mathcal{A}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\|\cdot\|^*$  be some Barabanov norm for the matrix set  $\mathcal{A}$ . Since all norms in  $\mathbb{R}^m$  are equivalent, there are constants  $\sigma^- > 0$  and  $\sigma^+ < \infty$  such that

$$\sigma^- \|x\|^* \leq \|x\| \leq \sigma^+ \|x\|^*. \quad (10)$$

Consider for each  $k = 1, 2, \dots$  the functions

$$\Delta_k(x) = \max_{1 \leq i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k \leq r} \|A_{i_k} \dots A_{i_2} A_{i_1} x\|.$$

Then, as is easy to see,

$$\alpha^k \|x\| \leq \Delta_k(x) \leq \beta^k \|x\|. \quad (11)$$

Similarly, consider for each  $k = 1, 2, \dots$  the functions

$$\Delta_k^*(x) = \max_{1 \leq i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k \leq r} \|A_{i_k} \dots A_{i_2} A_{i_1} x\|^*.$$

For these functions, by definition of Barabanov norms the following identity hold

$$\Delta_k^*(x) \equiv \rho^k \|x\|^*, \quad (12)$$

which is stronger than (11).

Now, note that (10) and the definition of the functions  $\Delta_k(x)$  and  $\Delta_k^*(x)$  imply

$$\sigma^- \Delta_k^*(x) \leq \Delta_k(x) \leq \sigma^+ \Delta_k^*(x).$$

Then, by (11), (12),

$$\frac{\sigma^-}{\sigma^+} \alpha^k \leq \rho^k \leq \frac{\sigma^+}{\sigma^-} \beta^k, \quad \forall k,$$

from which the required estimates  $\alpha \leq \rho \leq \beta$  follow.  $\square$

So, Lemma 3.1 and the definition (5) of  $\rho_n^\pm$  imply that the quantities  $\{\rho_n^-\}$  form the family of lower bounds for the joint spectral radius  $\rho$  of the matrix set  $\mathcal{A}$ , while the quantities  $\{\rho_n^+\}$  form the family of upper bounds for  $\rho$ . This allows to estimate a posteriori errors of computation of the joint spectral radius with the help of the iteration procedure (5)–(6).

### 3.2 Convergence of the sequence of norms $\{\|\cdot\|_n\}$

Given a pair of norms  $\|\cdot\|'$  and  $\|\cdot\|''$  in  $\mathbb{R}^m$  define the quantities

$$e^-(\|\cdot\|', \|\cdot\|'') = \min_{x \neq 0} \frac{\|x\|'}{\|x\|''}, \quad e^+(\|\cdot\|', \|\cdot\|'') = \max_{x \neq 0} \frac{\|x\|'}{\|x\|''}. \quad (13)$$

Since all norms in  $\mathbb{R}^m$  are equivalent to each other, the quantities  $e^-(\|\cdot\|', \|\cdot\|'')$  and  $e^+(\|\cdot\|', \|\cdot\|'')$  are correctly defined and

$$0 < e^-(\|\cdot\|', \|\cdot\|'') \leq e^+(\|\cdot\|', \|\cdot\|'') < \infty.$$

Therefore the quantity

$$\text{ecc}(\|\cdot\|', \|\cdot\|'') = \frac{e^+(\|\cdot\|', \|\cdot\|'')}{e^-(\|\cdot\|', \|\cdot\|'')} \geq 1, \quad (14)$$

which is called *the eccentricity* of the norm  $\|\cdot\|'$  with respect to the norm  $\|\cdot\|''$  (see, e.g., [32]), is also correctly defined.

Let us start proving convergence of the sequence of the norms  $\|\cdot\|_n$ .

**LEMMA 3.2.** *Let  $\|\cdot\|^*$  be a Barabanov norm for the matrix set  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then the sequence of the numbers  $\text{ecc}(\|\cdot\|_n, \|\cdot\|^*)$  is nonincreasing.*

*Proof.* Denote by  $\rho$  the joint spectral radius of the matrix set  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then by definitions of the function  $e^+(\cdot)$  and of the Barabanov norm  $\|\cdot\|^*$  from the relations (5),

(6) we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|x\|_{n+1} &= \lambda_n \|x\|_n + (1 - \lambda_n) \gamma_n^{-1} \max_i \|A_i x\|_n \leq \\
&\leq e^+(\|\cdot\|_n, \|\cdot\|^*) \left( \lambda_n \|x\|^* + (1 - \lambda_n) \gamma_n^{-1} \max_i \|A_i x\|^* \right) = \\
&= e^+(\|\cdot\|_n, \|\cdot\|^*) \left( \lambda_n \|x\|^* + (1 - \lambda_n) \gamma_n^{-1} \rho \|x\|^* \right),
\end{aligned}$$

from which

$$e^+(\|\cdot\|_{n+1}, \|\cdot\|^*) \leq e^+(\|\cdot\|_n, \|\cdot\|^*) (\lambda_n + (1 - \lambda_n) \gamma_n^{-1} \rho). \quad (15)$$

Similarly, by definitions of the function  $e^-(\cdot)$  and of the Barabanov norm  $\|\cdot\|^*$  from the relations (5), (6) we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|x\|_{n+1} &= \lambda_n \|x\|_n + (1 - \lambda_n) \gamma_n^{-1} \max_i \|A_i x\|_n \geq \\
&\geq e^-(\|\cdot\|_n, \|\cdot\|^*) \left( \lambda_n \|x\|^* + (1 - \lambda_n) \gamma_n^{-1} \max_i \|A_i x\|^* \right) = \\
&= e^-(\|\cdot\|_n, \|\cdot\|^*) \left( \lambda_n \|x\|^* + (1 - \lambda_n) \gamma_n^{-1} \rho \|x\|^* \right),
\end{aligned}$$

from which

$$e^-(\|\cdot\|_{n+1}, \|\cdot\|^*) \geq e^-(\|\cdot\|_n, \|\cdot\|^*) (\lambda_n + (1 - \lambda_n) \gamma_n^{-1} \rho). \quad (16)$$

By dividing termwise the inequality (15) on (16) we get

$$\text{ecc}(\|\cdot\|_{n+1}, \|\cdot\|^*) = \frac{e^+(\|\cdot\|_{n+1}, \|\cdot\|^*)}{e^-(\|\cdot\|_{n+1}, \|\cdot\|^*)} \leq \frac{e^+(\|\cdot\|_n, \|\cdot\|^*)}{e^-(\|\cdot\|_n, \|\cdot\|^*)} = \text{ecc}(\|\cdot\|_n, \|\cdot\|^*).$$

Hence, the sequence  $\{\text{ecc}(\|\cdot\|_n, \|\cdot\|^*)\}$  is nonincreasing.  $\square$

Denote by  $N_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^m)$  the topological space of norms in  $\mathbb{R}^m$  with the topology of uniform convergence on bounded subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^m$ .

**COROLLARY 3.3.** *The sequence of norms  $\{\|\cdot\|_n\}$  is compact in  $N_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ .*

*Proof.* For each  $n$  and any  $x \neq 0$  by the definition (13) of the functions  $e^+(\cdot)$  and  $e^-(\cdot)$  the following relations hold

$$e^-(\|\cdot\|_n, \|\cdot\|^*) \leq \frac{\|x\|_n}{\|x\|^*} \leq e^+(\|\cdot\|_n, \|\cdot\|^*),$$

and then

$$e^-(\|\cdot\|_n, \|\cdot\|^*) \leq \frac{\|e\|_n}{\|e\|^*} \leq e^+(\|\cdot\|_n, \|\cdot\|^*),$$

from which

$$\frac{1}{\text{ecc}(\|\cdot\|_n, \|\cdot\|^*)} \frac{\|x\|^*}{\|e\|^*} \|e\|_n \leq \|x\|_n \leq \text{ecc}(\|\cdot\|_n, \|\cdot\|^*) \frac{\|x\|^*}{\|e\|^*} \|e\|_n.$$

Since here the norms  $\|\cdot\|_n$  by Remark 1 satisfy the normalization condition  $\|e\|_n \equiv 1$ , and by Lemma 3.2  $\text{ecc}(\|\cdot\|_n, \|\cdot\|^*) \leq \text{ecc}(\|\cdot\|_0, \|\cdot\|^*)$ , we obtain

$$\frac{1}{\text{ecc}(\|\cdot\|_0, \|\cdot\|^*)} \frac{\|x\|^*}{\|e\|^*} \leq \|x\|_n \leq \text{ecc}(\|\cdot\|_0, \|\cdot\|^*) \frac{\|x\|^*}{\|e\|^*}.$$

Therefore the norms  $\|\cdot\|_n$ ,  $n \geq 1$ , are equicontinuous and uniformly bounded on each bounded subset of  $\mathbb{R}^m$ . Moreover, their values are also uniformly separated from zero on each bounded subset of  $\mathbb{R}^m$  separated from zero. From here by the Arzela-Ascoli theorem the statement of the corollary follows.  $\square$

**COROLLARY 3.4.** *If at least one of subsequences of norms from  $\{\|\cdot\|_n\}$  converges in  $N_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^m)$  to some Barabanov norm then the whole sequence  $\{\|\cdot\|_n\}$  also converges in  $N_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^m)$  to the same Barabanov norm.*

*Proof.* Let  $\{\|\cdot\|_{n_k}\}$  be a subsequence of  $\{\|\cdot\|_n\}$  which converges in  $N_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^m)$  to some Barabanov norm  $\|\cdot\|^*$ . Then by definition of the eccentricity of one norm with respect to another

$$\text{ecc}(\|\cdot\|_{n_k}, \|\cdot\|^*) \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Here by Lemma 3.2 the eccentricities  $\text{ecc}(\|\cdot\|_n, \|\cdot\|^*)$  are nonincreasing in  $n$ , and then the following stronger relation holds

$$\text{ecc}(\|\cdot\|_n, \|\cdot\|^*) \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (17)$$

Note now that by the definition (13), (14) of the eccentricity of one norm with respect to another

$$\frac{1}{\text{ecc}(\|\cdot\|_n, \|\cdot\|^*)} \leq \frac{\|x\|_n}{\|x\|^*} \leq \text{ecc}(\|\cdot\|_n, \|\cdot\|^*),$$

from which by (17) it follows that the sequence of norms  $\{\|\cdot\|_n\}$  converges in space  $N_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^m)$  to the norm  $\|\cdot\|^*$ .  $\square$

**LEMMA 3.5.** *Assertion A3 is a corollary of Assertions A1 and A2.*

*Proof.* By Corollary 3.3 the sequence of norms  $\{\|\cdot\|_n\}$  has a subsequence  $\{\|\cdot\|_{n_k}\}$  that converges in space  $N_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^m)$  to some norm  $\|\cdot\|^*$ . Then, passing to the limit in (5) as  $n = n_k \rightarrow \infty$ , we get by Assertions A1 and A2:

$$\rho = \frac{\max_i \|A_i x\|^*}{\|x\|^*}, \quad \forall x \neq 0,$$

which means that  $\|\cdot\|^*$  is a Barabanov norm for the matrix set  $\mathcal{A}$ . This and Corollary 3.4 then imply that the sequence  $\{\|\cdot\|_n\}$  converges in space  $N_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^m)$  to the Barabanov norm  $\|\cdot\|^*$ . Assertion A3 is proved.  $\square$

In view of Lemma 3.5 to prove that the iteration procedure (5), (6) is convergent it suffices to verify only that Assertions A1 and A2 hold.

### 3.3 Convergence of the sequences $\{\rho_n^\pm\}$

In the same way as in Section 4, from Lemma 3.1 and the definition (5) of  $\rho_n^\pm$  it follows that quantities  $\{\rho_n^-\}$  form the family of lower bounds for the joint spectral



radius  $\rho$  of the matrix set  $\mathcal{A}$ , while the quantities  $\{\rho_n^+\}$  form the family of upper bounds for  $\rho$ . This allows to estimate a posteriori errors of computation of the joint spectral radius with the help of the iteration procedure (5), (6).

To prove that the sequences  $\{\rho_n^\pm\}$  are convergent, let us obtain first some auxiliary estimates for  $\max_i \|A_i x\|_{n+1}$ . By definition,

$$\max_i \|A_i x\|_{n+1} = \max_i \left\{ \lambda_n \|A_i x\|_n + (1 - \lambda_n) \gamma_n^{-1} \max_j \|A_j A_i x\|_n \right\}. \quad (18)$$

Here for each  $i$  the summand  $(1 - \lambda_n) \gamma_n^{-1} \max_j \|A_j A_i x\|_n$  in the right-hand part is estimated, by the definition (5) of the quantities  $\rho_n^\pm$ , as follows:

$$\rho_n^- (1 - \lambda_n) \gamma_n^{-1} \|A_i x\|_n \leq (1 - \lambda_n) \gamma_n^{-1} \max_j \|A_j A_i x\|_n \leq \rho_n^+ (1 - \lambda_n) \gamma_n^{-1} \|A_i x\|_n.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \max_i \left\{ \lambda_n \|A_i x\|_n + \rho_n^- (1 - \lambda_n) \gamma_n^{-1} \|A_i x\|_n \right\} &\leq \\ &\leq \max_i \left\{ \lambda_n \|A_i x\|_n + (1 - \lambda_n) \gamma_n^{-1} \max_j \|A_j A_i x\|_n \right\} \leq \\ &\leq \max_i \left\{ \lambda_n \|A_i x\|_n + \rho_n^+ (1 - \lambda_n) \gamma_n^{-1} \|A_i x\|_n \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Here by the definitions (5), (6) of the quantities  $\rho_n^-$  and of the norm  $\|x\|_{n+1}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max_i \left\{ \lambda_n \|A_i x\|_n + \rho_n^- (1 - \lambda_n) \gamma_n^{-1} \|A_i x\|_n \right\} &= \\ &= (\lambda_n + \rho_n^- (1 - \lambda_n) \gamma_n^{-1}) \max_i \|A_i x\|_n = \\ &= \lambda_n \max_i \|A_i x\|_n + \rho_n^- (1 - \lambda_n) \gamma_n^{-1} \max_i \|A_i x\|_n \geq \\ &\geq \rho_n^- \lambda_n \|x\|_n + \rho_n^- (1 - \lambda_n) \gamma_n^{-1} \max_i \|A_i x\|_n = \rho_n^- \|x\|_{n+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Similarly, by the definitions (5), (6) of the quantities  $\rho_n^+$  and of the norm  $\|x\|_{n+1}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max_i \left\{ \lambda_n \|A_i x\|_n + \rho_n^+ (1 - \lambda_n) \gamma_n^{-1} \|A_i x\|_n \right\} &= \\ &= (\lambda_n + \rho_n^+ (1 - \lambda_n) \gamma_n^{-1}) \max_i \|A_i x\|_n = \\ &= \lambda_n \max_i \|A_i x\|_n + \rho_n^+ (1 - \lambda_n) \gamma_n^{-1} \max_i \|A_i x\|_n \leq \\ &\leq \rho_n^+ \lambda_n \|x\|_n + \rho_n^+ (1 - \lambda_n) \gamma_n^{-1} \max_i \|A_i x\|_n = \rho_n^+ \|x\|_{n+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

The estimates (18)–(21) imply

$$\rho_n^- \|x\|_{n+1} \leq \max_i \|A_i x\|_{n+1} \leq \rho_n^+ \|x\|_{n+1},$$

from which

$$\rho_n^- \leq \frac{\max_i \|A_i x\|_{n+1}}{\|x\|_{n+1}} \leq \rho_n^+, \quad \forall x \neq 0,$$

and then

$$\rho_n^- \leq \rho_{n+1}^- \leq \rho_{n+1}^+ \leq \rho_n^+.$$

So, the following lemma is proved.

LEMMA 3.6. *The sequence  $\{\rho_n^-\}$  is bounded from above by each member of the sequence  $\{\rho_n^+\}$  and is nondecreasing. The sequence  $\{\rho_n^+\}$  is bounded from below by each member of the sequence  $\{\rho_n^-\}$  and is nonincreasing.*

In view of Lemma 3.6 there are the limits

$$\rho^- = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_n^-, \quad \rho^+ = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_n^+$$

which means that Assertion A1 holds. Hence, to prove that the iteration procedure (5), (6) is convergent it remains only to justify Assertion A2:  $\rho^- = \rho^+$ .

To prove that  $\rho^- = \rho^+$  below it will be supposed the contrary, which will lead us to a contradiction.

### 3.4 Transition to a new sequence of norms

To simplify further reasoning we will switch over to a new sequence of norms for which the quantities  $\rho_n^\pm$  will be independent of  $n$ .

As was established in Corollary 3.3 the sequence of the norms  $\|\cdot\|_n$  is compact in space  $N_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ . Consequently, there is a subsequence of indices  $\{n_k\}$  such that the norms  $\|\cdot\|_{n_k}$  converge to some norm  $\|\cdot\|_0^\bullet$  satisfying the normalization condition  $\|e\|_0^\bullet = 1$  while the the quantities  $\lambda_{n_k}$  and  $\gamma_{n_k}$  converge to some numbers  $\mu_0$  and  $\eta_0$  respectively. Then, passing to the limit in (5), by Lemma 3.6 we obtain:

$$\rho^+ = \max_{x \neq 0} \frac{\max_i \|A_i x\|_0^\bullet}{\|x\|_0^\bullet}, \quad \rho^- = \min_{x \neq 0} \frac{\max_i \|A_i x\|_0^\bullet}{\|x\|_0^\bullet}, \quad \eta_0 = \frac{\max_i \|A_i e\|_0^\bullet}{\|e\|_0^\bullet}.$$

Now by induction the following statement can be easily proved.

LEMMA 3.7. *For each  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  the sequence of the norms  $\|\cdot\|_{n_k+n}$  converges to some norm  $\|\cdot\|_n^\bullet$  satisfying  $\|e\|_n^\bullet = 1$ , and the sequences of the quantities  $\lambda_{n_k+n}$  and  $\gamma_{n_k+n}$  converge to some numbers  $\mu_n \in [\lambda^-, \lambda^+]$  and  $\eta_n$  respectively. Moreover, for each  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  we have the equalities*

$$\max_{x \neq 0} \frac{\max_i \|A_i x\|_n^\bullet}{\|x\|_n^\bullet} = \rho^+, \quad \min_{x \neq 0} \frac{\max_i \|A_i x\|_n^\bullet}{\|x\|_n^\bullet} = \rho^-, \quad \frac{\max_i \|A_i e\|_n^\bullet}{\|e\|_n^\bullet} = \eta_n, \quad (22)$$

and the recurrent relations

$$\|x\|_{n+1}^\bullet = \mu_n \|x\|_n^\bullet + (1 - \mu_n) \eta_n^{-1} \max_i \|A_i x\|_n^\bullet. \quad (23)$$

Note that the norms (23) and (6) are correctly defined since, by irreducibility of the matrix set  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_r\}$ , for any  $x \neq 0$  the vectors  $A_1 x, \dots, A_r x$  do not vanish simultaneously, and then  $\rho^- > 0$  as well as  $\eta_n \geq \rho^- > 0$ .

### 3.5 Sets $\omega_n$ and $\Omega_n$

Define for each  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  the sets

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_n &= \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^m : \rho^- \|x\|_n^\bullet = \max_i \|A_i x\|_n^\bullet \right\}, \\ \Omega_n &= \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^m : \rho^+ \|x\|_n^\bullet = \max_i \|A_i x\|_n^\bullet \right\}.\end{aligned}\tag{24}$$

By (22)  $\omega_n$  and  $\Omega_n$  are the sets on which the value

$$\frac{\max_i \|A_i x\|_n^\bullet}{\|x\|_n^\bullet}$$

attains its minimum and maximum respectively.

LEMMA 3.8. *The following relations hold:*

$$\begin{aligned}\|x\|_{n+1}^\bullet &= (\mu_n + (1 - \mu_n)\eta_n^{-1}\rho^-) \|x\|_n^\bullet \quad \text{for } x \in \omega_n, \\ \|x\|_{n+1}^\bullet &= (\mu_n + (1 - \mu_n)\eta_n^{-1}\rho^+) \|x\|_n^\bullet \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega_n.\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* The statement of the lemma is obvious for  $x = 0$  therefore in what follows it will be supposed that  $x \in \omega_n$ ,  $x \neq 0$ . In this case (24) and the inequalities  $\rho^- \leq \rho^+$  imply  $\max_i \|A_i x\|_n^\bullet = \rho^- \|x\|_n^\bullet$ . From here by the definition (23) of the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{n+1}^\bullet$  we obtain

$$\|x\|_{n+1}^\bullet = \mu_n \|x\|_n^\bullet + (1 - \mu_n)\eta_n^{-1} \max_i \|A_i x\|_n^\bullet = (\mu_n + (1 - \mu_n)\eta_n^{-1}\rho^-) \|x\|_n^\bullet.$$

For  $x \in \omega_n$  the required equality is proved. For  $x \in \Omega_n$  the required equality can be proved similarly.  $\square$

LEMMA 3.9. *For each  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  the inclusions  $\omega_{n+1} \subseteq \omega_n$ ,  $\Omega_{n+1} \subseteq \Omega_n$  hold.*

*Proof.* Let  $x \in \omega_{n+1}$ . If  $x = 0$  then clearly  $x \in \omega_n$ . Therefore in what follows it suffices to suppose that  $x \neq 0$ . In this case, by definition of the set  $\omega_{n+1}$ ,

$$\max_i \|A_i x\|_{n+1}^\bullet = \rho^- \|x\|_{n+1}^\bullet = \rho^- \left( \mu_n \|x\|_n^\bullet + (1 - \mu_n)\eta_n^{-1} \max_i \|A_i x\|_n^\bullet \right).\tag{25}$$

On the other hand by substituting  $\|\cdot\|_n^\bullet$  for the norm  $\|\cdot\|_n$  in (18)–(20), and  $\rho^-$ ,  $\mu_n$  and  $\eta_n$  for the parameters  $\rho_n^-$ ,  $\lambda_n$  and  $\gamma_n$  respectively, we obtain the following estimate for  $\max_i \|A_i x\|_{n+1}^\bullet$ :

$$\max_i \|A_i x\|_{n+1}^\bullet \geq \mu_n \max_i \|A_i x\|_n^\bullet + (1 - \mu_n)\eta_n^{-1}\rho^- \max_i \|A_i x\|_n^\bullet.\tag{26}$$

Since by Lemma 3.7  $\mu_n \geq \lambda^- > 0$ , from (25), (26) it follows that  $\rho^- \|x\|_n^\bullet \geq \max_i \|A_i x\|_n^\bullet$  or, what is the same,

$$\rho^- \geq \frac{\max_i \|A_i x\|_n^\bullet}{\|x\|_n^\bullet}.$$

This last inequality by definition of the number  $\rho^-$  holds only for the elements  $x \in \omega_n$ . So, the inclusion  $\omega_{n+1} \subseteq \omega_n$  is proved.

Proof of the inclusion  $\Omega_{n+1} \subseteq \Omega_n$  can be provided similarly, nevertheless for the sake of completeness prove it too.

Let  $x \in \Omega_{n+1}$ . If  $x = 0$  then clearly  $x \in \Omega_n$ . So, consider further the case when  $x \neq 0$ . In this case by definition of the set  $\Omega_{n+1}$ ,

$$\max_i \|A_i x\|_{n+1}^\bullet = \rho^+ \|x\|_{n+1}^\bullet = \rho^+ \left( \mu_n \|x\|_n^\bullet + (1 - \mu_n) \eta_n^{-1} \max_i \|A_i x\|_n^\bullet \right). \quad (27)$$

On the other hand by substituting  $\|\cdot\|_n^\bullet$  for the norm  $\|\cdot\|_n$  in (18), (19), (21), and  $\rho^-$ ,  $\mu_n$  and  $\eta_n$  for the parameters  $\rho_n^-$ ,  $\lambda_n$  and  $\gamma_n$  respectively, we obtain the following estimate for  $\max_i \|A_i x\|_{n+1}^\bullet$ :

$$\max_i \|A_i x\|_{n+1}^\bullet \leq \mu_n \max_i \|A_i x\|_n^\bullet + (1 - \mu_n) \eta_n^{-1} \rho^+ \max_i \|A_i x\|_n^\bullet. \quad (28)$$

Since by Lemma 3.7  $\mu_n \geq \lambda^- > 0$ , we see that (27), (28) imply  $\rho^+ \|x\|_n^\bullet \leq \max_i \|A_i x\|_n^\bullet$  or, what is the same,

$$\rho^+ \leq \frac{\max_i \|A_i x\|_n^\bullet}{\|x\|_n^\bullet}.$$

By definition of the number  $\rho^-$  the last inequality holds only for the elements  $x \in \Omega_n$ . Thus, the inclusion  $\Omega_{n+1} \subseteq \Omega_n$  is also proved.  $\square$

COROLLARY 3.10.  $\omega = \bigcap_{n \geq 0} \omega_n \neq 0$  and  $\Omega = \bigcap_{n \geq 0} \Omega_n \neq 0$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.9  $\{\omega_n\}$  is a family of embedded closed non-zero conic sets. Then the intersection  $\omega$  of these sets is also a closed non-zero conic set. The same is valid for the sets  $\{\Omega_n\}$ .  $\square$

### 3.6 Completion of the proof of Assertion A2

Choose non-zero vectors  $g \in \bigcap_{n \geq 0} \omega_n$ ,  $h \in \bigcap_{n \geq 0} \Omega_n$  which exist by Corollary 3.10. Then by Lemma 3.9 for each  $n \geq 0$  the following equalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \|g\|_{n+1}^\bullet &= (\mu_n + (1 - \mu_n) \eta_n^{-1} \rho^-) \|g\|_n^\bullet, \\ \|h\|_{n+1}^\bullet &= (\mu_n + (1 - \mu_n) \eta_n^{-1} \rho^+) \|h\|_n^\bullet, \end{aligned}$$

From here

$$\|g\|_n^\bullet = \xi_n^- \|g\|_0^\bullet, \quad \|h\|_n^\bullet = \xi_n^+ \|h\|_0^\bullet, \quad n \geq 0,$$

where

$$\xi_n^- = \prod_{k=0}^n \{ \mu_k + (1 - \mu_k) \eta_k^{-1} \rho^- \}, \quad \xi_n^+ = \prod_{k=0}^n \{ \mu_k + (1 - \mu_k) \eta_k^{-1} \rho^+ \}.$$

The eccentricities of the norms  $\|\cdot\|_n^\bullet$  are uniformly bounded with respect to some Barabanov norm  $\|\cdot\|^*$  (this fact can be proved by verbatim repetition of the analogous proof for the norms  $\|\cdot\|_n$ ). Therefore the norms  $\|\cdot\|_n^\bullet$  form a family, uniformly bounded and equicontinuous with respect to the Barabanov norm  $\|\cdot\|^*$ :

$$\exists \delta^\pm \in (0, \infty) : \quad \delta^- \|x\|^* \leq \|x\|_n^\bullet \leq \delta^+ \|x\|^*, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

Then the sequences  $\{\|g\|_n^\bullet\}$  and  $\{\|h\|_n^\bullet\}$  are uniformly bounded and uniformly separated from zero, and the same holds for the sequences  $\{\xi_n^-\}$  and  $\{\xi_n^+\}$ . Let us show that the latter can be valid only under the condition  $\rho^- = \rho^+$ .

Note first that the inclusions  $\eta_k \in [\rho^-, \rho^+]$ , valid by (22) for all  $k$ , imply

$$\mu_k + (1 - \mu_k)\eta_k^{-1}\rho^- \leq 1, \quad k \geq 0, \quad (29)$$

$$\mu_k + (1 - \mu_k)\eta_k^{-1}\rho^+ \geq 1, \quad k \geq 0. \quad (30)$$

If we additionally suppose that  $\rho^- < \rho^+$  then the inclusions  $\mu_n \in [\lambda^-, \lambda^+]$  and  $\eta_k \in [\rho^-, \rho^+]$ , valid for all  $k$ , will imply stronger estimates:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_k + (1 - \mu_k)\eta_k^{-1}\rho^- \leq \\ \lambda^+ + (1 - \lambda^+)\frac{2\rho^-}{\rho^- + \rho^+} < 1 \quad \text{if} \quad \eta_k \in \left[ \frac{\rho^- + \rho^+}{2}, \rho^+ \right], \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_k + (1 - \mu_k)\eta_k^{-1}\rho^+ \geq \\ \lambda^- + (1 - \lambda^-)\frac{2\rho^+}{\rho^- + \rho^+} > 1 \quad \text{if} \quad \eta_k \in \left[ \rho^-, \frac{\rho^- + \rho^+}{2} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Now, note that under the condition  $\rho^- < \rho^+$  infinitely many of numbers  $\eta_k$  get into one of the intervals  $\left[ \rho^-, \frac{\rho^- + \rho^+}{2} \right]$  or  $\left[ \frac{\rho^- + \rho^+}{2}, \rho^+ \right]$ . Therefore either for infinitely many indices  $k$  the estimates (31) are valid while for the rest of them the estimates (29) hold or for infinitely many indices  $k$  the estimates (32) are valid while for the rest of them the estimates (30) hold. Then in the first case  $\xi_n^- \rightarrow 0$  while in the second case  $\xi_n^+ \rightarrow \infty$ .

Thus, in any case the assumption  $\rho^- < \rho^+$  leads to the conclusion that the sequences  $\{\xi_n^-\}$  and  $\{\xi_n^+\}$  cannot be uniformly bounded and uniformly separated from zero simultaneously.

So, the proof of the equality  $\rho^- = \rho^+$  is completed, and hence the iteration procedure (5), (6) is convergent.

#### 4. Max-relaxation iteration scheme

In [21], for the same purposes, it was introduced the so-called max-relaxation procedure. We describe it shortly. Let  $\gamma(t, s)$ ,  $t, s > 0$ , be a continuous function satisfying

$$\gamma(t, t) = t, \quad \min\{t, s\} < \gamma(t, s) < \max\{t, s\} \quad \text{for } t \neq s.$$

In [21] such a function is called *an averaging function*. Examples for averaging functions are:

$$\gamma(t, s) = \frac{t + s}{2}, \quad \gamma(t, s) = \sqrt{ts}, \quad \gamma(t, s) = \frac{2ts}{t + s}.$$

Given some averaging function  $\gamma(\cdot, \cdot)$ , construct recursively the norms  $\|\cdot\|_n$  and  $\|\cdot\|_n^\circ$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , in accordance with the following rules:

MR<sub>1</sub>: if the norm  $\|\cdot\|_n$  has been already defined compute the quantities

$$\rho_n^+ = \max_{x \neq 0} \frac{\max_i \|A_i x\|_n}{\|x\|_n}, \quad \rho_n^- = \min_{x \neq 0} \frac{\max_i \|A_i x\|_n}{\|x\|_n}, \quad \gamma_n = \gamma(\rho_n^-, \rho_n^+); \quad (33)$$

MR<sub>2</sub>: define the norms  $\|\cdot\|_{n+1}$  and  $\|\cdot\|_{n+1}^\circ$ :

$$\|x\|_{n+1} = \max \left\{ \|x\|_n, \gamma_n^{-1} \max_i \|A_i x\|_n \right\}, \quad (34)$$

$$\|x\|_{n+1}^\circ = \|x\|_{n+1} / \|e\|_{n+1}. \quad (35)$$

The max-relaxation procedure (33)–(35) (*the MR-procedure*) possesses the same convergence properties as the LR-procedure [21].

## 5. Examples and concluding remarks

Several dozen numerical tests with  $2 \times 2$  matrices were carried out with the help of MATLAB. Two of them, quite typical, are presented below. In the LR-procedure the relaxation parameter  $\lambda_n$  was chosen to be identically equal to 0.3, while the averaging function in the MR-procedure was taken as follows:  $\lambda(t, s) = (t + s)/2$ .

**Example 5.1** Consider the family  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2\}$  of  $2 \times 2$  matrices

$$A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The functions  $\Phi_i(\varphi), H_i(\varphi), R_n(\varphi), R_n^*(\varphi)$  were chosen to be piecewise linear with 3000 nodes uniformly distributed over the interval  $[-\pi, \pi]$ . It was needed 21 steps of the LR-procedure and 22 steps of the MR-procedure to compute the joint spectral radius  $\rho(\mathcal{A})$  with the absolute accuracy  $10^{-3}$ . The computed value of the joint spectral radius is  $\rho(\mathcal{A}) = 1.389$ . The computed unit sphere of the Barabanov norm  $\|\cdot\|^*$  is plotted on Fig. 1 on the left.

**Example 5.2** Consider the family  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2\}$  of  $2 \times 2$  matrices

$$A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 15/17 & -16/17 \\ 4/17 & 15/17 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 4/5 & 3/5 \\ -3/5 & 4/5 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Here the functions  $\Phi_i(\varphi), H_i(\varphi), R_n(\varphi), R_n^*(\varphi)$  were also chosen to be piecewise linear with 3000 nodes uniformly distributed over the interval  $[-\pi, \pi]$ . It was needed 31 steps of the LR-procedure and 25 steps of the MR-procedure to compute the joint spectral radius  $\rho(\mathcal{A})$  with the absolute accuracy  $10^{-3}$ . The computed value of the joint spectral radius is  $\rho(\mathcal{A}) = 1.192$ . The computed unit sphere of the Barabanov norm  $\|\cdot\|^*$  is plotted on Fig. 1 on the right.

As is seen from these examples the computational “quality” of the above iteration procedures is approximately the same. At the same time similar steps in their proofs require different efforts and potentially may have different theoretical extensions, and now we are unable to predict which of these two algorithms might be more useful in the future.

In conclusion note that the above algorithms allow to calculate the joint spectral radius of a finite matrix family with any required accuracy and to evaluate a posteriori the computational error. At the same time the question about the accuracy




Figure 1. Examples of computation of Barabanov norms for a pair of  $2 \times 2$  matrices.

of approximation of the Barabanov norm  $\|\cdot\|^*$  by the norms  $\|\cdot\|_n$  is open. It seems, the difficulty in answering this question is caused by the fact that in general the Barabanov norms for a matrix family are determined ambiguously. Namely to overcome this difficulty we preferred to consider relaxation algorithms instead of direct ones. Moreover, if to set  $\lambda_n \equiv 0$  in (6) then, as demonstrate numerical tests, the obtained direct computational analog of the LR-procedure may turn out to be non-convergent.

The question about the rate of convergence of the sequences  $\{\rho_n^+\}$  and  $\{\rho_n^-\}$  to the joint spectral radius is also open.

## Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research, project no. 06-01-00256.

The author is deeply indebted to a referee for his detailed suggestions and a number of valuable comments.

## References

- [1] Barabanov, N.E., *Lyapunov Indicator of Discrete Inclusions. I*, Automat. Remote Control, 1988, vol. 49, no. 2, pp. 152–157.
- [2] Barabanov, N.E., *Lyapunov Indicator of Discrete Inclusions. II*, Automat. Remote Control, 1988, vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 283–287.
- [3] Barabanov, N.E., *Lyapunov Indicator of Discrete Inclusions. III*, Automat. Remote Control, 1988, vol. 49, no. 5, pp. 558–565.
- [4] Barabanov, N., *Lyapunov Exponent and Joint Spectral Radius: Some Known and New Results*, in *Proceedings of the 44th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control and European Control Conference 2005, Seville, Spain, December 12–15, 2005* pp. 2332–2337.
- [5] Berger, M.A. and Wang, Y., *Bounded Semigroups of Matrices*, Linear Algebra Appl., 1992, vol. 166, pp. 21–27.
- [6] Brayton, R.K. and Tong, C.H., *Constructive Stability and Asymptotic Stability of Dynamical Systems*, IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst., 1980, vol. 27, pp. 1121–1130.
- [7] Chen, Q. and Zhou, X., *Characterization of Joint Spectral Radius via Trace*, Linear Algebra Appl., 2000, vol. 315, no. 1–3, pp. 175–188.
- [8] Colella, D. and Heil, C., *The Characterization of Continuous, Four-Coefficient Scaling Functions and Wavelets*, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, 1992, vol. 38, no. 2/II, pp. 876–881.
- [9] Daubechies, I. and Lagarias, J.C., *Sets of Matrices all Infinite Products of Which Converge*, Linear Algebra Appl., Apr. 1992, vol. 161, pp. 227–263.
- [10] Daubechies, I. and Lagarias, J.C., *Corrigendum/addendum to: Sets of Matrices all Infinite Products of Which Converge*, Linear Algebra Appl., 2001, vol. 327, pp. 69–83.

- [11] Daubechies, I. and Lagarias, J.C., *Two-Scale Difference Equations. II: Local Regularity, Infinite Products of Matrices, and Fractals*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 1992, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 1031–1079.
- [12] Elsner, L., *The Generalized Spectral-Radius Theorem: An Analytic-Geometric Proof*, Linear Algebra Appl., 1995, vol. 220, pp. 151–159.
- [13] Gripenberg, G., *Computing the Joint Spectral Radius*, Linear Algebra Appl., 1996, vol. 234, pp. 43–60.
- [14] Guglielmi, N. and Zennaro, M., *On the Asymptotic Properties of a Family of Matrices*, Linear Algebra Appl., 2001, vol. 322, no. 1–3, pp. 169–192.
- [15] Guglielmi, N. and Zennaro, M., *An Algorithm for Finding Extremal Polytope Norms of Matrix Families*, Linear Algebra Appl., 2008, vol. 428, no. 10, pp. 2265–2282. doi:10.1016/j.laa.2007.07.009.
- [16] Kozyakin, V., *A Dynamical Systems Construction of a Counterexample to the Finiteness Conjecture*, in *Proceedings of the 44th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control and European Control Conference 2005, Seville, Spain, December 12–15, 2005* pp. 2338–2343.
- [17] Kozyakin, V.S., *Structure of Extremal Trajectories of Discrete Linear Systems and the Finiteness Conjecture*, Automat. Remote Control, 2007, vol. 68, no. 1, pp. 174–209. doi:10.1134/S0005117906040171.
- [18] Kozyakin, V.S. and Pokrovskii, A.V., *The Role of Controllability-Type Properties in the Study of the Stability of Desynchronized Dynamical Systems*, Soviet Phys. Dokl., 1992, vol. 37, no. 5, pp. 213–215.
- [19] Kozyakin, V.S. and Pokrovskii, A.V., *Estimates of Amplitudes of Transient Regimes in Quasi-Controllable Discrete Systems*, CADSEM Report 96–005, Deakin University, Geelong, Australia, 1996.
- [20] Kozyakin, V.S. and Pokrovskii, A.V., *Quasi-Controllability and Estimation of the Amplitudes of Transient Regimes in Discrete Systems*, Izv., Ross. Akad. Estestv. Nauk, Mat. Mat. Model. Inform. Upr., 1997, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 128–150, in Russian.
- [21] Kozyakin, V., *Iterative Building of Barabanov Norms and Computation of the Joint Spectral Radius for Matrix Sets*, ArXiv.org e-Print archive, Oct. 2008. arXiv:0810.2154.
- [22] Maesumi, M., *An Efficient Lower Bound for the Generalized Spectral Radius of a Set of Matrices*, Linear Algebra Appl., 1996, vol. 240, pp. 1–7.
- [23] Parrilo, P.A. and Jadbabaie, A., *Approximation of the Joint Spectral Radius Using sum of Squares*, Linear Algebra Appl., 2008, vol. 428, no. 10, pp. 2385–2402. arXiv:0712.2887, doi:10.1016/j.laa.2007.12.027.
- [24] Plischke, E. and Wirth, F., *Duality Results for the Joint Spectral Radius and Transient Behavior*, Linear Algebra Appl., 2008, vol. 428, no. 10, pp. 2368–2384. doi:10.1016/j.laa.2007.12.009.
- [25] Plischke, E., Wirth, F., and Barabanov, N., *Duality Results for the Joint Spectral Radius and Transient Behavior*, in *Proceedings of the 44th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control and European Control Conference 2005, Seville, Spain, December 12–15, 2005* pp. 2344–2349.
- [26] Protasov, V.Yu., *The Joint Spectral Radius and Invariant Sets of Linear Operators*, Fundamentalnaya i prikladnaya matematika, 1996, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 205–231, in Russian.
- [27] Protasov, V., *The Geometric Approach for Computing the Joint Spectral Radius*, in *Proceedings of the 44th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control and European Control Conference 2005, Seville, Spain, December 12–15, 2005* pp. 3001–3006.
- [28] Protasov, V.Yu., *A Generalization of the Joint Spectral Radius: The Geometrical Approach*, Facta Univ., Ser. Math. Inf., 1998, vol. 13, pp. 19–23.
- [29] Rota, G.-C. and Strang, G., *A Note on the Joint Spectral Radius*, Indag. Math., 1960, vol. 22, pp. 379–381.
- [30] Theys, J., *Joint Spectral Radius: theory and approximations*, Ph.D. thesis, Faculté des sciences appliquées, Département d'ingénierie mathématique, Center for Systems Engineering and Applied Mechanics, Université Catholique de Louvain, May 2005.
- [31] Wirth, F., *The Generalized Spectral Radius and Extremal Norms*, Linear Algebra Appl., 2002, vol. 342, pp. 17–40.
- [32] Wirth, F., *On the Structure of the Set of Extremal Norms of a Linear Inclusion*, in *Proceedings of the 44th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, and the European Control Conference 2005 Seville, Spain, December 12–15, 2005* pp. 3019–3024.