

A conjecture concerning $*$ -algebras that unifies some matrix decompositions

Ran Gutin
Imperial College London

10th August 2023

Abstract

In this note, we propose a simple-looking but broad conjecture about star-algebras over the field of real numbers. The conjecture enables many matrix decompositions to be represented by star-algebras and star-ideals. This paper is written for people with a background in representation theory and module theory. The motivation for investigating this is the possibility of expressing polymorphic algorithms in numerical and theoretical linear algebra. This is similar to but different from algebraic (semiring based) approaches to dynamic programming. We prove certain cases of the conjecture.

1 Introduction

In this note, we propose a conjecture about finite-dimensional $*$ -algebras (also called involution algebras) [17] which we think has applications in numerical and theoretical linear algebra. Our conjecture is that a simple-looking but broad generalisation of the spectral theorem is true for all finite-dimensional $*$ -algebras over the field \mathbb{R} . We provide a proof for some cases.

We state the conjecture:

Conjecture 1 *Let H be a self-adjoint element (that is, satisfying $H^* = H$) of a finite-dimensional $*$ -algebra \mathcal{A} over \mathbb{R} . Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be the maximum number for which the following decomposition exists:*

$$H = \sum_{i=1}^k P_i H P_i,$$

where for all $i, j \in [k]$:

- $P_i \in \mathcal{A}$,
- $P_i^* = P_i$,
- $P_i P_j = \delta_{ij} P_i$,
- $P_i \neq 0$.

Consider another such decomposition for the same H :

$$H = \sum_{i=1}^k Q_i H Q_i.$$

Then there exists a permutation $\sigma \in S_k$ and a $U \in \mathcal{A}$ such that:

- $U^* = U^{-1}$,
- $U H U^* = H$,
- for all $i \in [k]$: $U Q_i U^* = P_{\sigma(i)}$.

By assuming the conjecture, we can pick $*$ -algebras which in some sense *represent* certain matrix decompositions (with prior investigation here [9]). By a matrix decomposition, we mean a way of writing matrices as a product of other matrices – a connection which is partly justified by lemma 1. This unification of some matrix decompositions emphasises the uniqueness

aspect, as opposed to the existence aspect (which is made trivial), of those decompositions. One of the motivations is that the use of $*$ -algebras allows computer code written to compute *one* decomposition to be directly used to compute different ones (related to but different from the somewhat well-known ideas in [19, 13]). Note that we will not develop these computing applications here because this is a theoretical paper.

We demonstrate the correspondence this creates using some examples below.

2 Consequences for different $*$ -algebras

We're going to show how this conjecture easily re-derives some existing matrix decompositions. These re-derivations are justified by the observation (later proven in lemma 1) that the conjecture is sometimes equivalent to the statement that over certain $*$ -algebras, the conjecture is equivalent to the cancellation property of unitary similarity.

2.1 Matrices over the complex numbers, with conjugate-transpose as their involution

Let H be an $n \times n$ Hermitian matrix over \mathbb{C} . We recall the spectral theorem from linear algebra:

$$H = VDV^*,$$

and recall that we're interested in decompositions of the form

$$H = \sum_{i=1}^k P_i H P_i,$$

for maximum k . In fact, we may obtain this by taking each column of V , which we will call v_i , and letting $P_i = v_i v_i^*$. We get $k = n$ and that $P_i H P_i = \lambda_i v_i v_i^*$. So we have:

$$H = \sum_{i=1}^k P_i H P_i = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i v_i v_i^*.$$

This illustrates (and sketches the proof for) the conjecture for \mathbb{C} , and shows that the conjecture generalises the spectral theorem.

2.2 Matrices over the double numbers, with conjugate-transpose as their involution

Let ${}^2\mathbb{R}$ denote the $*$ -algebra of *double numbers*: The underlying algebra is $\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}$, and the involution is $(a, b) \mapsto (b, a)$.

Given any finite-dimensional (*without star*) \mathbb{R} -algebra R , we can make a $*$ -algebra $R \oplus R^{\text{op}}$, with involution being $(x, y) \mapsto (y, x)$ [10]. Note that for some such algebras R (but not all), there exists some (any) involution, and we therefore have $R^{\text{op}} \cong R$. In those cases, we have $R \oplus R^{\text{op}} \cong R \oplus R \cong R \otimes {}^2\mathbb{R}$, where the algebra R in the last expression is equipped with any involution.

Observe that the conjecture for $M_n(R) \oplus M_n(R)^{\text{op}}$ is equivalent to the invariant subspace decomposition for matrices in $M_n(R)$. The existence of such a decomposition is a corollary of the Krull-Schmidt theorem [14] – albeit for $R \in \{\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}, \mathbb{H}\}$ it is better described as the Jordan Normal Form or primary decomposition.

In particular, this means that the conjecture for $M_n({}^2\mathbb{R})$ – that is, $n \times n$ matrices over the double numbers – is equivalent to the Jordan Normal Form for \mathbb{R} -matrices.

2.3 General picture

In general, we obtain a correspondence between on the one hand:

- Matrix decompositions,

and

- finite-dimensional $*$ -algebras over \mathbb{R} along with an ideal.

The corresponding decomposition is obtained by considering Hermitian matrices over the given $*$ -algebra whose elements all belong to the specified ideal, and then (nearly all the time) considering block-diagonal canonical forms of those matrices under unitary similarity.

We make this explicit using a table, where we exhaust all indecomposable 2 and 3-dimensional $*$ -algebras (which can be done with the aid of the Wedderburn-Malcev theorem) and consider the decomposition which the conjecture implies for all of its matrix algebras:

Algebra	Involution	$*$ -ideal	Corresponding decomposition	Tame?
\mathbb{R}	id	$\langle 1 \rangle$	Spectral theorem	Y
\mathbb{C}	$a + bi \mapsto a - bi$	$\langle 1 \rangle$	Spectral theorem for \mathbb{C} -Hermitian matrices	Y
\mathbb{C}	id	$\langle 1 \rangle$	Complex-symmetric spectral theorem	Y ¹
$\mathbb{R}[X]/(X^2)$	id	$\langle 1 \rangle$	Spectral decomposition of $H + \varepsilon H' + o(\varepsilon)$ where $H, H' \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$ and both are symmetric	Y [4, 8]
$\mathbb{R}[X]/(X^2)$	$a + bX \mapsto a - bX$	$\langle 1 \rangle$	Spectral decomposition of $H + \varepsilon H' + o(\varepsilon)$ where $H, H' \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$; H is symmetric; H' is skew-symmetric	Y [4, 8]
$\mathbb{R}[X]/(X^2)$	$a + bX \mapsto a - bX$	$\langle X \rangle$	Spectral theorem for skew-symmetric \mathbb{R} -matrices	Y
$\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}$	$(a, b) \mapsto (b, a)$	$\langle 1 \rangle$	Jordan Normal Form	Y
$(\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}) + \mathbb{R}\delta^2$	Unique one where $\delta \mapsto \delta$	$\langle 1 \rangle$	Canonical basis for a pair (Q, L) consisting of a quadratic form Q and an operator L self-adjoint with respect to Q	Y [5]
$(\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}) + \mathbb{R}\delta^2$	Unique one where $\delta \mapsto -\delta$	$\langle 1 \rangle$	Canonical basis for a pair (ω, L) consisting a of symplectic form ω and an operator L self-adjoint with respect to ω	Y [5]
$(\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}) + \mathbb{R}\delta^2$	Unique one where $\delta \mapsto \delta$	$\langle \delta \rangle$	Sylvester's Law of Inertia	Y
$(\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}) + \mathbb{R}\delta^2$	Unique one where $\delta \mapsto -\delta$	$\langle \delta \rangle$	Analogue of Sylvester's Law of Inertia for skew-symmetric matrices ³	Y
$\mathbb{R}[X]/(X^3)$	id	$\langle 1 \rangle$	2nd-order perturbation theory of spectral theorem	Y [4]
$\mathbb{R}[X]/(X^3)$	$X \mapsto -X$	$\langle 1 \rangle$	2nd-order perturbation theory of invariant subspace decomposition where skew-symmetric part is infinitesimal	Y [4]
$\mathbb{R}[X]/(X^3)$	$X \mapsto -X$	$\langle X \rangle$	Spectral decomposition of $H + \varepsilon H' + o(\varepsilon)$ where $H, H' \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$; H is skew-symmetric; H' is symmetric	Y
$\mathbb{R}[X, Y]/(X^2, Y^2, XY)$	$X \mapsto X, Y \mapsto -Y$	$\langle 1 \rangle$	Spectral decomposition of $H + \varepsilon H' + o(\varepsilon)$ where $H, H' \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$; H is symmetric; H' is an <i>arbitrary</i> matrix	N ⁴
$\mathbb{R}[X, Y]/(X^2, Y^2, XY)$	$X \mapsto X, Y \mapsto Y$	$\langle 1 \rangle$	1st-order perturbation theory of spectral theorem, with 2 independent perturbations in symmetric directions	N ⁴
$\mathbb{R}[X, Y]/(X^2, Y^2, XY)$	$X \mapsto -X, Y \mapsto -Y$	$\langle 1 \rangle$	1st-order perturbation theory of spectral theorem, with 2 independent perturbations in skew-symmetric directions	N ⁴
$\mathbb{R}[X, Y]/(X^2, Y^2, XY)$	$X \mapsto X, Y \mapsto -Y$	$\langle X, Y \rangle$	Block-diagonal form for \mathbb{R} -matrices under orthogonal similarity	N [18, sec. 4]
$\mathbb{R}[X, Y]/(X^2, Y^2, XY)$	$X \mapsto X, Y \mapsto Y$	$\langle X, Y \rangle$	Block-diagonal form for pairs of symmetric \mathbb{R} -matrices under orthogonal similarity.	N [18, sec. 4]

¹follows from observation that all square \mathbb{C} -matrices are similar to \mathbb{C} -symmetric matrices, combined with the polar decomposition trick given for instance in [15]

²with relations $\delta^2 = 0, \delta(x, y) = (y, x)\delta = x\delta$

³The decomposition is for when $M = -M^T \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$; then there is an invertible $P \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$ such that $PMP^T = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^{\oplus \text{rank}(M)/2} \oplus [0]^{\oplus \text{null}(M)}$

⁴Wild even when restricted to an ideal

$\mathbb{R}[X, Y]/(X^2, Y^2, XY)$	$X \mapsto -X, Y \mapsto -Y$	$\langle X, Y \rangle$	Block-diagonal form for pairs of skew-symmetric \mathbb{R} -matrices under orthogonal similarity	N [18, sec. 4]
-----------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------	--	----------------

The above lists all 2- and 3-dimensional cases. Note that we treat much of the perturbation theory of matrix decompositions as – in some sense – being matrix decompositions in their own right.

We also consider some notable 4-dimensional cases. There are too many cases to exhaustively list here, so we’ve listed only a few below. Pay attention to the corresponding decompositions. Note that these are not the only tame ones in 4 dimensions.

Algebra	Involution	*-ideal	Corresponding decomposition	Tame?
$(a, b) + \delta(a', b')$ ⁵	Any which sends $(x, y) \mapsto (y, x)$	$\langle \delta \rangle$	Singular Value Decomposition	Y
$(a + bi) + \delta(a' + b'i)$ ⁶	$\delta \mapsto \delta, i \mapsto -i$	$\langle \delta \rangle$	Autone-Takagi decomposition [11]	Y
$(a + bi) + \delta(a' + b'i)$ ⁶	$\delta \mapsto -\delta, i \mapsto -i$	$\langle \delta \rangle$	Skew-symmetric Takagi decomposition	Y
$M_2(\mathbb{R})$	Matrix adjugate	$\langle 1 \rangle$	“Symplectic spectral theorem”: Analogue of the spectral theorem for $2n \times 2n$ symplectic-self adjoint matrices under symplectic similarity	Y ⁷
$\mathbb{R}[X, Y]/(X^2, Y^2)$	$X \mapsto -X, Y \mapsto Y$	$\langle X \rangle$	Spectral decomposition of $H + \varepsilon H' + o(\varepsilon)$ where H and H' are skew-symmetric	Y

By taking tensor products of *-algebras and their ideals, one can combine features of different decompositions. For instance:

- The somewhat intricate – but still tame! – conjugate-less analogue of SVD for complex matrices considered in [12] is obtained by tensoring the representative of the SVD – which is 4-dimensional – with the representative for the complex-symmetric spectral theorem – which is 2-dimensional. It should be intuitively plausible that this combines their features in a compelling way.
- Referring to the same paper [12], the main decomposition there can be seen as the analogue of Singular Value Decomposition for matrices over the *-algebra of double numbers⁸. Since a matrix over the double numbers is essentially a pair of real matrices, this creates an analogue of SVD for pairs of real matrices. Equivalently, this may be obtained by using tensor products: A representative of the main decomposition of that paper can be obtained by tensoring the triple representing the Singular Value Decomposition with the one representing the Jordan Normal Form. The resulting triple gives an involution and an ideal of an 8-dimensional algebra.

3 Obstacles to a general proof

While there isn’t much literature on *-algebras, there is plenty on C^* -algebras. Unfortunately, much of the machinery does not generalise well to *-algebras, as we will now show [17]. And already in 2 dimensions, most *-algebras are not C^* -algebras. This situation is particularly interesting because much of the general theory in the literature concerning *-algebras that aren’t C^* -algebras appears to concern algebras consisting of unbounded (that is, discontinuous) linear operators on infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces – it’s difficult to apply their methods to problems like this one.

One piece of machinery in the literature is “star representations” or **-representations*. This is the same thing as a representation of an algebra, but with the additional requirement that the involution $*$ be sent to the conjugate-transpose on complex matrices. This is already impossible for most 2-dimensional *-algebras. We therefore have a curious situation that while every algebra has a representation, almost no *-algebra has a *-representation.

Much of the representation theory of topological groups is developed for compact groups [1]. However, the unitary elements of our *-algebras usually don’t form compact groups.

We’ve noticed that results in the literature which *claim* to solve (effectively) special cases of our conjecture often have erroneous proofs. For instance, we’ve tried to find generalisations of Specht’s theorem [15, 11] to prove additional cases of

⁵where $\delta(a', b') = (b', a')\delta$ and $\delta^2 = 0$

⁶where $\delta i = -i\delta$ and $\delta^2 = 0$

⁷Tame for similar reasons to case $(\mathbb{C}, \text{id}, \langle 1 \rangle)$

⁸Recall that this is the algebra $\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}$ equipped with the involution $(a, b) \mapsto (b, a)$

our conjecture, but the proofs we found in the literature for those generalisations were wrong. We confirmed this with the authors. We will not cite examples for obvious reasons.

Trying to generalise the conjecture may be fraught: The conjecture over arbitrary fields is false, as follows from basic Witt theory and the failure of Sylvester’s Law of Inertia (undermining a prediction of the generalised conjecture) over such fields. In spite of these obstacles, some steps to produce something like a theory of matrix decompositions for finite fields have been done [7]. There is prior work unifying the classical groups [10] instead of the decompositions (with an eye towards algebraic K-theory), but the structures considered (form rings, form modules) are quite different, and we are not sure how to apply those general tools here.

4 Proofs of certain cases

We can prove some cases of the conjecture.

Definition 1 *Self-adjoint matrices over a $*$ -algebra \mathcal{A} satisfy the cancellation property under unitary similarity if whenever A is unitarily similar to A' and $A \oplus B$ is unitarily similar to $A' \oplus B'$, then B is unitarily similar to B' . Note that the matrices A, A', B, B' are understood to be self-adjoint.*

Lemma 1 *If for a given local $*$ -algebra \mathcal{A} , if the self-adjoint matrices over \mathcal{A} satisfy the cancellation property under unitary similarity, then for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the conjecture holds for $M_n(\mathcal{A})$.*

Proof Consider $H = \sum_{i=1}^k P_i H P_i = \sum_{i=1}^k Q_i H Q_i$ for largest k .

Use $\text{im}(P_i)$ for each i . Clearly, $\mathcal{A}^n \cong \bigoplus_i \text{im}(P_i)$. By Kaplansky’s theorem, we have that each $\text{im}(P_i)$ is a free submodule. Now take any basis for each $\text{im}(P_i)$, put the column vectors together, and then use the polar decomposition [15] trick to arrive at the multiplicative decomposition $H = [U_1 \mid U_2 \mid \dots \mid U_k](E_1 \oplus E_2 \oplus \dots \oplus E_k)[U_1 \mid U_2 \mid \dots \mid U_k]^*$.

The same can be done for the Q_i s to arrive at $H = [V_1 \mid V_2 \mid \dots \mid V_k](F_1 \oplus \dots \oplus F_k)[V_1 \mid V_2 \mid \dots \mid V_k]^*$.

Imagine for the sake of contradiction that E_1 is not unitarily similar to any F_i . This then produces the decomposition $\mathcal{A}^n \cong \bigoplus_i (\text{im}(Q_i) \cap \text{im}(P_1)) \oplus \bigoplus_i (\text{im}(Q_i) \cap \text{im}(P_1)^\perp)$, which has more than k non-zero factors. This contradicts the maximality of k . So there must be some F_i unitarily similar to E_1 . Assume without loss of generality that this is F_1 . Use the cancellation property to cancel E_1 and F_1 and arrive at the fact that $\bigoplus_{i \geq 2} E_i$ is unitarily similar to $\bigoplus_{i \geq 2} F_i$. In a similar way, we conclude that each E_j is unitarily similar to some F_i . The conclusion follows. \square

Proposition 1 *The above conjecture is true when the underlying algebra of \mathcal{A} is the ring of $n \times n$ matrices $M_n(\mathcal{D})$ over any division $*$ -algebra \mathcal{D} .*

Proof Either \mathcal{D} is:

- The real numbers with the trivial involution.
- The complex numbers with either the involution $\text{id}_{\mathbb{C}}$ or $(-)^*$.
- The quaternions with either the involution $t + xi + yj + zk \mapsto t - xi - yj - zk$ or $t + xi + yj + zk \mapsto t - xi + yj + zk$. Note that while it is true that the quaternions have infinitely many involutions, it admits only two up to isomorphism of $*$ -algebras. [16]

We verify the conjecture for each case in turn.

Let \mathcal{D} be the real numbers. The theorem is equivalent to the spectral theorem here.

Let \mathcal{D} be the complex numbers with the involution $(-)^*$. The theorem is equivalent to the spectral theorem here.

Let \mathcal{D} be the complex numbers with the involution $\text{id}_{\mathbb{C}}$. Note that every square complex matrix is similar to a complex symmetric matrix. Thus, given a complex-symmetric matrix S , take its Jordan Normal Form, and replace each Jordan block with the complex symmetric matrix which it’s similar to – giving $S \sim J_1 \oplus \dots \oplus J_k$ where each J_i is complex-symmetric. We have that S is similar to another complex-symmetric matrix. But then S is furthermore orthogonally similar to $J_1 \oplus \dots \oplus J_k$, by the polar decomposition trick [15].

Let \mathcal{D} be the quaternions with the standard involution $t + xi + yj + zk \mapsto t - xi - yj - zk$. The theorem is equivalent to the spectral theorem here.

Let \mathcal{D} be the quaternions with the non-standard involution $t + xi + yj + zk \mapsto t - xi + yj + zk$. The proof here is the same as in the case of \mathbb{C} equipped with the involution $\text{id}_{\mathbb{C}}$. We only need to observe that:

- an analogue of the Jordan Normal Form exists, [16]
- every square quaternion matrix is similar to a complex-symmetric matrix,
- the polar decomposition generalises to this setting. This is presently proved in a MathOverflow post [20].

□

Lemma 2 *Non-singular matrices over the quaternions equipped with the non-standard involution $t + xi + yj + zk \mapsto t - xi + yj + zk$ admit polar decompositions.*

Proof This would be a corollary of the statement that for every non-singular matrix M that is Hermitian with respect to the above involution, such a matrix admits a polynomial p with real coefficients such that $p(M)^2 = M$.

Let M be a matrix Hermitian with respect to this involution. Consider a representation of M as an \mathbb{R} -matrix $\chi(M)$. We can use the standard technique for generalising analytic functions to matrices by way of Hermite interpolation. We would like though for the coefficients of the interpolating polynomial $p \in \mathbb{C}[z]$ (for which $p(M)^2 = M$) to be real numbers, otherwise we might encounter problems with non-commutativity. We can ensure this whenever $\chi(M)$ has no negative real eigenvalues, by ensuring that for every congruence

$$p(z) \equiv \sqrt{z} \pmod{(z - \lambda)^n}$$

we have another congruence of the form

$$p(z) \equiv \sqrt{\bar{z}} \pmod{(z - \bar{\lambda})^n}.$$

This system of congruences becomes contradictory when $\chi(M)$ has a negative real eigenvalue.

In the event that M has a negative real eigenvalue, we may perturb M in such a way as to eliminate its real eigenvalues. We may construct a sequence of approximations M_n to M , consider the sequence $\sqrt{M_n}$, refine this to a convergent subsequence if need be (by way of Bolzano-Weierstrass) and then take the limit to obtain a square root of M . □

A corollary of the Wedderburn-Malcev theorem is that every *local finite-dimensional* \mathbb{R} -algebra admits a vector space decomposition $A \oplus B$ where $A \in \{\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}, \mathbb{H}\}$, and B consists only of nilpotent elements.

Definition 2 *Call an involution $(-)^*$ of a local finite-dimensional \mathbb{R} -algebra \mathcal{A} **standard** if over the subalgebra A (which is a division algebra) of $\mathcal{A} = A \oplus B$, we have that $z^2 = -1$ implies $z^* = -z$.*

Call any other involution *non-standard*. Notice that the only standard involution for \mathbb{C} is $a + bi \mapsto a - bi$, while the only non-standard involution is $a + bi \mapsto a + bi$. Both involutions for the algebra of dual numbers are standard.

Lemma 3 *Every unit element x over a local finite-dimensional $*$ -algebra \mathcal{A} over \mathbb{R} that carries a standard involution admits a square root and a polar decomposition.*

Proof We only need to verify the existence of a square root. Going from the existence of a square root to a polar decomposition is a fairly standard argument.

Consider an \mathbb{R} -matrix M representing x^*x . We perform Hermite interpolation to obtain a polynomial p with only real coefficients for which $p(M)^2 = M$. To ensure the coefficients of p are real, the interpolation problem should be set up so that the interpolation points are complex conjugates of each other. This is only possible to do if M has no negative eigenvalues. But M can't have a negative eigenvalue because $x^*x \text{ mod } J(\mathcal{A})$ (where $J(\mathcal{A})$ is the Jacobson radical of \mathcal{A}) is a positive definite element of $M_n(\mathcal{A}/J(\mathcal{A}))$.

We see now that $p(x^*x)^2 = x$. □

Proposition 2 *The above conjecture is true when the underlying algebra of \mathcal{A} is $n \times n$ matrices over a local ring \mathcal{B} , and the involution is standard.*

Proof By the Krull-Schmidt theorem, there exists a decomposition:

$$H = \sum_{i=1}^k P_i H P_i,$$

with

- $P_i \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A})$,
- $P_i P_j = \delta_{ij} P_i$,
- $P_i \neq 0$.

but not necessarily with $P_i^* = P_i$. We seek to make this last identity true as well.

Choose some $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$. Since \mathcal{A} is a local ring, we may choose a basis $\{v_1, v_2, \dots\}$ where each v_j belongs to the image of P_i . We now show how to construct an improved basis $\{v'_1, v'_2, \dots\}$ of $\text{im}(P_i)$ that is orthonormal.

We choose v'_1 to equal $v_1 \sqrt{v_1^* v_1}^{-1}$. This definition should make sense as long as $v_1^* v_1$ is a unit, because we know that every unit has a square root. Assume for the sake of contradiction that it isn't a unit. Then quotienting by the Jacobson radical, and using the property of *standard* involutions, gives that each component of v_1 is a non-unit. But then the module spanned by v_1 is a projective module which isn't free, which contradicts Kaplansky's theorem. So we conclude that $v_1^* v_1$ is indeed a unit and the definition of v'_1 makes sense.

We now must choose a value of v'_2 to take the place of v_2 . To this end, consider the linear map $f : \text{im}(P_i) \rightarrow \text{im}(P_i)$, $x \mapsto v'_1 v_1^* x$. Observe that $f(f(x)) = f(x)$ for all x . From this, observe that for every vector x , we have that $x = f(x) - (x - f(x))$, where $x - f(x)$ is in the kernel of f . Assume that we have an $x \in \text{im}(f) \cap \ker(f)$. Then we have $x = f(y)$ for some y , and then $x = f(y) = f(f(y)) = f(x) = 0$, so $x = 0$. Therefore we have the decomposition $\text{im}(P_i) = \ker(f) \oplus \text{im}(f)$. Since \mathcal{A} is local, $\ker(f)$ is a free module, whose every element is orthogonal to v'_1 . Continuing in the obvious way produces an orthonormal basis for $\text{im}(P_i)$.

Putting these orthonormal bases for $\text{im}(P_i)$ for each i together gives that H is similar to a self-adjoint matrix.

We now use the polar decomposition trick to make H *unitarily similar* to a self-adjoint matrix. □

5 Suggestion for programme

We propose a programme, which we think might be useful in applications:

- Prove the conjecture above.
- Classify the complexity of the corresponding decompositions or canonical forms. It's common to use the three-way label *domestic*, *tame* and *wild*. [3, 2]
- Investigate the use of polymorphism in programming languages to write the same numerical algorithm for multiple decompositions. This has some resemblance to the well-known possibility of using polymorphism in dynamic programming algorithms [19]. We might limit the numerical algorithms to all those decompositions of low enough complexity. Are many numerical algorithms simply the QR algorithm [6] in disguise, written in a polymorphic way?

References

- [1] Michael Artin. *Algebra*. Birkhäuser, 1998.
- [2] Genrich R Belitskii and Vladimir V Sergeichuk. Complexity of matrix problems. *Linear Algebra and its applications*, 361:203–222, 2003.
- [3] Ju. A. Drozd. Tame and wild matrix problems. In *Representation Theory II*, pages 242–258. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1980.
- [4] I. Gohberg, P. Lancaster, and L. Rodman. Perturbation of analytic hermitian matrix functions. *Applicable Analysis*, 20(1-2):23–48, 1985.

- [5] Israel Gohberg, Peter Lancaster, and Leiba Rodman. *Indefinite linear algebra and applications*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [6] Gene H Golub and Charles F Van Loan. *Matrix computations*. JHU press, 2013.
- [7] Robert M. Guralnick. On the singular value decomposition over finite fields and orbits of $gu \times gu$. *Indagationes Mathematicae*, 32(5):1083–1094, 2021.
- [8] Ran Gutin. Generalizations of singular value decomposition to dual-numbered matrices. *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, 70(20):5107–5114, 2022.
- [9] Ran Gutin. Unitary canonical forms over clifford algebras, and an observed unification of some real-matrix decompositions. *Linear and multilinear algebra*, 2023.
- [10] Alexander J Hahn and O Timothy O’Meara. *The classical groups and K-theory*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [11] Roger A Horn and Charles R Johnson. *Matrix analysis*. Cambridge university press, 2012.
- [12] Roger A. Horn and Dennis I. Merino. Contragredient equivalence: A canonical form and some applications. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 214:43–92, 1995.
- [13] Liang Huang. Advanced dynamic programming in semiring and hypergraph frameworks. *Coling 2008: Advanced Dynamic Programming in Computational Linguistics: Theory, Algorithms and Applications-Tutorial notes*, pages 1–18, 2008.
- [14] Nathan Jacobson. *Basic Algebra II*. 1989.
- [15] Irving Kaplansky. *Linear algebra and geometry: a second course*. Courier Corporation, 2003.
- [16] Leiba Rodman. *Topics in quaternion linear algebra*. Princeton University Press, 2014.
- [17] Konrad Schmüdgen. *An invitation to unbounded representations of *-algebras on Hilbert space*. Springer, 2020.
- [18] Vladimir V Sergeichuk. Unitary and euclidean representations of a quiver. *Linear algebra and its applications*, 278(1-3):37–62, 1998.
- [19] Amir Shaikhha and Lionel Parreaux. Finally, a polymorphic linear algebra language. *lipics*, 134, 2019.
- [20] wlad. Polar decomposition with respect to the nonstandard involution of quaternionic matrices?, 2023.