

A Hybrid Approach to Joint Spectral Radius Computation

Thomas Mejsstrik* Ulrich Reif†

In this paper we propose a new method to determine the joint spectral radius of a finite set of real matrices by verifying that a given family of candidates actually consists of spectrum maximizing products. Our algorithm aims at constructing a finite set-valued tree according to the approach of Möller and Reif using a norm that is constructed in the spirit of the invariant polytope algorithm. This combines the broad range of applicability of the first algorithm with the efficiency of the latter.

1. Introduction

We are concerned with the exact computation of the *joint spectral radius* (JSR) of a finite set $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_J\}$ of real matrices $A_j \in \mathbb{R}^{s \times s}$. The JSR describes the maximal asymptotic growth rate of the norms of products of matrices from that set.

The JSR was initially introduced by Rota and Strang in 1960 [RS60], and has since found applications in various seemingly unrelated fields of mathematics. For instance, in computing the regularity of wavelets and subdivision schemes [DL92], in analysing code capacities [MOS01], in studying the stability of linear switched systems [Gur95], and in exploring connections with the Euler partition function [Prot00], see also [GP16, Jung09] and the references therein.

Basically, except for the treatment of special cases, there exist two different approaches to the computation of the JSR: The finite tree algorithm of Möller and Reif [MR14] and the invariant polytope algorithm [GP13, GP16, Mej20]. Both algorithms start from a given set of matrices that are expected to be spectrum maximizing products. When either algorithm terminates, this assumption is verified, and therewith the JSR is determined. If not, runtime limits may have been exceeded or the given set of candidates was deficient. The latter can be caused by an insufficient search for spectrum maximizing products, or it may even have been impossible if the given set \mathcal{A} of matrices does not possess the finiteness property [LW95, BM02, HMST11].

*University of Vienna, Austria, e-mail: thomas.mejsstrik@gmx.at

†Technische Universität Darmstadt, Germany, e-mail: reif@mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de

Invariant polytope algorithms try to construct a finite set of points such that the image of any of these points under any of the given matrices lies inside the convex hull of the points. Existing implementations have proven to be very efficient, even for matrices of high dimension. However, the range of applicability is restricted by the fact that termination of the algorithms is in general only possible when the given set \mathcal{A} of matrices has a simple leading eigenvalue. By contrast, the finite tree algorithm potentially works even in these cases. The finite tree algorithm aims at constructing a finite tree with nodes consisting of sets of matrix products whose leaves are bounded by 1 with respect to a given matrix norm. A disadvantage of this algorithm is its strong dependency of the runtime on the chosen norm.

In this paper, we suggest a hybrid method that promises to combine the broad range of applicability of the finite tree algorithm with the efficiency of the invariant polytope algorithm. As we will show, the resulting *adapted tree search* may converge even if the invariant polytope algorithm does not.

The paper is organized as follows: In the next section, we introduce notation and recall some important facts about the joint spectral radius and its determination from the literature. In Section 2, we establish adapted tree search as a new algorithm for JSR determination and analyse its basic properties, and in Section 3.2, we describe implementation details and discuss an example.

1.1. Definitions and basic properties

We denote the set of positive integers by \mathbb{N} , the set of non-negative integers by \mathbb{N}_0 , the spectral radius of the square matrix A by $\rho(A)$, the identity matrix by I , the closure of the set $X \subseteq \mathbb{C}^s$ by $\text{cl}(X)$, the convex hull of X by $\text{co}(X)$, and the symmetric convex hull of X by $\text{co}_s X = \text{co}(X \cup -X)$. Sums and products of sets are understood element-wise.

Throughout, $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_J\}$ denotes a set of $J \in \mathbb{N}$ matrices $A_j \in \mathbb{R}^{s \times s}$, and $\mathcal{J}_n := \{1, \dots, J\}^n$ is the set of index vectors with $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ elements. Products of matrices are denoted by

$$A_{\mathbf{j}} = A_{j_n} \cdots A_{j_1}, \quad \mathbf{j} = [j_1, \dots, j_n] \in \mathcal{J}_n.$$

For $n = 0$, the expression above is understood to be the identity matrix. The length of the vector $\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{J}_n$ is denoted by $|\mathbf{j}| = n$.

Definition 1.1. The *joint spectral radius* (JSR) of \mathcal{A} is defined by

$$\text{JSR}(\mathcal{A}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{J}_n} \|A_{\mathbf{j}}\|^{1/n}, \quad (1)$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is any sub-multiplicative matrix norm.

We will discuss the ideas behind the aforementioned algorithms after defining some crucial concepts.

Definition 1.2. If the matrices $A_j \in \mathcal{A}$ do not share a common invariant subspace other than $\{0\}$ and \mathbb{R}^s , then the set \mathcal{A} is called *irreducible*.

From an algebraic point of view, irreducibility expresses that there does not exist a change of basis under which all matrices of the given set are simultaneously block triangularized.

Theorem 1.3 ([BW92, Proposition 3]). *Given $v \in \mathbb{R}^s \setminus \{0\}$, define the set $P(v)$ by*

$$P(v) = \text{co}_s \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{J}_n} A_j v. \quad (2)$$

If \mathcal{A} is irreducible and $\text{JSR}(\mathcal{A}) = 1$, then $P(v)$ is a bounded subset of \mathbb{R}^s with non-empty interior.

Definition 1.4. Let $P \in \mathbb{R}^s$ be a bounded, convex set with non-empty interior, and such that $tP \subseteq P$ for all $t \in [-1, 1]$. We define the *Minkowski norm* $\|\cdot\|_P : \mathbb{R}^s \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\|x\|_P = \inf \{t > 0 : x \in tP\}. \quad (3)$$

Lemma 1.5 ([Jung09, Theorem 2.2]). *If \mathcal{A} is irreducible, then*

$$\|A_j x\|_{P(v)} \leq \text{JSR}(\mathcal{A}) \cdot \|x\|_{P(v)} \quad (4)$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^s$, $v \in \mathbb{R}^s \setminus \{0\}$, and $A_j \in \mathcal{A}$.

Definition 1.6. The set \mathcal{A} is said to possess the *finiteness property* if there exists a finite product $\Pi = A_{\mathbf{g}}$, $\mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{J}_n$, such that $\rho(\Pi)^{1/n} = \text{JSR}(\mathcal{A})$. We will call any such product a *spectrum maximizing product* or short an *s.m.p.*

Definition 1.7. Let $\Pi \in \mathbb{R}^{s \times s}$ be a matrix with eigenvalues sorted by modulus, i.e. $|\lambda_1| \geq \dots \geq |\lambda_s|$. The eigenvalues λ_i with $|\lambda_i| = \rho(\Pi)$ are the *leading eigenvalues* and the corresponding eigenvectors are the *leading eigenvectors*. If $|\lambda_2| < \rho(\Pi)$ or $\lambda_1 = \bar{\lambda}_2 \notin \mathbb{R}$ and $|\lambda_3| < \rho(\Pi)$, we say that the leading eigenvalue λ_1 is *simple*¹.

An immediate consequence of Theorem 1.3 is the following:

Lemma 1.8. *For any s.m.p. Π of an irreducible set \mathcal{A} the geometric and algebraic multiplicities of the leading eigenvectors coincide.*

Definition 1.9. The set \mathcal{A} is said to possess a *spectral gap* if there exists $\gamma < 1$ such that any product A_j is either an s.m.p. or its spectral radius is bounded by

$$\rho(A_j) \leq \gamma \cdot \text{JSR}(\mathcal{A})^{|\mathbf{j}|}.$$

1.2. Preparation

The invariant polytope algorithms and the tree algorithm share the following basic procedure: First, an *s.m.p.-candidate* $\Pi = A_{\mathbf{g}}$, $\mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{J}_n$, which is a product for which there

¹In the literature a simple leading eigenvector is also called *unique*.

is numerical evidence that it is in fact an s.m.p., is determined; Actually, a whole list of candidates is determined, but this is irrelevant at this point. A fast algorithm identifying s.m.p.-candidates can be found in [Mej20, Section 3]. Second, scaling the given matrices using the factor $\lambda := \rho(\Pi)^{1/n}$ yields the set $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} := \{\lambda^{-1}A_1, \dots, \lambda^{-1}A_J\}$. The corresponding s.m.p.-candidate $\tilde{\Pi} = \lambda^{-n}\Pi$, has spectral radius $\rho(\tilde{\Pi}) = 1$. Third, and this is the crucial task, one tries to prove that $\tilde{\Pi}$ is actually an s.m.p. of $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$, which is equivalent to $\text{JSR}(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}) = 1$ and $\text{JSR}(\mathcal{A}) = \lambda$.

From now on, we assume that the first two steps have already been carried out so that, omitting notation of the tilde, all s.m.p.-candidates Π_1, \dots, Π_M have spectral radius 1, and the conjecture to be proven is $\text{JSR}(\mathcal{A}) = 1$.

1.3. Two known algorithms

Let us briefly recall the two general-purpose algorithms for JSR determination described in the literature: The *finite tree algorithm* [MR14] and the *invariant polytope algorithm* [GP13, GP16, Mej20].

Apart from the s.m.p.-candidates Π_1, \dots, Π_M , the *finite tree algorithm* needs a fixed sub-multiplicative matrix norm as an additional input. It then tries to compute a tree where each node consists of a set of matrix products. Children of nodes consist of all matrix products which can be formed by multiplying the parent matrices with a single matrix A_j or with all integer powers of an s.m.p. Π_m . A leaf is a node in the tree with the property that all its containing matrix products have norm not exceeding 1.

The *invariant polytope algorithm* on the other hand tries to construct a vector-norm under which induced matrix norm all matrices from the set \mathcal{A} have norm not exceeding 1. It does so by trying to construct the unit ball P of a norm, which is invariant under all matrices in \mathcal{A} . The unit ball is constructed in the fashion of (2) with a carefully chosen starting vector v (or actually a set of starting vectors).

2. Adapted tree search

In order to combine the ideas of the two algorithms described above, we introduce the basic concept of the finite tree algorithm using notation mostly following [MR14].

The set $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \mathcal{J}_n$ of index vectors of arbitrary length, and with it the set of all finite matrix products $A_j = A_{j_n} \cdots A_{j_1}$, will be equipped with the structure of a rooted J -ary tree in a natural way. To prove $\text{JSR}(\mathcal{A}) \leq 1$, it is sufficient to determine a finite sub-tree with the property that every leaf contains a matrix with norm not exceeding 1. By contrast, if $\text{JSR}(\mathcal{A}) = 1$, then such sub-trees are typically infinite, what makes them inconvenient for an immediate algorithmic scanning. To account for that situation, the tree algorithm aims at constructing a *finite* tree whose nodes do not contain single matrices, but sets of products, which can be finite or countably infinite.

Definition 2.1 ($(\mathcal{A}, \mathbf{G})$ -tree). Let $\mathbf{G} = \{\mathbf{g}_1, \dots, \mathbf{g}_I\}$ be a set of index vectors $\mathbf{g}_i \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{J}_n$, whose corresponding matrix products $A_{\mathbf{g}_i}$ have spectral radius not exceeding 1.




Figure 1: $(\mathcal{A}, \mathbf{G})$ -tree for $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2\}$ and $\mathbf{G} = \{[1, 2]\}$ with covered (\square) and uncovered (\circ) leaves. The covered leaf $\{A_2A_1(A_2A_1)^nA_1, n \in \mathbb{N}_0\} = \{(A_2A_1)^nA_1 : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a (proper) subset of its grandparent $\{(A_2A_1)^nA_1 : n \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$.

A finite, rooted tree \mathbf{T} with nodes consisting of sets of matrices is called an $(\mathcal{A}, \mathbf{G})$ -tree if it has the following properties:

- The root node $\mathbf{t}_0 := \{I\}$ contains the identity matrix.
- Each node $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{T}$ is either
 - a *leaf*, i.e., it has no children,
 - or parent of exactly J *siblings* $\{A_jP : P \in \mathbf{t}\}$, $j = 1, \dots, J$,
 - or parent of arbitrary many *generators* $\{A_{\mathbf{g}}^n P : P \in \mathbf{t}, n \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ for some $\mathbf{g} \in \mathbf{G}$.
- No generator is a leaf.

A leaf is called *covered* if it is a subset of one of its predecessors, and otherwise *uncovered*. The *leafage* of \mathbf{T} is denoted by $\mathcal{L} := \{L \in \mathbf{t} : \mathbf{t} \text{ is uncovered leaf of } \mathbf{T}\}$.

Definition 2.2 (1-boundedness). Given a sub-multiplicative matrix norm $\|\cdot\|$, \mathbf{T} is called *1-bounded* if $\sup_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \|L\| \leq 1$ and *strongly 1-bounded* if $\sup_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \|L\| < 1$.

In practice, the matrices $A_{\mathbf{g}}$, $\mathbf{g} \in \mathbf{G}$, are s.m.p.-candidates or matrices with spectral radius close to 1. Figure 1 illustrates the definition, and in particular the emergence of covered nodes.

The main result in [MR14] (Theorem 3.3) is the following:

Theorem 2.3. *Let \mathbf{T} be an $(\mathcal{A}, \mathbf{G})$ -tree and $\|\cdot\|$ be a sub-multiplicative matrix norm. If \mathbf{T} is 1-bounded, then $\text{JSR}(\mathcal{A}) \leq 1$.*

We next give a definition and a theorem which are at the core of invariant polytope algorithms:

Definition 2.4 (V -closedness). Let $V \subset \mathbb{R}^s$ be a finite set of vectors spanning \mathbb{R}^s . An $(\mathcal{A}, \mathbf{G})$ -tree \mathbf{T} is said to be V -closed if $\mathcal{L}V \subseteq \text{co}_s V$. If there exists $\gamma < 1$ such that $\mathcal{L}V \in \gamma \text{co}_s(V)$, then \mathbf{T} is *strongly V -closed*.

As in Definition 2.2, we require that only matrices in the leafage of \mathbf{T} map vertices to interior of $\text{co}_s V$. Indeed, any leading eigenvector of an s.m.p. will always get mapped to the boundary of $\text{co}_s V$ by matrices element of a covered node.

The conditions under which the invariant polytope algorithm terminates [GP16, Theorem 3.3] can be restated using the terminology of the tree algorithm.

Theorem 2.5. *If the set \mathcal{A} is irreducible, and its JSR does not exceed 1, then the following are equivalent:*

- *There exists an $(\mathcal{A}, \mathbf{G})$ -tree with exactly 1 generator directly located at the root node, which is strongly V -closed for a set V of a leading eigenvector v_1 of an s.m.p. and suitable scaled additional vectors v_2, \dots, v_s , such that $\{v_1, \dots, v_s\}$ span \mathbb{R}^s .*
- *The set \mathcal{A} has a spectral gap, there exist exactly 1 s.m.p. (up to cyclic permutations and powers), and the s.m.p. has exactly one simple leading eigenvalue.*

Strict closedness is relevant in applications for numerical reasons. Deciding if a vertex Lv is inside or outside of a polytope $\text{co}_s(V)$ is hard or even impossible for a point on the boundary when working in a floating-point environment because even smallest rounding errors or inexact input data may distort the result.

Invariant polytope algorithms are known to be highly efficient in applications, while the finite tree approach covers a wider range of treatable cases. The following considerations prepare a hybrid method that is designed to combine the advantages.

Theorem 2.6. *If there exists a V -closed $(\mathcal{A}, \mathbf{G})$ -tree, then $\text{JSR}(\mathcal{A}) \leq 1$.*

Proof. Since $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_m\}$ is spanning \mathbb{R}^s , the set $P := \text{co}_s(V)$ has non-empty interior and hence defines a Minkowski norm $\|\cdot\|_P$ according to Definition 1.4. Moreover, any point $x \in \mathbb{R}^s$ with $\|x\|_P \leq 1$ can be written in the form $x = \sum_{m=1}^M \lambda_m v_m$ with coefficients λ_m satisfying $\sum_{m=1}^M |\lambda_m| \leq 1$. Let $L \in \mathcal{L}$ be any matrix in the leafage of \mathbf{T} . We obtain $Lx = \sum_{m=1}^M \lambda_m Lv_m$ and observe that $Lv_m \in P$ by assumption. This implies $Lx \in \text{co}_s P = P$ and hence $\|Lx\|_P \leq 1$. We conclude $\|L\|_P = \max\{\|Lx\|_P : \|x\|_P = 1\} \leq 1$, and Theorem 2.3 applies. \square

Theorem 2.5 informs us that, whenever the invariant polytope algorithm terminates, there exists a strongly V -closed tree of a very special shape. But in addition, V -closed and even strongly V -closed trees may exist in cases where invariant polytope algorithms fail.

Theorem 2.7. *Let V be a finite set of vectors spanning \mathbb{R}^s . If $\mathcal{A}V \subseteq \text{co}_s V$, then \mathcal{A} possesses a V -closed $(\mathcal{A}, \mathbf{G})$ -tree. Moreover, there are cases where invariant polytope algorithms do not terminate, but for which strongly V -closed trees exist nevertheless.*




Figure 2: V -closed tree \mathbf{T}_1 (left) and strongly V -closed tree \mathbf{T}_γ (right) for the example in the proof of Theorem 2.7.

Proof. The first part of the theorem follows easily by choosing the tree \mathbf{T} consisting of nothing but the root and the matrices A_1, \dots, A_J as its children. In this case, closedness of V with respect to \mathcal{A} is equivalent to \mathbf{T} being a V -closed tree.

The second part of the theorem is established by means of a simple example: Consider the pair

$$A_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad A_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1/2 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

and the s.m.p.-candidate $\Pi = A_1$ corresponding to the index set $\mathbf{G} = \{[1]\}$. According to Theorem 2.5, the two leading eigenvalues ± 1 of Π rule out the possibility that the invariant polytope algorithm terminates. However, choosing the leading eigenvectors $v_1 = [1 \ 0]^T$ and $v_2 = \frac{1}{2}[0 \ 1]^T$ of Π to form the set $V = \{v_1, v_2\}$, the $(\mathcal{A}, \mathbf{G})$ -tree \mathbf{T}_1 consisting of the root and the leaves $\{A_1\}$ and $\{A_2\}$ is V -closed since

$$A_1 v_1 = v_1, \quad A_1 v_2 = -v_2, \quad A_2 v_1 = v_2, \quad A_2 v_2 = v_1/2$$

all lie in $\text{co}_s(V)$. This confirms the claim $\text{JSR}(\mathcal{A}) = 1$. However, \mathbf{T}_1 is not a strongly V -closed tree because $A_1 v_1$, $A_1 v_2$, and $A_2 v_1$ all lie on the boundary of $\text{co}_s(V)$. An alternative tree \mathbf{T}_γ , with the set $V = \{v_1, v_2\}$ consisting of the leading eigenvectors $v_1 = [1 \ 0]^T$ and $v_2 = \frac{3}{4}[0 \ 1]^T$, is shown in Figure 2. It contains one uncovered leaf,

$$\mathcal{L} = \{A_2 A_1^n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1^n \\ 1/2 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\},$$

which has to be checked for closedness. For $L \in \mathcal{L}$, both $Lv_1 = \frac{1}{2}[0 \ 1]^T$ and $Lv_2 = \pm \frac{3}{4}[1 \ 0]^T$ lie in $\frac{3}{4}\text{co}_s(V)$. Hence, \mathbf{T}_γ is a strongly V -closed tree. \square

Unlike in the most simple example presented in the proof, single children and their descendants are typically countably infinite. But even then, ranges for the products Lv can be determined by numerical or analytical methods which are sufficiently tight to establish V -closedness. We will discuss this issue in the following section.

3. Algorithms

We envision two ways how to combine the tree and the invariant polytope algorithms:

3.1. Invariant polytope flavoured tree algorithm

We start by running an invariant polytope algorithm for a few steps. The so-far constructed norm is then already well adapted to the given task, meaning that the norms of the matrices A_j are close to 1. After that, we feed this norm into the tree algorithm.

3.2. Tree flavoured invariant polytope algorithm

Run an invariant polytope algorithm. Instead of always testing whether the J children of a vertex are mapped into the interior, we try to construct $(\mathcal{A}, \mathbf{G})$ -subtrees and check whether their leafage is 1-bounded.

We give a brief pseudo code implementation of this algorithm. The only difference to the original invariant polytope algorithm (see e.g. [Mej20, Section 4]) lies in the lines marked with (*). The original invariant polytope algorithm chooses in those lines as \mathbf{T} always the set $\{A_1, \dots, A_J\}$.

Algorithm 3.1 (Tree-flavoured-invariant-polytope-algorithm).

Given: s.m.p.-candidates Π_1, \dots, Π_M with $\rho(\Pi_m) = 1$, $m = 1 \dots, M$

Result upon Termination: Invariant polytope for \mathcal{A}

```

Select leading eigenvectors  $V := \{v_1, \dots, v_M\}$ 
Set  $V_{\text{new}} := V$ 
while  $V_{\text{new}} \neq \emptyset$ 
    Set  $V_{\text{rem}} := V_{\text{new}}$ 
    Set  $V_{\text{new}} := \emptyset$ 
    for  $v \in \mathcal{A}V_{\text{rem}}$  do
        Construct some  $\mathbf{T}$  satisfying Definition 2.1 (*)
        if  $Lv \notin \text{co}_s(V)$  for any  $L \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{T})$  then (*)
            Set  $V := V \cup v$ 
            Set  $V_{\text{new}} := V_{\text{new}} \cup v$ 
return  $\text{co}_s V$ 

```

3.3. Implementation details

Now, we are concerned with the task to check whether all points of a finitely expressible tree are mapped into a polytope. Instead of using matrix balls, as done in [MR14], we will make use of the pseudo spectral radius of matrices in the following.

Let $\text{co}_s P \subsetneq \mathbb{R}^s$ be a polytope, $w \in \mathbb{R}^s$ a vector, and $X, \Pi \in \mathbb{R}^{s \times s}$ some matrices. Furthermore, we presume that $X\Pi^\infty v \in P$, where Π^∞ denotes the set of accumulation

points of $\Pi^* = \{\Pi^n : n \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$. Our task is to check whether

$$X\Pi^*v \in \text{co}_s P. \quad (5)$$

Without loss of generality we can assume that $\rho(\Pi) = 1$ and that the algebraic and geometric multiplicities coincide for all of its leading eigenvalues.

In general the set Π^* has infinitely many limit points. Denote with Π° one of them and choose $L \in \mathbb{N}$. If Π^∞ is finite, then we can choose L equal to the number of accumulation points of Π^∞ .

We are going to estimate the difference $\|X(\Pi^n - \Pi^l \Pi^\circ)v\|$, $l = 0, \dots, L-1$, by splitting up v into the part which is in the subspace spanned by the leading eigenvectors of Π and the rest.

Denote with K the number of leading eigenvalues of Π . From the Kreiss Matrix Theorem [Kreiss62, Satz 4.1] and Theorem 1.3 it follows that there exists an invertible matrix V and a matrix Δ which is a diagonal matrix Λ^K with all entries equal to one in modulus for the first K entries, and an upper triangular matrix T for the remaining part, i.e.

$$\Pi = V\Delta V^{-1} \text{ with } \Delta = \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda^K & 0 \\ 0 & T \end{bmatrix}, \Lambda^K = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & & 0 \\ & \ddots & \\ 0 & & \lambda_K \end{bmatrix}. \quad (6)$$

Now, with $q^n := X\Pi^n v$ and $q^{l^\circ} := X\Pi^l \Pi^\circ v$,

$$q^n - q^{l^\circ} = XV\Delta^n V^{-1}v - XV\Delta^l \Delta^\circ V^{-1}v = XV(\Delta^n - \Delta^l \Delta^\circ)V^{-1}v. \quad (7)$$

We set $w = V^{-1}v$ and split up $w = w^K + w^R$ where w^K holds the first K entries of w and w^R the rest. The difference $\Delta^{n,l^\circ} = \Delta^n - \Delta^l \Delta^\circ$ takes the form

$$\Delta^{n,l^\circ} = \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda^n - \Lambda^l \Lambda^\circ & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & T^n \end{bmatrix} = \Delta^{n,l^\circ,K} + \Delta^{n,R},$$

where $\Delta^{n,l^\circ,K}$ contains the first K entries of the diagonal of Δ^{n,l° and $\Delta^{n,R}$ the rest, and T is the same matrix as in (6). Combining everything we get

$$\|q^n - q^{l^\circ}\| \leq \|XV\| \left(\|\Delta^{n,l^\circ,K}\| \cdot \|w^K\| + \|\Delta^{n,R}\| \cdot \|w^R\| \right).$$

It remains to estimate, for arbitrary $n \in \mathbb{N}$, (a) the norms of powers of the triangular matrix $\Delta^{n,R}$ whose entries on the main diagonal are all strictly less than one in modulus, and (b) the norms of $\Delta^{n,l^\circ,K}$.

We estimate (a) first. Let $\gamma < 1$ be the largest eigenvalue of T in modulus. By the Kreiss Matrix theorem there exist $M \geq 1$ and $1 > \gamma_M > \gamma$, such that

$$\|\Delta^{n,R}\| \leq M\gamma_M^n.$$

One way to compute M and γ_M is to use the pseudo spectral radius $\rho_{\varepsilon, \|\cdot\|}$ [1, Meng06].

For a given $\varepsilon > 0$ and matrix norm $\|\cdot\|$ the pseudo spectral radius $\rho_{\varepsilon, \|\cdot\|}$ is defined as

$$\rho_{\varepsilon, \|\cdot\|}(\Delta) = \sup \{ |z| : z \in \mathbb{C}, \|(zI - \Delta)^{-1}\| > \varepsilon^{-1} \}.$$

and it holds that $M = \varepsilon^{-1} \cdot \rho_{\varepsilon, \|\cdot\|}(\Delta)$ and $\gamma_M = \rho_{\varepsilon, \|\cdot\|}(\Delta)$. Because $\gamma_M < 1$ there exists $N_{\Delta^{n,R}} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\max_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|\Delta^{n,R}\| = \max_{1 \leq n \leq N_{\Delta^{n,R}}} \|\Delta^{n,R}\|.$$

We proceed with estimating (b). The norm $\|w^K\|$ typically is not small. But, we can make the norm $\|\Delta^{n,l_0,K}\|$ arbitrarily small by taking L large enough and finding the optimal index l . Computing this norm with respect to the polytope $\text{co}_s P$ may be prohibitively expensive, and thus we resort in the following to the 2-norm for its estimation. The polytope-norm can be bounded by the 2-norm up to a factor of C_P (see Lemma A.2 for details). In the 2-norm, for given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the above problem reduces to computing the minimum (and corresponding argument l) of

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \Delta^{n,l_0,K} \right\|_2 &= \min_{0 \leq l < L} \max_{1 \leq k \leq K} \left| \lambda_k^l \lambda^o - \lambda_k^n \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{C}^K \\ \|x\|_2=1}} \min_{0 \leq l < L} \max_{1 \leq k \leq K} \left| \lambda_k^l - x \right| =: e_\Delta. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, for any given $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists L_ε such that $e_\Delta < \varepsilon$. Putting everything together, for arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$ and any $n, l \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|q^n\| &\leq \|q^n - q^{l_0}\| + \|q^{l_0}\| \\ &\leq \|XV\| \left(C_P \varepsilon \|w^K\| + \max_{1 \leq n \leq N_{\Delta^{n,R}}} \|\Delta^{n,R}\| \cdot \|w^R\| \right) + \max_{0 \leq l < L_\varepsilon} \|q^{l_0}\|, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where the right hand side does not depend on n and l any more.

Remark 3.2. If Π^∞ is finite, i.e. all leading eigenvalues of Π are roots of unity, we can choose $\varepsilon = 0$, $L_\varepsilon = |\Pi^\infty|$, and Equation (8) simplifies to

$$\|q^n\| \leq \|XV\| \cdot \max_{1 \leq n \leq N_{\Delta^{n,R}}} \|\Delta^{n,R}\| \cdot \|w^R\| + \max_{0 \leq l < |\Pi^\infty|} \|q^{l_0}\|, \quad (9)$$

We show the applicability of the described method on an example.

Example 3.3. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2\}$, with

$$A_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{13}} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 & 2 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 2 & -2 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad A_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{13}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -2 & 2 \\ -2 & 2 & 1 \\ 2 & 1 & -2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The set \mathcal{A} has joint spectral radius $\text{JSR}(\mathcal{A}) = \rho(A_2) = 1$. The s.m.p. $\Pi = A_2$ has two leading eigenvalues ± 1 , and thus, the invariant polytope algorithm cannot termi-




Figure 3: Tree constructed by the tree-flavoured-invariant-polytope-algorithm for the problem considered in Example 3.3. Dots (\bullet) mark the vertices of the polytope P ; Empty bullets (\circ) mark vertices which are mapped into $\text{co}_s P$; Squares (\square) mark covered nodes. Note that the starting vector v_0 use to construct the polytope P is an eigenvector of A_2 , and thus the node $\{A_2^n v_0\}$ only consists of one vector;

nate [GP13, Theorem 4]. Let $v_0 = [3 + \sqrt{13} \quad -4 - \sqrt{13} \quad 1]^T$ be the leading eigenvector corresponding to $+1$. We show that the tree-flavoured-invariant-polytope-algorithm terminates with the polytope $P = \text{co}_s\{v_0, A_1 v_0, A_1 A_1 v_0, A_2 A_1 v_0, A_1 A_2 A_1 v_0, A_2 A_2 A_1 v_0\}$, and whose corresponding finitely expressible tree can be seen in Figure 3.

With the notation from Remark 3.2, for $M_0 = 2$ we have that $\Pi^{M_0} = A_2^2$ has all eigenvalues equal to one. We choose $\Pi^\circ = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (A^2)^n$.

After constructing the polytope P consisting of the vertices in the dashed box ($P = \text{co}_s\{v_0, A_1 v_0, A_1 A_1 v_0, A_2 A_1 v_0, A_1 A_2 A_1 v_0, A_2 A_2 A_1 v_0\}$), the vertices denoted with \star ($\{A_1 A_1^2 v_0, A_2 A_1^2 v_0, A_1 A_1 A_2 A_1 v_0, A_2 A_1 A_2 A_1 v_0\}$) are all contained inside of P , as can be easily checked by hand.

It remains to show that the vertices denoted with \bullet ($q_0^n = A^1 A_2^{2n} A_2^2 A_1 v_0, q_1^n = A^1 A^2 A_2^{2n} A_2^2 A_1 v_0$) are contained in P for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. We do not need to check the vertex denoted with \circ ($A_2 A_2^{2n} A_2^2 A_1 v_0$) since this is a covered vertex. Denote for $m \in \{0, 1\}$ the limit points of q_0^n and q_1^n by $p_m = A^1 \Pi^m \Pi^{\circ 2} A_2^2 A_1 v_0$. It is easy to check that p_0 and p_1 are contained in $\text{co}_s P$, in particular

$$\max_{m \in \{0, 1\}} \|p_m\|_{\text{co}_s P} = \max \{\|p_0\|_{\text{co}_s P}, \|p_1\|_{\text{co}_s P}\} \simeq \max \{0.9714, 0.9819\} \simeq 0.9819.$$

The matrix A_2^2 has the Schur form

$$A_2^2 = V D^2 V^{-1}, \quad D^2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & \\ & 1 & \\ & & \frac{1}{13} \end{bmatrix}, \quad V = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 3 + \sqrt{13} & 3 - \sqrt{13} \\ 1 & -4 - \sqrt{13} & -4 + \sqrt{13} \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

<i>dimension</i>	4	6	8	10	12	14
<i>ratio of vertices</i>	0.6	0.30	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1
<i>ratio of computation time</i>	1	3.6	2.5	3.0	0.9	0.4

Figure 4: Comparison between the original invariant polytope algorithm, and the algorithm described in Remark 3.4. For each dimension 20 tests were done. First row: Ratio of number of vertices of computed polytope (values smaller than one mean, the new algorithm produces polytopes with less vertices). Second row: Ratio between the computation times (values smaller than one mean, the new algorithm is faster). One can see, that the new algorithm produces consistently smaller polytopes, but the introduced overhead does not pay off for small matrices.

and we set $\Delta^n = D^{2n} - D^{o2} = \text{diag} \left(\left[0 \quad 0 \quad \frac{1}{13^n} \right] \right)$. Due to simple form of Δ we immediately obtain $\max_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \|\Delta^n\|_{\text{cos } P} \leq \|\Delta\|_{\text{cos } P} \simeq 0.0006085$, in the general case we need to resort to the computation of the pseudo spectral radius of Δ . It remains to compute w^R ,

$$V^{-1}A_2A_1v_0 = w^1 + w^R \implies w^R = \frac{1}{507} [0 \quad 0 \quad -78 + 23 \cdot \sqrt{13}]^T.$$

Eventually, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|q^n\| &\leq \|AV\| \cdot \max_n \|\Delta^n\| \cdot \|w^R\| + \max_{m \in \{0, 1\}} \|p^m\| \\ &\leq 7.300 \cdot 0.0006085 \cdot 0.01299 + 0.9819 \leq 0.9820 \end{aligned}$$

which proves the claim.

Remark 3.4. The function `ipa` contained in [Mej20] does not implement yet the “tree flavoured“-modification, but a simpler version of it is implemented; It tries finite subtrees in the lines marked with (*). This already decreases the computational time for some matrices of high dimensions significantly, see Figure 4.

4. Conclusion

We designed two similar new algorithms for computing the JSR of a finite set of matrices, both being a combination of the tree algorithm and the invariant polytope algorithms. Which of the two has better performance, and which of the two needs weaker conditions for termination is to be investigated.

Acknowledgments

The first author is sponsored by the Austrian Science Fund FWF, grant number P3335221.

A. Upper and lower bounds of the polytope norm

Unfortunately and as already noted, the estimate of $\Delta^{n,l_0,K}$, as well as the computation of the pseudo spectral radius in the polytope norm, is prohibitively expensive. Thus we have to resort to other norms in some cases.

Lemma A.1. *Let $V, W \subsetneq \mathbb{R}^s$ be finite sets of vertices, and $\|\cdot\|_V, \|\cdot\|_W$ the corresponding polytope norms with unit balls $\text{co}_s V, \text{co}_s W \subsetneq \mathbb{R}^s$. It holds that*

$$\|x\|_W \leq \max_{v \in V} \|v\|_W \cdot \|x\|_V.$$

In particular for the 1-norm,

$$\min_{v \in V} \|v\|_1^{-1} \cdot \|x\|_1 \leq \|x\|_V \leq \max_{i=1,\dots,s} \|e_i\|_V \cdot \|x\|_1.$$

Proof. This follows from the fact, that both norm's unit balls are polytopes, and thus, we only need to compute the norms of one polytope's vertices in the other polytope's norm. \square

Lemma A.2. *Let $V = \{v_n \in \mathbb{R}^s : n = 1, \dots, N\}$ be a set of vertices and $x \in \mathbb{R}^s$. It holds that*

$$r_s \|x\|_2 \leq \|x\|_{\text{co}_s V} \leq R_s \|x\|_2, \quad (10)$$

where r and R are defined as

$$R_s^{-1} = \max_{v \in V} \|v\|_2,$$

$$r_s^{-2} = \begin{cases} \text{minimize } \|p\|_2^2, & p \in \mathbb{R}^s, \text{ subject to} \\ p = \sum_{v \in V} a_v v, \\ \sum_{v \in V} |a_v| \leq 1 \end{cases}.$$

In particular, for $A \in \mathbb{R}^{s \times s}$,

$$\frac{r_s}{R_s} \|A\|_2 \leq \|A\|_{\text{co}_s P} \leq \frac{R_s}{r_s} \|A\|_2 \quad (11)$$

B. Generalization to the complex case

In general, the leading eigenvalues may be complex. In this case, one has to replace the symmetric convex hull co_s with the elliptic convex hull, see Definition B.1 and Figure 5. Also the estimates about the pseudo spectral radius in Section 3.2 change. For the remaining details see [MP22].




Figure 5: Symmetric and elliptic convex hull. $v_1 = [\frac{1}{2}]$, $v_2 = [\frac{2}{1}]$, $v_3 = [\frac{2}{i}]$, $v_4 = [\frac{i}{2}]$,

Definition B.1. For $v = a + ib \in \mathbb{C}^s$ we define its corresponding ellipse $E(v) = E(a, b)$ as the set of points $\{a \cos t + b \sin t : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$. For finite $V \subsetneq \mathbb{C}^s$, we define the *elliptic convex hull* of V by

$$\text{co}_e V = \text{co} \{E(v) : v \in V\}. \quad (12)$$

Lemma B.2. Let $V = \{v_n \in \mathbb{C}^s : n = 1, \dots, N\}$ be a set of vertices and $x \in \mathbb{C}^s$. It holds that

$$r_e \|x\|_2 \leq \|x\|_{\text{co}_e P} \leq R_e \|x\|_2,$$

where r_e and R_e are defined as

$$R_e^{-1} = \max_{v \in \Re V} \|v\|_2 + \max_{v \in \Im V} \|v\|_2$$

$$r_e^{-2} = \begin{cases} \text{minimize } 2 \|p\|_2^2, p \in \mathbb{R}^s, \text{ subject to} \\ \sum_{v \in \Re V \cup \Im V} a_v v = p, \\ \sum_{v \in \Re V \cup \Im V} |a_v| \leq 1 \end{cases}.$$

In particular, for $A \in \mathbb{R}^{s \times s}$,

$$\frac{r_e}{R_e} \|A\|_2 \leq \|A\|_{\text{co}_e P} \leq \frac{R_e}{r_e} \|A\|_2$$

Proof. This follows from Lemma A.2 and the fact that

$$\frac{1}{2} \|x\|_{\text{co}_s \Re V \cup \Im V} \leq \|x\|_{\text{co}_e V} \leq \|x\|_{\text{co}_s \Re V \cup \Im V}$$

□

References

- [AJPR11] Ali Ahmadi, Raphael Jungers, Paolo A. Parrilo and Mardavij Roozbehani, *Joint spectral radius and F-complete graph Lyapunov functions*, SIAM J. Control Optim. 52 (2011) 1, 687–717, doi: 10.1137/110855272.

- [BM02] Thierry Bousch, Jean Mairesse, *Asymptotic height optimization for topical IFS, Tetris heaps, and the finiteness conjecture*, J. Amer. Math. Soc., 15 (2002), 77–111, doi: 10.1090/S0894-0347-01-00378-2.
- [BTV03] Vincent D. Blondel, Jacques Theys, Alexander A. Vladimirov, 2003. *An elementary counterexample to the finiteness conjecture*, SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl., 24 (2003), 963–970, doi: 10.1137/S0895479801397846.
- [BW92] Marc A. Berger, Wang Yang, *Bounded semigroups of matrices*, Linear Alg. Appl., 166 (1992), 21–27, doi: 10.1016/0024-3795(92)90267-E.
- [CCGZ10] Antonio Cicone, Nicola Guglielmi, Stefano Serra-Capizzano, Marino Zennaro, *Finiteness property of pairs of 2×2 sign-matrices via real extremal polytope norm*, Linear Algebra Appl., 432 (2010) 01, 796–816, doi: 10.1016/j.laa.2009.09.022.
- [DL92] Ingrid Daubechies, Jeffrey C. Lagarias, *Two-scale difference equations. ii. local regularity, infinite products of matrices and fractals*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 23 (1992) 4, 1031–1079, doi: 10.1137/0523059.
- [MOS01] Bruce E. Moision, Alon Orlicsky, Paul H. Siegel, *On codes that avoid specified differences*, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, 47 (2001), doi: 10.1109/18.904557.
- [Gur95] Leonid Gurvits, *Stability of discrete linear inclusion*, Linear Alg. Appl., 231 (1995), doi: 10.1016/0024-3795(95)90006-3.
- [Prot00] Vladimir Yu. Protasov, *Asymptotic behaviour of the partition function*, Sb. Math., 191 (2000) 3–4, doi: 0.1070/SM2000v191n03ABEH000464.
- [GO11] Nicola Guglielmi, Michael L. Overton, *Fast algorithm for the approximation of the pseudospectral abscissa and pseudospectral radius*, SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl., 32 (2001) 4, doi: 10.1137/100817048.
- [1] Nicola Guglielmi, Michael L. Overton, *Fast Algorithms for Approximating the Pseudospectral Abscissa and Pseudospectral Radius* cs.nyu.edu/~overton/software/psapsr/, 2022-02-23.
- [GP13] Nicola Guglielmi, Vladimir Yu. Protasov, *Exact computation of joint spectral characteristics of linear operators*, Found. Comput. Math., 13 (2013) 1, 37–39, doi: 10.1007/s10208-012-9121-0.
- [GP16] Nicola Guglielmi, Vladimir Yu. Protasov, *Invariant polytopes of sets of matrices with applications to regularity of wavelets and subdivisions*, SIAM J. Matr. Anal. Appl., 37 (2016) 1, 18–52, doi: 10.1137/15M1006945.
- [GWZ05] Nicola Guglielmi, Fabian Wirth, Marino Zennaro, *Complex polytope extremality results for families of matrices*, SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl., 27 (2005), 721–743, doi: 10.1137/040606818.
- [GZ07] Nicola Guglielmi, Marino Zennaro, *Balanced complex polytopes and related vector and matrix norms*, J. Convex Anal., 14 (2007), 729–766.
- [GZ08] Nicola Guglielmi, Marino Zennaro, *An algorithm for finding extremal polytope norms of matrix families*, Lin. Alg. Appl., 428 (2008) 10, 2265–2282, doi: 10.1016/j.laa.2007.07.009.
- [GZ09] Nicola Guglielmi, Marino Zennaro, *Finding extremal complex polytope norms for families of real matrices*, SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl., 31 (2009) 2, 602–620, doi: 10.1137/080715718.

- [HMST11] Kevin G. Hare, Ian D. Morris, Nikita Sidorov, Jacques Theys, *An explicit counterexample to the Lagarias–Wang finiteness conjecture*, *Adv. Math.*, 226 (2011) 6, 4667–4701, doi: 10.1016/j.aim.2010.12.012.
- [Jung09] Raphael Jungers, *The joint spectral radius. Theory and applications*, Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences (2009), Springer, ISBN: 978-3-540-95980-9.
- [Kreiss62] Heinz-Otto Kreiss, *Über die Stabilitätsdefinition für Differenzgleichungen die partielle Differentialgleichungen approximieren*, *Nord. Tidskr. Inf.*, 2 (1962) 3, 153–181, doi: 10.1007/BF01957330.
- [Meng06] Emre Mengi, *Measures for Robust Stability and Controllability*, Dissertation, New York University, 2006.
- [2] Emre Mengi, *Software for Robust Stability and Controllability*, home.ku.edu.tr/~emengi/software/robuststability.html, 2022-02-23.
- [LW95] Jeffrey C. Lagarias, Yang Wang, *The finiteness conjecture for the generalized spectral radius of a set of matrices*, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 214 (1995).
- [Mej20] Thomas Mejstrik, *Improved invariant polytope algorithm and applications*, *ACM Trans. Math. Softw.*, 46 (2020) 3 (29), 1–26, doi: 10.1145/3408891.
- [3] Thomas Mejstrik, *t-toolboxes for Matlab*, Gitlab, (2018), gitlab.com/tommsch/ttoolboxes, 2022-02-23.
- [Mö15] Claudia Möller, *A New Strategy for Exact Determination of the Joint Spectral Radius*, PhD thesis, TU Darmstadt, 2015.
- [MP22] Thomas Mejstrik, Vladimir Yu. Protasov, *Elliptic polytopes and Lyapunov norms of linear operators*, arXiv: 2107.02610.
- [MR14] Claudia Möller, Ulrich Reif, *A tree-based approach to joint spectral radius determination*, *Linear Alg. Appl.*, 463 (2014), 154–170.
- [PJ08] Pablo A. Parrilo, Ali Jadbabaie, *Approximation of the joint spectral radius using sum of squares*, *Linear Alg. Appl.*, 428 (2008), 2385–2402, doi: 10.1016/j.laa.2007.12.027.
- [RS60] Gian-Carlo Rota, Gilbert Strang, *A note on the joint spectral radius*, *Kon. Nederl. Acad. Wet. Proc.* 63 (60).
- [4] Thomas G. Wright, *EigTool*, 2002 comlab.ox.ac.uk/pseudospectra/eigtool/, 2022-02-23.