

**The definite generalized eigenvalue problem:**

**A reworked perturbation theory**

Chi-Kwong Li

Department of Mathematics

College of William and Mary

Williamsburg, Virginia 23187-8795

Joint work with: Roy Mathias

## Notation and definitions

Let  $A$  and  $B$  be  $n \times n$  Hermitian matrices.

They form a definite pair if the Crawford number

$$c(A, B) = \min\{|x^*(A + iB)x| : x \in \mathbb{C}^n, x^*x = 1\} > 0.$$

If a real ordered pair  $(a, b)$  satisfies  $a^2 + b^2 = 1$  and

$$bAx = aBx \text{ for some nonzero } x \in \mathbb{C}^n,$$

then  $(a, b)$  is a *normalized generalized eigenvalue* of  $(A, B)$ .

**Remark**

If  $B = I$ , we have the usual eigenvalue problem.

If  $B$  is positive definite, we have  $bB^{-1}Ax = ax$ , which is essentially the usual eigenvalue problem.

**Proposition** For a definite pair  $(A, B)$  there exists an invertible matrix  $X$  such that

$$X^*(A + iB)X = \text{diag}(a_1 + ib_1, \dots, a_n + ib_n),$$

where  $(a_j, b_j)$  are normalized generalized eigenvalues of  $(A, B)$ .

## Some nice properties [Li and Mathias, 1998]

### Theorem [Uniqueness]

The normalized eigenvalues are unique up to ordering.

### Theorem [max-min characterization]

If  $C = A + iB$  and  $X^*CX = \text{diag}(e^{i\theta_1}, \dots, e^{i\theta_n})$  with  $\pi > \theta_1 \geq \dots \geq \theta_n > 0$  then for any  $1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_k \leq n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \theta_{j_1} + \dots + \theta_{j_k} \\ = & \sup_{\substack{V_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq V_k \\ \dim V_t = j_t}} \inf_{\substack{y_t \in W_t \\ \det(y_r^* y_s) > 0}} \sum_{t=1}^k \arg(y_t^* C y_t). \end{aligned}$$

**Theorem** [Interlacing inequalities]

Suppose  $C = A + iB$  and  $X^*CX = \text{diag}(e^{i\theta_1}, \dots, e^{i\theta_n})$  with  $\pi > \theta_1 \geq \dots \geq \theta_n > 0$ . If  $Z$  is  $n \times n - 1$  such that  $Z^*Z$  is invertible, and  $Z^*CZ = \text{diag}(e^{i\phi_1}, \dots, e^{i\phi_{n-1}})$  with  $\pi > \phi_1 \geq \dots \geq \phi_{n-1} > 0$ , then

$$\theta_1 \geq \phi_1 \geq \theta_2 \geq \dots \theta_{n-1} \geq \phi_{n-1} \geq \theta_n.$$

## Perturbation bounds

Let  $r(E + iF) = \max\{|x^*(E + iF)x| : x \in \mathbb{C}^n, x^*x = 1\}$

be the *numerical radius* of  $E + iF$ .

**Proposition** Let  $(A, B)$  be a definite pair, and  $(E, F)$  be a Hermitian pair so that

$$\varepsilon = r(E + iF)/c(A, B) < 1.$$

Then  $(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}) = (A, B) + (E, F)$  is a definite pair.

**Theorem** [Li and Mathias, 2004] Let  $(A, B)$  be a definite pair.

Then

$$c(A, B) = \inf\{r(E + iF) : (A + E, B + F) \text{ is indefinite}\}.$$

Suppose  $s_1(X) \geq \cdots \geq s_n(X)$  are the singular values of  $X$ . Denote by  $s(X) = (s_1(X), \dots, s_n(X))$ .

For  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n}$ ,  $x \prec_w y$  if the sum of the  $k$  largest entries of  $x$  is not larger than that of  $y$  for  $k = 1, \dots, n$ .

**Theorem** Let  $(A, B)$  be a definite pair, and  $(E, F)$  be a Hermitian pair so that  $\varepsilon = r(E + iF)/c(A, B) < 1$ .

The matrices  $A + iB$  and  $\tilde{A} + i\tilde{B}$  are  $*$ -congruent to

$$e^\phi \text{diag}(e^{i\theta_1}, \dots, e^{i\theta_n}) \quad \text{and} \quad e^\phi \text{diag}(e^{i\tilde{\theta}_1}, \dots, e^{i\tilde{\theta}_n})$$

such that  $\pi \geq \theta_1 \geq \cdots \geq \theta_n > 0$ ,  $\pi > \tilde{\theta}_1 \geq \cdots \geq \tilde{\theta}_n > 0$ ,

$$(|\tilde{\theta}_1 - \theta_1|, \dots, |\tilde{\theta}_n - \theta_n|) \prec_w \left(1 + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{1-\varepsilon}}\right) \frac{1}{c(A, B)} s([E|F]).$$

A symmetric norm (symmetric gauge function) on  $\mathbb{R}^{1 \times n}$  is an absolute norm satisfying  $\|x\| = \|xP\|$  for any permutation matrix  $P$ . Examples include  $\ell_p$  norms with  $p \in [1, \infty]$ .

Let  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n}$ . Then  $x \prec_w y$  if and only if  $\|x\| \leq \|y\|$  for all symmetric norms  $\|\cdot\|$ .

**Corollary** Continue to use the hypotheses and notation in the last theorem. For any symmetric norm  $\|\cdot\|$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,

$$\|(|\tilde{\theta}_1 - \theta_1|, \dots, |\tilde{\theta}_n - \theta_n|)\| \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{1-\varepsilon}}\right) \frac{1}{c(A,B)} \|s([E|F])\|.$$

## A new approach

**Proposition** Suppose  $(A, B)$  is a definite pair. There is an invertible  $X$  with unit columns such that

$$X^*(A + iB)X = \text{diag}(a_1 + ib_1, \dots, a_n + ib_n). \quad (1)$$

## Remarks

- (1) Note that  $(a_j, b_j)$  are generalized eigenvalue pairs, not necessarily normalized.
- (2) The pairs  $(a_j, b_j)$  are not determined uniquely. They will be if additional assumption is imposed on  $X$ .

For example, we may use any one of the following:

- (i)  $X$  is chosen so that  $(a_j, b_j) = (a_k, b_k)$  whenever

$$\arg(a_j + ib_j) = \arg(a_k + ib_k).$$

- (ii)  $\det(X^*X)$  is max (min) among all  $X$  satisfying (1).

## A new approach

Consider  $(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}) = (A, B) + (E, F)$ .

Suppose  $X$  has linearly independent unit columns and

$X^*(A + iB)X = \text{diag}(z_1, \dots, z_n)$  is diagonal, where

$z_j = d_j e^{i\theta_j}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, n$ , such that  $\pi > \theta_1 > \dots > \theta_n > 0$ .

We continue to assume  $r = r(E + iF) < c(A, B)$ .

Applying the mapping  $T \mapsto X^*TX$  to each matrix, we may and we will assume that  $(A, B)$  are diagonal matrices.

Note that  $\|E\|$  and  $\|F\|$  will be increased by a factor of  $n$ .

It still worths the price.

**Theorem** [Perturbation of normalized generalized eigenvalues]

Set  $u_j = \theta_j + \sin^{-1}(r/d_j)$  and  $l_j = \theta_j - \sin^{-1}(r/d_j)$ .

Rearrange the entries of  $(u_1, \dots, u_n)$  and  $(l_1, \dots, l_n)$  in descending order to get  $(\tilde{u}_1, \dots, \tilde{u}_n)$  and  $(\tilde{l}_1, \dots, \tilde{l}_n)$ .

Assume that  $(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B})$  has normalized generalized eigenvalues such that  $\pi > \tilde{\theta}_1 \geq \dots \geq \tilde{\theta}_n > 0$ . Then

$$\tilde{l}_j \leq \theta_j \leq \tilde{u}_j \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, n.$$

Consequently,

$$|\theta_j - \tilde{\theta}_j| \leq \sin^{-1}(r/d_{\min}) \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, n.$$

Other authors use  $c(A, B)$  instead of  $d_{\min}$

which may give much worse bounds.

For example, if  $A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $B = \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon & 0 \\ 0 & \varepsilon \end{pmatrix}$ ,

then  $d_{\min} = \sqrt{1 + \varepsilon^2}$  can be much larger than  $c(A, B) = \varepsilon$ .

So,  $\sin^{-1}(r/d_{\min})$  could be much smaller than  $\sin^{-1}(r/c(A, B))$

**Theorem** [A quadratic bound]

Suppose  $E = \begin{pmatrix} 0_m & R \\ R^* & 0_{n-m} \end{pmatrix}$  and  $F = \begin{pmatrix} 0_m & S \\ S^* & 0_{n-m} \end{pmatrix}$ .

For any  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , let

$$d = \min\{d_j : j = m + 1, \dots, n\} \quad \text{and}$$

$$\Delta_k = \min\{|d_j \sin(\theta_j - \tilde{\theta}_k)| : j = 1, \dots, m\}.$$

Assume that  $\Delta_k > 0$  and  $r^2/\Delta_k < c(A, B)$ . Then

$$|\theta_k - \tilde{\theta}_k| \leq \sin^{-1} (r^2/d\Delta_k).$$

## Eigenvector perturbation

**Theorem** Suppose  $v$  is a generalized eigenvector corresponding to a normalized generalized eigenvalue  $(\cos \tilde{\theta}, \sin \tilde{\theta})$  of  $(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B})$ .

Let

$$\tilde{\Delta} = \min\{|d_j \sin(\tilde{\theta} - \theta_k)| : j \neq k\}.$$

If  $r < \tilde{\Delta}$ , then there is  $j$  such that

$$\|v - e_j\| \leq r/[\tilde{\Delta} + r].$$

We have the result for the non-diagonal case.

**Theorem** Suppose  $A + iB$  is not in diagonal form, and  $X$  has linearly independent unit columns  $X^*(A + iB)X$  is in diagonal form. Suppose  $v$  is a generalized eigenvector corresponding to a normalized generalized eigenvalue  $(\cos \tilde{\theta}, \sin \tilde{\theta})$  of  $(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B})$ . Let

$$\tilde{\Delta} = \min\{|d_j \sin(\tilde{\theta} - \theta_k)| : j \neq k\}.$$

If  $\|X\|^2 r < \tilde{\Delta}$ , then there is  $j$  such that

$$\|v - X_j\| \leq \|X\|^2 r / [\tilde{\Delta} + \|X\|^2 r].$$

There are perturbation bounds on eigensubspace.

We omit their discussion because of its technicality.

### **Key message**

Our approach can give much stronger bounds.

### **Question**

Can one refine the results and get prettier theorems?

**Thank you for your attention!**