

## EIGENVALUE CONDITION NUMBERS AND A FORMULA OF BURKE, LEWIS AND OVERTON\*

MICHAEL KAROW†

**Abstract.** In a paper by Burke, Lewis and Overton, a first order expansion has been given for the minimum singular value of  $A - zI$ ,  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ , about a nonderogatory eigenvalue  $\lambda$  of  $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ . This note investigates the relationship of the expansion with the Jordan canonical form of  $A$ . Furthermore, formulas for the condition number of eigenvalues are derived from the expansion.

**Key words.** Eigenvalue condition numbers, Jordan canonical form, Singular values.

**AMS subject classifications.** 15A18, 65F35.

**1. Introduction.** By  $\pi_\Sigma(A)$  we denote the product of the nonzero singular values of the matrix  $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$ , counting multiplicities. For the zero matrix  $0 \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$  we set  $\pi_\Sigma(0) = 1$ . If  $A$  is square then  $\Lambda(A)$  denotes the spectrum and  $\pi_\Lambda(A)$  stands for the product of the nonzero eigenvalues, counting multiplicities. If all eigenvalues of  $A$  are zero then we set  $\pi_\Lambda(A) = 1$ . The subject of this note is the ratio

$$q(A, \lambda) := \frac{\pi_\Sigma(A - \lambda I_n)}{|\pi_\Lambda(A - \lambda I_n)|}, \quad \lambda \in \Lambda(A).$$

In [1] the following first order expansion has been given for the function

$$z \mapsto \sigma_{\min}(A - zI_n), \quad z \in \mathbb{C},$$

where  $\sigma_{\min}(\cdot)$  denotes the minimum singular value and  $I_n$  is the  $n \times n$  identity matrix.

**THEOREM 1.1.** *Let  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  be a nonderogatory eigenvalue of algebraic multiplicity  $m$  of the matrix  $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ . Then*

$$\sigma_{\min}(A - zI_n) = \frac{|z - \lambda|^m}{q(A, \lambda)} + \mathcal{O}(|z - \lambda|^{m+1}), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}.$$

The relevance of this result for the perturbation theory of eigenvalues is as follows. The closed  $\epsilon$ -pseudospectrum of  $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  with respect to the spectral norm,  $\|\cdot\|$ , is defined by

$$\Lambda_\epsilon(A) = \{ z \in \mathbb{C} \mid z \in \Lambda(A + \Delta), \Delta \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}, \|\Delta\| \leq \epsilon \}.$$

In words,  $\Lambda_\epsilon(A)$  is the set of all eigenvalues of all matrices of the form  $A + \Delta$  where the spectral norm of the perturbation  $\Delta$  is bounded by  $\epsilon > 0$ . It is well known [10] that

$$\Lambda_\epsilon(A) = \{ z \in \mathbb{C} \mid \sigma_{\min}(A - zI) \leq \epsilon \}.$$

---

\*Received by the editors 11 January 2006. Accepted for publication 25 April 2006. Handling Editor: Michael Neumann.

† Berlin University of Technology, Institute for Mathematics, Straße des 17.Juni 136, D-10623 Berlin, Germany (karow@math.TU-Berlin.de).

Theorem 1.1 yields an estimate for the size of pseudospectra for small  $\epsilon$ : Roughly speaking if  $\epsilon$  is small enough then the connected component of  $\Lambda_\epsilon(A)$  that contains the eigenvalue  $\lambda$  is approximately a disk of radius  $(q(A, \lambda)\epsilon)^{1/m}$  about  $\lambda$ . It follows that  $q(A, \lambda)^{1/m}$  is the Hölder condition number of  $\lambda$ . We discuss this in detail in Section 4.

However, the main concern of this note is to establish the relationship of  $q(A, \lambda)$  with the Jordan decomposition of  $A$ . For a simple eigenvalue the relationship is as follows. Let  $x, y \in \mathbb{C}^n \setminus \{0\}$  be a right and a left eigenvector of  $A$  to the eigenvalue  $\lambda$  respectively, i.e.  $Ax = \lambda x$ ,  $y^*A = \lambda y^*$ , where  $y^*$  denotes the conjugate transpose of  $y$ . Then

$$P = (y^*x)^{-1}xy^* \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$$

is a projection onto the one dimensional eigenspace  $\mathbb{C}x$ . The kernel of  $P$  is the direct sum of all generalized eigenspaces belonging to the eigenvalues different from  $\lambda$ . As is well known [5, p.490],[3, p.202],[9, p.186], the condition number of  $\lambda$  equals the norm of  $P$ . Combined with the considerations above this yields that

$$q(A, \lambda) = \|P\|. \tag{1.1}$$

In Section 3 we give an elementary proof of the identity (1.1) without using Theorem 1.1. Furthermore, we show that for a nondegeneratory eigenvalue of algebraic multiplicity  $m \geq 2$ ,

$$q(A, \lambda) = \|N^{m-1}\|, \tag{1.2}$$

where  $N$  is the nilpotent operator associated with  $\lambda$  in the Jordan decomposition of  $A$ . The formulas (1.1) and (1.2) are the main results of this note. The proofs also show that the assumption that  $\lambda$  is nondegeneratory is necessary.

The next section contains some preliminaries about the computation of the two products  $\pi_\Sigma(A)$  and  $\pi_\Lambda(A)$  and about the relationship of the Schur form of  $A$  with the Jordan decomposition.

Throughout this note,  $\|\cdot\|$  stands for the spectral norm.

**2. Preliminaries.** Below we list some easily verified properties of  $\pi_\Lambda(A)$ , the product of the nonzero eigenvalues of  $A$ , and of  $\pi_\Sigma(A)$ , the product of the nonzero singular values of  $A$ . In the sequel  $A^T$  and  $A^*$  denote the transpose and the conjugate transpose of  $A$  respectively.

- (a) If  $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  is nonsingular then  $\pi_\Lambda(A) = \det(A)$ .
- (b) For any  $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  :  $\pi_\Lambda(A^T) = \pi_\Lambda(A)$  and  $\pi_\Lambda(A^*) = \overline{\pi_\Lambda(A)}$ .
- (c) Let  $S \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  be nonsingular. Then for any  $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ ,  $\pi_\Lambda(SAS^{-1}) = \pi_\Lambda(A)$ .
- (d) Let  $A_{11} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ ,  $A_{22} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$  and  $A_{12} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$ . Then

$$\pi_\Lambda \left( \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ 0 & A_{22} \end{bmatrix} \right) = \pi_\Lambda(A_{11}) \pi_\Lambda(A_{22}).$$

- (e) For any  $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$ ,  $\pi_\Sigma(A)^2 = \pi_\Lambda(A^*A) = \pi_\Lambda(AA^*)$ .

- (f) If  $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  is nonsingular then  $\pi_\Sigma(A) = |\det(A)| = |\pi_\Lambda(A)|$ .  
 (g) Let  $U \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  and  $V \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$  be unitary. Then for any  $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$ ,  
 $\pi_\Sigma(UAV) = \pi_\Sigma(A)$ .

In the next section we need the lemmas below.

LEMMA 2.1. Let  $M \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  be nonsingular,  $X \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$  and  $Y = XM^{-1}$ . Then

$$\pi_\Sigma \left( \begin{bmatrix} M \\ X \end{bmatrix} \right) = \pi_\Sigma(M) \sqrt{\det(I_n + Y^*Y)}.$$

*Proof.* We have

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_\Sigma \left( \begin{bmatrix} M \\ X \end{bmatrix} \right)^2 &= \pi_\Lambda \left( \begin{bmatrix} M^* & X^* \\ & \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} M \\ X \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &= \det(M^*M + X^*X) \\ &= \det(M^*(I_n + Y^*Y)M) \\ &= \det(M^*) \det(M) \det(I_n + Y^*Y) \\ &= \pi_\Sigma(M)^2 \det(I_n + Y^*Y). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

LEMMA 2.2. Let  $Y \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ . Then  $\|I_n + Y^*Y\| = \|I_m + YY^*\|$  and  $\det(I_n + Y^*Y) = \det(I_m + YY^*)$ .

*Proof.* The case  $Y = 0$  is trivial. Let  $Y \neq 0$ . The matrices  $Y$  and  $Y^*$  have the same nonzero singular values  $\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \dots \geq \sigma_p > 0$  say. The eigenvalues different from 1 of both  $I_n + Y^*Y$  and  $I_m + YY^*$  are  $1 + \sigma_1^2 \geq 1 + \sigma_2^2 \geq \dots \geq 1 + \sigma_p^2$ . Thus  $\|I_n + Y^*Y\| = \|I_m + YY^*\| = 1 + \sigma_1^2$  and  $\det(I_n + Y^*Y) = \det(I_m + YY^*) = \prod_{k=1}^p (1 + \sigma_k^2)$ .  $\square$

We proceed with remarks on the Jordan decomposition. Let  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\kappa$  be the pairwise different eigenvalues of  $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ . Let  $\mathcal{X}_j = \ker(A - \lambda_j I_n)^n$  be the generalized eigenspaces. By the Jordan decomposition theorem we have

$$A = \sum_{j=1}^{\kappa} (\lambda_j P_j + N_j), \tag{2.1}$$

where  $P_1, \dots, P_\kappa \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  are the projectors of direct decomposition  $\mathbb{C}^n = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{\kappa} \mathcal{X}_j$ , i.e.

$$P_j^2 = P_j, \quad \text{range}(P_j) = \mathcal{X}_j, \quad \ker(P_j) = \bigoplus_{k=1, k \neq j}^{\kappa} \mathcal{X}_k,$$

and  $N_1, \dots, N_\kappa \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  are the nilpotent matrices  $N_j = (A - \lambda_j I_n)P_j$ . The eigenvalue  $\lambda_j$  is said to be

- semisimple (nondefective) if  $\mathcal{X}_j = \ker(A - \lambda_j I_n)$ ,
- simple if  $\dim \mathcal{X}_j = 1$ ,
- nonderogatory if  $\dim \ker(A - \lambda_j I_n) = 1$ .

In the following  $m$  denotes the algebraic multiplicity of  $\lambda_j$ . Note that if  $m \geq 2$  then  $\lambda_j$  is nonderogatory if and only if  $N_j^{m-1} \neq 0$ . We now recall how to obtain the operators  $P_j$  and  $N_j$  from a Schur form of  $A$ . We only consider the nontrivial case that  $A$  has at least two different eigenvalues. By the Schur decomposition theorem there exists a unitary matrix  $U \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  such that

$$U^*AU = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_j I_m + T & A_{12} \\ 0 & A_{22} \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $A_{12} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times (n-m)}$ ,  $A_{22} \in \mathbb{C}^{(n-m) \times (n-m)}$ ,  $\Lambda(A_{22}) = \Lambda(A) \setminus \{\lambda_j\}$  and  $T \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  is strictly upper triangular,

$$T = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & t_{12} & \dots & \dots & t_{1m} \\ & \ddots & t_{23} & & \vdots \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ & & & \ddots & t_{m-1,m} \\ & & & & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

If  $m = 1$  (i.e.  $\lambda_j$  is simple) then  $T$  is the  $1 \times 1$  zero matrix. Since the spectra of  $T$  and  $A_{22} - \lambda_j I_{n-m}$  are disjoint the Sylvester equation

$$R(A_{22} - \lambda_j I_{n-m}) - TR = A_{12}. \tag{2.2}$$

has a unique solution  $R \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times (n-m)}$ .

**PROPOSITION 2.3.** *With the notation above the projector onto the generalized eigenspace and the nilpotent operator associated with  $\lambda_j$  are given by*

$$P_j = U \begin{bmatrix} I_m & -R \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} U^*, \quad \text{and} \quad N_j = U \begin{bmatrix} T & -TR \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} U^*.$$

For any integer  $\ell \geq 1$  we have

$$N_j^\ell = U \begin{bmatrix} T^\ell & -T^\ell R \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} U^*. \tag{2.3}$$

The spectral norms of  $P_j$  and of  $N_j^\ell$  satisfy

$$\|P_j\| = \|I_m + RR^*\|^{1/2} \tag{2.4}$$

$$\|N_j^\ell\| = \|T^\ell(I_m + RR^*)(T^*)^\ell\|^{1/2}. \tag{2.5}$$

*Proof.* Let  $X_1 := U \begin{bmatrix} I_m \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$ ,  $X_2 := U \begin{bmatrix} R \\ I_{n-m} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times (n-m)}$ . Then obviously

$\mathbb{C}^n = \text{range}(X_1) \oplus \text{range}(X_2)$  and

$$AX_1 = X_1(\lambda_j I_m + T). \tag{2.6}$$

Furthermore, (2.2) yields that

$$A X_2 = X_2 A_{22}. \quad (2.7)$$

Hence,  $\text{range}(X_1)$  and  $\text{range}(X_2)$  are complementary invariant subspaces of  $A$ . The relations (2.6) and (2.7) imply that for any  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  and any integer  $\ell \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (A - \lambda I_n)^\ell X_1 &= X_1((\lambda_j - \lambda)I_m + T)^\ell, \\ (A - \lambda I_n)^\ell X_2 &= X_2(A_{22} - \lambda I_{n-m})^\ell. \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

Using this and the fact that  $\lambda_j \notin \Lambda(A_{22})$  it is easily verified that  $\text{range}(X_1) = \ker(A - \lambda_j I_n)^n$  and  $\text{range}(X_2) = \bigoplus_{k=1, k \neq j}^{\kappa} \ker(A - \lambda_k I_n)^n$ . The matrix

$$P_j = U \begin{bmatrix} I_m & -R \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} U^*, \quad (2.9)$$

satisfies  $P_j^2 = P_j$ ,  $P_j X_1 = X_1$  and  $P_j X_2 = 0$ . Hence,  $P_j$  is the Jordan projector onto the generalized eigenspace  $\ker(A - \lambda_j I_n)^n$ . For the associated nilpotent matrix  $N_j$  one obtains

$$N_j = (A - \lambda_j I_n)P_j = U \begin{bmatrix} T & -T R \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} U^*. \quad (2.10)$$

The formulas (2.3), (2.4) and (2.5) are immediate from (2.9) and (2.10).  $\square$

We give an expression for  $\|N_j^{m-1}\|$  which is a bit more explicit than formula (2.5). First note that if  $\lambda_j$  has algebraic multiplicity  $m \geq 2$  then

$$T^{m-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \dots & 0 & \tau \\ \vdots & & \vdots & 0 \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{where } \tau = \prod_{k=1}^{m-1} t_{k,k+1}.$$

Let  $e_m^T = [0 \dots 0 1]^T \in \mathbb{C}^m$  and  $r = e_m^T R$ . Then  $r$  is the lower row of  $R$ . Since the lower row of  $TR$  is zero it follows from the Sylvester equation (2.2) that

$$r = e_m^T A_{12}(A_{22} - \lambda_j I_m)^{-1}. \quad (2.11)$$

From (2.3) or (2.5) we obtain

PROPOSITION 2.4. *Suppose  $\lambda_j$  has algebraic multiplicity  $m \in \{2, \dots, n-1\}$ . Then*

$$\|N_j^{m-1}\| = |\tau| \sqrt{1 + \|r\|^2}.$$

**3. Main result.** We are now in a position to state and prove our main result on the ratio

$$q(A, \lambda_j) = \frac{\pi_\Sigma(A - \lambda_j I_n)}{|\pi_\Lambda(A - \lambda_j I_n)|}, \quad \lambda_j \in \Lambda(A). \quad (3.1)$$

**THEOREM 3.1.** *Let  $\lambda_j \in \mathbb{C}$  be an eigenvalue of  $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ . Let  $P_j$  and  $N_j$  be the eigenprojector and the nilpotent operator associated with  $\lambda_j$ . Then the following holds.*

- (a) *If  $\lambda_j$  is a semisimple eigenvalue then  $q(A, \lambda_j) = \pi_\Sigma(P_j)$ .*
- (b) *If  $\lambda_j$  is a simple eigenvalue then  $q(A, \lambda_j) = \|P_j\|$ .*
- (c) *If  $\lambda_j$  is a nonderogatory eigenvalue of algebraic multiplicity  $m \geq 2$  then*

$$q(A, \lambda_j) = \|N_j^{m-1}\|.$$

*Proof.* First, we treat the case that  $A$  has at least two different eigenvalues. In view of Proposition 2.3 and since the products  $\pi_\Sigma(A - \lambda_j I_n)$ ,  $\pi_\Lambda(A - \lambda_j I_n)$  are invariant under unitary similarity transformations we may assume that

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_j I_m + T & A_{12} \\ 0 & A_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad P_j = \begin{bmatrix} I_m & -R \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $\Lambda(A_{22}) = \Lambda(A) \setminus \{\lambda_j\}$ ,  $T \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$  is strictly upper triangular and  $R \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times (n-m)}$  is the solution of the Sylvester equation  $R(A_{22} - \lambda_j I_{n-m}) - TR = A_{12}$ .

(a). Suppose  $\lambda_j$  is semisimple. Then  $T = 0$  and  $R(A_{22} - \lambda_j I_{n-m}) = A_{12}$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} (A - \lambda_j I_n)^*(A - \lambda_j I_n) &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & (A_{22} - \lambda_j I_{n-m})^*(A_{22} - \lambda_j I_{n-m}) + A_{12}^* A_{12} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & (A_{22} - \lambda_j I_{n-m})^*(I_{n-m} + R^* R)(A_{22} - \lambda_j I_{n-m}) \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_\Sigma(A - \lambda_j I_n)^2 &= \pi_\Lambda((A - \lambda_j I_n)^*(A - \lambda_j I_n)) \\ &= \det((A_{22} - \lambda_j I_{n-m})^*(I_{n-m} + R^* R)(A_{22} - \lambda_j I_{n-m})) \quad (3.2) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= |\det(A_{22} - \lambda_j I_{n-m})|^2 \det(I_{n-m} + R^* R) \\ &= |\pi_\Lambda(A - \lambda_j I_n)|^2 \det(I_{n-m} + R^* R). \quad (3.3) \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore we have  $P_j P_j^* = \begin{bmatrix} I_m + R R^* & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$  and hence

$$\pi_\Sigma(P_j)^2 = \det(I_m + R R^*) = \det(I_{n-m} + R^* R). \quad (3.4)$$

The latter equation holds by Lemma 2.2. By combining (3.3) and (3.4) we obtain (a). (b). If  $m = 1$  then  $P_j$  has rank 1 and hence,  $\pi_\Sigma(P_j) = \|P_j\|$ . Thus (b) follows from (a).

(c) Suppose  $m \geq 2$  and  $\lambda_j$  is nonderogatory. Then  $T = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & \\ & D & & \\ & \vdots & & \\ & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ , where  $D \in \mathbb{C}^{(m-1) \times (m-1)}$  is upper triangular and nonsingular. In the following we write  $A_{12} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{A} \\ a \end{bmatrix}$ , where  $a$  is the lower row of  $A_{12}$ . Let  $r$  denote the lower row of  $R$ . By Formula (2.11) we have

$$r = a(A_{22} - \lambda_j I)^{-1}. \quad (3.5)$$

Let us determine  $\pi_\Sigma(A)$ . Since removing of a column of zeros and a permutation of rows does not change the nonzero singular values of a matrix we have

$$\pi_\Sigma(A - \lambda_j I_n) = \pi_\Sigma \left( \begin{bmatrix} 0 & D & & \tilde{A} \\ \vdots & & & \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & a \\ 0 & & A_{22} - \lambda_j I_{n-m} & \end{bmatrix} \right) = \pi_\Sigma \left( \begin{bmatrix} D & & \tilde{A} \\ 0 & A_{22} - \lambda_j I_{n-m} & \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & a \end{bmatrix} \right).$$

Lemma 2.1 yields

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_\Sigma \left( \begin{bmatrix} D & & \tilde{A} \\ 0 & A_{22} - \lambda_j I_{n-m} & \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & a \end{bmatrix} \right) &= \pi_\Sigma \left( \begin{bmatrix} D & \tilde{A} \\ 0 & A_{22} - \lambda_j I \end{bmatrix} \right) \sqrt{\det(1 + yy^*)} \\ &= |\det(D)\det(A_{22} - \lambda_j I)| \sqrt{1 + \|y\|^2} \\ &= |\pi_\Lambda(A - \lambda_j I)| |\det(D)| \sqrt{1 + \|y\|^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$y = [0 \dots 0 \ a] \begin{bmatrix} D & \tilde{A} \\ 0 & A_{22} - \lambda_j I \end{bmatrix}^{-1}.$$

From (3.5) it follows that  $y = [0 \dots 0 \ r]$  and hence,  $\|y\| = \|r\|$ . In summary,

$$\pi_\Sigma(A - \lambda_j I_n) = |\pi_\Lambda(A - \lambda_j I_n)| |\det(D)| \sqrt{1 + \|r\|^2}.$$

But  $|\det(D)| \sqrt{1 + \|r\|^2} = \|N_j^{m-1}\|$  by Proposition 2.4. Hence, (c) holds.

Finally, we treat the case that  $\lambda_1$  is the only eigenvalue of  $A$ . Let  $U^*AU = \lambda_1 I_n + T$  be a Schur decomposition. The eigenprojection is  $P_1 = I_n$  and the nilpotent operator is  $N_1 = A - \lambda_1 I_n = UTU^*$ . Since all eigenvalues of  $A - \lambda_1 I_n$  are zero we have  $\pi_\Lambda(A - \lambda_1 I_n) = 1$  by definition. If  $\lambda_1$  is semisimple then also  $\pi_\Sigma(A - \lambda_1 I_n) = \pi_\Sigma(0) = 1$ . Hence,  $q(A, \lambda_1) = 1 = \pi_\Sigma(P_1)$ . Suppose  $n \geq 2$  and  $\lambda_1$  is nonderogatory. Then

$$q(A, \lambda_1) = \pi_\Sigma(A - \lambda_1 I_n) = \pi_\Sigma(T) = |\det(D)| = \|T^{n-1}\| = \|N_1^{n-1}\|,$$

where  $T = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & \\ & D & & \\ & \vdots & & \\ & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ .  $\square$

**4. Condition numbers.** In this section we show that  $q(A, \lambda)^{1/m}$  equals the Hölder condition number of the nonderogatory eigenvalue  $\lambda$  of algebraic multiplicity  $m$ . To this end we introduce some additional notation. By  $\mathcal{D}_\lambda(r)$  we denote the closed disk of radius  $r > 0$  about  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ . If  $\lambda \in \Lambda(A)$ ,  $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ , then  $\mathcal{C}_\lambda(\epsilon)$  denotes the connected component of the  $\epsilon$ -pseudospectrum,  $\Lambda_\epsilon(A)$ , that contains  $\lambda$ . We define

$$R_\lambda^+(\epsilon) := \inf\{r > 0 \mid \mathcal{C}_\lambda(\epsilon) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_\lambda(r)\},$$

$$R_\lambda^-(\epsilon) := \sup\{r > 0 \mid \mathcal{D}_\lambda(r) \subseteq \mathcal{C}_\lambda(\epsilon)\}.$$

Then

$$\mathcal{D}_\lambda(R_\lambda^-(\epsilon)) \subseteq \mathcal{C}_\lambda(\epsilon) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_\lambda(R_\lambda^+(\epsilon)).$$

**THEOREM 4.1.** *Let  $\lambda \in \Lambda(A)$  be a nonderogatory eigenvalue of algebraic multiplicity  $m$ . Then*

$$R_\lambda^\pm(\epsilon) = q(A, \lambda)^{1/m} \epsilon^{1/m} + o(\epsilon^{1/m}). \quad (4.1)$$

The proof uses Theorem 1.1 and the lemma below.

**LEMMA 4.2.** *Let  $U \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$  be an open neighborhood of  $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}^n$ . Let  $f, g : U \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  be continuous functions. For  $\epsilon \geq 0$  let  $S_f(\epsilon)$  and  $S_g(\epsilon)$  denote the connected component containing  $z_0$  of the sublevel set  $\{z \in U \mid f(z) \leq \epsilon\}$  and  $\{z \in U \mid g(z) \leq \epsilon\}$  respectively. Assume that  $0 = g(z_0)$  is an isolated zero of  $g$ , and*

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow z_0} \frac{f(z)}{g(z)} = 1. \quad (4.2)$$

*Then there exists an  $\epsilon_0 > 0$  and functions  $h_\pm : [0, \epsilon_0] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  with  $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} h_\pm(\epsilon) = 1$  such that for all  $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]$ ,*

$$S_g(h_-(\epsilon)\epsilon) \subseteq S_f(\epsilon) \subseteq S_g(h_+(\epsilon)\epsilon). \quad (4.3)$$

We postpone the proof of the lemma to the end of this section.

*Proof of Theorem 4.1:* Let in Lemma 4.2,  $z_0 = \lambda$  and

$$f(z) = \sigma_{\min}(A - zI_n), \quad g(z) = \frac{|z - \lambda|^m}{q(A, \lambda)}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Then  $S_f(\epsilon) = \mathcal{C}_\lambda(\epsilon)$  and  $S_g(\epsilon) = \mathcal{D}_\lambda((q(A, \lambda)\epsilon)^{1/m})$ . Theorem 1.1 yields  $\lim_{z \rightarrow \lambda} \frac{f(z)}{g(z)} = 1$ . Hence, by the lemma there are functions  $h_\pm$  with  $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} h_\pm(\epsilon) = 1$  and

$$\mathcal{D}_\lambda((q(A, \lambda)h_-(\epsilon)\epsilon)^{1/m}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}_\lambda(\epsilon) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_\lambda((q(A, \lambda)h_+(\epsilon)\epsilon)^{1/m}).$$

This shows (4.1).  $\square$

Now, we give the definition for the Hölder condition number of an eigenvalue of arbitrary multiplicity (see [2]). For  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\tilde{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  we set

$$d_m(\tilde{A}, \lambda) := \min\{r \geq 0 \mid \mathcal{D}_\lambda(r) \text{ contains at least } m \text{ eigenvalues of } \tilde{A}\}.$$

If  $\lambda$  is an eigenvalue of  $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  of algebraic multiplicity  $m$  then the Hölder condition number of  $\lambda$  to the order  $\alpha > 0$  is defined by

$$\text{cond}_\alpha(A, \lambda) = \lim_{\epsilon \searrow 0} \sup_{\|\Delta\| \leq \epsilon} \frac{d_m(A + \Delta, \lambda)}{\|\Delta\|^\alpha}.$$

It is easily seen that  $0 \neq \text{cond}_\alpha(A, \lambda) \neq \infty$  for at most one order  $\alpha > 0$ .

**THEOREM 4.3.** *Let  $\lambda \in \Lambda(A)$  be a nonderogatory eigenvalue of multiplicity  $m$ . Then*

$$\text{cond}_{1/m}(A, \lambda) = q(A, \lambda)^{1/m} = \begin{cases} \|P\| & \text{if } m = 1, \\ \|N^{m-1}\|^{1/m} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (4.4)$$

where  $P \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  is the eigenprojector onto the generalized eigenspace  $\ker(A - \lambda I_n)^m$ , and  $N = (A - \lambda I_n)P$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\Delta \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  with  $\|\Delta\| \leq \epsilon$ . Then the continuity of eigenvalues yields, that for any  $t \in [0, 1]$  at least  $m$  eigenvalues of  $A + t\Delta$  are contained in  $\mathcal{C}_\lambda(\epsilon)$  counting multiplicities. Hence

$$d_m(A + \Delta, \lambda) \leq R_\lambda^+(\epsilon) = q(A, \lambda)^{1/m} \epsilon^{1/m} + o(\epsilon^{1/m}).$$

By letting  $\epsilon = \|\Delta\|$  we obtain that for all  $\Delta \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ ,

$$\frac{d_m(A + \Delta, \lambda)}{\|\Delta\|^{1/m}} \leq q(A, \lambda)^{1/m} + o(\|\Delta\|^{1/m}) \|\Delta\|^{-(1/m)}.$$

This yields

$$\text{cond}_{1/m}(A, \lambda) \leq q(A, \lambda)^{1/m}.$$

Let  $r > 0$  be such that  $\mathcal{D}_\lambda(r) \cap \Lambda(A) = \{\lambda\}$ . Then by the continuity of eigenvalues there is an  $\epsilon_0$  such that the following holds for all  $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$ ,

- (a)  $\mathcal{D}_\lambda(r) \cap \Lambda_\epsilon(A) = \mathcal{C}_\lambda(\epsilon)$ .
- (b) For any  $\Delta \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  with  $\|\Delta\| \leq \epsilon$ , the set  $\mathcal{C}_\lambda(\epsilon)$  contains precisely  $m$  eigenvalues of  $A + \Delta$  counting multiplicities.

Let  $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$  and let  $z_\epsilon \in \mathbb{C}$  be a boundary point of  $\mathcal{C}_\lambda(\epsilon)$ . Then  $\sigma_{\min}(A - z_\epsilon I_n) = \epsilon$ . Let  $\Delta_\epsilon = -\epsilon u v^*$ , where  $u, v \in \mathbb{C}^n$  is a pair of normalized left and right singular vectors of  $A - z_\epsilon I_n$  belonging to the minimum singular value, i.e.

$$(A - z_\epsilon I_n) v = \epsilon u, \quad u^*(A - z_\epsilon I_n) = \epsilon v^*, \quad \|u\| = \|v\| = 1.$$

Then  $\|\Delta_\epsilon\| = \epsilon$  and  $z_\epsilon \in \Lambda(A + \Delta_\epsilon)$  since  $(A + \Delta_\epsilon)v = z_\epsilon v$ . Thus, by (a) and (b),

$$\begin{aligned} d_m(A + \Delta_\epsilon, \lambda) &\geq |z_\epsilon - \lambda| \\ &\geq R_\lambda^-(\epsilon) \\ &= q(A, \lambda)^{1/m} \epsilon^{1/m} + o(\epsilon^{1/m}). \end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\frac{d_m(A + \Delta_\epsilon, \lambda)}{\|\Delta_\epsilon\|^{1/m}} \geq q(A, \lambda)^{1/m} + o(\epsilon^{1/m})\epsilon^{-(1/m)}.$$

Hence,  $\text{cond}_{1/m}(A, \lambda) \geq q(A, \lambda)^{1/m}$ .  $\square$

REMARK 4.4. In [7] (see also [2, 4]) the following generalization of Theorem 4.3 has been shown. Let  $\lambda$  be an *arbitrary* eigenvalue of  $A$ . If  $\lambda$  is semisimple then

$$\text{cond}_1(A, \lambda) = \|P\|.$$

If  $\lambda$  is not semisimple then

$$\text{cond}_{1/m}(A, \lambda) = \|N^{m-1}\|^{1/m},$$

where  $m$  denotes the index of nilpotency of  $N$ , i.e.  $N^m = 0$ ,  $N^{m-1} \neq 0$ .

*Proof of Lemma 4.2:* By  $B_r$  we denote the closed ball of radius  $r > 0$  about  $z_0$ . The condition that  $z_0$  is an isolated zero of  $g$  combined with (4.2) yields that  $z_0$  is also an isolated zero of  $f$ . Hence, there is an  $r_0 > 0$  such that  $f(z) > 0$  for all  $z \in B_{r_0} \setminus \{z_0\}$ . This implies that  $\epsilon_r := \min_{z \in \partial B_r} f(z) > 0$  for any  $r \in (0, r_0]$ . If  $\epsilon < \epsilon_r$  then  $\partial B_r$  does not intersect the sublevel sets  $\{z \in U \mid f(z) \leq \epsilon\}$ . Thus  $S_f(\epsilon)$  is contained in the interior of  $B_r$ . Note that  $S_f(\epsilon)$  being a connected component of a closed set is closed. It follows that  $S_f(\epsilon)$  is compact if  $\epsilon < \epsilon_{r_0}$ . Now, let

$$\phi_\pm(z) := \begin{cases} (1 \pm \|z - z_0\|) \frac{g(z)}{f(z)} & z \in B_{r_0} \setminus \{z_0\}, \\ 1, & z = z_0. \end{cases}$$

Condition (4.2) yields that the functions  $\phi_\pm : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are continuous. For  $\epsilon < \epsilon_{r_0}$  let

$$h_-(\epsilon) := \min_{z \in S_f(\epsilon)} \phi_-(z), \quad h_+(\epsilon) := \max_{z \in S_f(\epsilon)} \phi_+(z).$$

Then we have for all  $\epsilon < \epsilon_r$ ,

$$\min_{z \in B_r} \phi_\pm(z) \leq h_\pm(\epsilon) \leq \max_{z \in B_r} \phi_\pm(z).$$

As  $r$  tends to 0 the max and the min tend to  $\phi_\pm(z_0) = 1$ . This yields  $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} h_\pm(\epsilon) = 1$ . If  $z \in \partial S_f(\epsilon)$  then  $f(z) = \epsilon$  and  $g(z) > (1 - \|z - z_0\|) \frac{g(z)}{f(z)} f(z) \geq h_-(\epsilon)\epsilon$ . Thus  $\partial S_f(\epsilon)$  does not intersect  $E := \{z \in U \mid g(z) \leq h_-(\epsilon)\epsilon\}$ . Thus  $S_g(h_-(\epsilon)\epsilon)$  being a connected component of  $E$  is either contained in the interior of  $S_f(\epsilon)$  or in the complement of  $S_f(\epsilon)$ . The latter is impossible since  $z_0 \in S_f(\epsilon) \cap S_g(h_-(\epsilon)\epsilon)$ . Hence,  $S_g(h_-(\epsilon)\epsilon) \subset S_f(\epsilon)$ . This proves the first inclusion in (4.3). To prove the second suppose  $z_0 \neq z \in \partial S_g(h_+(\epsilon)\epsilon) \cap S_f(\epsilon)$ . Then  $g(z) = h_+(\epsilon)\epsilon$  and  $0 < f(z) \leq \epsilon$ . Hence  $g(z)/f(z) \geq h_+(\epsilon)$ , a contradiction. Thus  $S_f(\epsilon)$  is contained in the interior of  $S_g(h_+(\epsilon)\epsilon)$ .  $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] J. V. Burke, A. S. Lewis, and M. L. Overton. Optimization and pseudospectra, with applications to robust stability. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 25:80–104, 2003.
- [2] F. Chaitin-Chatelin, A. Harrabi, and A. Ilahi. About Hölder condition numbers and the stratification diagram for defective eigenvalues. *Math. Comput. Simul.*, 54(4-5):397–402, 2000.
- [3] G. H. Golub and C. F. Van Loan. *Matrix Computations*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1988.
- [4] A. Harrabi. *Pseudospectres d'Operateurs Intégraux et Différentiels: Application a la Physique Mathématique*. Thesis. Université des Sciences Sociales de Toulouse, May 1998.
- [5] D. Hinrichsen and A. J. Pritchard. *Mathematical Systems Theory I. Modelling, State Space Analysis, Stability and Robustness*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005.
- [6] R. A. Horn, and C. R. Johnson. *Matrix analysis*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1985.
- [7] M. Karow. *Geometry of spectral value sets*. Ph.D. thesis. University of Bremen, Germany, July 2003.
- [8] J. Moro, J. V. Burke, and M. L. Overton. On the Lidskii-Vishik-Lyusternik perturbation theory for eigenvalues of matrices with arbitrary Jordan structure. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 18(4):793–817, 1997.
- [9] G. W. Stewart and J. Sun. *Matrix Perturbation Theory*. Academic Press, San Diego, 1990.
- [10] L. N. Trefethen. Pseudospectra of linear operators. *SIAM Review*, 39:383–406, 1997.
- [11] L. N. Trefethen and M. Embree. *Spectra and Pseudospectra. The behavior of nonnormal matrices and operators*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2005.