The Joint Essential Numerical Range of operators: Convexity and Related Results

Chi-Kwong Li *and Yiu-Tung Poon†

Abstract

Let $W(\mathbf{A})$ and $W_e(\mathbf{A})$ be the joint numerical range and the joint essential numerical range of an m-tuple of self-adjoint operators $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_m)$ acting on an infinite dimensional Hilbert space, respectively. In this paper, it is shown that $W_e(\mathbf{A})$ is always convex and admits many equivalent formulations. In particular, for any fixed $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, $W_e(\mathbf{A})$ can be obtained as the intersection of all sets of the form

$$\mathbf{cl}(W(A_1, \dots, A_{i+1}, A_i + F, A_{i+1}, \dots, A_m)),$$

where $F = F^*$ has finite rank Moreover, it is shown that the closure $\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$ of $W(\mathbf{A})$ is always star-shaped with the elements in $W_e(\mathbf{A})$ as star centers. Although $\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$ is usually not convex, an analog of the separation theorem is obtained, namely, for any element $\mathbf{d} \notin \mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$, there is a linear functional f such that $f(\mathbf{d}) > \sup\{f(\mathbf{a}) : \mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{cl}(W(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}))\}$, where $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ is obtained from $\mathbf{A}$ by perturbing one of the components A_i by a finite rank self-adjoint operator. Other results on $W(\mathbf{A})$ and $W_e(\mathbf{A})$ extending those on a single operator are obtained.

AMS Subject Classification 47A12, 47A13, 47A55.

Keywords Joint essential numerical range, self-adjoint operator, Hilbert space.

---

*Department of Mathematics, The College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia 23185, USA (ckli@math.wm.edu). Li is an honorary professor of the University of Hong Kong. His research was partially supported by an NSF grant and the William and Mary Plumeri Award

†Department of Mathematics, Iowa State University, Ames, IA (ytpoon@iastate.edu).

1 Introduction

Let $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ denote the algebra of bounded linear operators acting on a complex Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. The *numerical range* of $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is defined as

$$W(A) = \{\langle A\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}\rangle : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{H},\ \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}\rangle = 1\},$$

which is useful in studying operators; see [10, 11, 22, 24] and [25, Chapter 1]. Let $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ denote the set of self-adjoint operators in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Since every $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ admits a decomposition $A = A_1 + iA_2$ with $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$, we can identify $W(A)$ with

$$\{(\langle A_1\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}\rangle, \langle A_2\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}\rangle) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{H},\ \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}\rangle = 1\} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^2.$$

This leads to the *joint numerical range* of $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \ldots, A_m) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$,

$$W(\mathbf{A}) = \{(\langle A_1\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}\rangle, \cdots, \langle A_m\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}\rangle) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{H},\ \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}\rangle = 1\} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^m,$$

which has been studied by many researchers in order to understand the joint behavior of several operators $A_1, \ldots, A_m$. One may see [1, 5, 12, 14, 15, 16, 19, 23, 28, 31, 33, 35] and their references for the background and many applications of the joint numerical range.

Let $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$ be the sets of finite rank and compact operators in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. In the study of finite rank or compact perturbations of operators, researchers consider the *joint essential numerical range* of $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$ defined by

$$W_e(\mathbf{A}) = \cap\{\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{K})) : \mathbf{K} = (K_1, \ldots, K_m) \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})^m \cap \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m\}.$$

Here $\mathbf{cl}(S)$ denotes the closure of the set S. For $m = 2$, $W_e(\mathbf{A})$ can be identified with the *essential numerical range* of $A = A_1 + iA_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ defined by

$$W_e(A) = \cap\{\mathbf{cl}(W(A + K)) : K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})\}.$$

One may see [2, 3, 6, 7, 13, 18, 20, 21, 26, 27, 30, 32, 36, 37] for many interesting results on $W_e(A)$ and $W_e(\mathbf{A})$.

In theoretical study as well as applications, it is desirable to deal with $\mathbf{A}$ such that $W(\mathbf{A})$ or $\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$ is convex. For example, let $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \ldots, A_m)$. If $\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$ is convex, one can apply the separation theorem to show that $\mathbf{0} \notin \mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$ if and only if there exist $r > 0$ and $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \ldots, c_m) \in \mathbf{R}^m$ such that $(\sum_{i=1}^m c_iA_i) > rI_{\mathcal{H}}$. Unfortunately, $\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$ is not always convex. Here are some results concerning the convexity of $W(\mathbf{A})$ and $\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$, and related to $W_e(\mathbf{A})$; for example, see [5, 10, 11, 36, 21, 29, 31] and their references.

(P1) [31] $W(A_1, \ldots, A_m)$ is convex if

(a) span$\{I, A_1, \ldots, A_m\}$ has dimension at most 3, or

(b) $\dim \mathcal{H} \geq 3$ and span$\{I, A_1, \ldots, A_m\}$ has dimension at most 4.

(P2) [31] For any $A_1, A_2, A_3 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ such that span$\{I, A_1, A_2, A_3\}$ has dimension 4, there is always an $A_4 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ for which $W(A_1, \ldots, A_4)$ is not convex.

(P3) [31] If $m \geq 4$ then there exists $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$ such that $W(\mathbf{A})$ is non-convex.

(P4) For any positive integer m and any $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$, $W_e(\mathbf{A})$ is a compact set contained in $W(\mathbf{A})$. If span$\{I, A_1, \ldots, A_m\}$ has dimension at most 4, then $W_e(\mathbf{A})$ is convex.

(P5) [36] For $S \subseteq \mathbf{R}^m$, let Ext(S) be the set of all points in S that does not lie in the open line segment joining two distinct points in S. Then Ext $(\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))) \subseteq \text{Ext}(W(\mathbf{A})) \cup \text{Ext}(W_e(\mathbf{A}))$.

We remark that (P1)-(P3) also hold if we replace $W(\mathbf{A})$ by $\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$. In view of (P2) and (P3), if $m > 3$, then for $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$ and $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})^m \cap \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$ the set $\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}+\mathbf{K}))$ is usually non-convex. Since $W_e(\mathbf{A})$ is the intersection of non-convex sets, one does not expect the set $W_e(\mathbf{A})$ to be convex. This might be the reason why the convexity of $W_e(\mathbf{A})$ is seldom discussed for $m > 3$. In fact, some researchers have studied different geometrical properties of $W_e(\mathbf{A})$ under the assumption that $W_e(\mathbf{A})$ is convex, and some researchers studied $W_e(\mathbf{A})$ for different classes of operators without discussing their convexity; for example, see [6, 26, 27, 30, 32].

In this paper, we prove the rather unexpected result that $W_e(\mathbf{A})$ *is always convex*. Moreover, it is shown that the closure $\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$ of $W(\mathbf{A})$ is always star-shaped with the elements in $W_e(\mathbf{A})$ as star centers. Many results relating $W_e(\mathbf{A})$ and $W(\mathbf{A})$ are also obtained. Our paper is organized as follows.

In Section 2, we extend the results in [21] to establish several equivalent formulations of the essential joint numerical range for $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$. One key obstacle for such an extension is the fact that $W(\mathbf{A})$ may not be convex. To get around this problem, we show that $\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$ is star-shaped. The star-shapedness of $\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$ and the equivalent formulations of $W_e(\mathbf{A})$ in Section 2 lead to our main result that $W_e(\mathbf{A})$ is convex and its elements are star centers of the set $\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$, which is presented in Section 3. With the convexity theorem, we obtain additional descriptions of $W_e(\mathbf{A})$ in Section 4 in terms of the perturbations of one of the components of $\mathbf{A}$, and also in terms of linear combinations of the components of $\mathbf{A}$. For example, we show that $W_e(A_1, \ldots, A_m)$ is equal to the sets

$$\cap\{\mathbf{cl}(W(A_1, \ldots, A_{i-1}, A_i + F, A_{i+1}, \ldots, A_m) : F \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}) \cap \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})\}$$

and

$$\left\{(a_1, \ldots, a_m) : \sum_{j=1}^{m} c_j a_j \in W_e\left(\sum_{j=1}^{m} c_j A_j\right) \text{ for all } (c_1, \ldots, c_m) \in \Omega\right\},$$

where $\Omega = \left\{(c_1, \ldots, c_m) \in \mathbf{R}^m : \sum_{j=1}^m c_j^2 = 1\right\}$. Also, we obtain an analog of the separation theorem for the not necessarily convex set $\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$, namely, for any element $\mathbf{d} \notin \mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$, there is a linear functional f such that $f(\mathbf{d}) > \sup\{f(\mathbf{a}) : \mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{cl}(W(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}))\}$, where $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ is obtained from $\mathbf{A}$ by perturbing one of the components A_j by a finite rank self-adjoint operator. In Section 5, we present additional results on $W(\mathbf{A})$ and $W_e(\mathbf{A})$. For instance, $W_e(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$ if and only if the extreme points of $W(\mathbf{A})$ are contained in $W_e(\mathbf{A})$; the convex hull of $\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$ can always be realized the the joint essential numerical range of $(\tilde{A}_1, \ldots, \tilde{A}_m)$ for linear operators $\tilde{A}_1, \ldots, \tilde{A}_m$ acting on a separable Hilbert space.

In our discussion, we always assume that $\mathcal{H}$ is infinite-dimensional. For any vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \ldots, A_m) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$, we will use the following notation

$$\langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}\rangle = (\langle A_1\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}\rangle, \ldots, \langle A_m\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}\rangle).$$

Furthermore, $\mathbf{R}^m$ will be used to denote the inner product space of $1 \times m$ real vectors with the usual inner product $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}\rangle$.

2 Equivalent formulations of $W_e(\mathbf{A})$

Following [21, Theorem 5.1] and its corollary on a single operator $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, we obtain several equivalent formulations of $W_e(\mathbf{A})$.

Theorem 2.1 *Let $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \ldots, A_m) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$. The following conditions are equivalent for a real vector $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_m)$.*

(1) $\mathbf{a} \in W_e(\mathbf{A}) = \cap\{\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{K})) : \mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})^m \cap \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m\}$.

(2) $\mathbf{a} \in \cap\{\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{F})) : \mathbf{F} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})^m \cap \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m\}$.

(3) *There is an orthonormal sequence of vectors* $\{\mathbf{x}_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \in \mathcal{H}$ *such that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}_n \rangle = \mathbf{a}.$$

(4) *There is a sequence of unit vectors* $\{\mathbf{x}_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \in \mathcal{H}$ *converging weakly to* $\mathbf{0}$ *in* $\mathcal{H}$ *such that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}_n \rangle = \mathbf{a}.$$

(5) *There is an infinite-dimensional projection* $P \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ *such that*

$$P(A_j - a_j I)P \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H}) \qquad \textit{for } j = 1, \dots, k.$$

Most of the argument in [21] can be applied here except for one crucial step, where the convexity of $W(\mathbf{A})$ for $m = 2$ is needed. Since $W(\mathbf{A})$ may not be convex for $m > 3$, we need the following auxiliary result to overcome the obstacle. As a byproduct, it shows that $\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$ is star-shaped.

Theorem 2.2 *Let* $\mathbf{A}$ *satisfy the hypothesis of Theorem 2.1, and let* $W_3(\mathbf{A})$ *be the set of real vectors* $\mathbf{a}$ *satisfying condition* (3) *of Theorem 2.1. Then* $W_3(\mathbf{A})$ *is non-empty and closed. Moreover, each element* $\mathbf{a} \in W_3(\mathbf{A})$ *is a star center of* $\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$, *i.e., for any* $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$ *we have* $(1-t)\mathbf{a}+t\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$ *for all* $0 \le t \le 1$.

Proof. To prove that $W_3(\mathbf{A})$ is non-empty, let $\{\mathbf{x}_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be an orthonormal sequence of vectors in $\mathcal{H}$. Then the sequence $\{\langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}_n \rangle\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is bounded. By choosing a subsequence, if necessary, we can assume that $\langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}_n \rangle$ converges. Hence, $W_3(\mathbf{A})$ is non-empty.

Next, we show that $W_3(\mathbf{A})$ is closed. Suppose $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{cl}(W_3(\mathbf{A}))$. Then for each $n \ge 1$, there exists an orthonormal sequence $\{\mathbf{x}_k^n\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ such that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_k^n, \mathbf{x}_k^n \rangle = \mathbf{a}^n \in \mathbf{R}^m$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{a}^n = \mathbf{a}$. Let $\delta_n = 1/(4n^2)$. By going to subsequences, if necessary, we may assume that $\|\langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_k^n, \mathbf{x}_k^n \rangle - \mathbf{a}\| < \delta_n$ for all n, k. We may also assume that $\|A_1\|^2 + \cdots + \|A_m\|^2 \le 1$. Then $\|\langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle\| \le \|\mathbf{x}\|\|\mathbf{y}\|$ for all $\mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{H}$.

Choose $\mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{x}_1^1$. Then we have $\|\langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_1 \rangle - \mathbf{a}\| < 1$. Suppose we have chosen $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n\}$ orthonormal, with $\|\langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}_k \rangle - \mathbf{a}\| < 1/k$ for $1 \le k \le n$. Then choose N such that for all $1 \le k \le n$, we have

$$|\langle \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}_N^{n+1} \rangle|, \ \|\langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}_N^{n+1} \rangle\| < \delta_{n+1}.$$

Let $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x}_N^{n+1} - \sum_{k=1}^{n} \langle \mathbf{x}_N^{n+1}, \mathbf{x}_k \rangle \mathbf{x}_k$. Then

$$\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_N^{n+1}\| \le n\delta_{n+1} \Rightarrow 1 - n\delta_{n+1} \le \|\mathbf{y}\| \le 1 + n\delta_{n+1}.$$

Therefore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \|\langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}\rangle - \mathbf{a}\| \\
\leq\ & \|\langle \mathbf{A}\left(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_N^{n+1}\right), \mathbf{y}\rangle\| + \|\langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_N^{n+1}, \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_N^{n+1}\rangle\| + \|\langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_N^{n+1}, \mathbf{x}_N^{n+1}\rangle - \mathbf{a}\| \\
\leq\ & \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_N^{n+1}\|(\|\mathbf{y}\| + \|\mathbf{x}_N^{n+1}\|) + \delta_{n+1} \\
\leq\ & (2n+2)\delta_{n+1}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Let $\mathbf{x}_{n+1} = \mathbf{y}/\|\mathbf{y}\|$. Then

$$\|\mathbf{x}_{n+1} - \mathbf{y}\| = |1 - \|\mathbf{y}\|| \leq n\delta_{n+1}.$$

Hence, $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}_{n+1}\}$ is an orthonormal set and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_{n+1}, \mathbf{x}_{n+1}\rangle - \mathbf{a}\| & \leq \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_{n+1}\|(\|\mathbf{y}\| + \|\mathbf{x}_{n+1}\|) + (2n+2)\delta_{n+1} \\
& \leq (4n+3)\delta_{n+1} < 1/(n+1).
\end{aligned}
$$

To prove the last assertion, let $\mathbf{a} \in W_3(\mathbf{A})$ and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{cl}\,(W(\mathbf{A}))$. Suppose $\{\mathbf{x}_n\}$ is an orthonormal sequence in $\mathcal{H}$ such that $\langle A\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}_n\rangle \to \mathbf{a}$. For $0 \leq t \leq 1$, we are going to show that $(1-t)\mathbf{a} + t\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, let y be a unit vector in $\mathcal{H}$ such that $\|\langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}\rangle - \mathbf{b}\| < \varepsilon$. Choose n such that $\|\langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}_n\rangle - \mathbf{a}\| < \varepsilon$ and $\|\langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}_n\rangle\| < \varepsilon$. Choose $\theta \in \mathbf{R}$ such that $\langle e^{i\theta}\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}_n\rangle$ is imaginary. Let $\mathbf{z} = \sqrt{t}e^{i\theta}\mathbf{y} + \sqrt{1-t}\mathbf{x}_n$ Then we have

$$\langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}\rangle = t\langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}\rangle + (1-t)\langle \mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}_n\rangle + 2\sqrt{t}\sqrt{1-t}\left(\langle e^{i\theta}\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}_n\rangle + \langle \mathbf{x}_n, e^{i\theta}\mathbf{y}\rangle\right) = 1$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \|\langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}\rangle - ((1-t)\mathbf{a} + t\mathbf{b})\| \\
\leq\ & (1-t)\|\langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}_n\rangle - \mathbf{a}\| + t\|\langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}\rangle - \mathbf{b}\| \\
& \quad + \sqrt{t}\sqrt{1-t}\|\langle e^{i\theta}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}_n\rangle + \langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_n, e^{i\theta}\mathbf{y}\rangle\| \\
\leq\ & 2\varepsilon.
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, $(1-t)\mathbf{a} + t\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$. □

The referee indicated that $W_3(\mathbf{A})$ is clearly closed, and a short proof is possible. We include the detailed proof for the sake of completeness and easy reference.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. For $j = 2, 3, 4, 5$, let $W_j(\mathbf{A})$ be the set of $\mathbf{a}$ satisfying condition (j). Clearly, we have

$$W_5(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq W_3(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq W_4(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq W_e(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq W_2(\mathbf{A}).$$

Suppose $\mathbf{a} \in W_2(\mathbf{A})$. We are going to show that $\mathbf{a} \in W_5(\mathbf{A})$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{0}$.

Since $\mathbf{0} \in W_2(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq \mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$, there exists a unit vector $\mathbf{x}_1 \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $\|\langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_1\rangle\| < 1/2$. Suppose we have an orthonormal set of vectors $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n\}$ such that $\|\langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}_n\rangle\| < 1/2^n$. Let Q be the orthogonal projection of $\mathcal{H}$ onto the subspace S spanned by $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$ and

$$\mathbf{B} = ((I-Q)A_1(I-Q)|_{S^\perp}, \dots, (I-Q)A_m(I-Q)|_{S^\perp}).$$

Let $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_m) \in W_3(\mathbf{B})$ and $\mathbf{b}I_S = (b_1 I_S, \dots, b_m I_S)$. Then for $\overline{Q} = I - Q$, we have

$$\mathbf{b}I_S \oplus \mathbf{B} = \left(b_1 Q + \overline{Q}A_1\overline{Q}, \dots, b_m Q + \overline{Q}A_m\overline{Q}\right) = \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{F}$$

for some $\mathbf{F} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})^m \cap \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$. Therefore, $\mathbf{0} \in \mathbf{cl}\,(W(\mathbf{b}I_S \oplus \mathbf{B}))$. Hence, there exists a unit vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $\|\langle (\mathbf{A}+\mathbf{F})\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}\rangle\| < 1/(2^{n+2})$. Let $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{z}$, where $\mathbf{y} \in S$ and $\mathbf{z} \in S^\perp$. Then $\|\mathbf{y}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{z}\|^2 = \|\mathbf{x}\|^2 = 1$. If $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{0}$, then $\langle (\mathbf{A}+\mathbf{F})\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}\rangle = \mathbf{b} \in W_3(\mathbf{B}) \subseteq \mathbf{cl}\,(W(\mathbf{B}))$. If $\mathbf{z} \neq \mathbf{0}$, then by Theorem 2.2, we have

$$\langle (\mathbf{A}+\mathbf{F})\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}\rangle = \|\mathbf{y}\|^2\mathbf{b} + \|\mathbf{z}\|^2\langle \mathbf{B}\left(\frac{\mathbf{z}}{\|\mathbf{z}\|}\right), \left(\frac{\mathbf{z}}{\|\mathbf{z}\|}\right)\rangle \in \mathbf{cl}\,(W(\mathbf{B})).$$

So there exists a unit vector $\mathbf{x}_{n+1} \in S^\perp$ such that

$$\|\langle (\mathbf{A}+\mathbf{F})\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}\rangle - \langle \mathbf{B}\mathbf{x}_{n+1}, \mathbf{x}_{n+1}\rangle\| < \frac{1}{2^{n+2}}$$

$$\Rightarrow \quad \|\langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_{n+1}, \mathbf{x}_{n+1}\rangle\| = \|\langle \mathbf{B}\mathbf{x}_{n+1}, \mathbf{x}_{n+1}\rangle\| < \frac{1}{2^{n+1}},$$

because $\langle \mathbf{F}\mathbf{x}_{n+1}, \mathbf{x}_{n+1}\rangle = \mathbf{0}$. Inductively, we can choose an orthonormal sequence of vectors $\{\mathbf{x}_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ such that

$$\|\langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}_n\rangle\| < \frac{1}{2^n} \quad \text{for all } n \geq 1. \tag{1}$$

Let $n_1 = 1$. For every $1 \leq i \leq m$, we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^\infty |\langle A_i\mathbf{x}_{n_1}, \mathbf{x}_n\rangle|^2 \leq \|A_i\mathbf{x}_{n_1}\|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{n=1}^\infty |\langle A_i\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}_{n_1}\rangle|^2 \leq \|A_i^*\mathbf{x}_{n_1}\|^2.$$

Hence, there exists $n_2 > n_1$ such that

$$\sum_{n=n_2}^\infty |\langle A_i\mathbf{x}_{n_1}, \mathbf{x}_n\rangle|^2 < 1/2 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{n=n_2}^\infty |\langle A_i\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}_{n_1}\rangle|^2 < 1/2$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq m$. Repeating this procedure, we can get a strictly increasing sequence $\{n_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ of positive integers such that for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, we have

$$\sum_{n=n_{k+1}}^{\infty} |\langle A_i \mathbf{x}_{n_k}, \mathbf{x}_n \rangle|^2 < 1/2^k \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{n=n_{k+1}}^{\infty} |\langle A_i \mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}_{n_k} \rangle|^2 < 1/2^k \,. \qquad (2)$$

(1) and (2) imply that

$$\sum_{k,\ell=1}^{\infty} |\langle A_i \mathbf{x}_{n_k}, \mathbf{x}_{n_\ell} \rangle|^2 < \infty \,. \qquad (3)$$

Let P be the orthogonal projection onto the subspace spanned by $\{\mathbf{x}_{n_k}\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$. Then it follows from (3) that PA_iP is compact for all $1 \leq i \leq m$. □

3 Convexity and star-shapedness

Theorem 3.1 *Let* $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$. *Then* $W_e(\mathbf{A})$ *is a compact convex subset of* $\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$. *Moreover, each element in* $W_e(\mathbf{A})$ *is a star center of the star-shaped set* $\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$.

Proof. Because $W_e(\mathbf{A})$ is the intersection of compact sets, it is compact. To prove the convexity, let $\mathbf{a}$, $\mathbf{b} \in W_e(\mathbf{A})$ and $0 \leq t \leq 1$. Then for every $\mathbf{F} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})^m \cap \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$, we have $\mathbf{a} \in W_e(\mathbf{A}) = W_e(\mathbf{A}+\mathbf{F})$ and $\mathbf{b} \in W_e(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq \mathbf{cl}\,(W(\mathbf{A}+\mathbf{F}))$. So, by Theorem 2.2, we have $t\mathbf{a}+(1-t)\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{cl}\,(W(\mathbf{A}+\mathbf{F}))$. Hence,

$$t\mathbf{a} + (1-t)\mathbf{b} \in \cap\{\mathbf{cl}\,(W(\mathbf{A}+\mathbf{F})) : \mathbf{F} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})^m \cap \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m\} = W_e(\mathbf{A}).$$

By Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.2, we have the last assertion. □

Note that $W_e(\mathbf{A}) \cap W(\mathbf{A})$ may be empty. For example, if

$$A = \operatorname{diag}(1, 1/2, 1/3, \dots)$$

acts on ℓ^2, then $W_e(A) = \{0\}$ and $W(A) = (0, 1]$. One may wonder whether a point $\mathbf{a} \in W_e(\mathbf{A}) \cap W(\mathbf{A})$ is a star center of $W(\mathbf{A})$. This is not true as shown by the following example. Moreover, the example shows that for $m \geq 4$ there exists $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$ such that $\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$ is convex whereas $W(\mathbf{A})$ is not. Of course this is impossible for $m \leq 3$ as $W(\mathbf{A})$ is always convex.

Example 3.2 *Consider $\mathcal{H} = \ell^2$ with canonical basis $\{e_n : n \geq 1\}$. Let $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \ldots, A_4)$ with $A_1 = \mathrm{diag}(1, 0, 1/3, 1/4, ...)$, $A_2 = \mathrm{diag}(1, 0) \oplus \mathbf{0}$,*

$$A_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \oplus \mathbf{0} \quad \textit{and} \quad A_4 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i \\ -i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \oplus \mathbf{0}.$$

Then $(1, 1, 0, 0) \in W(\mathbf{A})$ and $(0, 0, 0, 0) \in W(\mathbf{A}) \cap W_e(\mathbf{A})$, but $(1/2, 1/2, 0, 0) \notin W(\mathbf{A})$. Hence, $W(\mathbf{A})$ is not convex. However, $\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$ is convex.

Proof of the claims in the example. Note that $(1, 1, 0, 0) = \langle \mathbf{A}e_1, e_1 \rangle \in W(\mathbf{A})$ and

$$(0, 0, 0, 0) = \langle \mathbf{A}e_2, e_2 \rangle = \lim_{n\to\infty} \langle \mathbf{A}e_n, e_n \rangle \in W(\mathbf{A}) \cap W_e(\mathbf{A}).$$

To show that $(1/2, 1/2, 0, 0) \notin W(\mathbf{A})$, consider a unit vector $\mathbf{x} = \sum x_j e_j$ such that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n|^2 = 1$. If $\langle A_1\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle = \langle A_2\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle = 1/2$, then

$$|x_1|^2 + \sum_{n=3}^{\infty} |x_n|^2/n = |x_1|^2 = 1/2.$$

Thus, $x_n = 0$ for all $n \geq 3$ and $|x_1|^2 = |x_2|^2 = 1/2$. It then follows that $(\langle A_3\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle, \langle A_4\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle) \neq (0, 0)$. This proves that $(1/2, 1/2, 0, 0) \notin W(\mathbf{A})$. Hence, $(0, 0, 0, 0) \in W_e(\mathbf{A}) \cap W(\mathbf{A})$ is not a star center of $W(\mathbf{A})$ and $W(\mathbf{A})$ is not convex.

To see that $\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$ is convex, note that $\mathbf{0} \in W_e(\mathbf{A})$. Thus, by Theorem 3.1, for every $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$ we have $t\mathbf{0} + (1-t)\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$ for any $t \in [0, 1]$.

Let $\mathbf{B} = (B_1, B_2, B_3, B_4)$, where $B_1 = \mathrm{diag}(0, 1, 0)$, $B_2 = \mathrm{diag}(0, 1, 0)$,

$$B_3 = [0] \oplus \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad B_4 = [0] \oplus \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i \\ -i & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

and $\mathbf{C} = (C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4)$, where $C_1 = \mathrm{diag}(1/3, 1/4, ...) \oplus [0]$, $C_2 = C_3 = C_4 = \mathrm{diag}(0, 0, \ldots) \oplus [0]$. Then it is easy to verify that

$$W(\mathbf{B}) = \{(r, r, s, t) \in \mathbf{R}^4 : 4(r - 1/2)^2 + s^2 + t^2 \leq 1\}$$

and

$$W(\mathbf{C}) = \{(c, 0, 0, 0) : c \in [0, 1/3]\}$$

are both compact and convex. Hence, $W(\mathbf{B} \oplus \mathbf{C}) = \mathbf{conv}(W(\mathbf{B}) \cup W(\mathbf{C}))$ is compact and convex and

$$W(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq W(\mathbf{B} \oplus \mathbf{C}) \Rightarrow \mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A})) \subseteq W(\mathbf{B} \oplus \mathbf{C}).$$

On the other hand, $\mathbf{B} \oplus \mathbf{C} = [0] \oplus \mathbf{A} \oplus [0]$. Therefore,

$$W(\mathbf{B} \oplus \mathbf{C}) = \{t\mathbf{0} + (1-t)\mathbf{b} : \mathbf{b} \in W(\mathbf{A})\} \subseteq \mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A})).$$

So, $\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A})) = W(\mathbf{B} \oplus \mathbf{C})$ is convex. $\square$

4 Other descriptions of $W_e(\mathbf{A})$

For $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_m) \in \mathbf{R}^m$ and $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_m) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$, let $\mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{A} = \sum_{i=1}^m c_i A_i$. Using the convexity of $W_e(\mathbf{A})$, we obtain additional equivalent formulations of $W_e(\mathbf{A})$ in terms of $\mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ so that the joint behavior of $A_1, \dots, A_m$ can be understood by their linear combinations. For $A \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ and a positive integer k, let

$$\lambda_k(A) = \inf\{\max \sigma(A + F) : F \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \text{ with } \operatorname{rank}(F) < k\}.$$

Theorem 4.1 *Let $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$ and $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_m) \in \mathbf{R}^m$. Then $\mathbf{a} \in W_e(\mathbf{A})$ if and only if any one (and hence all) of the following conditions holds.*

(1) *For every $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbf{R}^m$, $\mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{a} \in W_e(\mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{A})$.*

(2) *For every $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbf{R}^m$, $\mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{a} \in \cap\{\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{A} + F)) : F \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}) \cap \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})\}$.*

(3) *For every $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbf{R}^m$, there is an orthonormal sequence of vectors*

$$\{\mathbf{x}_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \in \mathcal{H} \quad \textit{such that} \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} \langle \mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}_n \rangle = \mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{a}.$$

(4) *For every $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbf{R}^m$, there is a sequence of unit vectors $\{\mathbf{x}_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $\{\mathbf{x}_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ converges weakly to $\mathbf{0}$ in $\mathcal{H}$ and*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \langle \mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}_n \rangle = \mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{a}.$$

(5) *For every $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbf{R}^m$, there is an infinite-dimensional projection $P \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $P(\mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{a}I)P \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$.*

(6) *For every $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbf{R}^m$ and $k \geq 1$, $\lambda_k(\mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{a}I) \geq 0$.*

Proof. By the convexity of $W_e(\mathbf{A})$, we can apply the separation theorem to Theorem 2.1 to show that $\mathbf{a} \in W_e(\mathbf{A})$ if and only if any one of the conditions (1) to (5) holds.

To prove the equivalence of condition (6), suppose $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{R}^m$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{0}$. Suppose $\mathbf{0}$ satisfies condition (6). Then for every $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbf{R}^m$ and $F \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}) \cap \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ with rank $F = k$, we have

$$\lambda_1(\mathbf{c}\cdot\mathbf{A}+F) \geq \lambda_{k+1}(\mathbf{c}\cdot\mathbf{A}) \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_1(-(\mathbf{c}\cdot\mathbf{A}+F)) \geq \lambda_{k+1}(-\mathbf{c}\cdot\mathbf{A}) \geq 0\,.$$

Hence, $\mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{0} = 0 \in \mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{A} + F))$. Therefore, condition (2) is satisfied.

Conversely, if $\mathbf{0}$ does not satisfy condition (6), then there exist $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbf{R}^m$ and $k \geq 1$ such that $\lambda_k(\mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{A}) < 0$. Thus there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}) \cap \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{A} + F < 0$ and $\mathbf{0}$ does not satisfy condition (2). □

Let $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$. Although the set $\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$ may not be convex if $m \geq 4$, we have the following analog of the separation theorem for a convex set.

Theorem 4.2 *Let* $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \ldots, A_m) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$ *and* $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \ldots, d_m) \in \mathbf{R}^m$. *Then* $\mathbf{d} \notin W_e(\mathbf{A})$ *if and only if any one (and hence all) of the following conditions holds..*

(a) *There exists* $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})^m \cap \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$ *such that* $\mathbf{d} \notin \mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}+\mathbf{K}))$.

(b) *There exists* $\mathbf{F} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})^m \cap \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$ *such that* $\mathbf{d} \notin \mathbf{conv}\,(\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}+\mathbf{F})))$.

(c) *There exist* $F \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}) \cap \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$, $r > 0$ *and* $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \ldots, c_m) \in \mathbf{R}^m$ *such that*

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} c_i(A_i - d_i I)\right) + F > rI_{\mathcal{H}}. \tag{4}$$

Proof. For simplicity, replace $(A_1, \ldots, A_m)$ by $(A_1 - d_1 I, \ldots, A_m - d_m I)$ and assume that $\mathbf{d} = (0, \ldots, 0)$.

(c)$\Rightarrow$ (b). Suppose (c) holds. We may perturb $(c_1, \ldots, c_m)$ so that $c_j \neq 0$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ so that condition (4) still holds true. In particular, we have $c_1 \neq 0$. Then let $\mathbf{F} = (F/c_1, 0, \ldots, 0)$. We have $\mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{a} > r > 0$ for all $\mathbf{a} \in W(\mathbf{A}+\mathbf{F})$. Therefore, $\mathbf{0} \notin \mathbf{conv}\,(\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}+\mathbf{F})))$.

Clearly, we have (b) $\Rightarrow$ (a), which implies that $\mathbf{0} \notin W_e(\mathbf{A})$.

Finally, suppose $\mathbf{0} \notin W_e(\mathbf{A})$. Then by Theorem 4.1 (2), there exist a real vector $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \ldots, c_m)$ and $F \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}) \cap \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $0 = \mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{0} \notin \mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{A} + F))$. Since $\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{A} + F))$ is a closed interval $[s, t]$ of $\mathbf{R}$, we may assume that $0 < s \leq t$. Let $r = s/2$, we have $(\sum_{i=1}^m c_i A_i) + F > rI_{\mathcal{H}}$. Hence, (c) holds. □

Let $\Omega = \{\mathbf{c} \in \mathbf{R}^m : \langle \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{c} \rangle = 1\}$. By Theorem 4.2, we have the following result showing that $W_e(\mathbf{A})$ can be expressed as the intersection of half spaces.

Corollary 4.3 *Let* $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \ldots, A_m) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$. *Then*

$$\begin{aligned} W_e(\mathbf{A}) &= \cap_{\mathbf{c} \in \Omega}\{\mathbf{d} \in \mathbf{R}^m : \langle \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d} \rangle \leq \max W_e(\mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{A})\} \\ &= \{\mathbf{d} \in \mathbf{R}^m : \langle \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d} \rangle \in W_e(\mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{A}) \ \textit{for all } \mathbf{c} \in \Omega\}. \end{aligned}$$

For $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, let $\sigma_e(A) = \cap\{\sigma(A+K) : K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})\}$ bet the essential spectrum of A. Then for $A \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$, we have

$$W_e(A) = \mathbf{conv}\sigma_e(A).$$

Thus, one may replace $\max W_e(\mathbf{c}\cdot\mathbf{A})$ by $\max \sigma_e(\mathbf{c}\cdot\mathbf{A})$ in Corollary 4.3.

Corollary 4.4 *Let* $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \ldots, A_m) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$. *If* $\mathbf{d} \notin \mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$, *then for any* $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ *there exists* $F \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}) \cap \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ *such that* $\mathbf{d} \notin \mathbf{conv}(\mathbf{cl}(W(\tilde{\mathbf{A}})))$, *where* $\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = (A_1, \ldots, A_{i-1}, A_i + F, A_{i+1}, \ldots, A_m)$.

Proof. If $\mathbf{d} \notin \mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$, then $\mathbf{d} \notin W_e(\mathbf{A})$. The result readily follows from the arguments in the last paragraph in proof of Theorem 4.2. □

It follows from Theorem 2.1 that the intersection of the non-convex sets $\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}+\mathbf{K}))$, which equals $W_e(\mathbf{A})$, is a convex set. By Theorem 4.2 and Corollary 4.4, we see that one can replace $\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}+\mathbf{K}))$ by its convex hull for the intersection to obtain the same convex set $W_e(\mathbf{A})$. It is known that for any $\mathbf{B} = (B_1, \ldots, B_m) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$,

$$\mathbf{conv}(\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{B}))) = \{(f(B_1), \ldots, f(B_m)) : f \in \Omega\},$$

where Ω is the set of linear functionals f on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ satisfying $1 = f(I) = \max\{f(X) : X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}), \|X\| \le 1\}$; for example, see [10, 11]. So, it is easier to determine $\mathbf{conv}(\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}+\mathbf{K})))$ than $\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}+\mathbf{K}))$. In fact, we have the following.

Corollary 4.5 *Let* $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$ *and* $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$. *Then*

$$\begin{aligned} & W_e(\mathbf{A}) \\ = \ & \cap\{\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}+\mathbf{F})) : \mathbf{F} \in \{0\}^{i-1} \times (\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}) \cap \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})) \times \{0\}^{m-i}\} \\ = \ & \cap\{\mathbf{conv}\,(\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}+\mathbf{F}))) : \mathbf{F} \in \{0\}^{i-1} \times (\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}) \cap \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})) \times \{0\}^{m-i}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $\mathbf{F} \in \{0\}^{i-1} \times (\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}) \cap \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})) \times \{0\}^{m-i}$. Clearly, we have

$$W_e(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq \mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}+\mathbf{F})) \subseteq \mathbf{conv}(\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}+\mathbf{F}))).$$

So, we may take the intersection of the second and third sets over all $\mathbf{F} \in \{0\}^{i-1} \times (\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}) \cap \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})) \times \{0\}^{m-i}$, and get a set inclusion relation involving the three sets in the corollary. Finally, if $\mathbf{d} \notin W_e(\mathbf{A})$, then $\mathbf{d}$ will not belong to the third set by Corollary 4.4. So, the third set is a subset of $W_e(\mathbf{A})$. Hence, the three sets in the corollary are equal. □

5 Additional Results

Thee following result shows that $W_e(\mathbf{A})$ is unchanged under certain operations on $\mathbf{A}$.

Theorem 5.1 *Let $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \ldots, A_m) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$.*

(a) *Suppose $\mathcal{H}_1$ is a closed subspace of $\mathcal{H}$ such that $\mathcal{H}_1^\perp$ is finite dimensional. If $X : \mathcal{H}_1 \to \mathcal{H}$ is such that $X^*X = I_{\mathcal{H}_1}$, then*

$$W_e(\mathbf{A}) = W_e(X^*A_1X, \ldots, X^*A_mX).$$

(b) *For each $j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, suppose $P_j : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ is an orthogonal projection such that $I - P_j$ has finite rank. Then*

$$W_e(\mathbf{A}) = W_e(P_1A_1P_1, \ldots, P_mA_mP_m).$$

Proof. Using the formulation of $W_e(\mathbf{A})$ in Theorem 2.1, one readily shows that the set equalities in (a) and (b) hold. □

We will establish some additional relationships between the sets $W_e(\mathbf{A})$ and $W(\mathbf{A})$. The next theorem generalizes the results in [29] and [14].

Theorem 5.2 *Let $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$. Then $W_e(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$ if and only if* $\mathrm{Ext}(W(\mathbf{A})) \subseteq W_e(\mathbf{A})$.

Proof. If $W_e(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$, then we have

$$\mathrm{Ext}(W(\mathbf{A})) \subseteq W(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq W_e(\mathbf{A}).$$

Conversely, if $\mathrm{Ext}(W(\mathbf{A})) \subseteq W_e(\mathbf{A})$, then by (P6), we have

$$\mathrm{Ext}\left(\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))\right) \subseteq W_e(\mathbf{A}).$$

Hence,

$$\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A})) \subseteq \mathbf{conv}\left(\mathrm{Ext}\left(\mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))\right)\right) \subseteq \mathbf{conv}\left(W_e(\mathbf{A})\right) = W_e(\mathbf{A}).$$

Since $W_e(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq \mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$, we have $W_e(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A}))$. □

For $k \geq 1$, let I_k denotes the $k \times k$ identity matrix. Then for $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \ldots, A_m) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$, we have $\mathbf{A} \otimes I_k = (A_1 \otimes I_k, \ldots, A_m \otimes I_k) \in \mathcal{S}(\underbrace{\mathcal{H} \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathcal{H}}_{k-\text{copies}})^m$.

Similarly, let I_∞ denotes the identity operator acting on ℓ_2. Then for $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \ldots, A_m) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$, we have $\mathbf{A} \otimes I_\infty = (A_1 \otimes I_\infty, \ldots, A_m \otimes I_\infty) \in \mathcal{S}(\underbrace{\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H} \oplus \cdots}_{\text{infinite copies}})^m$.

Theorem 5.3 *Let* $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \ldots, A_m) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$. *Then for any positive integer* $k > \sqrt{m} - 1$,

$$W(\mathbf{A} \otimes I_k) = \mathbf{conv}(W(\mathbf{A})).$$

Moreover, we have

$$W_e(\mathbf{A} \otimes I_\infty) = \mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv}(W(\mathbf{A}))).$$

Proof. Suppose $k > \sqrt{m}-1$. By the result in [34], every $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{conv}(W(\mathbf{A}))$ can be written as $\mathbf{a} = \sum_{j=1}^k t_j \langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{x}_j \rangle$ for some unit vectors $\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_k \in \mathcal{H}$. Thus, for $\mathbf{x} = (\sqrt{t_1}\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \sqrt{t_k}\mathbf{x}_k) \in \mathcal{H} \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathcal{H}$, we have $\langle \mathbf{A} \otimes I_k \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle = \mathbf{a}$. Conversely, if $\mathbf{a} = \langle \mathbf{A} \otimes I_k \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \in W(\mathbf{A} \otimes I_k)$, one can decompose the unit vector $\mathbf{x}$ into k parts $\mathbf{y}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{y}_k$ according to the structure of $\mathcal{H} \otimes I_k$. Then

$$\mathbf{a} = \sum_{j=1}^k \|\mathbf{y}_j\|^2 \langle A\mathbf{y}_j/\|\mathbf{y}_j\|, \mathbf{y}_j/\|\mathbf{y}_j\| \rangle \in \mathbf{conv}(W(\mathbf{A}))\}.$$

If $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{cl}\,(\mathbf{conv}(W(\mathbf{A})))$, then there is a sequence of unit vectors $\{\mathbf{x}_n\}$ in $\mathcal{H}$ such that $\langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}_n \rangle \to \mathbf{a}$. Let

$$\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_n = \big(\underbrace{0, \ldots, 0}_{n-1 \text{ terms}}, \mathbf{x}_n, 0, \ldots \big) \in \mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H} \oplus \cdots .$$

Then $\{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_n\}$ is an orthonormal sequence in $\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H} \oplus \cdots$ such that $\langle \mathbf{A} \otimes I_\infty \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_n \rangle \to \mathbf{a}$. Therefore, $\mathbf{a} \in W_e(\mathbf{A} \otimes I_\infty)$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} & W_e\left(\mathbf{A} \otimes I_\infty\right) \subseteq \mathbf{cl}\left(W\left(\mathbf{A} \otimes I_\infty\right)\right) \\ = \; & \mathbf{cl}\left(\bigcup_{k=1}^\infty W\left(\mathbf{A} \otimes I_k\right)\right) \subseteq \mathbf{cl}(\mathbf{conv}(W(\mathbf{A})))\ , \end{aligned}$$

we get the reverse inclusion. □

Corollary 5.4 *Let* S *be a compact convex subset of* $\mathbf{R}^m$. *Then there are* $\mathbf{A}, \tilde{\mathbf{A}} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$ *with* $\mathcal{H} = \ell^2$ *such that* $W(\mathbf{A})$ *is convex and*

$$W(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq S = \mathbf{cl}(W(\mathbf{A})) = W_e(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}).$$

Proof. For $j = 1, \ldots, m$, let $A_j = \mathrm{diag}(a_{1j}, a_{2j}, \ldots)$ act on ℓ^2 with the standard canonical basis $\{e_n : n \geq 1\}$ such that $\{(a_{i1}, a_{i2}, \ldots, a_{im}) : i \geq 1\}$ is a dense subset of S. Then for $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \ldots, A_m)$, we have

$$W(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{conv}\{(a_{i1}, a_{i2}, \ldots, a_{im}) : i \geq 1\}$$

is convex, and $\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{A} \otimes I_\infty$ will satisfy the assertion by Theorem 5.3. □

References

[1] Y.S. Abramov, On the geometric properties of the joint spectrum of a family of self-adjoint operators, Studia Math. 61 (1977), 55-62.

[2] J.A. Anderson, On compact perturbations of operators, Canad. J. Math. 26 (1974), 247–250.

[3] S.C. Arora and R. Kumar, Joint essential numerical range, Glas. Mat. Ser. III 18(38) (1983), 317–320.

[4] Y.H. Au-Yeung and Y.T. Poon, A Remark on the Convexity and Positive Definiteness Concerning Hermitian Matrices, SEA Bull. Math. 3 (1979), 85-92.

[5] Y.H. Au-Yeung and N.K. Tsing, An extension of the Hausdorff-Toeplitz theorem on the numerical range, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 89 (1983), 215–218.

[6] M. Barraa, Essential numerical range of elementary operators, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 133 (2005), 1723–1726

[7] M. Barraa and V. Müller, On the essential numerical range, Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) 71 (2005), no. 1-2, 285–298.

[8] S.K. Berberian and G.H. Orland, On the closure of the numerical range of an operator, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 18 (1967), 499-503.

[9] P. Binding and C.K. Li, Joint ranges of Hermitian matrices and simultaneous diagonalization, Linear Algebra Appl. 151 (1991), 157-168.

[10] F.F. Bonsall and J.Duncan, Numerical Ranges of Operators on Normed Spaces and Elements of Normed Algebras, London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes Series 2, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1971.

[11] F.F. Bonsall and J. Duncan, Numerical ranges, II, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1973.

[12] J.J. Buoni and B.L. Wadhwa, On joint numerical ranges, Pacific J. Math 77 (1878), 303-306.

[13] G.F. Cao, On the joint essential spectrum, the joint essential numerical range and the boundary of joint numerical range, J. Math. Res. Exposition 10 (1990), 25–31.

[14] M. Cho and M. Takagunchi, Boundary points of joint numerical ranges, Pacific J. Math. 95 (1881), 27 -35.

[15] A.T. Dash, Joint numerical range, Glasnik Mat. 7 (1972), 75-81.

[16] A.T. Dash, Joint spectra, Studia Math 45 (1973), 225-237.

[17] A.T. Dash, Joint spectrum in the Calkin algebra, Bulletin Amer. Math. Soc. 81 (1975), 1083-1085.

[18] T.M., El-Adawy, M.Z. Abd-Alla and H.A. Atia, On the joint essential and joint maximal essential centre valued range, Proc. Math. Phys. Soc. Egypt No. 77 (2002), 29–49 (2003).

[19] M.K.H. Fan and A.L. Tits, On the generalized numerical range, Linear and Multilinear Algebra 21 (1987), 313-320.

[20] P. Fan and C.K. Fong and D.A. Herrero, On zero-diagonal operators and traces, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 99 (1987), 445–451.

[21] P.A. Fillmore, J.G. Stampfli and J.P. Williams, On the essential numerical range, the essential spectrum, and a problem of Halmos, Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) 33 (1972), 179–192

[22] K.E. Gustafson and D.K.M. Rao, Numerical ranges: The field of values of linear operators and matrices, Springer, New York, 1997.

[23] E. Gutkin, E.A. Jonckheere and M. Karow, Convexity of the joint numerical range: topological and differential geometric viewpoints, Linear Algebra Appl. 376 (2004), 143–171.

[24] P.R. Halmos, A Hilbert Space Problem Book, Second edition, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 19, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1982.

[25] R.A. Horn and C.R. Johnson, Topics in Matrix Analysis, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991.

[26] G. Ji, N. Liu, and Z. Li, Essential numerical range and maximal numerical range of the Aluthge transform, Linear and Multilinear Algebra 55 (2007), 315–322.

[27] M.S. Jones and H.P. Rogosinski, Inclusion relations involving the k-numerical range and the essential numerical range. Special Issue: The numerical range and numerical radius, Linear and Multilinear Algebra 37 (1994), 161–173.

[28] S.P. Juneja, On extreme points of the joint numerical range of commuting normal operators, Pacific J. Math. 67 (1976), 473-476.

[29] J.S. Lancaster, The boundary of the numerical range, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc 49 (1975), 393-398.

[30] D.A. Legg and D.W. Townsend, Essential numerical range in $B(l_1)$, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 81 (1981), 541–545.

[31] C.K. Li and Y.T. Poon, Convexity of the joint numerical range, SIAM J. Matrix Analysis Appl. 21 (1999), 668-678.

[32] B. Magajna, On the essential numerical range of a generalized derivation, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 99 (1987), 86–92.

[33] Y. Ogata, Local distinguishability of quantum states in infinite-dimensional systems, J. Phys. A 39 (2006), no. 12, 3059–3069.

[34] Y.T. Poon, On the convex hull of the multiform numerical range, Linear and Multilinear Algebra 37 (1994), 221-223.

[35] Y.T. Poon, Generalized numerical ranges, joint positive definiteness and multiple eigenvalues, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 125 (1997), no. 6, 1625–1634.

[36] M. Takagunchi and M. Cho, The joint numerical range and the joint essential numerical range, Sci. Prp. Hirosaki Univ. 27 (1980), 6-8.

[37] J.P. Williams, The numerical range and the essential numerical range, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 66 (1977), 185-186.