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ABSTRACT. The paper studies normal and structured matrices under unitary and structure-preserving similarity transformations. It is concerned with four matrix structures $\mathcal{S}$: Hamiltonian, skew-Hamiltonian, per-Hermitian, and perskew-Hermitian. First, we give structured canonical forms for matrices which are normal and structured for one of the structures in $\mathcal{S}$. Next, we propose structure-preserving Jacobi-type algorithms for computing the structured canonical forms and prove their convergence. Finally, given a structured matrix $A$ for one of the structures in $\mathcal{S}$, we consider the problem of finding the closest normal and structured matrix (with the same structure as $A$).

1. Introduction

The problem of finding the closest normal matrix $X$ to any unstructured matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ in the Frobenius norm
\[
\min_{X \in \mathcal{N}} \|X - A\|^2_F
\]
was an open question for a long time. Here $\mathcal{N}$ denotes the set of normal matrices
\[
\mathcal{N}_n = \{X \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n} : XX^H = X^H X\}.
\]
This problem was solved independently by Gabriel [4] and Ruhé [14]. A nice summary of all important findings is given by Higham in [8]. An extensive study of interesting properties of normal matrices can be found in [7] and [3].

It is well known that any square matrix $X$ can be expressed via its Schur form
\[
UXU^H = T = \begin{array}{c}
\end{array}
\]
with a unitary transformation $U$ and an upper triangular matrix $T$, see, e.g., [6]. From this, it is immediate to see that the set of normal matrices can also be described as the set of matrices that are unitarily diagonalizable, that is,
\[
\mathcal{N}_n = \{X \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n} : \exists U \in \mathcal{U}_n \ni U^H UX \text{ is diagonal}\}
\]
for
\[
\mathcal{U}_n = \{U \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n} : U^H U = UU^H = I\}.
\]
The following theorem from \cite{2} states the solution of (1.1) using a maximization problem formulation, see \cite{3} Theorem 5.2 for a full set of references.

**Theorem 1.1.** Let \( A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n} \) and let \( X = UDU^H \), where \( U \in \mathcal{U}_n \) and \( D \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n} \) is diagonal. Then \( X \) is a nearest normal matrix to \( A \) in the Frobenius norm if and only if

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(a)} & \quad \| \text{diag}(U^H A) \|_F = \max_{Q \in \mathcal{U}_n} \| \text{diag}(Q^H A) \|_F, \quad \text{and} \\
\text{(b)} & \quad D = \text{diag}(U^H AU).
\end{align*}
\]

Thus finding a nearest normal matrix of \( A \) (that is, \( \min_{X \in \mathcal{N}_n} \| X - A \|_F^2 \)) can be done by finding a unitary similarity transformation \( Q \) which makes the sum of squares of the diagonal elements of \( Q^H A Q \) as large as possible (that is, \( \max_{Q \in \mathcal{U}_n} \| \text{diag}(Q^H A) \|_F^2 \)). One can take a slightly different point of view. Instead of maximizing \( \| \text{diag}(Q^H A) \|_F \) we can just as well minimize \( \text{off}(Q^H A Q) = \| Q^H A Q - \text{diag}(Q^H A) \|_F^2 \), where for any matrix \( X \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n} \),

\[
\text{off}(X) := \| X - \text{diag}(X) \|_F^2 = \sum_{i,j=1;i \neq j}^n |x_{ij}|^2. \tag{1.2}
\]

Whenever useful, we will take on this view of the statement of Theorem 1.1.

If \( A \) is normal, it can be unitarily diagonalized. Hence, one can find a unitary matrix \( U \) such that \( \text{off}(U^H AU) = 0 \). This can be interpreted as that all the off-diagonal elements can be moved by a unitary similarity transformation to the diagonal. If \( A \) is not normal, it can not be completely unitarily diagonalized, but we want to “diagonalize it as much as possible” or to “move as much information as possible from the off-diagonal to the diagonal”. Ruhe gave in \cite{13} a Jacobi-type algorithm for computing the nearest normal matrix in the Frobenius norm, see also \cite{5}. This iterative algorithm constructs a sequence of Givens rotations \( G_k \) such that \( A^{(k+1)} = G_k^H A^{(k)} G_k \) converges to a matrix with maximal diagonal.

Based on these findings, we asked ourselves what can be done for structured matrices using unitary structure-preserving similarity transformations. That is, we will be concerned with certain sets \( S \) of structured \( m \times m \) matrices \( A \). Usually, a unitary similarity transformation \( Z^H AZ \) is not structure-preserving, that is, \( Z^H AZ \) will not necessarily be in \( S \) for \( A \in S \) and \( Z \in \mathcal{U}_m \). Thus, typically, \( Z \) will have to have an additional property in order to force \( Z^H AZ \in S \). Let us say, that \( Z \) needs to be in \( \mathcal{U}_m \cap \mathcal{Y}_m \) for a certain set \( \mathcal{Y}_m \) of matrices, such that \( Z^H AZ \in S \) for \( A \in S \). Now, assume that \( A \in \mathcal{N}_m \cap S \) is structured and normal. Then there need not be a matrix \( Z \in \mathcal{U}_m \cap \mathcal{Y}_m \) such that \( Z^H AZ \in S \) is diagonal (of course, there will be a unitary matrix \( U \) such that \( U^H AU \) is diagonal).

Hence, in the first part of this paper, for certain sets \( S \) of structured matrices we will determine the most condensed canonical form of a normal and structured matrix \( A \in \mathcal{N}_m \cap S \) under a unitary structure-preserving similarity transformations. This will define new functions \( \text{off}_S \) (similar to \cite{12}). Jacobi-type methods to compute these structured normal matrices using unitary structure-preserving similarity transformation (that is, to compute \( Z \in \mathcal{U}_m \cap \mathcal{Y}_m \) such that \( \text{off}_S(Z^H AZ) = 0 \)) will be developed. Convergence is proven.

In the second part of the paper, we will consider \( \min_{X \in \mathcal{N}_m \cap S} \| X - A \|_F \) for \( A \in S \), discuss appropriate analogues of Theorem 1.1 and corresponding structure-preserving Jacobi-type algorithms.
In particular, we will consider the following classes of matrices

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{H} &= \{ H \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n} : (JH)^H = JH \} \quad \text{Hamiltonian matrices,} \\
\mathcal{W} &= \{ W \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n} : (JW)^H = -JW \} \quad \text{skew-Hamiltonian matrices,} \\
\mathcal{M} &= \{ M \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n} : (FM)^H = FM \} \quad \text{per-Hermitian matrices,} \\
\mathcal{K} &= \{ K \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n} : (FK)^H = -FK \} \quad \text{perskew-Hermitian matrices,}
\end{align*}
\]

where

\[
J = J_{2n} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_n \\ -I_n & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n}, \quad F_n = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \quad \text{and} \quad F = F_{2n}.
\]

As already noted, the matrix \( U^H A U \) is not necessarily in \( S \in \{ \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{K} \} \) for \( A \in S \) and \( U \in U_{2n} \). It is well-known that transformations that keep the structure of the sets \( \mathcal{H} \) and \( \mathcal{W} \) are symplectic transformations, while transformations that keep the structure of the other two sets are perplectic transformations, where

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{S}_p &= \{ S \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n} : S^H J S = J \} \quad \text{symplectic matrices,} \\
\mathcal{P}_p &= \{ P \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n} : P^H F P = F \} \quad \text{perplectic matrices.}
\end{align*}
\]

That is, \( Z^H A Z \in \mathcal{H} \) (resp. \( \mathcal{W} \)) for \( A \in \mathcal{H} \) (resp. \( \mathcal{W} \)) and \( Z \in U_{2n} \cap \mathcal{S}_p \), and \( Z^H A Z \in \mathcal{M} \) (resp. \( \mathcal{K} \)) for \( A \in \mathcal{M} \) (resp. \( \mathcal{K} \)) and \( Z \in U_{2n} \cap \mathcal{P}_p \). Numerous properties of the sets \( \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{K}, \mathcal{S}_p, \mathcal{P}_p \) (and their interplay) have been studied in the literature, see, e.g., [11] [13] and the references therein.

For each of the four sets \( S \in \{ \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{K} \} \) of matrices, we will first give the canonical forms for matrices \( A \in \mathcal{N}_{2n} \cap S \) under unitary structure-preserving transformations. With this, we define suitable functions \( \text{off}_S \) for each \( S \in \{ \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{K} \} \). Next, we will develop Jacobi-type algorithms to compute the matrix \( Z \in U_{2n} \cap Y \) with \( \text{off}_S(Z^H A Z) = 0 \), where \( A \in S \) and \( Y = \mathcal{S}_p \) or \( Y = \mathcal{P}_p \) depending on the choice of \( S \). The rotations are carefully chosen to preserve the matrix structure. In Section 2 we consider the set of Hamiltonian and skew-Hamiltonian matrices, while in Section 3 the per-Hermitian and perskew-Hermitian case is dealt with. Based on those findings, in Section 4 appropriate analogues of Theorem 1.1 and corresponding structure-preserving Jacobi-like algorithms will be presented for each of the four sets \( S \) of matrices. In Section 5 the convergence of the Jacobi-like algorithms to a stationary point of the respective objective function is discussed for the algorithm which computes the structured canonical form of a normal and Hamiltonian matrix. Convergence of the other algorithms follow in an analogous way. In the final section, Section 6, some numerical results are reported.

2. Normal Hamiltonian and skew-Hamiltonian matrices

The (complex) Hamiltonian matrices\(^1\) form a Lie algebra and the (complex) skew-Hamiltonian matrices\(^2\) form a Jordan algebra associated with the skew-Hermitian sesquilinear form \( x^H J y \).

---

\(^1\)These matrices have been called \( J \)-Hermitian matrices in [11], in order to distinguish them from the matrices \( H \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n} \) which satisfy \( (JH)^T = JH \). The latter ones are called \( J \)-symmetric in [11]. As there is no ambiguity here, we will simply use the term Hamiltonian.

\(^2\)These matrices have been called \( J \)-skew-Hermitian matrices in [11], in order to distinguish them from the matrices \( W \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n} \) which satisfy \( (JW)^T = -JW \). The latter ones are called \( J \)-skew-symmetric in [11]. As there is no ambiguity here, we will simply use the term skew-Hamiltonian.
Both classes of matrices are well studied, see, e.g., [11] and the references therein. The symplectic matrices form the automorphism group associated with the skew-Hermitian sesquilinear form $x^Jy$.

### 2.1. Canonical form for normal and Hamiltonian matrices under unitary and symplectic similarity transformation

A matrix $H \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n}$ is (complex) Hamiltonian if $(JH)^H = JH$, or equivalently, $H^H = JHJ$. If we write $H$ as a $2 \times 2$ block matrix of $n \times n$ blocks, it is easy to verify that

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} H_{11} & H_{12} \\ H_{21} & -H_{11}^H \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{where } H_{12}^H = H_{21}, \ H_{21}^H = H_{12}. \tag{2.1}$$

The eigenvalues of Hamiltonian matrices $H$ come in pairs $(\lambda, -\bar{\lambda})$ with $\lambda$ and $-\bar{\lambda}$ having the same multiplicity: if $\lambda \in \sigma(H)$, then $\bar{\lambda} \in \sigma(H^H) = \sigma(JHJ) = \sigma(-J^{-1}HJ) = -\sigma(H)$.

Obviously, a diagonal Hamiltonian matrix $\hat{H}$ is of the form

$$\hat{H} = \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda & 0 \\ 0 & -\Lambda^H \end{bmatrix}, \tag{2.2}$$

with a diagonal matrix $\Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n)$.

A normal Hamiltonian matrix $H$ can be unitarily diagonalized;

$$U^H H U = \text{diag}(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_{2n}) =: D$$

with a unitary matrix $U$. Clearly, $\mu_i \in \sigma(H) = \{\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n, -\bar{\lambda}_1, \ldots, -\bar{\lambda}_n\}$. The eigenvalues of $H$ can appear in any order on the diagonal $D$. In particular, $U$ can be chosen such that $D = U^H H U$ is a diagonal Hamiltonian matrix as in (2.2). But, this $U$ will not be symplectic in general. So, when we restrict our transformations to unitary and symplectic ones, then we might not be able to diagonalize a normal Hamiltonian matrix. Consider the Hamiltonian matrix $J_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$. It is normal, but any symplectic transformation does not change it at all. Thus we will not be able to find a unitary and symplectic transformation which diagonalizes $J_2$. The most condensed form for normal and Hamiltonian matrices under unitary and symplectic transformation which can be achieved is derived next.

We will start with the Hamiltonian Schur form presented in [10] (see also [12]).

**Theorem 2.1** (Hamiltonian Schur form). For any Hamiltonian matrix $H \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n}$ there exists a unitary and symplectic matrix $Z$ such that

$$Z^H H Z = \begin{bmatrix} T_{11} & T_{12} & X_{11} & X_{12} \\ 0 & T_{22} & X_{21} & X_{22} \\ 0 & 0 & -T_{11}^H & 0 \\ 0 & Y_{22} & -T_{12}^H & -T_{22}^H \end{bmatrix}$$

where $T_{11} \in \mathbb{C}^{n_1 \times n_1}$ is upper triangular and $[T_{22} X_{22} Y_{22} Y_{22}^T] \in \mathbb{C}^{2n_2 \times 2n_2}$ is a Hamiltonian matrix with purely imaginary eigenvalues; $n_1 + n_2 = n$.

---

3These matrices have been called conjugate symplectic in [11], in order to distinguish them from the matrices $S \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n}$ which satisfy $S^T J S = J$. The latter ones are called complex symplectic in [11]. As there is no ambiguity here, we will simply use the term symplectic.
If $H$ is normal, that is, if $HH^H = H^HH$, then it follows that

$$U^HHU = \begin{bmatrix} D_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & T_{22} & 0 & X_{22} \\ 0 & 0 & -D_1^H & 0 \\ 0 & Y_{22} & 0 & -T_{22}^H \end{bmatrix}$$

where $D_1$ is diagonal and $\hat{H} = \begin{bmatrix} T_{22} & X_{22} \\ Y_{22} & -T_{22}^H \end{bmatrix}$ is a normal Hamiltonian matrix with purely imaginary eigenvalues. In particular, it holds $X_{22}^H = X_{22}$. Moreover, a normal matrix with purely imaginary eigenvalues is skew-Hermitian. This implies $\hat{H} = -\hat{H}^H$. From this we have $T_{22} = -T_{22}^H$ and $Y_{22} = -X_{22}^H$. Thus,

$$\hat{H} = \begin{bmatrix} T_{22} & X_{22} \\ -X_{22} & T_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad X_{22} = X_{22}^H, \quad T_{22} = -T_{22}^H.$$  

Now let $Q = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} I & iJ \end{bmatrix}$. $Q$ is unitary and block-diagonalizes $\hat{H}$,

$$M = Q^H \hat{H} Q = \begin{bmatrix} T_{22} + iX_{22} & 0 \\ 0 & T_{22} - iX_{22} \end{bmatrix}.$$

$M$ is skew-Hermitian, $M^H = -M$. Thus, the block matrices $T_{22} + iX_{22}$ and $T_{22} - iX_{22}$ are skew-Hermitian and can be diagonalized by unitary matrices $V_1$ and $V_2$, respectively. Hence, $V^HMV$ is diagonal with the unitary matrix $V = \text{diag}(V_1, V_2)$. Finally, transforming $V$ by $Q$, that is, $\hat{S} = QVQ^H$ yields a symplectic and unitary matrix $\hat{S}$ which diagonalizes the four blocks of $\hat{H}$,

$$\hat{S}^H \hat{H} \hat{S} = \begin{bmatrix} D_2 & D_3 \\ -D_3 & D_2 \end{bmatrix}$$  

with $D_2 = -D_2^H$, $D_3 = D_3^H$. This implies $D_2$ is a diagonal matrix with purely imaginary diagonal elements, while $D_3$ is diagonal with real diagonal elements. Now partition $\hat{S} = \begin{bmatrix} S_{11} & S_{12} \\ S_{21} & S_{22} \end{bmatrix}$ into four square block conformal to (2.3) and embed $\hat{S}$ into a $2n \times 2n$ identity matrix

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} & S_{11} \\ S_{21} & I_{n_1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} S_{12} \\ S_{22} \end{bmatrix}$$

such that the four blocks are of size $n \times n$. Then $US$ is a unitary and symplectic matrix which diagonalizes all four $n \times n$ blocks of $H$. In summary, we have

**Theorem 2.2** (Hamiltonian Schur form for normal Hamiltonian matrices). For any normal Hamiltonian matrix $H \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n}$ there exists a unitary and symplectic matrix $Z$ such that

$$Z^HHZ = \begin{bmatrix} D_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & D_2 & 0 & D_3 \\ 0 & 0 & -D_1^H & 0 \\ 0 & -D_3 & 0 & D_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

where $D_j, j = 1, 2, 3$ are diagonal matrices, $D_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{n_1 \times n_1}, D_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times n_2}, D_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times n_2}, n_1 + n_2 = n$, and $\begin{bmatrix} D_2 & D_3 \\ -D_3 & D_2 \end{bmatrix}$ is a Hamiltonian matrix with purely imaginary eigenvalues.
Hence, the canonical form for normal and Hamiltonian matricies $H \in \mathcal{N}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{H}$ under a unitary and symplectic transformation $Z \in \mathcal{U}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{S}_p$ can be depicted as
\[
Z^H H Z = \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_1 & \Lambda_2 \\
-\Lambda_2^\text{T} & -\Lambda_1^\text{T} \end{bmatrix} =: \Lambda
\] (2.4)
with diagonal matrices $\Lambda_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ and $\Lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. Moreover, if the $i$th diagonal element of $\Lambda_2$ is nonzero, then the $i$th diagonal element of $\Lambda_1$ is purely imaginary (or zero).

This suggests that we want to find $Z \in \mathcal{U}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{S}_p$ with
\[
\text{off}_H(Z^H H Z) = 0
\] for
\[
\text{off}_H(A) = \left\| A - \text{diag}(A) - J \text{diag}(J A) \right\|_F^2
\] (2.5)
for $A \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n}$ and $J = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_n \\ I_n & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n}$. Once such a $Z$ has been found, we have obtained a matrix $\Lambda$ of the form (2.4). In order to achieve the desired form given in Theorem 2.2 each $2 \times 2$ subproblem
\[
\begin{bmatrix} \lambda_{1,i} & \lambda_{2,i} \\
-\lambda_{2,i} & -\lambda_{1,i} \end{bmatrix}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n,
\]
has to be considered. Here the $i$th diagonal element of $\Lambda_j$ is denoted by $\lambda_{j,i}, j = 1, 2$. The $2 \times 2$ subproblem has to be transformed by a unitary and symplectic transformation either to a diagonal matrix $\begin{bmatrix} d_i & 0 \\ 0 & -d_i \end{bmatrix}, d_i \in \mathbb{C}$, or, if it has purely imaginary eigenvalues, to a matrix of the form $\begin{bmatrix} ib_i & c_i \\ -c_i & ib_i \end{bmatrix}, b_i, c_i \in \mathbb{R}$. Finally, reordering the $2 \times 2$ subproblems appropriately yields the canonical form stated in Theorem 2.2.

2.2. Canonical form for normal and skew-Hamiltonian matrices. A matrix $W \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n}$ is (complex) skew-Hamiltonian if $(JW)^H = -JW$, or equivalently, $W^H = -JWJ$. Written as a $2 \times 2$ block matrix of $n \times n$ blocks it takes the form
\[
W = \begin{bmatrix} W_{11} & W_{12} \\
W_{21} & W_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad W_{12}^H = -W_{12}, \; W_{21}^H = -W_{21}.
\]
The eigenvalues of skew-Hamiltonian matrices $W$ come in pairs $(\lambda, \bar{\lambda})$ with $\lambda$ and $\bar{\lambda}$ having the same multiplicity: if $\lambda \in \sigma(W)$, then $\bar{\lambda} \in \sigma(W^H) = \sigma(-JWJ) = \sigma(J^{-1}WJ) = \sigma(W)$. Obviously, a diagonal skew-Hamiltonian matrix $\hat{W}$ is of the form
\[
\hat{W} = \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda & 0 \\
0 & \Lambda^H \end{bmatrix}
\] (2.6)
with a diagonal matrix $\Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n)$.

A normal skew-Hamiltonian matrix $W$ can be unitarily diagonalized. In particular, the unitary transformation matrix $U$ can be chosen such that $U^H W U$ is a diagonal skew-Hamiltonian matrix as in (2.6). But, as in the Hamiltonian case, $U$ will not be symplectic in general.

It is easy to check that for every skew-Hamiltonian matrix $W \in \mathcal{W}$ there is a Hamiltonian matrix $H \in \mathcal{H}$ (and for every $H \in \mathcal{H}$ there is $W \in \mathcal{W}$) such that
\[
W = iH.
\]
Hence, the results given in the previous section can be applied here in a straightforward way.
2.3. Jacobi-type algorithm for solving \((2.4)\). Let \(H \in \mathcal{N}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{H}\). Our goal is to develop a Jacobi-type algorithm for determining \(Z \in \mathcal{U}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{S}_p\) such that \(\text{off}_H(Z^HZ) = 0\) for the function \(\text{off}_H\) as defined in \((2.5)\). As any Jacobi-type algorithm, this algorithm iterates as

\[
H^{(0)} = H, \quad H^{(k+1)} = R_k^H H^{(k)} R_k, \quad k \geq 0
\]

where \(R_k\) is a unitary Givens-like transformation which, for our purposes, needs to be symplectic as well. In case the unitary and symplectic rotations \(R_k\) are chosen appropriately, the sequence \(H^{(k)}\) will converge to a matrix of the form \((2.4)\). The unitary and symplectic matrix \(Z_k = R_0R_1 \cdots R_k\) will converge to \(Z\). In each iteration step, \(R_k\) will be chosen to minimize \(\text{off}_H(R_k H^{(k)} R_k)\). As minimizing \(\text{off}_H(Z^HZ)\) is equivalent to maximizing

\[
f_H(Z) := \|\text{diag}(Z^HZ)\|_F^2 + \|\text{diag}(JZ^HZ)\|_F^2
\]

with

\[
f_H : \mathcal{U}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{S}_p \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0},
\]

we will take on this point of view whenever useful.

We will make use of rotations which are set up by simple Givens rotations:

\[
G = \begin{bmatrix}
cos \phi & -e^{i\alpha} \sin \phi \\
e^{-i\alpha} \sin \phi & \cos \phi
\end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2}
\]

where \(c = \cos \phi \in \mathbb{R}\) and \(s = e^{i\alpha} \sin \phi \in \mathbb{C}\) such that \(c^2 + |s|^2 = 1\). For reasons of uniqueness, we will choose \(\phi \in (-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2})\) and \(\alpha \in (-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2})\). Embedding \(G\) into a \(m \times m\) identity matrix yields unitary matrices of the form

\[
G_{ij}(c, s) = \begin{bmatrix}
I_{i-1} & c & -s \\
& I_{j-i-1} & c \\
& & I_{m-j}
\end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}
\]

where \(i\) and \(j\) describe the positions of \(c\) and \(s\), \(1 \leq i < j \leq m\). We will use \(G_{ij}\) to set up two different unitary and symplectic transformations\(^4\).

(1) For \(m = n\) the direct sum \(G_{ij}(c, s) \oplus G_{ij}(c, s) \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n}\) yields a unitary and symplectic transformation matrix, called a symplectic direct sum embedding,

\[
R(i, j, \phi, \alpha) = \begin{bmatrix}
I_{i-1} & c & -s \\
& I_{j-i-1} & c \\
& & I_{n-j}
\end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}
\]

Clearly, we have to choose the indices \(i\) and \(j\) such that \(1 \leq i < j \leq n\). In \(R^H R\) only the rows and columns \(i, j, n + i, n + j\) will change. It is easy to see that \(R^H R\) yields

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
G_{ij}^H \\
G_{ij}^H
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
H_{11} & H_{12} \\
H_{21} & -H_{11}^H
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
G_{ij} & 0 \\
0 & G_{ij}
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
G_{ij}^H H_{11} G_{ij} & G_{ij}^H H_{12} G_{ij} \\
G_{ij}^H H_{21} G_{ij} & -G_{ij}^H H_{11}^H G_{ij}
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

\(^4\)The structured transformations introduced here are similar to the ones in [11].
Thus, in each of the four blocks two rows and columns change. Each block changes independently of the others, the blocks are not ‘mixed’.

(2) For \( m = 2n \) the indices \( i \) and \( j \) for \( G_{ij} \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n} \) will also be chosen such that \( 1 \leq i < j \leq n \). Then the sum \( G_{i,n+j}(c,s) + G_{j,n+i}(c,s) \) is a unitary and symplectic transformation, called symplectic concentric embedding,

\[
R(i, j, \phi, \alpha) = \begin{bmatrix} I_{i-1} & c & -s \\ \bar{s} & s & \bar{s} \\ I_{j-i-1} & I_{n-j} & c I_{j-i-1} \end{bmatrix}
\]

It is easy to see that in \( R^H HR \), similar to the situation using the symplectic direct sum embedding, the four rows and columns \( i, j, n+i \) and \( n+j \) change. But here, the four blocks of \( H \) will be ’mixed’, see Fig. 1 for an illustration. The two rows and columns \( i \) and \( n+j \) (denoted in Fig 1 by diamonds) are ’mixed’ by \( G_{i,n+j} \), as well as the two rows and columns \( j \) and \( n+i \) (denoted in Fig 1 by boxes) by \( G_{j,n+i} \). Just eight entries are affected by both Givens rotations (denoted in Fig 1 by triangles).

Now we would like to use the transformations \( R(i, j, \phi, \alpha) \) \( (2.9) \) and \( (2.11) \) to maximize

\[
\| \text{diag}(R^H HR) \|_F^2 + \| \text{diag}(J R^H HR) \|_F^2.
\]

(2.12)
Consider a transformation by the symplectic direct sum $H$. Due to (2.10) it suffices to look at

$$H_{ij}' = \begin{bmatrix}
\cos \phi & -e^{i\alpha} \sin \phi & 0 & 0 \\
e^{-i\alpha} \sin \phi & \cos \phi & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \cos \phi & -e^{i\alpha} \sin \phi \\
e^{-i\alpha} \sin \phi & 0 & \cos \phi & 0
\end{bmatrix}^H \begin{bmatrix}
\cos \phi & -e^{i\alpha} \sin \phi & 0 & 0 \\
e^{-i\alpha} \sin \phi & \cos \phi & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \cos \phi & -e^{i\alpha} \sin \phi \\
e^{-i\alpha} \sin \phi & 0 & \cos \phi & 0
\end{bmatrix},$$

(2.13)

with the $4 \times 4$ subproblem $\tilde{H}_{ij}$ of $H$

$$\tilde{H}_{ij} = \begin{bmatrix}
h_{ii} & h_{ij} & h_{i,n+i} & h_{i,n+j} \\
h_{ji} & h_{jj} & h_{j,n+i} & h_{j,n+j} \\
h_{n+i,i} & h_{n+i,j} & h_{n+i,n+i} & h_{n+i,n+j} \\
h_{n+j,i} & h_{n+j,j} & h_{n+j,n+i} & h_{n+j,n+j}
\end{bmatrix}.\quad (2.14)

In order to maximize (2.12) we have to choose $\phi$ and $\alpha$ such that

$$|h_{ii}'|^2 + |h_{jj}'|^2 + |h_{n+i,n+i}'|^2 + |h_{n+j,n+j}'|^2 + |h_{i,n+i}'|^2 + |h_{j,n+j}'|^2 + |h_{n+i,n}'|^2 + |h_{n+j,n}'|^2$$

(2.15)

is maximized.

In case a symplectic concentric embedding as in (2.11) is used, we need to maximize (2.15) where

$$H_{ij}' = \begin{bmatrix}
\cos \phi & 0 & 0 & -e^{i\alpha} \sin \phi \\
0 & \cos \phi & -e^{-i\alpha} \sin \phi & 0 \\
e^{i\alpha} \sin \phi & 0 & \cos \phi & 0 \\
e^{-i\alpha} \sin \phi & 0 & 0 & \cos \phi
\end{bmatrix}^H \begin{bmatrix}
\cos \phi & 0 & 0 & -e^{i\alpha} \sin \phi \\
0 & \cos \phi & -e^{-i\alpha} \sin \phi & 0 \\
e^{i\alpha} \sin \phi & 0 & \cos \phi & 0 \\
e^{-i\alpha} \sin \phi & 0 & 0 & \cos \phi
\end{bmatrix}.\quad (2.16)

Choosing $\phi$ and $\alpha$ in order to maximize (2.15) is straightforward, but very technical and long. The choice of $\phi$ and $\alpha$ for transformations of type (2.9) is given in the Appendix A. A similar derivation holds for transformations of type (2.11).

In our Jacobi-type algorithm we will apply a sequence of rotations of type (2.9) and (2.11). The idea is that we try to move as much weight from the off-diagonal entries in each of the four blocks of $H$ onto the diagonals of the four blocks $H_{11}, H_{12}, H_{21}$ and $H_{22}$. In order to do so, we have to make sure that each off-diagonal element (that is, each element of $H$ that is not on a diagonal of one of the four blocks) is given the chance to leave some weight towards one of the diagonals.

Symplectic direct sum transformations $R(i_k,j_k,\phi_k,\alpha_k), (i_k,j_k) \in I = \{ (i,j) : 1 \leq i < j \leq n \}$ (2.9) are used to move weight on the diagonals of all four blocks of $H$. However, although weight is moved towards the diagonal in each of the four blocks, it stays within its own block. This will not suffice in order to achieve convergence. It is necessary to allow that some weight from the (1,2)- and the (2,1)-block is moved to the (1,1)- and (2,2)-diagonal blocks of $H$. To achieve this, symplectic concentric embedding transformations $R(i_k,j_k,\phi_k,\alpha_k)$ as in (2.11) will be used for pivot pairs $(i_k,j_k)$ chosen from $I$. As before, all off-diagonal elements in each of the four blocks are manipulated by these transformations.

We will use a so-called cyclic pivot ordering. That is, we move through the matrix $H$ rowwise from row 1 to row $n-1$ and in each row we move columnwise from column $i+1$ to $n$ and further on from column $n+i+1$ to $2n$. One such sweep through all relevant elements of $H$ is called a cycle. Please note that this way each off-diagonal entry of $H$ (which is not on one of the diagonals of $H_{12}$ or $H_{21}$) is contributing to two rotations. Any other sweep through all relevant elements of $H$ can also be used. In any case, the cycle has to be repeated until convergence is observed. The algorithm is summarized in Algorithm 1. If $A \in \mathcal{W}$, the same algorithm can be used.
Algorithm 1. Jacobi-type algorithm for solving (2.4)

\begin{algorithm}
Input: $A \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n}$ Hamiltonian or skew-Hamiltonian.
Output: symplectic unitary $Z$ such that $\text{off}_H(Z^H A Z) \approx 0$

$k = 0$

\begin{align*}
Z^{(1)} &= A \\
&\text{repeat} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, n-1 \text{ do} \\
&\quad \text{for } j = i+1, \ldots, n \text{ do} \\
&\quad \quad k = k + 1 \\
&\quad \quad \text{Find } \phi_k, \alpha_k \text{ for } R_k = R(i, j, \phi_k, \alpha_k) \text{ as in (2.9)} \\
&\quad \quad A^{(k+1)} = R_k^H A^{(k)} R_k \\
&\quad \quad Z^{(k+1)} = Z^{(k)} R_k \\
&\quad \text{end for} \\
&\quad \text{for } j = n+i+1, \ldots, 2n \text{ do} \\
&\quad \quad k = k + 1 \\
&\quad \quad \text{Find } \phi_k, \alpha_k \text{ for } R_k = R(i, j-n, \phi_k, \alpha_k) \text{ as in (2.11)} \\
&\quad \quad A^{(k+1)} = R_k^H A^{(k)} R_k \\
&\quad \quad Z^{(k+1)} = Z^{(k)} R_k \\
&\quad \text{end for} \\
&\text{end for} \\
&\text{until convergence}
\end{align*}

In Section 5, we prove convergence of Algorithm 1 to a stationary point of the objective function $f_H$ (2.7).

3. Per-Hermitian and perskew-Hermitian matrices

The perskew-Hermitian matrices form a Lie algebra, while the per-Hermitian matrices form a Jordan algebra associated with $x^H F y$. The perplectic matrices form the automorphism group associated with the skew-Hermitian sesquilinear form $x^H J y$. Unlike in the (skew-)Hamiltonian case we did not find a suitable canonical form in the literature from which a canonical form for normal and per(skew)-Hermitian matrices can be deduced. Thus we will directly state and prove such a form.

3.1. Canonical form for normal and per-Hermitian matrices under unitary and perplectic similarity transformation. A matrix $M \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n}$ is per-Hermitian if $(FM)^H = FM$, or equivalently, $M^H = FMF$. If we write $M$ as a $2 \times 2$ block matrix of $n \times n$ blocks, it is easy to see that

\[ M = \begin{bmatrix}
M_{11} & M_{12} \\
M_{21} & FM_{11}^HF
\end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{where } (FM_{12})^H = FM_{12}, (FM_{21})^H = FM_{21}. \]

The elements of the antidiagonal of $M_{12}$ and $M_{21}$ have to be real.

As $F = F^H = F^{-1}$, we have $\sigma(M^H) = \sigma(FMF) = \sigma(M) = \sigma(M^T) = \overline{\sigma(M)}$. Thus, eigenvalues with nonzero imaginary part appear in pairs ($\lambda, \overline{\lambda}$). There is no restriction on the algebraic multiplicity of real eigenvalues, in particular, it can be odd. Just the number of all real eigenvalues counted with multiplicity has to be even.
Obviously, a diagonal per-Hermitian matrix $\hat{M}$ has to be of the form

$$\hat{M} = \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda & 0 \\ 0 & F\Lambda^H F \end{bmatrix}$$

with a diagonal matrix $\Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n)$, and, thus, $F\Lambda^H F = \text{diag}(\overline{\lambda}_1, \ldots, \overline{\lambda}_1)$.

Thus, for any normal and per-Hermitian matrix $M$ there exists a unitary matrix $U$ which diagonalizes $M$ such that

$$D = U^H MU = \text{diag}(D(\lambda_1), D(\overline{\lambda}_1), \ldots, D(\lambda_t), D(\overline{\lambda}_t), D(\mu_1), \ldots, D(\mu_s))$$

where

$$D(\lambda_j) = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_j \\ \vdots \\ \lambda_j \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{m_{\lambda_j} \times m_{\lambda_j}}, \quad \lambda_j \in \mathbb{C}, j = 1, \ldots, t, \text{ with } \text{Im}(\lambda_j) \neq 0,$$

$$D(\mu_j) = \begin{bmatrix} \mu_j \\ \vdots \\ \mu_j \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_{\mu_j} \times m_{\mu_j}}, \quad \mu_j \in \mathbb{R}, j = 1, \ldots, s,$$

and $2n = 2 \sum_{j=1}^{t} m_{\lambda_j} + \sum_{j=1}^{s} m_{\mu_j}$ with $\lambda_j \neq \lambda_i$ and $\mu_j \neq \mu_i$, for $j \neq i$. Moreover, $D(\overline{\lambda}_j) \in \mathbb{C}^{m_{\lambda_j} \times m_{\lambda_j}}$. We will transform this unitary eigendecomposition into a similar decomposition of $M = V\hat{D}V^H$ with a unitary and perplectic $V$ and a matrix $\hat{D}$ from which the eigenvalues can be read off immediately.

Certainly, the columns of $U = [u_1 \ u_2 \ \cdots \ u_{2n}]$ are orthonormal eigenvectors of $M$. As $F$ is unitary we have that $D = U^H M U = (FU)^H M^H (FU)$, and $(FU)^H M (FU) = D^H$. Hence, $FU$ is another unitary matrix which diagonalizes $M$. Therefore, $u_j^H F u_k$ can only be nonzero in one of the following situations:

1. $u_j$ is an eigenvector of $M$ for some $\lambda_t \in \mathbb{C}$ and $u_k$ is an eigenvector of $M$ for $\overline{\lambda}_t$ (or vice versa).

2. $u_j$ and $u_k$ are eigenvectors of $M$ for some $\mu_t \in \mathbb{R}$.

In all other cases, $u_j^H F u_k = 0$. This implies that $H^H FU$ has the following form

$$U^H FU = \text{diag}\left( \begin{bmatrix} 0 & S(\lambda_1) \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \ldots, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & S(\lambda_t) \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, S(\mu_1), \ldots, S(\mu_s) \right).$$

As $U^H FU$ is unitary, all blocks $S(\lambda_j)$ and $S(\mu_j)$ have to be unitary. Moreover, as $U^H FU$ is Hermitian, the blocks $S(\mu_j)$ are Hermitian.

Let $T \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n}$ denote the matrix

$$T = \text{diag}(S(\lambda_1), I_{m_{\lambda_1}}, \ldots, S(\lambda_t), I_{m_{\lambda_t}}, I_{2r})$$

with $2r = \sum_{j=1}^{s} m_{\mu_j}$. Clearly, $T$ is unitary. With $U_1 = UT$ we obtain

$$U_1^H FU_1 = \text{diag}\left( \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_{m_{\lambda_1}} \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \ldots, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_{m_{\lambda_t}} \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, S(\mu_1), \ldots, S(\mu_s) \right),$$

and

$$U_1^H MU_1 = D.$$ 

Next, we consider the blocks $S(\mu_j), j = 1, \ldots, s$. Each such block is unitary and Hermitian. Thus, all these blocks have eigenvalues $\pm 1$ (as $U_1^H FU_1$ is similar to $F$). Therefore, for each block $S(\mu_j)$
there exists a unitary matrix $V_j \in \mathbb{C}^{m_{\mu_j} \times m_{\mu_j}}$ such that $V_j^H S(\mu_j)V_j = \text{diag}(\pm 1, \ldots, \pm 1) = \tilde{I}_{\mu_j}$ for some combination of $+1$ and $-1$ entries. Let

$$V = \text{diag}(I_{2c}, V_1, \ldots, V_s) \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n}$$

where $c = \sum_{j=1}^{s} m_{\lambda_j}$. By construction, $V$ is unitary. With $U_2 = U_1 V = UTV$ we obtain

$$U_2^H FU_2 = \text{diag}\left( \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_{m_{\lambda_1}} \\ I_{m_{\lambda_1}} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \ldots, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_{m_{\lambda_t}} \\ I_{m_{\lambda_t}} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \tilde{I}_{\mu_1}, \ldots, \tilde{I}_{\mu_s} \right),$$

and

$$U_2^H MU_2 = D.$$ 

As $F$ has exactly $n$ eigenvalues $+1$ and $n$ eigenvalues $-1$ and the blocks $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_m \\ I_m & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ have exactly $m$ eigenvalues $+1$ and $m$ eigenvalues $-1$, the diagonal block

$$J = \text{diag}(\tilde{I}_{\mu_1}, \ldots, \tilde{I}_{\mu_s}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2r \times 2r}$$

has to have exactly $r$ eigenvalues/diagonal entries $+1$ and $r$ eigenvalues/diagonal entries $-1$ (recall that $2r = \sum_{j=1}^{s} m_{\mu_j}$). These $\pm 1$ diagonal entries can be reordered by a simple permutation $\tilde{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{2r \times 2r}$ such that

$$\tilde{P}^T J \tilde{P} = \text{diag}(+1, -1, +1, -1, \ldots, +1, -1).$$

Let

$$P_1 = \text{diag}(I_{2c}, \tilde{P}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n}.$$ 

As $\tilde{P}$ and $P_1$ are unitary, the matrix $U_3 = U_2 P_1 = UTV P_1$ is unitary. Moreover,

$$U_3^H FU_3 = \text{diag}\left( \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_{m_{\lambda_1}} \\ I_{m_{\lambda_1}} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \ldots, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_{m_{\lambda_t}} \\ I_{m_{\lambda_t}} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, +1, -1, +1, -1, \ldots, +1, -1 \right),$$

and

$$U_3^H MU_3 = D_1,$$ 

where $D_1$ is still diagonal, but not necessarily the same as $D$, some of the real eigenvalues may have swapped places. Next, we will make use of the fact that $\begin{bmatrix} +1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$ and $F_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ are unitarily similar. Thus, there exists a unitary matrix $Z \in \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2}$ such that $Z^H \begin{bmatrix} +1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} Z = F_2$. Let $\tilde{W} = \text{diag}(Z, \ldots, Z) \in \mathbb{C}^{2r \times 2r}$ and

$$W = \text{diag}(I_{2c}, \tilde{W}) \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n}.$$ 

Now, as $\tilde{W}$ and $W$ are unitary, the matrix $U_4 = U_3 W = UTV P_1 W$ is unitary. Moreover,

$$U_4^H FU_4 = \text{diag}\left( \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_{m_{\lambda_1}} \\ I_{m_{\lambda_1}} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \ldots, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_{m_{\lambda_t}} \\ I_{m_{\lambda_t}} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, F_2, F_2, \ldots, F_2 \right),$$

and

$$U_4^H MU_4 = D_2 = \text{diag}(D(\lambda_1), D(\overline{\lambda_1}), \ldots, D(\lambda_t), D(\overline{\lambda_t}), X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_r)$$

for some $X_j = \begin{bmatrix} a_j & b_j \\ b_j & a_j \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}, j = 1, \ldots, s$. Next, observe that $U_4^H FU_4$ is permutationaly similar to $F$. This can be seen as follows. First, there is a permutation matrix $\tilde{P}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{2r \times 2r}$ such that
\[ X = \overline{P}_2^T \text{diag}(X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_r) \overline{P}_2 \] is real, symmetric und per-symmetric

\[
X = \begin{bmatrix}
  a_1 & a_2 & \cdots & a_s & b_1 \\
  & a_2 & \cdots & a_s & b_2 \\
  & & \cdots & a_s & b_1 \\
  & & & a_2 & b_1 \\
  & & & & a_1
\end{bmatrix}
\] (3.1)

and

\[
\overline{P}_2^T \text{diag}(F_2, F_2, \ldots, F_2) \overline{P}_2 = F_{2r}.
\]

Moreover, there is a permutation matrix \( \hat{P}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{2c \times 2c} \) which reorders the diagonal blocks \( D(\lambda_j) \) and \( D(\overline{\lambda_j}) \) in \( U_4^H MU_4 \) such that \( P_2 = \text{diag}(\hat{P}_2, \overline{\hat{P}_2}) \) achieves

\[
P_2^T U_4^H MU_4 P_2 = \text{diag}(D(\lambda_1), D(\lambda_2), \ldots, D(\lambda_t), D(\overline{\lambda_1}), D(\overline{\lambda_2}), \ldots, D(\overline{\lambda_t}), X)
\]

and

\[
P_2^T U_4^H FU_4 P_2 = \text{diag}(F_{2c}, F_{2r}).
\]

Finally, there is a \( 2n \times 2n \) permutation matrix \( P_3 \) such that

\[
P_3^T P_2^T U_4^H FU_4 P_2 P_3 = F_{2n}.
\]

This permutation reorders the diagonal blocks of \( P_2^T U_4^H MU_4 P_2 \) as follows

\[
P_3^T P_2^T U_4^H MU_4 P_2 P_3 = \text{diag}(D(\lambda_1), D(\lambda_2), \ldots, D(\lambda_t), X, D(\overline{\lambda_1}), D(\overline{\lambda_2}), \ldots, D(\overline{\lambda_t})).
\]

Our findings can be summarized as follows.

**Theorem 3.1.** Let \( M \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n} \) be normal and per-Hermitian; \( M \in \mathcal{N}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{M}_{2n} \). Then there exists a unitary and perplectic matrix \( U \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n} \) such that

\[
U^H MU = \begin{bmatrix}
  D & X \\
  F D^H F
\end{bmatrix},
\]

where \( D \) is a diagonal matrix whose diagonal entries have nonzero imaginary parts and \( X \) is a real-valued matrix of the form (3.1). Moreover, \( X \) is symmetric as well as per-symmetric. In particular, all eigenvalues of \( X \) are real.

Hence, the canonical form for normal and per-Hermitian matrices \( M \in \mathcal{N}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{M}_{2n} \) under a unitary and perplectic transformation \( Z \in \mathcal{U}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{P}_p \) can be depicted as

\[
Z^H M Z = \begin{bmatrix}
  \Lambda_1 & \Lambda_2 F \\
  F \Lambda_2 & F \Lambda_2^H F
\end{bmatrix} =: \Lambda
\] (3.2)

with diagonal matrices \( \Lambda_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n} \) and \( \Lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \). This suggests that we want to find \( Z \in \mathcal{U}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{P}_p \) with

\[
\text{off}_M(Z^H M Z) = 0
\]
for
\[ \text{off}_M(A) = \|A - \text{diag}(A) - F\text{diag}(FA)\|_F^2 \] (3.3)
for \( A \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n} \). Once such a \( Z \) has been found, we have obtained a matrix \( \Lambda \) of the form (3.2).

Similar to the discussion at the end of Section 2.1, in order to achieve the desired form given in Theorem 3.1, 2 × 2 subproblems have to be considered in a final step.

3.2. Canonical form for normal and perskew-Hermitian matrices under unitary and perplectic similarity transformation.

It is easy to check that for every perskew-Hermitian matrix \( K \in \mathcal{K} \) there is a per-Hermitian matrix \( M \in \mathcal{M} \) (and for every \( M \in \mathcal{M} \) there is \( K \in \mathcal{K} \)) such that
\[ K = iM. \]

Hence, the results given in the previous section can be applied here in a straightforward way.

3.3. Jacobi-type algorithm for solving (3.2).

Let \( M \in \mathcal{N}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{M} \). Using the same ideas as in Section 2.3 a Jacobi-type algorithm for determining \( Z \in \mathcal{U}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{P}_p \) such that \( \text{off}_M(Z^HMZ) = 0 \) for the function \( \text{off}_M \) as defined in (3.3) can be derived. The sequence
\[ M^{(0)} = M, \quad M^{(k+1)} = R_k^H M^{(k)} R_k, \quad k \geq 0 \]
where \( R_k \) is a unitary and perplectic Givens-like transformation will converge to a matrix of the form (3.2).

Based on \( G_{ij}(c, s) \) as in (2.8) we set up two different unitary and perplectic transformations similar to the unitary and symplectic ones in Section 2.3.

(1) For \( m = n \) the direct sum \( G_{ij}(c, s) \oplus G_{ij}(c, -\bar{s}) \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n} \) yields a unitary and perplectic transformation matrix, called a perplectic direct sum embedding,
\[
R(i, j, \phi, \alpha) = \begin{bmatrix}
I_{i-1} & c & -s & I_{n-j} \\
\bar{s} & I_{j-i-1} & c & I_{n-j} \\
I_{i-1} & \bar{s} & I_{j-i-1} & I_{n-j} \\
-s & c & I_{j-i-1} & I_{n-j}
\end{bmatrix},
\]
where \( 1 \leq i < j \leq n \). In \( R^H M R \) only the rows and columns \( i, j, n + i, n + j \) will change. Each of the four blocks of \( M \) changes independently of the others, the blocks are not ‘mixed’.

(2) For \( m = 2n \) the indices \( i \) and \( j \) for \( G_{ij} \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n} \) will also be chosen such that \( 1 \leq i < j \leq n \). Then the sum \( G_{i,n+i}(c, s) + G_{j,n+j}(c, -\bar{s}) \) is a unitary and perplectic transformation.

---

5The structured transformations introduced here are similar to the ones in [11].
called perplectic concentric embedding,

\[
R(i, j, \phi, \alpha) = \begin{bmatrix}
I_{i-1} & c & -s & i \\
\bar{s} & I_{j-i-1} & c & j \\
\bar{s} & c & I_{n-j} & n+i \\
-s & I_{j-i-1} & c & n+j \\
I_{n-j} & \end{bmatrix}.
\]

(3.5)

It is easy to see that in \(R^H MR\), the four rows and columns \(i, j, n + i\) and \(n + j\) change. But here, the four blocks of \(M\) will be 'mixed'. Just eight entries are affected by both Givens rotations.

Now we would like to use the transformations \(R(i, j, \phi, \alpha)\) (3.4) and (3.5) to maximize

\[
||\text{diag}(R^H MR)||_F^2 + ||\text{diag}(FR^H MR)||_F^2.
\]

(3.6)

Analogous to the discussion in Section 2.3, a \(4 \times 4\) subproblem \(\tilde{M}_{ij}\) of \(M\) as in (2.14) has to be considered. In particular, in order to maximize (3.6) we have to choose \(\phi\) and \(\alpha\) such that

\[
|m_{i1}'|^2 + |m_{jj}'|^2 + |m_{n+i,n+i}'|^2 + |m_{n+j,n+j}'|^2 + |m_{i,n+j}'|^2 + |m_{j,n+i}'|^2 + |m_{n+i,j}'|^2 + |m_{n+j,i}'|^2
\]

is maximized where \(M_{ij}'\) is defined analogous to (2.13) and (2.16). Choosing \(\phi\) and \(\alpha\) is straightforward, but very technical and long. We omit all details here. The Jacobi-type algorithm for solving (3.2) is the same as Algorithm 1 just the rotations (2.9) and (2.11) have to be replaced by (3.4) and (3.5). Moreover, the second inner for-loop (the one for the rotation (3.5)) has to be modified to 'for \(j = n + 1 : 2n - i\) do'. Convergence can be proven similar to the proof for the Hamiltonian case given in Section 5.

4. STRUCTURED ANALOGUES OF THEOREM 1.1

Now we are ready to discuss the problem

\[
\min_{X \in \mathcal{N}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{S}} ||X - A||_F
\]

(4.1)

for \(A \in \mathcal{S}\) and \(\mathcal{S} \in \{\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{K}\}\).

Recall that in the unstructured case \(\min_{X \in \mathcal{N}} ||X - A||_F\) Theorem 1.1 suggests to find a unitary matrix \(U\) which maximizes \(||\text{diag}(U^H AU)||_F\) (which is the same as to minimize \(\text{off}(X)\)). In other words, the goal is to make the matrix \(U^H AU\) as diagonal as possible as then \(X = U \text{diag}(U^H AU)U^H\) is the closest normal matrix to \(A\).

In complete analogy, in the Hamiltonian case, Theorem 2.2 seems to suggest to consider

\[
\max_{Z \in \mathcal{U}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{S}_p} \{||\text{diag}(Z^H HZ)||_F^2 + ||\text{diag}(\bar{J}Z^H HZ)||_F^2\}
\]

or

\[
\min_{Z \in \mathcal{U}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{S}_p} \text{off}_H(Z^H HZ).
\]

In plain words, this implies that the goal might be to move as much weight as possible from the off-diagonals of the four \(n \times n\) blocks onto the four diagonals by a unitary and symplectic
transformation. But extracting the diagonals of the four blocks of $Z^H H Z$

$$\text{diag}(Z^H H Z) + \tilde{J} \text{diag}(\tilde{J} Z^H H Z) = \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_1 & \Lambda_2 \\ \Lambda_3 & -\Lambda_1^H \end{bmatrix} = V_H$$

does not necessarily yield a normal and Hamiltonian matrix! If $H$ is Hamiltonian, but not normal, $\Lambda_2$ and $\Lambda_3$ will be real, but there is no reason why $\Lambda_3$ should be equal to $-\Lambda_2$. Even if $\Lambda_3 = -\Lambda_2$, $V_H$ does not need to be normal. Thus, all we can do is to extract the diagonal of $Z^H H Z$

$$\text{diag}(Z^H H Z) = \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_1 \\ -\Lambda_1^H \end{bmatrix} = D_H. \quad (4.2)$$

Thus we need to modify (4.1) to

$$\min_{X \in D_H} \|X - H\|_F \quad (4.3)$$

for $H \in \mathcal{H}$ and

$$D_H = \{ H \in \mathcal{N}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{H} : \exists Z \in \mathcal{U}_{2n} \cap S_p \ni Z^H H Z \text{ is diagonal} \},$$

which denotes the set of $2n \times 2n$ normal and Hamiltonian matrices which are diagonalizable by a unitary and symplectic similarity transformation.

A similar argument in the per-Hermitian case shows that (4.1) needs to be modified to

$$\min_{X \in D_M} \|X - M\|_F \quad (4.4)$$

for $M \in \mathcal{M}$ and

$$D_M = \{ H \in \mathcal{N}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{M} : \exists Z \in \mathcal{U}_{2n} \cap P_p \ni Z^H M Z \text{ is diagonal} \},$$

which denotes the set of $2n \times 2n$ normal and per-Hermitian matrices which are diagonalizable by a unitary and perplectic similarity transformation. Certainly, extracting the diagonal of $Z^H M Z$ for a per-Hermitian matrix $M \in \mathcal{M}$ and $Z \in \mathcal{U}_{2n} \cap P_p$ yields a matrix of the form

$$\text{diag}(Z^H M Z) = \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_1 \\ F_n \Lambda_1^H F_n \end{bmatrix} = D_M. \quad (4.5)$$

### 4.1. Appropriate Structured Analogue of Theorem 1.1 for the (skew-)Hamiltonian case.

We consider (4.3) and (4.4). Our goal is to find $Z \in \mathcal{U}_{2n} \cap S_p$ such that $\text{off}(Z^H H Z) = \min$ for a Hamiltonian matrix $H$. Notice that the set $\mathcal{U}_{2n} \cap S_p$ is closed and bounded since $\|Z\|_2 = 1$ for any $Z \in \mathcal{U}_{2n} \cap S_p$. Therefore $\mathcal{U}_{2n} \cap S_p$ is compact. Thus, viewing $\text{off}(Z^H H Z)$ as a function of $Z \in \mathcal{U}_{2n} \cap S_p$, off is continuous, so in particular it reaches minimal and maximal values.

**Theorem 4.1.** Let $H \in \mathcal{H}$. Let $Z \in \mathcal{U}_{2n} \cap S_p$ be such that $\text{off}(Z^H H Z) = \min$. Set $X := Z \text{diag}(Z^H H Z) Z^H$. Then the following statements hold:

1. The matrix $X \in D_H$ is Hamiltonian and normal and

$$\|H - X\|_F \leq \|H - Y\|_F$$

for all $Y \in D_H$. 
(2) Let $Y \in \mathcal{D}_H$, that is, there is a unitary and symplectic matrix $Q \in \mathcal{U}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{S}_p$ such that $Q^H Y Q = D_H^Y$ with a diagonal matrix $D_H^Y$ as in (4.2). Then if $\|H - X\|_F = \|H - Y\|_F$ holds, we have
\[
D_H^Y = \text{diag}(Q^H H Q)
\]
and
\[
\text{off}(Z^H H Z) = \text{off}(Q^H H Q) = \min .
\]

Proof. (1) Let $Z \in \mathcal{U}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{S}_p$ be such that off$(Z^H H Z)$ is minimal. Let $X = Z \text{diag}(Z^H H Z) Z^H$ be as above. Then it is obvious, that $X \in \mathcal{D}_H$. Moreover,
\[
\|H - X\|^2_F = \|Z^H H Z - \text{diag}(Z^H H Z)\|^2_F = \text{off}(Z^H H Z).
\]
Now let $Y \in \mathcal{D}_H$. Then there exists a matrix $Q \in \mathcal{U}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{S}_p$ which transforms $Y$ to its Hamiltonian diagonal form $Q^H Y Q = D_H^Y$ (4.2). We have
\[
\|H - Y\|^2_F = \|Q^H H Q - D_H^Y\|^2_F
\]
\[
= \|Q^H H Q - \text{diag}(Q^H H Q) + \text{diag}(Q^H H Q) - D_H^Y\|^2_F
\]
\[
= \text{off}(Q^H H Q) + \|\text{diag}(Q^H H Q) - D_H^Y\|^2_F
\]
\[
\geq \text{off}(Z^H H Z) + \|D_H^Y\|^2_F
\]
\[
\geq \text{off}(Z^H H Z) = \|H - X\|^2_F,
\]
where (4.6) holds as the matrix expressing the first term $B_1 = Q^H H Q - \text{diag}(Q^H H Q)$ has zeros on the diagonal while the matrix representing the second term $B_2 = \text{diag}(Q^H H Q) - D_H^Y$ has nonzero entries only on the diagonal. Therefore, $\|H - Y\|_F \geq \|H - X\|_F$. This proves the first statement.

(2) Let $Z \in \mathcal{U}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{S}_p$ be such that off$(Z^H H Z)$ is minimal. Let $X = Z \text{diag}(Z^H H Z) Z^H$ be as above. Let $Y \in \mathcal{D}_H$. Then there exists a matrix $Q \in \mathcal{U}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{S}_p$ which transforms $Y$ to diagonal form (4.2) $Q^H Y Q = D_H^Y$.

Clearly, the first statement of this theorem holds, that is, $\|H - Y\|^2_F \geq \|H - X\|^2_F$. Let us assume that this is an equality. That is, $\|H - Y\|^2_F = \|H - X\|^2_F = \text{off}(Z^H H Z)$. Then in (4.6) we have
\[
\|\text{diag}(Q^H H Q) - D_H^Y\|^2_F = 0.
\]
This implies
\[
D_H^Y = \text{diag}(Q^H H Q).
\]
This proves the first part of the second statement.

A straightforward computation shows
\[
\|H - Y\|^2_F = \|Q^H H Q - D_H^Y\|^2_F = \|Q^H H Q - \text{diag}(Q^H H Q)\|^2_F = \text{off}(Q^H H Q).
\]
In conclusion $\text{off}(Q^H H Q) = \|H - X\|^2_F = \text{off}(Z^H H Z)$, so $Q$ is another symplectic and unitary matrix such that $\text{off}(Q^H H Q)$ is minimal.

Algorithm [I] was designed to minimize $\text{off}_H(Z^H H Z)$ for a unitary and symplectic $Z$. In case $H$ is normal and Hamiltonian, it will converge to a matrix with zero $\text{off}_H$. For nonnormal $H$ it will converge to a matrix which has a minimal $\text{off}_H$. In particular, weight is accumulated on the diagonals of the four blocks of $H$. It can easily be modified in order to minimize $\text{off}(Z^H H Z)$. We
just need to add rotations which move weight from the diagonals of the off-diagonal blocks of $H$ onto the diagonal of $H$. This can be done by the unitary and symplectic rotation

$$R(i, n + i, \phi, 0) = G_{i,n+i}(\cos \phi, \sin \phi) = \begin{bmatrix} I_{i-1} & \cos \phi & -\sin \phi \\ -\sin \phi & I_{n-i} & 0 \\ \sin \phi & 0 & I_{n-i} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.7)$$

The modified Jacobi-like algorithm is given as Algorithm 2. Its convergence can be proven along the lines of the proof given in Section 5. Details are omitted here.

**Algorithm 2.** Jacobi-type algorithm for min off($Z^H H Z$)

*Input:* $A \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n}$ Hamiltonian or skew-Hamiltonian.

*Output:* symplectic unitary $Z$ such that off($Z^H AZ$) = min

$k = 0$

$A^{(1)} = A$

$Z_1 = I$

repeat

for $i = 1, \ldots, n - 1$ do

for $j = i + 1, \ldots, n$ do

$k = k + 1$

Find $\phi_k$, $\alpha_k$ for $R_k = R(i,j,\phi_k,\alpha_k)$ as in (2.9)

$A^{(k+1)} = R_k^H A^{(k)} R_k$

$Z_{k+1} = Z_k R_k$

end for

for $j = n + i + 1, \ldots, 2n$ do

$k = k + 1$

Find $\phi_k$, $\alpha_k$ for $R_k = R(i,j - n, \phi_k, \alpha_k)$ as in (2.11)

$A^{(k+1)} = R_k^H A^{(k)} R_k$

$Z_{k+1} = Z_k R_k$

end for

end for

for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ do

$k = k + 1$

Find $\phi_k$, $\alpha_k$ for $R_k = R(i,n + i, \phi_k, \alpha_k)$ as in (4.7)

$A^{(k+1)} = R_k^H A^{(k)} R_k$

$Z_{k+1} = Z_k R_k$

end for

until convergence

4.2. Analogue of Theorem 1.1 for the per-Hermitian case. Let us now consider (4.4) and (1.2) in the context of per-Hermitian matrices. The following theorem gives a statement on closest normal and per-Hermitian matrices. Notice its similarity to Theorem 4.1.

**Theorem 4.2.** Let $M \in \mathcal{M}$. Let $Z \in \mathcal{U}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{P}p$ be such that off($Z^H M Z$) = min. Set $X := Z \text{diag}(Z^H M Z) Z^H$. Then the following statements hold:
(1) The matrix $X \in D_M$ is per-Hermitian and normal and
\[
\|M - X\|_F \leq \|M - Y\|_F
\]
for all $Y \in D_M$.

(2) Let $Y \in D_M$, that is, there is a unitary and perplectic matrix $Q \in U_{2n} \cap \mathcal{P}_p$ such that $Q^H Y Q = D^Y_M$ with a diagonal matrix $D^Y_M$ as in (4.5). Then if $\|M - X\|_F = \|M - Y\|_F$ holds, we have
\[
D^Y_M = \text{diag}(Q^H M Q)
\]
and
\[
\text{off}(Z^H M Z) = \text{off}(Q^H M Q) = \min.
\]

The proof of Theorem 4.2 follows exactly the same reasoning as in the proof of Theorem 4.1 replacing the Hamiltonian structure by the per-Hermitian one and considering the sets $U_{2n} \cap \mathcal{P}_p$ and $D_M$ instead of $U_{2n} \cap S_p$ and $D_H$. Therefore, we skip the proof of Theorem 4.2.

Algorithm 2 can easily be modified to minimize $\text{off}(Z^H M Z)$ for a unitary and perplectic $Z$. The rotations (2.9) and (2.11) have to be replaced by the unitary and perplectic rotations (3.4) and (3.5). Moreover, the inner for-loop for the rotation (3.5) has to be modified to 'for $j = n+1 : 2n-i$ do'. Instead of (4.7) the unitary and perplectic rotation
\[
R(i, 2n - i + 1, \phi, -\frac{\pi}{2}) = G_{i, 2n-i+1}(\cos \phi, i \sin \phi) = \begin{bmatrix}
I_{i-1} & \cos \phi & i \sin \phi \\
\sin \phi & i & \cos \phi \\
i \sin \phi & I_{2n-2i} & I_{i-1}
\end{bmatrix}
\]
has to be used.

5. Convergence of Algorithm 1

In this section we provide a convergence proof for Algorithm 1. We will discuss only the case of Hamiltonian matrices, the proof for skew-Hamiltonian matrices follows in exactly the same way with only minor modifications. In particular, we will prove the following theorem.

**Theorem 5.1.** Let $(Z_k, k \geq 0)$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. Every accumulation point of $(Z_k, k \geq 0)$ is a stationary point of function $f_H$ from (2.7).

The proof of Theorem 5.1 uses the technique from [9]. First we need to consider $f_H$ from (2.7) more closely,
\[
f_H : U_{2n} \cap S_p \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0},
\]
\[
Z \mapsto \|\text{diag}(Z^H H Z)\|_F^2 + \|\text{diag}(J Z^H H Z)\|_F^2.
\]

Since $Z$ is symplectic unitary, $Z$ and $Z^H$ commute with $J$. Thus, for $f_H$ we have
\[
f_H(Z) = \|\text{diag}(Z^H A Z)\|_F^2 + \|\text{diag}(J Z^H A Z)\|_F^2
\]
\[
= \sum_{j=1}^{2n} \|Z^H A Z e_j, e_j\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{2n} \|Z^H J A Z e_j, e_j\|^2
\]
\[
= \sum_{j=1}^{2n} \|A Z e_j, Z e_j\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{2n} \|J A Z e_j, Z e_j\|^2
\]
where $(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes the standard inner product $(x, y) = y^H x$ for $x, y \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n}$.

As a real valued function of a complex variable is complex differentiable only if it is constant, the function $f_H$ is not complex differentiable; that is, $\frac{\partial f_H}{\partial z_{jk}}$ does not exist for $Z = [z_{jk}] \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n}$. But with $z_{jk} = \Re(z_{jk}) + i\Im(z_{jk}), j, k = 1, \ldots, 2n$, the partial derivatives

$$\frac{\partial f_H}{\partial \Re(z_{jk})} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial f_H}{\partial \Im(z_{jk})}$$

do exist as this involves only real differentiation. For our next argument, we identify $\mathbb{C}$ with $\mathbb{R}^{1 \times 2}, \mathbb{C}^{2n}$ with $\mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2}$ (or $\mathbb{R}^{4n}$) and $\mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n}$ with $\mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2 \times 2}$ (or $\mathbb{R}^{8n^2}$). Consequently, $f_H$ is viewed as a real-valued function on the Euclidian space $\mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2 \times 2} \cong \mathbb{R}^{8n^2}$. As such, it is differentiable and its gradient is a matrix in $\mathbb{R}^{8n^2} \cong \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2 \times 2} \cong \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n}$ given by

$$\nabla f_H(Z) = \left[ \frac{\partial f_H}{\partial \Re(z_{jk})} + i \frac{\partial f_H}{\partial \Im(z_{jk})} \right]_{j, k=1}^{2n}. $$

In order to prove Theorem 5.1 the following three steps are necessary (the following restates the description given in [8] adapted to our situation): First, in Lemma 5.2 the structure of $\nabla f_H$ is determined. This is then used to prove in Lemma 5.3 that if a point $Z$ is not a stationary point, then there exists a rotation $R(i, j, \phi, \alpha)$ that increases the value of $f_H$. The third step (Lemma 5.5) will prove that if $Z$ is not a stationary point, then for any point in a small neighborhood around $Z$, applying one step of Algorithm 1 will increase the value of $f_H$ by a nonzero amount. Finally, based on Polak’s theorem [13, Section 1.3, Theorem 3] the main result is proved by contradiction: Let $(Z_k, k \geq 0)$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. Assume that there is an accumulation point $Z$ that is not a stationary point and take a subsequence $\{Z_j\}, j \in K \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ that converges to $Z$. Then there is an index $k_0$ such that for all $k \geq k_0 \parallel Z_k - Z \parallel < \epsilon$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. Lemma 5.5 then gives that the value of $f_H(Z_j)$ continues to increase as $k \to \infty$. However, since $f_H$ is continuous and $\{Z_j\}, j \in K$ converges, $\{f_H(Z_j)\}, j \in K$ should converge too, which is a contradiction.

We will not be able to determine $\nabla f_H(Z)$ directly. Instead, we define an auxiliary function $\tilde{f} : \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$,

$$\tilde{f}(Z) = \sum_{j=1}^{2n} |\langle AZe_j, Z e_j \rangle|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{2n} |\langle JAZe_j, Z e_j \rangle|^2 \quad (5.1)$$
on a larger domain; $f_H$ is the restriction of $\tilde{f}$ to $U_{2n} \cap Sp$. We will first determine $\nabla \tilde{f}(Z)$. Then $\nabla f_H(Z)$ is obtained by projecting $\nabla \tilde{f}(Z)$ onto the tangent space at $Z$ to the space of unitary symplectic matrices

$$\nabla f_H(Z) = P_Z \nabla \tilde{f}(Z).$$

The set $U_{2n}$ of all unitary matrices $W \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n}$ is a Lie group as well as a differentiable manifold. At the identity, the tangent space is the Lie algebra of skew-Hermitian matrices $T_I U_{2n} = \{ V \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n} \mid V = -V^H \}$, see, e.g., [1]. Similarly, the set $Sp$ of all symplectic matrices $S \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n}$ is a Lie group as well as a differentiable manifold. At the identity, the tangent space is the Lie algebra of Hamiltonian matrices $T_I Sp = H$. Thus we need to project onto the skew-Hermitian Hamiltonian matrices. If some matrix $P_I$ is the projection at the identity, then $P_Z = Z P_I$ is the projection at $Z$.

Now we can prove the following statement.
Lemma 5.2. The gradient of $f_H$ from (2.7) can be expressed as
\[ \nabla f_H(Z) = ZX, \]
where $\text{diag}(X) = 0$, $\text{diag}(JX) = 0$, and $X$ is skew-Hermitian Hamiltonian.

Proof. Defining the function $g : \mathbb{C}^{2n} \to \mathbb{R}$, $g(z) = |\langle Az, z \rangle|^2 + |\langle JAz, z \rangle|^2$, allows us to rewrite $\tilde{f}$ as
\[ \tilde{f}(Z) = \sum_{j=1}^{2n} g(Ze_j). \]
Viewing $f_H$ as a function on $\mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n \times 2} \cong \mathbb{R}^{8n^2}$ and $g$ as a function on $\mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2} \cong \mathbb{R}^n$ we can write
\[ \nabla \tilde{f}(Z) = \begin{bmatrix} \nabla g(Ze_1) & \cdots & \nabla g(Ze_{2n}) \end{bmatrix}, \]
where for $z = [z_j] \in \mathbb{C}^{2n}$
\[ \nabla g(z) = \left[ \frac{\partial g}{\partial \text{Re}(z_j)} + i \frac{\partial g}{\partial \text{Im}(z_j)} \right]_{j=1}^{2n}, \]
as $g$ is real differentiable. In order to determine $\nabla g(z)$ we continue viewing $g$ as a real-valued function on $\mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2} \cong \mathbb{R}^n$. As such its Taylor expansion exists. This can be written in terms of
\[ g(z + h) = g(z) + \langle \nabla g(z), h \rangle_R + O(\|h\|^2) \]
for $h \in \mathbb{C}^{2n}$ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_R : \mathbb{C}^{2n} \times \mathbb{C}^{2n} \to \mathbb{R}$ with $\langle u, v \rangle_R = \text{Re}(\langle u, v \rangle) = \text{Re}(v^H u) = \text{Re}(\sum_{j=1}^{2n} u_j v_j)$. Then
\[ g(z + h) - g(z) = |\langle Az, z \rangle| + |\langle JAz, z \rangle|^2 - |\langle Az, z \rangle|^2 - |\langle JAz, z \rangle|^2 \\
\quad + |\langle JAz, z \rangle + \langle JAz, h \rangle + \langle JA_h, z \rangle + \langle JA_h, h \rangle|^2 - |\langle JAz, z \rangle|^2 \\
= 2\text{Re}\left( \langle Az, h \rangle + \langle Ah, z \rangle \langle Az, z \rangle + \langle JAz, h \rangle + \langle JA_h, z \rangle \langle JAz, z \rangle \right) + O(\|h\|^2) \\
= 2\text{Re}\left( \langle Az, z \rangle Az + \langle Az, z \rangle A^H z + \langle JAz, z \rangle JAz + \langle JA_h, z \rangle (JA^H z, h) \right) + O(\|h\|^2) \]
as
\[ \langle Az, z \rangle = \langle Az, z \rangle = \langle Az, z \rangle A^H z = \langle Az, z \rangle A^H z, \]
Thus we have
\[ g(z + h) - g(z) = 2\text{Re}\left( \langle Az, z \rangle Az + \langle Az, z \rangle A^H z + \langle JAz, z \rangle JAz + \langle JA_h, z \rangle (JA^H z, h) \right) + O(\|h\|^2) \]
which implies that
\[ \nabla g(z) = 2\langle Az, z \rangle Az + 2\langle Az, z \rangle A^H z + 2\langle JAz, z \rangle JAz + 2\langle JA_h, z \rangle (JA^H z, h) \]
With this, we have described $\nabla \tilde{f}(Z)$.

For any unitary (and symplectic) matrix $Z$, the matrix $Y := Z^H \text{grad} \tilde{f}(Z)$ does exist. Let $X$ be the projection of $Y$ onto the space of skew-Hermitian Hamiltonian matrices. Then
\[ \text{grad} f_H(Z) = ZX. \]
This proves the first part of the statement of the theorem. It remains to prove that $\text{diag}(X) = 0$, and $\text{diag}(JX) = 0$. In order to do so, we determine the diagonals of $Y$ and of $JY$.

The diagonal of $Y$ is given by
\[ \text{diag}(Y) = \text{diag}(Z^H \text{grad} \tilde{f}(Z)) = (\langle \nabla g(Ze_j), Ze_j \rangle)_{j=1}^{2n}. \]
Further on,
\[ \langle \nabla g(z), z \rangle = \langle 2(Az, z)Az + 2(Az, z)A^H z + 2(JAz, z)JAz + 2(JAz, z)(JA)^H z, z \rangle \]
\[ = 4|\langle Az, z \rangle|^2 + 4|\langle JAz, z \rangle|^2 \in \mathbb{R}. \]

Thus, \( \text{diag}(Y) \) is real. Its projection onto the space of skew-Hermitian matrices will give zeros on the diagonal of \( X \), that is \( \text{diag}(X) = 0 \).

It will require more computation to prove that \( \text{diag}(JX) = 0 \). First we determine that \( \text{diag}(JY)_j + \text{diag}(JY)_{n+j}, j = 1, \ldots, n, \) is purely imaginary. Here we have

\[ \text{diag}(JY) = \text{diag}(JZ^H \text{grad} \tilde{f}(Z)) = (\langle J\nabla g(Ze_j), Ze_j \rangle)^{2n}_{j=1}. \]

Let us start with \( \text{diag}(JY)_j, j = 1, \ldots, n, \) and keep in mind that \( A \) is Hamiltonian, that is \( JA^H J = A, \) and that \( J^2 = -I \)

\[ \text{diag}(JY)_j = \langle J\nabla g(Ze_j), Ze_j \rangle \]
\[ = 2\langle Az_j, Ze_j \rangle \langle JAze_j, Ze_j \rangle + 2\langle Az_j, Ze_j \rangle \langle JA^H Ze_j, Ze_j \rangle \]
\[ + 2\langle JAz_j, Ze_j \rangle \langle J^2 Az, JZe_j \rangle + 2\langle JAz_j, Ze_j \rangle \langle -JA^H JZe_j, Ze_j \rangle \]
\[ = 2\langle Az_j, Ze_j \rangle \langle JAze_j, Ze_j \rangle + 2\langle Az_j, Ze_j \rangle \langle JA^H Ze_j, Ze_j \rangle \]
\[ - 2\langle JAz_j, Ze_j \rangle \langle Az, JZe_j \rangle - 2\langle JAz_j, Ze_j \rangle \langle Az, JZe_j \rangle \]
\[ = 2\left( \langle Az_j, Ze_j \rangle \langle JAze_j, Ze_j \rangle - \langle JAze_j, Ze_j \rangle \langle Az, Ze_j \rangle \right) \]
\[ + 2\left( \langle JA^H Ze_j, Ze_j \rangle - \langle JAze_j, Ze_j \rangle \right) \langle Az, Ze_j \rangle \]
\[ = -4\text{Im} \left( \langle Az_j, Ze_j \rangle \langle JAze_j, Ze_j \rangle \right) + 2 \left( \langle JA^H Ze_j, Ze_j \rangle - \langle JAze_j, Ze_j \rangle \right) \langle Az, Ze_j \rangle. \]

Next, consider \( \text{diag}(JY)_{n+j}, j = 1, \ldots, n, \) and make use of the fact that \( Ze_{n+j} = -JZe_j \) as \( Z \) is unitary symplectic

\[ \text{diag}(JY)_{n+j} = \langle J\nabla g(Ze_{n+j}), Ze_{n+j} \rangle \]
\[ = 2\langle Az_j, Ze_j \rangle \langle JAze_j, Ze_j \rangle + 2\langle Az_j, Ze_j \rangle \langle JA^H Ze_j, Ze_j \rangle + 2\langle JAz_j, Ze_j \rangle \langle J^2 Az, JZe_j \rangle + 2\langle JAz_j, Ze_j \rangle \langle -JA^H JZe_j, JZe_j \rangle \]
\[ = 2\langle Az_j, Ze_j \rangle \langle JAze_j, Ze_j \rangle + 2\langle Az_j, Ze_j \rangle \langle JA^H Ze_j, Ze_j \rangle \]
\[ - 2\langle JAz_j, Ze_j \rangle \langle Az, JZe_j \rangle - 2\langle JAz_j, Ze_j \rangle \langle Az, JZe_j \rangle \]
\[ = 4\text{Im} \left( \langle Az_j, Ze_j \rangle \langle JA^H Ze_j, Ze_j \rangle \right) + 2 \left( \langle JAze_j, Ze_j \rangle - \langle JA^H Ze_j, Ze_j \rangle \right) \langle J^H Ze_j, Ze_j \rangle \]
\[ = 4\text{Im} \left( \langle Az_j, Ze_j \rangle \langle JA^H Ze_j, Ze_j \rangle \right) - 2 \left( \langle JA^H Ze_j, Ze_j \rangle - \langle JAze_j, Ze_j \rangle \right) \langle AZe_j, Ze_j \rangle. \]
as \( \langle A^H Ze_j, Ze_j \rangle = e_j^T Z^H A Ze_j = e_j^T Z^H A^H Ze_j = \langle AZe_j, Ze_j \rangle \). Thus

\[
\text{diag}(JY)_j + \text{diag}(JY)_{n+j} = -4 \text{Im} \left( \langle AZe_j, Ze_j \rangle \langle JA Ze_j, Ze_j \rangle \right) + 4 \text{Im} \left( \langle AZe_j, Ze_j \rangle \langle JA^H Ze_j, Ze_j \rangle \right)
\]

\[
+ 2 \left( \langle JA^H Ze_j, Ze_j \rangle - \langle JA Ze_j, Ze_j \rangle \right) \left( \langle AZe_j, Ze_j \rangle - \langle AZe_j, Ze_j \rangle \right)
\]

\[
= -4 \text{Im} \left( \langle AZe_j, Ze_j \rangle \langle JA Ze_j, Ze_j \rangle \right) + 4 \text{Im} \left( \langle AZe_j, Ze_j \rangle \langle JA^H Ze_j, Ze_j \rangle \right)
\]

\[
+ 4 \left( \langle JA^H - JA \rangle Ze_j, Ze_j \rangle \right) \text{Im} \left( \langle AZe_j, Ze_j \rangle \right) \in i \mathbb{R}
\]

as \( JA^H, JA \) and hence \( Z^H (JA^H - JA) Z \) are Hermitian and thus have real-valued diagonal elements. Since the projection \( X \) of \( Y \) is Hamiltonian, \( \text{diag}(JX) \) is real, which leads to

\[
\text{diag}(JX)_j + \text{diag}(JX)_{n+j} = 0, \quad j = 1 \ldots, n.
\]

Moreover, \( X \) is skew-Hermitian. Hence, \( \text{diag}(X)_{n+j} = -\text{diag}(X)_j \) and

\[
\text{diag}(JX)_{n+j} = \text{diag}(JX)_j, \quad j = 1 \ldots, n.
\]

We conclude that

\[
\text{diag}(JX)_j = 0, \quad j = 1 \ldots, 2n.
\]  

\[\square\]

**Remark 5.3.** The orthogonal projection of \( Y = \begin{bmatrix} Y_{11} & Y_{12} \\ Y_{21} & Y_{22} \end{bmatrix} \) onto the subspace of skew-Hermitian Hamiltonian matrices is given by

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
B & C \\
-C & B
\end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \frac{Y_{11} + Y_{22} - Y_{11}^H - Y_{22}^H}{4}, \quad C = \frac{Y_{12} - Y_{21} + Y_{12}^H - Y_{21}^H}{4}.
\]

**Lemma 5.4.** For every symplectic unitary \( Z \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n} \) there is symplectic rotation \( R(i, j, \phi, \alpha) \) such that

\[
|\langle \text{grad} f_H(Z), Z \dot{R}(i, j, 0, \alpha) \rangle| \geq \eta \|\text{grad} f_H(Z)\|_F, \quad \eta = \frac{4}{\sqrt{4n^2 - 4n}},
\]

where \( \dot{R}(i, j, 0, \alpha) \) denotes \( \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} R(i, j, \phi, \alpha) \big|_{\phi=0} \).

**Proof.** Obviously, if \( \|\text{grad} f_H(Z)\|_F = 0 \), the lemma holds for any rotation. Thus, assume that \( \|\text{grad} f_H(Z)\|_F \neq 0 \). From Lemma 5.2 we have \( \text{grad} f_H(Z) = ZX \). Hence, with \( |x| = |x_{rs}| = \max_{i \neq j} |x_{ij}| > 0 \) for \( X = [x_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^{2n} \) it holds that

\[
\|\text{grad} f_H(Z)\|_F = \|ZX\|_F = \|X\|_F \leq \sqrt{4n^2 - 4n} |x|.
\]  

(5.2)

On the other hand,

\[
\langle \text{grad} f_H(Z), Z \dot{R}(i, j, 0, \alpha) \rangle = \text{Re} \langle \text{grad} f_H(Z), Z \dot{R}(i, j, 0, \alpha) \rangle
\]

\[
= \text{Re} \langle \text{trace}((Z X)^H Z \dot{R}(i, j, 0, \alpha)) \rangle
\]

\[
= \text{Re} \langle \text{trace}(X^H \dot{R}(i, j, 0, \alpha)) \rangle.
\]  

(5.3)
Let us first consider a unitary symplectic rotation $R(i, j, \phi, \alpha)$ of the form (2.9). Then

$$
\dot{R}(i, j, \phi, \alpha) = \begin{bmatrix}
- \sin \phi & -e^{i\alpha} \cos \phi \\
\phantom{-}e^{-i\alpha} \cos \phi & - \sin \phi \\
\end{bmatrix}
$$

and

$$
\dot{R}(i, j, 0, \alpha) = \begin{bmatrix}
\phantom{-}e^{-i\alpha} & -e^{i\alpha} \\
\phantom{-}e^{-i\alpha} & -e^{-i\alpha} \\
\end{bmatrix}
$$

where in the matrices on the right all elements that are not explicitly given are zero.

From Lemma 5.2 we know that $X$ is skew-Hermitian and Hamiltonian. Hence, with $x = x_{ij}$ we have $x_{ji} = -\bar{x}$, $x_{n+i,n+j} = x$ and $x_{n+j,n+i} = -\bar{x}$. This gives

$$
X^H \dot{R}(i, j, 0, \alpha) = \begin{bmatrix}
-x & \bar{x} \\
\bar{x} & -x \\
\end{bmatrix}
$$

where in $X^H$ only the 4 relevant entries at the positions $(i, j), (j, i), (n+i, n+j)$ and $(n+j, n+i)$ are given. Now (5.3) implies

$$
\langle \nabla f_H(Z), Z \dot{R}(i, j, 0, \alpha) \rangle = \text{Re}(-2xe^{-i\alpha} - 2\bar{x}e^{i\alpha}) = -4\text{Re}(xe^{-i\alpha}).
$$

Choose $\tilde{\alpha}$ such that

$$
e^{-i\tilde{\alpha}} = \text{sgn}(\bar{x}) = \frac{\bar{x}}{|x|}.
$$

Then

$$
|\langle \nabla f_H(Z), Z \dot{R}(i, j, 0, \tilde{\alpha}) \rangle| = 4\text{Re}(x\frac{\bar{x}}{|x|}) = 4|x|.
$$

Now, with (5.2) we obtain

$$
|\langle \nabla f_H(Z), Z \dot{R}(i, j, 0, \tilde{\alpha}) \rangle| \geq \frac{4}{\sqrt{4n^2 - 4n}} \|\nabla f_H(Z)\|_F = \eta \|\nabla f_H(Z)\|_F.
$$
Now let us consider a unitary symplectic rotation $R(i, j, \phi, \alpha)$ of the form (2.11). Then

\[
\hat{R}(i, j, 0, \alpha) = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & -e^{i\alpha} \\
-e^{-i\alpha} & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\]

where in the matrix on the right all elements that are not explicitly given are zero. The statement of the lemma follows in this case just as before.

**Lemma 5.5.** Let $(Z_k, k \geq 0)$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. For every $\tilde{Z} \in U_{2n} \cap S_p$ with $\text{grad} f_\mathcal{H}(\tilde{Z}) \neq 0$, there exist $\epsilon > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ such that

\[
\|Z_k - \tilde{Z}\|_F < \epsilon \quad \Rightarrow \quad f_\mathcal{H}(Z_{k+1}) - f_\mathcal{H}(Z_k) \geq \delta.
\]

**Proof.** As $\text{grad} f_\mathcal{H}(\tilde{Z}) \neq 0$ there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that

\[
\eta_1 = \min_{\|Z - \tilde{Z}\|_F < \epsilon} \|\text{grad} f_\mathcal{H}(Z)\|_F > 0.
\]  

(5.5)

For a fixed $k$ we define the differentiable function $h_k : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R},$

\[
h_k(\phi, \alpha) = f_\mathcal{H}(Z_k R(i_k, j_k, \phi, \alpha)),
\]

where $R(i_k, j_k, \phi, \alpha)$ is a unitary symplectic rotation as in (2.9) or (2.11). Algorithm 1 will determine $\phi_k$ and $\alpha_k$, and hence, $R_k = R(i_k, j_k, \phi_k, \alpha_k)$, such that $f_\mathcal{H}$ is maximized. Thus, since $R(i_k, j_k, 0, \alpha) = I$ for any $\alpha$ we have

\[
h_k(0, \alpha) = f_\mathcal{H}(Z_k) \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{\phi, \alpha} h_k(\phi, \alpha) = h_k(\phi_k, \alpha_k) = f_\mathcal{H}(Z_{k+1}).
\]  

(5.6)

Take $\bar{\alpha}$ as in (5.4) and define another function $H_k : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R},$

\[
H_k(\phi) = h_k(\phi, \bar{\alpha}).
\]  

(5.7)

The Taylor expansion of $H_k$ around 0 yields

\[
H_k(\phi_k) = H_k(0) + H_k'(0)\phi_k + \frac{1}{2} H_k''(\xi)\phi_k^2, \quad 0 < \xi < \phi_k.
\]

Let $M = \max |H_k''(\xi)| < \infty$. Then

\[
H_k(\phi_k) - H_k(0) \geq H_k'(0)\phi_k - \frac{1}{2} M \phi_k^2.
\]  

(5.8)

The derivative of $H_k$ is

\[
H_k'(\phi) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} f_\mathcal{H}(Z_k R(i_k, j_k, \phi, \bar{\alpha})) = \langle \text{grad} f_\mathcal{H}(Z_k R(i_k, j_k, \phi, \bar{\alpha})), Z_k R(i_k, j_k, \phi, \bar{\alpha}) \rangle \mathbb{R},
\]

and, in particular,

\[
H_k'(0) = \langle \text{grad} f_\mathcal{H}(Z_k), Z_k \hat{R}(i_k, j_k, 0, \bar{\alpha}) \rangle \mathbb{R}.
\]

From Lemma 5.4 and relation (5.5) we obtain

\[
|H_k'(0)| \geq \eta \|\text{grad} f_\mathcal{H}(Z_k)\| \geq \eta \min_{\|Z - \tilde{Z}\|_F < \epsilon} \|\text{grad} f_\mathcal{H}(Z)\|_F = \eta \eta_1.
\]  

(5.9)
From (5.6), (5.7) and (5.8), for any \( \phi \), we have
\[
\| f_H(Z_{k+1}) - f_H(Z_k) - h_k(\phi, \alpha_k) - h_k(0, \tilde{\alpha}) - h_k(0, \tilde{\alpha}) \| \geq H'_k(\phi) - H'_k(0) \geq \frac{1}{2}M\phi^2. \tag{5.10}
\]

Choose \( \phi = \frac{H'_k(0)}{M} \). Finally, from (5.10) and (5.9) we obtain
\[
f_H(Z_{k+1}) - f_H(Z_k) \geq \frac{H'_k(0)^2}{M} - \frac{H'_k(0)^2}{2M} = \frac{H'_k(0)^2}{2M} \geq \frac{\eta^2\eta^2}{2M} = \delta.
\]

\[\square\]

Now we can prove Theorem 5.1.

**Proof of Theorem 5.1.** Suppose that \( \hat{Z} \) is an accumulation point of Algorithm 1. Then there is a subsequence \( \{Z_j\} \), \( j \in K \subseteq \mathbb{N} \) such that \( Z_j \) converges to \( \hat{Z} \). Assume that \( \hat{Z} \) is not a stationary point of \( f_H \), that is grad \( f_H(\hat{Z}) \neq 0 \). Then, for any \( \epsilon > 0 \), there is an index \( k_0 \in K \) such that \( \| Z_k - \hat{Z} \| < \epsilon \) for every \( k > k_0 \). Lemma 5.5 implies that \( f_H(Z_{k+1}) - f_H(Z_k) \geq \delta > 0 \). Then \( f_H(Z_k) \to \infty \), when \( k \to \infty \), but if \( Z_k \) converges, then \( f_H(Z_k) \) should converge, too. This gives a contradiction. \[\square\]

The convergence of the sequence obtained by Algorithm 2 to a stationary point of \( \text{off}(Z^HHZ) \) can be proven along the lines of the proof of Theorem 5.1. Appropriate analogues of the Lemmata 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4 have to be used. Note that instead of minimizing \( \text{off}(Z^HHZ) \) one can just as well maximize
\[
f_D(Z) := \| \text{diag}(Z^HHZ) \|_F^2.
\]

In the modified Lemma 5.2 the gradient of the function \( f_D \) has to be considered. It can be expressed as grad \( f_D(Z) = ZX \), where \( \text{diag}(X) = 0 \) and \( X \) is skew-Hermitian. In the analogue of Lemma 5.4 we obtain \( \eta = \frac{2}{\sqrt{4\eta^2 - 2\eta^2}} \). Further on, using this result, Lemma 5.5 holds, when \( f_H \) is replaced by \( f_D \).

6. **Numerical Experiments**

In this section we present some numerical experiments for the Hamiltonian case. All tests were done in Matlab R2017b. Recall that any pivot ordering can be used in Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 as the convergence proof from Section 5 does not depend on the ordering inside one sweep. Our implementation uses the following pivot ordering in Algorithm 1
\[
(1, 2), (1, 3), \ldots, (1, n), (2, 3), \ldots, (2, n), \ldots, (n - 1, n),
(1, n + 2), (1, n + 3), \ldots, (1, 2n), (2, n + 3), \ldots, (2, 2n), \ldots, (n - 1, 2n),
\]

while in Algorithm 2 we use
\[
(1, 2), (1, 3), \ldots, (1, n), (2, 3), \ldots, (2, n), \ldots, (n - 1, n),
(1, n + 1), (2, n + 2), \ldots, (n, 2n),
(1, n + 2), (1, n + 3), \ldots, (1, 2n), (2, n + 3), \ldots, (2, 2n), \ldots, (n - 1, 2n).
\]

To ensure the convergence one must check that each pivot pair satisfies the condition implied by Lemma 5.4.

For all experiments we set up random \( 2n \times 2n \) Hamiltonian matrices \( H \) as in (2.1) by generating a random \( n \times n \) matrix \( H_{11} \) and random \( n \times n \) Hermitian matrices \( H_{12} \) and \( H_{21} \). In case, a normal Hamiltonian matrix which can be diagonalized by a unitary and symplectic transformation
was needed to set up experiments, we first set up a random Hamiltonian matrix and then use Algorithm 2 to compute its closest normal Hamiltonian matrix under unitary and symplectic transformations.

Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 are always run for 20 iterations. For all examples considered that was more than sufficient to achieve convergence.

For the first set of experiments, 50 normal Hamiltonian $20 \times 20$ matrices $X_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, 50$, which can be diagonalized using symplectic unitary matrices were generate as described above. To each $X_i$ we add a perturbation to obtain a Hamiltonian matrix $H_i$ which is no longer normal. This perturbation is such that $X_i$ and $H_i$ differ in two elements. We run 20 iterations of Algorithm 2 on the matrices $H_i$ to obtain matrices $Y_i$, the closest normal to $H_i$. In Figure 2 we compare the distance between $H_i$ and $Y_i$ with the distance between $H_i$ and $X_i$. As expected, $\|H_i - X_i\|_F$ is the upper bound for $\|H_i - Y_i\|_F$. However, since our algorithm converges to a stationary point, sometimes it could happen that $\|H_i - Y_i\|_F > \|H_i - X_i\|_F$.

![Figure 2. Upper bound for the closest normal matrix.](image)

In the second set of experiments the departure from normality is compared to off. For any matrix $A$ its Schur form

$$U^H A U = T = D + N,$$

exists, where $U$ is unitary, $D = \text{diag}(T)$ and $N$ is strictly upper triangular. The quantity $\Delta(A) = \|N\|_F$ is referred to as $A$’s departure from normality, see e.g. [6]. In Table 1 we report for ten random Hamiltonian matrices $H_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, 10$, of different sizes their departure from normality $\Delta(H_i)$ (computed using Matlab’s \texttt{schur} function) and the off-norm $\text{off}(H_i^{(20)})$ for the matrix $H_i^{(20)}$ obtained from $H_i$ after 20 iterations of Algorithm 2. One can see that these two values are of the same order and that $\text{off}(H_i^{(20)}) < \Delta(H)$.

Finally, in Figure 3 we illustrate convergence of Algorithm 1. If we run the algorithm for 20 iterations on a normal Hamiltonian matrix $H$ which can be diagonalized by a unitary and symplectic transformation to obtain $H^{(20)}$, one can observe that the canonical form given in Theorem 2.2 is obtained. The matrix norm can be completely moved to the diagonal of the four blocks of $H$, that is, $\|H\|_F^2 \approx \|\text{diag}(Z^H H^{(20)} Z)\|_F^2 + \|\text{diag}(J Z^H H^{(20)} Z)\|_F^2 =: \Gamma(H^{(20)})$. Here, $Z$ is the accumulated transformation matrix from Algorithm 1. On the other hand, if we run the algorithm on a random Hamiltonian matrix, then most, but not all, of the matrix norm can be moved.
Table 1. Departure from normality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example i</th>
<th>Size of $H_i$</th>
<th>$\Delta(H_i)$</th>
<th>$\text{off}(H_i^{(20)})$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$7.1 \cdot 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>$6.4 \cdot 10^{-6}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$4.0 \cdot 10^{-3}$</td>
<td>$3.1 \cdot 10^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$3.5 \cdot 10^{-5}$</td>
<td>$3.1 \cdot 10^{-5}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$5.3 \cdot 10^{-2}$</td>
<td>$4.4 \cdot 10^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$7.7 \cdot 10^{0}$</td>
<td>$6.7 \cdot 10^{0}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$1.0 \cdot 10^{-1}$</td>
<td>$9.0 \cdot 10^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$7.9 \cdot 10^{-7}$</td>
<td>$6.6 \cdot 10^{-7}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$3.1 \cdot 10^{-3}$</td>
<td>$2.7 \cdot 10^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$1.1 \cdot 10^{-2}$</td>
<td>$9.5 \cdot 10^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$7.8 \cdot 10^{-7}$</td>
<td>$6.8 \cdot 10^{-7}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Convergence to the canonical form.

7. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Normal and (skew-)Hamiltonian as well as normal and per(skew)-Hermitian matrices have been considered. Structured canonical forms under unitary and suitable structure-preserving similarity transformations have been given. Structure-preserving Jacobi-type algorithms for computing the structured canonical forms are presented and their convergence is proven.

Moreover, for any of the sets of structured matrices considered here, we discuss the problem of finding the closest normal and structured matrix to the structured matrix $A$ (with the same structure as $A$). We argue that we can not solve this in general, but need to modify the problem to find the closest normal and structured matrix which is diagonalizable by a suitable unitary and structure-preserving transformation. Structure-preserving Jacobi-type algorithms for computing this closest matrix are stated. Numerical examples demonstrate that the proposed algorithms perform as expected.
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Appendix A. Choice of $\phi$ and $\alpha$ to Maximize (2.15)

Here we give a brief overview of how $\phi$ and $\alpha$ are obtained, the exact computation is very long and technical. We will consider only transformations of the type (2.9), a similar derivation holds for transformations of the type (2.11).

Consider (2.15). Note that with $h_{ij} = x_{ij} + iy_{ij}$ we have

$$|x_{n+i,n+i}| = |x_{ii}|, \quad |y_{n+i,n+i}| = |y_{ii}| \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i < j \leq n$$

for any Hamiltonian matrix $H$. As the same relation holds for skew-Hamiltonian matrices, the following derivations not only hold for the Hamiltonian case, but also for skew-Hamiltonian matrices.

Define the function $g_H : (-\frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{4}) \times (-\frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{4}) \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$g_H(\phi, \alpha) = 2(x_{ii}^2) + 2(y_{ii}^2) + 2(x_{jj}^2) + 2(y_{jj}^2) + (x_{i,n+i})^2 + (y_{i,n+i})^2 + (x_{j,n+j})^2 + (y_{j,n+j})^2$$

$$+ (x_{n+i,i}^2) + (y_{n+i,i}^2) + (x_{n+j,j}^2) + (y_{n+j,j}^2).$$

This is just (2.15) written in terms of the real and imaginary parts of the elements $h_{rs}$. Therefore, the angles $\phi$ and $\alpha$ that maximize $g_H$ are those that maximize (2.15).

Let us consider (2.13). It is sufficient to consider

$$\begin{bmatrix}
  h'_{ii} & h'_{ij} \\
  h'_{ji} & h'_{jj}
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
  c & s \\
  -s & c
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
  h_{ii} & h_{ij} \\
  h_{ji} & h_{jj}
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
  c & -s \\
  s & c
\end{bmatrix}, \quad c = \cos \phi, s = e^{i\alpha} \sin \phi,$$

as the other three blocks change in the same way, just the indices of the elements of $H$ have to be adapted in a straightforward way. For the diagonal elements we have with $c_\phi = \cos \phi, s_\phi = \sin \phi, c_\alpha = \cos \alpha, s_\alpha = \sin \alpha$ and $e^{i\alpha} = c_\alpha + is_\alpha$

$$h'_{ii} = c_\phi^2 h_{ii} + c \sin h_{jj} + c_\phi \sin h_{ji} + |s|^2 h_{jj} = c_\phi^2 x_{ii} + c_\phi s_\phi c_\alpha(x_{ij} + x_{ji}) + c_\phi s_\phi s_\alpha(y_{ij} - y_{ji}) + s_\phi^2 y_{jj} + 1 (c_\phi^2 y_{ii} + c_\phi s_\phi c_\alpha(y_{ij} + y_{ji}) + c_\phi s_\phi s_\alpha(x_{ji} - x_{ij}) + s_\phi^2 y_{jj}),$$

$$h'_{jj} = |s|^2 h_{ii} - c \sin h_{jj} - c_\phi \sin h_{ji} + c_\phi^2 h_{jj} = s_\phi^2 x_{ii} - c_\phi s_\phi c_\alpha(x_{ij} + x_{ji}) + c_\phi s_\phi s_\alpha(y_{ij} - y_{ji}) + c_\phi^2 y_{jj} + 1 (s_\phi^2 y_{ii} - c_\phi s_\phi c_\alpha(y_{ij} + y_{ji}) + c_\phi s_\phi s_\alpha(x_{ji} - x_{ij}) + c_\phi^2 y_{jj}),$$

and therefore

$$x'_{ii} = c_\phi^2 x_{ii} + c_\phi s_\phi c_\alpha(x_{ij} + x_{ji}) + c_\phi s_\phi s_\alpha(y_{ij} - y_{ji}) + s_\phi^2 x_{jj},$$

$$y'_{ii} = c_\phi^2 y_{ii} + c_\phi s_\phi c_\alpha(y_{ij} + y_{ji}) + c_\phi s_\phi s_\alpha(x_{ji} - x_{ij}) + s_\phi^2 y_{jj},$$

$$x'_{jj} = s_\phi^2 x_{ii} - c_\phi s_\phi c_\alpha(x_{ij} + x_{ji}) + c_\phi s_\phi s_\alpha(y_{ij} - y_{ji}) + c_\phi^2 x_{jj},$$

$$y'_{jj} = s_\phi^2 y_{ii} - c_\phi s_\phi c_\alpha(y_{ij} + y_{ji}) + c_\phi s_\phi s_\alpha(x_{ji} - x_{ij}) + c_\phi^2 y_{jj}.$$
while in the skew-Hamiltonian case follow. (note that in the Hamiltonian case have to be replaced by the corresponding 

\[ z^2 = c_0^4 \beta^2 + 2c_0^3 s_0 c_0 \gamma + 2c_0^3 s_0 s_0 \delta + 2c_0^2 s_0^2 \beta \mu + c_0^2 s_0^2 c_0^2 \gamma^2 + c_0^2 s_0^2 s_0^2 \delta^2 + 2c_0^2 s_0^2 c_0 s_0 \gamma \delta + 2c_0^2 s_0^3 c_0 \mu + 2c_0 s_0^3 s_0 \delta \mu + s_0^4 \mu^2. \]

This gives

\[ (x_{ii}')^2 + (x_{jj}')^2 = (c_0^4 + s_0^4)(x_{ii}^2 + x_{jj}^2) + 4c_0^2 s_0^2 x_{ii} x_{jj} + 2c_0^2 s_0^2 \left\{ (c_0^2 (x_{ij} + x_{ji})^2 + 2c_0 s_0 (x_{ij} + x_{ji}) (y_{ij} - y_{ji}) + s_0^2 (y_{ij} - y_{ji})^2 \right\} + 2c_0 s_0 (c_0^2 - s_0^2) (x_{ii} - x_{jj}) \{ c_0 (x_{ij} + x_{ji}) - s_0 (y_{ij} - y_{ji}) \} = (c_4 \phi + 3)(x_{ii}^2 + x_{jj}^2)/4 + s_2 \phi x_{ii} x_{jj} + s_2 \phi \left\{ (c_0 (x_{ij} + x_{ji}) + s_0 (y_{ij} - y_{ji}))^2/2 \right\} + s_4 \phi (x_{ii} - x_{jj}) \{ c_0 (x_{ij} + x_{ji}) - s_0 (y_{ij} - y_{ji}) \} / 2 \]

where we made use of multiple angles formulae, \(2c_0 s_0 = 2 \cos(\phi) \sin(\phi) = \sin(2\phi) = s_{2\phi}\), and \(c_0^2 - s_0^2 = \cos^2(\phi) - \sin^2(\phi) = \cos(2\phi) = c_{2\phi}\) and of the powers \(s_0^4 = (c_4 \phi - 4c_{2\phi} + 3)/8\) and \(c_0^4 = (c_4 \phi + 4c_{2\phi} + 3)/8\). These formulae will be used without further ado in all calculations to follow.

For \((y_{ii}')^2 + (y_{jj}')^2\) we obtain the same expression as for \((x_{ii}')^2 + (x_{jj}')^2\), just all elements \(x\) have to be replaced by the corresponding \(y\)'s. The same holds for \((x_{i,n+i}')^2 + (x_{j,n+j}')^2, (y_{i,n+i}')^2 + (y_{j,n+j}')^2, (x_{n+i}', x_{n+j}')^2 + (y_{n+i}', y_{n+j}')^2\) and \((y_{n+i}, y_{n+j})^2\), just the indices have to be adapted. Please note that in the Hamiltonian case

\[ y_{n+i,i} = y_{i,n+i} = 0 \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n, \]

while in the skew-Hamiltonian case

\[ x_{n+i,i} = x_{i,n+i} = 0 \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n. \]

In any case, let

\[ g^{(1)}_{H}(\phi, \alpha) = (x_{ii}')^2 + (x_{jj}')^2 + (y_{ii}')^2 + (y_{jj}')^2 = c_4 \phi \nu_1 + 3 \nu_1 + s_2 \phi \nu_2 + s_4 \phi (c_0 \nu_3 + s_0 \nu_4) + s_2 \phi (c_0^2 \nu_5 + 2c_0 s_0 \nu_6 + s_0^2 \nu_7) \]
with
\[ \begin{align*}
\nu_1 &= (x_{ii}^2 + x_{jj}^2 + y_{ii}^2 + y_{jj}^2)/4, \\
\nu_2 &= x_{ii}x_{jj} + y_{ii}y_{jj}, \\
\nu_3 &= \{(x_{ii} - x_{jj})(x_{ij} + x_{ji}) + (y_{ii} - y_{jj})(y_{ij} + y_{ji})\}/2, \\
\nu_4 &= -\{(x_{ii} - x_{jj})(y_{ij} - y_{ji}) + (y_{ii} - y_{jj})(x_{ij} - x_{ji})\}/2, \\
\nu_5 &= ((x_{ij} + x_{ji})^2 + (y_{ij} + y_{ji})^2)/2 \\
&= (x_{ij}^2 + x_{ji}^2 + y_{ij}^2 + y_{ji}^2)/2 + (x_{ij}x_{ji} + y_{ij}y_{ji}) =: \nu_8 + \nu_9, \\
\nu_6 &= (x_{ij} + x_{ji})(y_{ij} - y_{ji}) + (y_{ij} + y_{ji})(x_{ij} - x_{ji}) \\
&= 2x_{ij}y_{ij} - 2x_{ji}y_{ji}, \\
\nu_7 &= ((y_{ij} - y_{ji})^2 + (x_{ij} - x_{ji})^2)/2 \\
&= (x_{ij}^2 + x_{ji}^2 + y_{ij}^2 + y_{ji}^2)/2 - (x_{ij}x_{ji} + y_{ij}y_{ji}) =: \nu_8 - \nu_9.
\end{align*} \]

Analogous expressions can be derived for
\[ g_H^{(2)}(\phi, \alpha) = (x_{i,n+i}^2 + (x_{j,n+j}^2 + (y_{i,n+i}^2 + (y_{j,n+j}^2)), \]
\[ g_H^{(3)}(\phi, \alpha) = (x_{i+n+i}^2 + (x_{j+n+j}^2 + (y_{i+n+i}^2 + (y_{j+n+j}^2)) \]
and, thus, collecting the expressions \( \nu_j \) for \( g_H^{(1)} \), \( g_H^{(2)} \) and \( g_H^{(3)} \) in \( \nu_j \), \( g_H \) can be written as a sum like
\[ g_H(\phi, \alpha) = 2g_H^{(1)}(\phi, \alpha) + g_H^{(2)}(\phi, \alpha) + g_H^{(3)}(\phi, \alpha) = c_{4\phi}\nu_1 + 3\nu_1 + s_{2\phi}\nu_2 + s_{4\phi}(c_{\alpha}\nu_3 + s_{\alpha}\nu_4) + s_{2\phi}^2(c_{2\alpha}\nu_5 + 2c_{\alpha}s_{\alpha}\nu_6 + s_{2\alpha}^2)\]

In order to understand how to compute \( \phi \) and \( \alpha \) it suffices to consider \( g_H^{(1)}(\phi, \alpha), g_H^{(2)}(\phi, \alpha) \) and \( g_H^{(3)}(\phi, \alpha) \) can be dealt with in exactly the same way.

As \( \nu_5 = \nu_8 + \nu_9 \) and \( \nu_7 = \nu_8 - \nu_9 \) we have
\[ c_{\alpha}^2\nu_5 + s_{\alpha}^2\nu_7 = (c_{\alpha}^2 + s_{\alpha}^2)\nu_8 + (c_{\alpha}^2 - s_{\alpha}^2)\nu_9 = \nu_8 + c_{2\alpha}\nu_9. \]

Therefore
\[ g_H^{(1)}(\phi, \alpha) = c_{4\phi}\nu_1 + 3\nu_1 + s_{2\phi}\nu_2 + s_{4\phi}(c_{\alpha}\nu_3 + s_{\alpha}\nu_4) + s_{2\phi}^2(c_{2\alpha}\nu_5 + 2c_{\alpha}s_{\alpha}\nu_6 + s_{2\alpha}^2), \]
and, hence,
\[ g_H(\phi, \alpha) = c_{4\phi}\nu_1 + 3\nu_1 + s_{2\phi}\nu_2 + s_{4\phi}(c_{\alpha}\nu_3 + s_{\alpha}\nu_4) + s_{2\phi}^2(c_{2\alpha}\nu_5 + 2c_{\alpha}s_{\alpha}\nu_6). \]

We need to have
\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}g_H(\phi, \alpha) = 0, \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha}g_H(\phi, \alpha) = 0 \]
in order for \( \phi \) and \( \alpha \) to maximize \( g_H \). As before, we consider only \( g_H^{(1)} \) in order to derive the partial derivatives. We obtain
\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}g_H^{(1)}(\phi, \alpha) = -4s_{4\phi}\nu_1 + 4c_{4\phi}(c_{\alpha}\nu_3 + s_{\alpha}\nu_4) + 4c_{2\phi}s_{2\phi}(\nu_2 + c_{2\alpha}\nu_6 + s_{2\alpha}\nu_4), \]
\[ = 4c_{4\phi}(c_{\alpha}\nu_3 + s_{\alpha}\nu_4) + 2s_{4\phi}(-2\nu_1 + \nu_2 + \nu_8 + c_{2\alpha}\nu_6 + s_{2\alpha}\nu_6), \]
and

\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} g^{(1)}_H(\phi, \alpha) = s_{4\phi}(c_\alpha \nu_1 - s_\alpha \nu_3) + 2s_{2\phi}^2(c_{2\alpha} \nu_6 - s_{2\alpha} \nu_9) \]

\[ = K_1(\alpha)s_{2\phi}c_{2\phi} + K_2(\alpha)s_{2\phi}^2. \]

Thus, the partial derivative of \( g_H \) with respect to \( \phi \) can be expressed as

\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} g_H(\phi, \alpha) = 4c_{4\phi}(c_\alpha \nu_3 + s_\alpha \nu_4) + 2s_{4\phi}(-2\nu_1 + \nu_2 + \nu_8 + c_{2\alpha} \nu_9 + s_{2\alpha} \nu_6), \]

while the one with respect to \( \alpha \) can be written as

\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} g_H(\phi, \alpha) = s_{4\phi}(c_\alpha \nu_1 - s_\alpha \nu_3) + 2s_{2\phi}^2(c_{2\alpha} \nu_6 - s_{2\alpha} \nu_9) = \hat{K}_1(\alpha)s_{2\phi}c_{2\phi} + \hat{K}_2(\alpha)s_{2\phi}^2. \]

We take a closer look at \( \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} g_H(\phi, \alpha) = 0 \) and distinguish between different cases:

- The trivial solution is \( \phi = 0 \) (that is, \( s_{2\phi} = 0 \)). The transformation matrix \( R \) will be just the identity.
- If \( \phi = \frac{\pi}{4} \) (that is, \( c_{2\phi} = 0 \)) is chosen, then we need an \( \alpha \) such that \( \hat{K}_2(\alpha) = 2c_{2\alpha} \nu_6 - s_{2\alpha} \nu_9 = 0 \). If \( \nu_9 = 0 \), this gives \( \alpha = \pm \frac{\pi}{4} \) (\( c_{2\alpha} = 0 \)). Otherwise, we have

\[ t_{2\alpha} = \frac{s_{2\alpha}}{c_{2\alpha}} = \frac{\nu_6}{\nu_9}. \]

For the partial derivative with respect to \( \phi \) we have for \( \phi = \frac{\pi}{4} \) as \( s_{4\phi} = 0 \), \( c_{4\phi} = -1 \)

\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} g_H(\frac{\pi}{4}, \alpha) = -4(c_\alpha \nu_3 + s_\alpha \nu_4). \]

For the above choice of \( \alpha \) this may be zero, depending on \( \nu_3, \nu_4 \).

- If neither \( \phi = 0 \) nor \( \phi = \frac{\pi}{4} \) is chosen, we obtain a quadratic equation in \( t_{2\phi} = \tan(2\phi) \)

\[ \hat{K}_1(\alpha) \frac{s_{2\phi}}{c_{2\phi}} + \hat{K}_2(\alpha) \frac{s_{2\phi}^2}{c_{2\phi}^2} = \hat{K}_1(\alpha)t_{2\phi} + \hat{K}_2(\alpha)t_{2\phi}^2 = 0. \]

As \( t_{2\phi} \neq 0 \), we have

\[ \hat{K}_2(\alpha)t_{2\phi} = -\hat{K}_1(\alpha). \]

Either \( \hat{K}_2(\alpha) = \hat{K}_1(\alpha) = 0 \) and any \( t_{2\phi} \) is a solution or \( \hat{K}_2(\alpha) \neq 0 \) and

\[ t_{2\phi} = -\frac{\hat{K}_1(\alpha)}{\hat{K}_2(\alpha)}. \tag{A.2} \]

is the solution. Now we need to consider the partial derivative \( \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} g_H(\phi, \alpha) = 0 \),

\[ 0 = 4c_{4\phi}(c_\alpha \nu_3 + s_\alpha \nu_4) + 2s_{4\phi}(-2\nu_1 + \nu_2 + \nu_8 + c_{2\alpha} \nu_9 + s_{2\alpha} \nu_6). \]

With \( s_{4\phi} = \frac{2t_{2\phi}}{1+t_{2\phi}} \) and \( c_{4\phi} = \frac{1-t_{2\phi}^2}{1+t_{2\phi}^2} \) this can be written as

\[ 0 = (t_{2\phi}^2 - 1)(c_\alpha \nu_3 + s_\alpha \nu_4) - t_{2\phi}(-2\nu_1 + \nu_2 + \nu_8 + c_{2\alpha} \nu_9 + s_{2\alpha} \nu_6). \]

Plugging in \( t_{2\phi} \) from \( (A.2) \) gives

\[ 0 = (\hat{K}_1^2(\alpha) - \hat{K}_2^2(\alpha))(c_\alpha \nu_3 + s_\alpha \nu_4) + \hat{K}_1(\alpha)\hat{K}_2(\alpha)(-2\nu_1 + \nu_2 + \nu_8 + c_{2\alpha} \nu_9 + s_{2\alpha} \nu_6). \tag{A.3} \]

It turns out that this is a cubic polynomial in \( \tau = \tan \alpha \).
Algorithm 3. Rotation angles in Algorithm 1 for transformations of type (2.9). Finally, we take that pair $(\phi, \alpha)$ from among all possible solutions that gives the largest value of $g_H(\phi, \alpha)$. Algorithm 3 summarizes the process of computing $\phi$ and $\alpha$.

**Algorithm 3.** Rotation angles in Algorithm 1 for transformations of type (2.9)

*Input:* $A \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n}$ Hamiltonian or skew-Hamiltonian, pivot pair $(i,j)$

*Output:* $\phi, \alpha$ Form $g_H(\phi, \alpha)$ (A.1).

Case 1: $(\phi_1, \alpha_1) = (0,0)$.

Case 2: $(\phi_2, \alpha_2) = (\frac{\pi}{4}, \pm \frac{\pi}{4})$ if $\hat{v}_9 = 0$ or $(\phi_2, \alpha_2) = (\frac{\pi}{4}, \alpha_2)$ with $\tan(2\alpha_2) = \frac{2\nu_1}{\nu_2}$ if $\hat{v}_9 \neq 0$.

Case 3: $(\phi_3, \alpha_3)$ with $\alpha_3 = \frac{\pi}{2}$ if $\hat{\mu}_4 = 0$ or $\alpha_3 = 0$ if $\hat{\mu}_1 = 0$, and the corresponding $\phi_3$ from [A.2].

Case 4: $(\phi_4, \alpha_4)$ with $\alpha_4 = \arctan \tau$ for all all real solutions $\tau$ of (A.4) and the corresponding $\phi_4$ from [A.2].

Choose that pair $(\phi, \alpha)$ which gives the largest value of $g_H(\phi, \alpha)$.
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