

# SCALED RELATIVE GRAPH OF NORMAL MATRICES

XINMENG HUANG\*, ERNEST K. RYU†, AND WOTAO YIN‡

**Abstract.** The Scaled Relative Graph (SRG) by Ryu, Hannah, and Yin (arXiv:1902.09788, 2019) is a geometric tool that maps the action of a multi-valued nonlinear operator onto the 2D plane, used to analyze the convergence of a wide range of iterative methods. As the SRG includes the spectrum for linear operators, we can view the SRG as a generalization of the spectrum to multi-valued nonlinear operators. In this work, we further study the SRG of linear operators and characterize the SRG of block-diagonal and normal matrices.

**Key words.** scaled relative graph, non-Euclidean geometry, hyperbolic geometry, normal matrix

**AMS subject classifications.** 47H05, 47H09, 51M04, 52A55, 90C25

**1. Introduction.** The Scaled Relative Graph (SRG), recently proposed by Ryu, Hannah, and Yin [12], is a geometric tool that maps the action of a multi-valued nonlinear operator onto the extended complex plane, analogous to how the spectrum maps the action of a linear operator to the complex plane. The SRG can be used to analyze convergence of a wide range of iterative methods expressed as fixed-point iterations.

**Scaled relative graph.** For a matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ , define  $z_A: \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  with

$$z_A(x) = \frac{\|Ax\|}{\|x\|} \exp[i\angle(Ax, x)],$$

where

$$\angle(a, b) = \begin{cases} \arccos\left(\frac{a^T b}{\|a\|\|b\|}\right) & \text{if } a \neq 0, b \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

denotes the angle in  $[0, \pi]$  between  $a$  and  $b$ . The SRG of a matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is

$$\mathcal{G}(A) = \{z_A(x), \overline{z_A(x)} : x \in \mathbb{R}^n, x \neq 0\}.$$

This definition of the SRG, specific to (single-valued) linear operators, coincides with the more general definition for nonlinear multi-valued operators provided in [12]. Ryu, Hannah, and Yin showed the SRG generalizes spectrum in the following sense.

**FACT 1** (Theorem 3.1 of [12]). *If  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  and  $n = 1$  or  $n \geq 3$ , then  $\Lambda(A) \subseteq \mathcal{G}(A)$ .*

2D geometric illustrations have been used by Eckstein and Bertsekas [4, 5], Giselsson [7, 6], Banjac and Goulart [1], and Giselsson and Moursi [8] to qualitatively understand convergence of optimization algorithms. Ryu, Hannah, and Yin presented the SRG as a rigorous formulation of such illustrations [12].

**Contributions.** Prior work [12, 9] focused on the SRG of *nonlinear* multi-valued operators. For linear operators, Ryu, Hannah, and Yin [12] established  $\mathcal{G}(A)$  includes  $\Lambda(A)$ , as stated in Fact 1, but did not characterize when and how  $\mathcal{G}(A)$  enlarges  $\Lambda(A)$ . In this work, we further study the SRG of linear operators. In particular, we fully characterize the SRG of block-diagonal and normal matrices as a certain polygon in hyperbolic (non-Euclidean) geometry, under the Poincaré half-plane model.

\*School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Science and Technology of China (hxm8888@mail.ustc.edu.cn)

†Department of Mathematics, University of California, Los Angeles (eryu@math.ucla.edu)

‡Department of Mathematics, University of California, Los Angeles (wotaoyin@math.ucla.edu)

**Preliminaries.** Let  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ . Write  $\Lambda(A)$  for the spectrum, the set of eigenvalues, of  $A$ .  $A$  is *normal* if  $A^T A = A A^T$ . Given matrices  $A_1, \dots, A_m$ , write  $\text{Diag}(A_1, \dots, A_m)$  for the block-diagonal matrix with  $m$  blocks. For  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ , write  $\bar{z}$  for its complex conjugate. For a set  $S \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ , write  $S^+ = \{z \in S \mid \text{Im } z \geq 0\}$ . In particular, write  $\mathbb{C}^+ = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid \text{Im } z \geq 0\}$  and  $\mathcal{G}^+(A) = \{z_A(x) : x \in \mathbb{R}^n, x \neq 0\}$ . Note  $z_A(x) \in \mathbb{C}^+$  for all nonzero  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . For  $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ , define

$$[z_1, z_2] = \{\theta z_1 + (1 - \theta)z_2 : \theta \in [0, 1]\},$$

i.e.,  $[z_1, z_2]$  is the line segment connecting  $z_1$  and  $z_2$ .

**2. Arc-edge polygon and arc-convexity.** Consider points  $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{C}^+$ . If  $\text{Re } z_1 \neq \text{Re } z_2$ , let  $\text{Circ}(z_1, z_2)$  be the circle in  $\mathbb{C}$  through  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  with the center on the real axis. We can construct  $\text{Circ}(z_1, z_2)$  by finding the center as the intersection of the perpendicular bisector of  $[z_1, z_2]$  and the real axis. If  $\text{Re } z_1 = \text{Re } z_2$  but  $z_1 \neq z_2$ , let  $\text{Circ}(z_1, z_2)$  be the line extending  $[z_1, z_2]$ . If  $z_1 = z_2$ , then  $\text{Circ}(z_1, z_2)$  is undefined. If  $\text{Re } z_1 \neq \text{Re } z_2$ , let  $\text{Arc}_{\min}(z_1, z_2) \subseteq \mathbb{C}^+$  be the arc of  $\text{Circ}(z_1, z_2)$  between  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  in the upper-half plane. (If  $\text{Im } z_1 > 0$  or  $\text{Im } z_2 > 0$ , then  $\text{Arc}_{\min}(z_1, z_2) \subseteq \mathbb{C}^+$  is the minor arc of  $\text{Circ}(z_1, z_2)$  between  $z_1$  and  $z_2$ . If  $\text{Im } z_1 = \text{Im } z_2 = 0$ , then  $\text{Arc}_{\min}(z_1, z_2)$  is a semicircle in  $\mathbb{C}^+$ .) If  $\text{Re } z_1 = \text{Re } z_2$  but  $z_1 \neq z_2$ , let  $\text{Arc}_{\min}(z_1, z_2) = [z_1, z_2]$ . If  $z_1 = z_2$ , then  $\text{Arc}_{\min}(z_1, z_2) = \{z_1\}$ . For  $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{C}^+$  such that  $\text{Re } z_1 \neq \text{Re } z_2$ , let  $\text{Disk}(z_1, z_2)$  and  $\text{Disk}^\circ(z_1, z_2)$  respectively be the closed and open disks enclosed by  $\text{Circ}(z_1, z_2)$ . Figure 1 illustrates these definitions.




Fig. 1: Illustration of  $\text{Circ}(z_1, z_2)$  and  $\text{Arc}_{\min}(z_1, z_2)$ .

For  $m \geq 1$  and  $z_1, \dots, z_m \in \mathbb{C}^+$ , we call  $\text{Poly}(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m)$  an *arc-edge polygon* and define it as follows. For  $m = 1$ , let  $\text{Poly}(z_1) = \{z_1\}$ . For  $m \geq 2$ , let

$$S = \bigcup_{1 \leq i, j \leq m} \text{Arc}_{\min}(z_i, z_j)$$

and

$$\text{Poly}(z_1, \dots, z_m) = S \cup \{\text{region enclosed by } S\}.$$

Figure 2 illustrates this definition. Note  $\text{Poly}(z_1, z_2) = \text{Arc}_{\min}(z_1, z_2)$ . The “region enclosed by  $S$ ” is the union of all regions enclosed by non-self-intersecting continuous loops (Jordan curves) within  $S$ . Since  $S$  is a connected set, we can alternatively define  $\text{Poly}(z_1, \dots, z_m)$  as the smallest simply connected set containing  $S$ .

This construction of  $\text{Arc}_{\min}$  gives rise to the classical *Poincaré half-plane model* of hyperbolic (non-Euclidean) geometry, where a  $\text{Arc}_{\min}(z_1, z_2)$  and  $\text{Circ}(z_1, z_2) \cap \mathbb{C}^+$  are, respectively, the “line segment” between  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  and the “line” through  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  in the




Fig. 2: The shaded region illustrates the arc-edge polygon  $\text{Poly}(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4)$  for  $z_1 = 1 + i$ ,  $z_2 = 2 + 3i$ ,  $z_3 = 4 + 2i$ , and  $z_4 = 4 + i$ . The solid arcs illustrate  $\text{Arc}_{\min}(z_i, z_j)$  and the dashed circles illustrate  $\text{Circ}(z_i, z_j)$  for  $i, j = 1, \dots, m$ .




Fig. 3: Illustration of  $f \circ g$  and Lemma 2.1. The one-to-one map  $f \circ g$  of (2.1) maps  $\text{Poly}(z_1, \dots, z_7)$  (a hyperbolic polygon) into a Euclidean polygon. We denote the mapped points as  $w_i = f(g(z_i))$  for  $i = 1, \dots, 7$ . The equivalent Euclidean geometry tells us that  $\text{Poly}(z_1, \dots, z_7)$  is “convex” and can be enclosed by the curve through  $z_1 \rightarrow z_2 \rightarrow z_3 \rightarrow z_4 \rightarrow z_6 \rightarrow z_1$ . Note that  $z_5$  and  $z_7$  are not necessary in the description of the boundary.

hyperbolic space [3, 11]. The *Beltrami–Klein model* maps the Poincaré half-plane model onto the unit disk and  $\text{Arc}_{\min}$  to straight line segments [10, 2]. Specifically, the one-to-one map

$$(2.1) \quad f \circ g: \mathbb{C}^+ \rightarrow \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \leq 1, z \neq 1\}$$

defined by

$$f(z) = \frac{2z}{1 + |z|^2}, \quad g(z) = \frac{z - i}{z + i}$$

maps the Poincaré half-plane model to the Beltrami–Klein model while mapping hyperbolic line segments  $\text{Arc}_{\min}$  into Euclidean straight line segments. The Beltrami–Klein model demonstrates that any qualitative statement about convexity in the Euclidean plane is equivalent to an analogous statement in the Poincaré half-plane model. See Figure 3.

**LEMMA 2.1.** *Let  $z_1, \dots, z_m \in \mathbb{C}^+$  and  $m \geq 1$ . Then  $\text{Poly}(z_1, \dots, z_m)$  is “convex” in the following non-Euclidean sense:*

$$w_1, w_2 \in \text{Poly}(z_1, \dots, z_m) \Rightarrow \text{Arc}_{\min}(w_1, w_2) \subseteq \text{Poly}(z_1, \dots, z_m).$$

*If  $\text{Poly}(z_1, \dots, z_m)$  has an interior, then there is  $\{\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_q\} \subseteq \{z_1, \dots, z_m\}$  such that*

$$\text{Arc}_{\min}(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \cup \text{Arc}_{\min}(\zeta_2, \zeta_3) \cup \dots \cup \text{Arc}_{\min}(\zeta_{q-1}, \zeta_q) \cup \text{Arc}_{\min}(\zeta_q, \zeta_1)$$

*is a Jordan curve, and the region the curve encloses is  $\text{Poly}(z_1, \dots, z_m)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $w_1, \dots, w_m$  be in the unit complex disk. Consider the construction

$$\tilde{S} = \bigcup_{1 \leq i, j \leq m} [w_i, w_j]$$

and

$$\widetilde{\text{Poly}}(w_1, \dots, w_m) = \tilde{S} \cup \{\text{region enclosed by } \tilde{S}\}.$$

This is the (Euclidean) 2D polyhedron given as the convex hull of  $w_1, \dots, w_m$ . The Euclidean convex hull has the properties analogous to those in the Lemma statement, and we use the map  $(f \circ g)^{-1}$ , where  $f \circ g$  is as given by (2.1) to map the properties to our setup.  $\square$

**3. SRGs of block-diagonal matrices.** We characterize the SRG of block-diagonal matrices as follows.

**THEOREM 3.1.** *Let  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  be square matrices, where  $m \geq 1$ . Then*

$$\mathcal{G}^+(\text{Diag}(A_1, \dots, A_m)) = \bigcup_{\substack{z_i \in \mathcal{G}^+(A_i) \\ i=1, \dots, m}} \text{Poly}(z_1, \dots, z_m).$$

*Proof.* When  $m = 1$ , there is nothing to show. Assume  $m \geq 2$ .

**Step 1.** Let  $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}$  and  $u_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . We use the notation  $n = n_1 + \dots + n_m$ ,

$$\mathbf{u} = \begin{bmatrix} u_1 \\ \vdots \\ u_m \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad \mathbf{u}_i = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ u_i \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^n \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, m,$$

and  $\mathbf{A} = \text{Diag}(A_1, \dots, A_m) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{G}^+(\text{Diag}(A_1, \dots, A_m)) &= \bigcup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}} z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}) \\
 (3.1) \qquad \qquad \qquad &= \bigcup_{\substack{u_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}, u_i \neq 0 \\ i=1, \dots, m}} z_{\mathbf{A}}(\text{span}(\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_m) \setminus \{0\})
 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 \bigcup_{\substack{u_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}, u_i \neq 0 \\ i=1, \dots, m}} \text{Poly}(z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}_1), \dots, z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}_m)) &= \bigcup_{\substack{u_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}, u_i \neq 0 \\ i=1, \dots, m}} \text{Poly}(z_{A_1}(u_1), \dots, z_{A_m}(u_m)) \\
 (3.2) \qquad \qquad \qquad &= \bigcup_{\substack{z_i \in \mathcal{G}^+(A_i) \\ i=1, \dots, m}} \text{Poly}(z_1, \dots, z_m).
 \end{aligned}$$

To clarify,  $\mathbf{u}_i$  depends on  $u_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . In the following, we show

$$(3.3) \qquad z_{\mathbf{A}}(\text{span}(\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_m) \setminus \{0\}) = \text{Poly}(z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}_1), \dots, z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}_m))$$

for all  $\mathbf{u}_i$  given by  $u_i \neq 0$  for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . Once (3.3) is proved, (3.1) and (3.2) are equivalent and the proof is complete.

**Step 2.** We show the following intermediate result: for all nonzero  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  such that

$$(3.4) \qquad \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{v} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{v} \rangle = 0,$$

we have

$$(3.5) \qquad z_{\mathbf{A}}(\text{span}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \setminus \{0\}) = \text{Arc}_{\min}(z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}), z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{v})).$$

First, consider the case  $\text{Re } z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}) \neq \text{Re } z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{v})$ . Let the circle  $\text{Circ}(z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}), z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{v}))$  be centered at  $(t, 0)$  with  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  and radius  $r \geq 0$ . Then  $z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u})$  and  $z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{v})$  satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\text{Re } z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}) - t)^2 + (\text{Im } z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}))^2 &= r^2 \\
 (\text{Re } z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{v}) - t)^2 + (\text{Im } z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{v}))^2 &= r^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

This is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned}
 \langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{u} \rangle - 2t\langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u} \rangle + (t^2 - r^2)\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u} \rangle &= 0 \\
 \langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{v} \rangle - 2t\langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v} \rangle + (t^2 - r^2)\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v} \rangle &= 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbf{w} = \alpha_1\mathbf{u} + \alpha_2\mathbf{v}$ . Assume  $\mathbf{w} \neq 0$ . Using (3.4) and basic calculations, we have

$$\langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{w} \rangle - 2t\langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w} \rangle + (t^2 - r^2)\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w} \rangle = 0,$$

and this is equivalent to

$$(\text{Re } z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{w}) - t)^2 + (\text{Im } z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{w}))^2 = r^2.$$

Therefore

$$z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{w}) = z_{\mathbf{A}}(\alpha_1\mathbf{u} + \alpha_2\mathbf{v}) \in \text{Circ}(z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}), z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{v})).$$

Notice that

$$\operatorname{Re} z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{\langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w} \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w} \rangle} = \frac{\alpha_1^2 \langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u} \rangle + \alpha_2^2 \langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v} \rangle}{\alpha_1^2 \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u} \rangle + \alpha_2^2 \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v} \rangle}$$

fills the interval  $[\operatorname{Re} z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}), \operatorname{Re} z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{v})]$  as  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  varies. So we have

$$\bigcup_{\substack{\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{R} \\ \alpha_1 \mathbf{u} + \alpha_2 \mathbf{v} \neq 0}} z_{\mathbf{A}}(\alpha_1 \mathbf{u} + \alpha_2 \mathbf{v}) = \operatorname{Arc}_{\min}(z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}), z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{v}))$$

and we conclude (3.5).

Next, consider the case  $\operatorname{Re} z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}) = \operatorname{Re} z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{v})$ . Note that

$$\operatorname{Re} z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}) = \frac{\langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u} \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u} \rangle}, \quad \operatorname{Re} z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{v}) = \frac{\langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v} \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v} \rangle}.$$

Let  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbf{w} = \alpha_1 \mathbf{u} + \alpha_2 \mathbf{v}$ . Assume  $\mathbf{w} \neq 0$ . Using (3.4) and basic calculations, we have

$$\operatorname{Re} z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{\langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w} \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w} \rangle} = \operatorname{Re} z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}) = \operatorname{Re} z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{v}).$$

Notice that

$$|z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{w})|^2 = \frac{\langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{w} \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w} \rangle} = \frac{\alpha_1^2 \langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{u} \rangle + \alpha_2^2 \langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{v} \rangle}{\alpha_1^2 \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u} \rangle + \alpha_2^2 \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v} \rangle}$$

fills the interval  $[|z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u})|^2, |z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{v})|^2]$  as  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  varies. So  $\operatorname{Im} z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{w})$  fills the interval  $[\operatorname{Im} z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}), \operatorname{Im} z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{v})]$  as  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  varies, and we conclude

$$z_{\mathbf{A}}(\operatorname{span}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \setminus \{0\}) = [z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}), z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{v})] = \operatorname{Arc}_{\min}(z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}), z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{v})).$$

**Step 3.** We show

$$(3.6) \quad z_{\mathbf{A}}(\operatorname{span}(\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_m) \setminus \{0\}) \subseteq \operatorname{Poly}(z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}_1), \dots, z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}_m))$$

by induction. Clearly

$$z_{\mathbf{A}}(\operatorname{span}(\mathbf{u}_1) \setminus \{0\}) = \operatorname{Poly}(z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}_1)).$$

Now assume (3.6) holds for  $m - 1$ . By (3.5), we have

$$z_{\mathbf{A}}(\operatorname{span}(\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_m) \setminus \{0\}) = \bigcup_{\zeta \in z_{\mathbf{A}}(\operatorname{span}(\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{m-1}) \setminus \{0\})} \operatorname{Arc}_{\min}(\zeta, z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}_m)).$$

By the induction hypothesis,  $\zeta \in z_{\mathbf{A}}(\operatorname{span}(\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{m-1}) \setminus \{0\})$ , implies

$$\zeta \in \operatorname{Poly}(z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}_1), \dots, z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}_{m-1})) \subseteq \operatorname{Poly}(z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}_1), \dots, z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}_m)).$$

By construction,

$$z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}_m) \in \operatorname{Poly}(z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}_1), \dots, z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}_m)).$$

“Convexity” of Lemma 2.1 implies

$$\bigcup_{\zeta \in z_{\mathbf{A}}(\operatorname{span}(\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{m-1}) \setminus \{0\})} \operatorname{Arc}_{\min}(\zeta, z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}_m)) \subseteq \operatorname{Poly}(z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}_1), \dots, z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}_m)),$$

and we conclude (3.6).

**Step 4.** We show

$$(3.7) \quad z_{\mathbf{A}}(\text{span}(\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_m) \setminus \{0\}) \supseteq \text{Poly}(z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}_1), \dots, z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}_m)).$$

First, consider the case where  $\text{Poly}(z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}_1), \dots, z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}_m))$  has no interior. In 2D Euclidean geometry, a polygon has no interior when it is a single line segment or a point. The Beltrami–Klein model provides us with an equivalent statement in hyperbolic geometry: the “polygon” can be expressed as  $\text{Poly}(z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}_1), \dots, z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}_m)) = \text{Arc}_{\min}(z_{\mathbf{A}}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1), z_{\mathbf{A}}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_2))$  where  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}_2 \in \{\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_m\}$ . By the reasoning of Step 2, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} z_{\mathbf{A}}(\text{span}(\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_m) \setminus \{0\}) &\supseteq z_{\mathbf{A}}(\text{span}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}_2) \setminus \{0\}) \\ &= \text{Arc}_{\min}(z_{\mathbf{A}}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1), z_{\mathbf{A}}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_2)) = \text{Poly}(z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}_1), \dots, z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}_m)). \end{aligned}$$

Next, consider the case where  $\text{Poly}(z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}_1), \dots, z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}_m))$  has an interior. In this case,  $\dim \text{span}(\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_m) \geq 3$  by the arguments of Step 2. Assume for contradiction that there is a  $z \in \text{Poly}(z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}_1), \dots, z_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}_m))$  but  $z \notin z_{\mathbf{A}}(\text{span}(\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_m) \setminus \{0\})$ . Let  $\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_q$  be vertices provided by Lemma 2.1. There exists corresponding  $\{\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\mu}_q\} \subseteq \{\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_m\}$  such that  $\zeta_i = z_{\mathbf{A}}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_i)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, q$ . Define the curve

$$\boldsymbol{\eta}(t) : [1, q+1] \rightarrow \text{span}(\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_m) \cap S^{m-1},$$

where  $S^{m-1} \subset \mathbb{R}^m$  is the unit sphere, as

$$\boldsymbol{\eta}(t) = \frac{\cos((t-p)\frac{\pi}{2})}{\|\boldsymbol{\mu}_p\|} \boldsymbol{\mu}_p + \frac{\sin((t-p)\frac{\pi}{2})}{\|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{p+1}\|} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{p+1}, \quad \text{for } p \leq t \leq p+1.$$

where we regard  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{q+1}$  as  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1$ . Then  $\{\gamma(t)\}_{t \in [1, q+1]} = \{z_{\mathbf{A}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}(t))\}_{t \in [1, q+1]}$  encloses  $z$ .

Since  $\text{span}(\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_m) \cap S^{m-1}$  is simply connected, we can continuously contract  $\{\boldsymbol{\eta}(t)\}_{t \in [1, q+1]}$  to a point in  $\text{span}(\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_m) \cap S^{m-1}$  and the curve under the map  $z_{\mathbf{A}}$  continuously contracts to a point in  $z_{\mathbf{A}}(\text{span}(\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_m) \setminus \{0\})$ . However, this is not possible as  $z \notin z_{\mathbf{A}}(\text{span}(\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_m) \setminus \{0\})$  and  $\{\gamma(t)\}_{t \in [1, q+1]}$  has a nonzero winding number around  $z$ . We have a contradiction and we conclude  $z \in z_{\mathbf{A}}(\text{span}(\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_m) \setminus \{0\})$ .  $\square$

**4. SRGs of normal matrices.** We now use Theorem 3.1 to fully characterize the SRG of normal matrices.





Fig. 4: Illustration of Proposition 4.1



(a) SRG of an  $n \times n$  normal matrix with one distinct real eigenvalue and three distinct complex conjugate eigenvalue pairs.

(b) SRG of an  $n \times n$  symmetric matrix with distinct eigenvalues  $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \dots < \lambda_6$ .

Fig. 5: Illustration of Theorem 4.3. For normal matrices, multiplicity of eigenvalues do not affect the SRG.

PROPOSITION 4.1. Let  $A = \begin{bmatrix} a_1 & b_1 \\ b_2 & a_2 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ . Then  $\mathcal{G}(A)$  consists of two circles centered at  $(\frac{a_1+a_2}{2}, \pm \frac{b_1-b_2}{2})$  with radius  $\sqrt{(\frac{a_1-a_2}{2})^2 + (\frac{b_1+b_2}{2})^2}$ .

*Proof.* Let

$$x_\theta = \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\theta) \\ \sin(\theta) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad T \left( \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} \right) = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ |x_2| \end{bmatrix}.$$

The stated result follows from

$$\mathcal{G}^+(A) = \{z_A(x_\theta) : \theta \in [0, 2\pi)\}$$

and the calculations

$$\begin{aligned} z_A(x_\theta) &= \left[ \frac{1}{2} (a_1 + a_2 + (a_1 - a_2) \cos(2\theta) + (b_1 + b_2) \sin(2\theta)) \right] \\ &\quad \left[ \frac{1}{2} (-b_1 + b_2 + (b_1 + b_2) \cos(2\theta) - (a_1 - a_2) \sin(2\theta)) \right] \\ &= T \left( \begin{bmatrix} \frac{a_1+a_2}{2} \\ -\frac{b_1-b_2}{2} \end{bmatrix} + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \cos(-2\theta) & -\sin(-2\theta) \\ \sin(-2\theta) & \cos(-2\theta) \end{bmatrix}}_{\text{rotation by } -2\theta} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{a_1-a_2}{2} \\ \frac{b_1+b_2}{2} \end{bmatrix} \right). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

PROPOSITION 4.2. A matrix's SRG is invariant under orthogonal similarity transforms.

*Proof.* Let  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ . Let  $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  be orthogonal. For any nonzero  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} z_{QAQ^T}(x) &= \frac{\|QAQ^T x\|}{\|x\|} \exp[i\angle(QAQ^T x, x)] \\ &= \frac{\|AQ^T x\|}{\|x\|} \exp[i\angle(AQ^T x, Q^T x)] = z_A(Q^T x). \end{aligned}$$



Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{G}(QAQ^T) &= \{z_{QAQ^T}(x), \overline{z_{QAQ^T}}(x) : x \in \mathbb{R}^n, x \neq 0\} \\ &= \{z_A(Qx), \overline{z_A}(Qx) : x \in \mathbb{R}^n, x \neq 0\} \\ &= \{z_A(x), \overline{z_A}(x) : x \in \mathbb{R}^n, x \neq 0\} = \mathcal{G}(A).\end{aligned}\quad \square$$

**THEOREM 4.3.** *If  $A$  is normal, then  $\mathcal{G}^+(A) = \text{Poly}(\Lambda(A) \cap \mathbb{C}^+)$ .*

*Proof.* A normal matrix is orthogonally similar to the real block-diagonal matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} a_1 & b_1 & & & & \\ -b_1 & a_1 & & & & \\ & & \ddots & & & \\ & & & a_k & b_k & \\ & & & -b_k & a_k & \\ & & & & & \lambda_{k+1} \\ & & & & & & \ddots \\ & & & & & & & \lambda_m \end{bmatrix}.$$

Propositions 4.1 tells us

$$\mathcal{G}^+\left(\begin{bmatrix} a_j & b_j \\ -b_j & a_j \end{bmatrix}\right) = \{a_j + |b_j|i\} = \Lambda\left(\begin{bmatrix} a_j & b_j \\ -b_j & a_j \end{bmatrix}\right) \cap \mathbb{C}^+$$

for  $j = 1, \dots, k$ . We conclude the stated result with Theorem 4.3 and Proposition 4.2.  $\square$

**COROLLARY 4.4.** *Let  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  be symmetric, and let  $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \dots < \lambda_m$  be the distinct (real) eigenvalues of  $A$ . If  $m = 1$ , then  $\mathcal{G}^+(A) = \{\lambda_1\}$ . If  $m \geq 2$ , then*

$$\mathcal{G}(A) = \text{Disk}(\lambda_1, \lambda_m) \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{m-1} \text{Disk}^\circ(\lambda_i, \lambda_{i+1}).$$

## REFERENCES

- [1] G. BANJAC AND P. J. GOULART, *Tight global linear convergence rate bounds for operator splitting methods*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 63 (2018), pp. 4126–4139.
- [2] E. BELTRAMI, *Saggio di interpretazione della geometria Non-Euclidea*, 1868.
- [3] E. BELTRAMI, *Teoria fondamentale degli spazii di curvatura costante*, Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata. Series II., 2 (1868), pp. 232–255.
- [4] J. ECKSTEIN, *Splitting methods for monotone operators with applications to parallel optimization*, PhD thesis, MIT, 1989.
- [5] J. ECKSTEIN AND D. P. BERTSEKAS, *On the Douglas–Rachford splitting method and the proximal point algorithm for maximal monotone operators*, Mathematical Programming, 55 (1992).
- [6] P. GISELSSON, *Lunds universitet, lecture notes: Large-scale convex optimization*, 2015. URL: <http://www.control.lth.se/education/doctorate-program/large-scale-convex-optimization/>. Last visited on 2018/12/01.
- [7] P. GISELSSON AND S. BOYD, *Linear convergence and metric selection for Douglas–Rachford splitting and ADMM*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 62 (2017), pp. 532–544.
- [8] P. GISELSSON AND W. M. MOURSI, *On compositions of special cases of Lipschitz continuous operators*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.13165, (2019).
- [9] X. HUANG, E. K. RYU, AND W. YIN, *Tight coefficients of averaged operators via scaled relative graph*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.01593, (2019).
- [10] F. KLEIN, *Ueber die sogenannte nicht-euklidische geometrie*, Mathematische Annalen, 6 (1873), pp. 112–145.
- [11] H. POINCARÉ, *Théorie des groupes fuchsien*, Acta Mathematica, 1 (1882), pp. 1–62.
- [12] E. K. RYU, R. HANNAH, AND W. YIN, *Scaled relative graph: Nonexpansive operators via 2D Euclidean geometry*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.09788, (2019).