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ABSTRACT. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a complex Hilbert space and let $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be the algebra of all bounded linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$. For a positive integer $k$ less than the dimension of $\mathcal{H}$ and $A = (A_1, \ldots, A_m) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$, the joint $k$-numerical range $W_k(A)$ is the set of $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m) \in \mathbb{C}^m$ such that $\alpha_i = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \langle A_j x_j, x_j \rangle$ for an orthonormal set $\{x_1, \ldots, x_k\}$ in $\mathcal{H}$. Relations between the geometric properties of $W_k(A)$ and the algebraic and analytic properties of $A_1, \ldots, A_m$ are studied. It is shown that there is $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $W_k(A)$ is a polyhedral set, i.e., the convex hull of a finite set, if and only if $A_1, \ldots, A_k$ have a common reducing subspace $V$ of finite dimension such that the compression of $A_1, \ldots, A_m$ on the subspace $V$ are diagonal operators $D_1, \ldots, D_m$ and $W_k(A) = W_k(D_1, \ldots, D_m)$. Characterization is also given to $A$ such that the closure of $W_k(A)$ is polyhedral. The conditions are related to the joint essential numerical range of $A$. These results are used to study $A$ such that (a) $\{A_1, \ldots, A_m\}$ is a commuting family of normal operators, or (b) $W_k(A_1, \ldots, A_m)$ is polyhedral for every positive integer $k$. It is shown that conditions (a) and (b) are equivalent for finite rank operators but it is no longer true for compact operators. Characterizations are given for compact operators $A_1, \ldots, A_m$ satisfying (a) and (b), respectively. Results are also obtained for general non-compact operators.

Keywords: Commuting normal operators, $k$-numerical range, essential numerical range.
AMS Classification: 47A12, 15A60.

1. Introduction

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a complex Hilbert space and let $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be the algebra of all bounded linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$. For a positive integer $k$ not larger than $\dim \mathcal{H}$ and $A = (A_1, \ldots, A_m) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$, the joint $k$-numerical range of $A$, denoted by $W_k(A)$, is the set of $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m) \in \mathbb{C}^m$ such that $\alpha_j = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \langle A_j x_i, x_i \rangle$ for an orthonormal set $\{x_1, \ldots, x_k\}$ in $\mathcal{H}$. Evidently, $W_k(A)$ is a bounded subset of $\mathbb{C}^m$, but is in general not closed. Let $\text{cl}(W_k(A))$ denote the closure of $W_k(A)$. When $\mathcal{H}$ is infinite dimensional, the joint essential numerical range of $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$ is

$$W_{\text{ess}}(A) = \cap\{\text{cl}(W_1(A + K)) : K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})^m\},$$

where $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$ is the set of all compact operators in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$.

The joint $k$-numerical range and the joint essential numerical range of $A$ are useful tools for studying the joint behavior of the operators. In particular, there is an interesting interplay between the geometrical properties of $W_k(A)$ and the algebraic and analytic properties of $A_1, \ldots, A_m$; for example, see [1, 3, 4, 11, 14, 16, 19, 21] and their references. The $k$-numerical range and essential numerical ranges of commuting normal operators have nice structure. It is known that if $A_1$ is normal, then $\text{cl}(W_1(A_1)) = \text{conv} \sigma(A_1)$, the convex hull of the spectrum $\sigma(A_1)$ of $A_1 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ [10]. More generally, if $A_1, A_2$ are commuting normal operators, then $\text{cl}W_1(A) = \text{conv} \sigma_{ap}(A)$, where $\sigma_{ap}(A)$ is the joint approximate spectrum of $(A_1, A_2)$ defined as the set of $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ such that $(A_j - \lambda_j)x_\ell \to 0$ for a sequence of unit vector $\{x_\ell\}$ in $\mathcal{H}$; see [11 Proposition 6].
Of course, if a family of operators is given, one may check whether the elements therein are normal and whether they commute. In our case, and so as many other researchers, we are interested in

(1) how one may conclude that a family of operators is commuting normal if only certain properties, say, about their joint spectrum and joint numerical ranges are known, and

(2) what kinds of nice properties the joint spectrum and joint numerical ranges will enjoy if the given operators are normal and commuting.

If dim $\mathcal{H} = n$ is finite, we can identify $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ with the set $M_n$ of $n \times n$ complex matrices. If $A_1, A_2 \in M_n$ are commuting normal matrices, then there is a unitary matrix $U \in M_n$ such that

$$U^* A_1 U = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n) \quad \text{and} \quad U^* A_2 U = \text{diag}(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n).$$

In such a case, it is easy to show that

$$W_1(A_1, A_2) = \text{conv}\{ (\lambda_j, \mu_j) : 1 \leq j \leq n\}$$

is a polyhedral set, i.e., the convex hull of a finite set in $\mathbb{C}^2$. In [15], the following results were obtained.

**Theorem 1.1.** Let $(A_1, \ldots, A_m) \in M_n$ and $A = (A_1, \ldots, A_m)$. The set $\{A_1, \ldots, A_m\}$ consists of commuting normal matrices if and only if any one of the following holds.

(a) $W_k(A)$ is polyhedral for all $k = 1, \ldots, n - 1$.

(b) There exists $k$ with $|n/2 - k| \leq 1$ such that $W_k(A)$ is polyhedral.

It is known and easy to check that for $A \in M_n^n$, $W_{n-k}(A) = (\text{tr}\ A_1, \ldots, \text{tr}\ A_m) - W_k(A)$. So, $W_k(A)$ is polyhedral if and only if $W_{n-k}(A)$ is. Thus one can focus on the study of $k \leq n/2$.

**Theorem 1.2.** Suppose $k \leq n/2$. The following are equivalent for $A = (A_1, \ldots, A_m) \in M_n^n$.

(a) $W_k(A)$ is polyhedral.

(b) There is a unitary $U \in M_n$ such that for $j = 1, \ldots, m$, $U^* A_j U = D_j \oplus B_j$, where $D_j \in M_r$ with $r \geq 2k$ is a diagonal matrix and $W_k(A) = W_k(D_1, \ldots, D_m)$.

Clearly, if the first $r$ columns of $U$ in condition Theorem 1.2(b) are $u_1, \ldots, u_r$, then they are common reducing eigenvectors of $A_1, \ldots, A_m$, i.e., each $u_j$ is an eigenvector for $A_1, \ldots, A_m, A_1^*, \ldots, A_m^*$. Thus, condition (b) is equivalent to the condition that $A_1, \ldots, A_m$ have an orthonormal set of reducing eigenvectors $\{u_1, \ldots, u_r\}$ and $W_k(A) = W_k(X^* A_1 X, \ldots, X^* A_m X)$ if $X = [u_1 \cdots u_r]$.

In this paper, we focus on operators on an infinite dimensional Hilbert space. We will extend Theorem 1.1 and show that a family of compact operators is commuting and normal if $W_k(A)$ is polyhedral for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the set of positive integers. We also extend Theorem 1.2 and show that for general operators $A_1, \ldots, A_m \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and a fixed $k$, the closure of $W_k(A)$ is polyhedral if and only if there is $r \geq 2k$ and a sequence of isometries $X_j : \mathbb{C}^r \to \mathcal{H}$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots$, such that $(X_j^* A_1 X_j, \ldots, X_j^* A_m X_j)$ converges to an $m$-tuple of commuting normal matrices $D = (D_1, \ldots, D_m)$ such that $\text{cl}(W_k(A)) = W_k(D)$. In case $W_k(A)$ is closed and polyhedral, $A_1, \ldots, A_m$ have a common reducing subspace $X$ of finite dimension $r \geq 2k$ such that their compressions on the subspace are commuting normal operators, equivalently, there is an orthonormal family $\{x_1, \ldots, x_r\} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ such that each $x_j$ is an eigenvector of $A_\ell$ and $A_\ell^*$ for $\ell = 1, \ldots, m$. Additional results on general operators are also obtained.

In our discussion, we will use the following result [6, Theorem 2.1], which is an extension of the results in [5] and [13].
Theorem 1.3. Let $A = (A_1, \ldots, A_m) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$. Then $\text{cl} \left( \text{conv} \, W_k(A) \right) = \text{conv} \left( \text{cl} \, (W_k(A)) \right)$, and the set is equal to
\[
\text{conv} \bigcup_{0 \leq \ell \leq k} (W_\ell(A) + (k - \ell)W_{\text{ess}}(A)).
\]
Consequently, $\text{conv} \, W_k(A)$ is closed if and only if
\[
(1.1) \quad W_\ell(A) + (k - \ell)W_{\text{ess}}(A) \subseteq \text{conv} \, W_k(A) \quad \text{for} \quad \ell = 0, \ldots, k - 1.
\]

Our paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we characterize $A$ such that $W_k(A)$ or $\text{cl} \, (W_k(A))$ is a polyhedral set. In Section 3, we obtain a characterization of an $m$-tuple of compact normal operators in terms of its joint $k$-numerical ranges. We also characterize an $m$-tuple of compact operators $A$ such that $\text{cl} \, (\text{conv} \, W_k(A))$ is polyhedral for all $k$. The results in Section 3 are extended to general operators in Section 4. We always assume that $\mathcal{H}$ is an infinite dimensional Hilbert space unless stated otherwise.

2. Polyhedral properties

In this section, we show that if $W_k(A)$ or $\text{cl} \, (W_k(A))$ is polyhedral, then the compression of the operators $A_1, \ldots, A_m \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ onto a certain subspace of $\mathcal{H}$ will have some nice structure. Let $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ be the real linear space of all self-adjoint operators in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Given $A = (A_1, \ldots, A_m) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$. Every $A_\ell$ can be decomposed into $A_\ell = G_\ell + iH_\ell$, with $G_\ell, H_\ell \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$. We can identify $W_k(A_1, \ldots, A_m) \subseteq \mathbb{C}^m$ with $W_k(G_1, H_1, \ldots, G_m, H_m) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{2m}$. Many of our proofs can be done on $A_1, \ldots, A_m \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$. We begin with the following observation.

Proposition 2.1. Suppose $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

(a) The set $W_k(A)$ is a singleton if and only if $A_j = \mu_j I$ for any $j = 1, \ldots, m$.

(b) The set $W_k(A)$ is a subset of a line segment in $\mathbb{C}^m$ if and only if there is $H \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ and complex numbers $a_1, \ldots, a_m, b_1, \ldots, b_m$ such that $A_j = a_j I + b_j H$ for $j = 1, \ldots, m$.

Proof. (a) The sufficiency is clear. Conversely, suppose $W_k(A)$ is a singleton. If $A_1$ is not a scalar, $W_k(A_1) = \{ \mu : (\mu, \mu_2, \ldots, \mu_m) \in W(A) \}$ is not a singleton, which is a contradiction. Applying the same argument to $A_j$ for any $j$, the result follows.

(b) The sufficiency is clear. Conversely, suppose $W_k(A)$ is a line segment. Then for any partial isometry $X$ of finite rank, $W_k(X^*A_1X, \ldots, X^*A_mX)$ is a line segment so that $X^*A_jX = a_j(X)I + b_j(X)H(X)$ for some scalar $a_j(X), b_j(X)$ and Hermitian matrix $H(X)$ depending on $X$ by [15, Theorem 3.5]. Since this is true for any isometry, we conclude that $A_1, \ldots, A_m$ have the said structure. \qed

To facilitate our discussion, we present some definitions and notations. To describe the connections among the operators $A_1, \ldots, A_m$, we often say that there is a unitary operator $U = [U_1 \ U_2] \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ such that for each $j = 1, \ldots, m$, $U^*A_jU = \begin{pmatrix} A_{j1}^{(1)} & A_{j2}^{(1)} \\ A_{j1}^{(2)} & A_{j2}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix}$, where $A_{rs} = U_r^*A_jU_s$ for $r, s \in \{1, 2\}$ with some special properties. For example, denote by $\mathcal{H}_1$ the range space of the partial isometry $U_1$.

(1) The operator $A_{j2}^{(1)}$ is zero for each $j$ means that $\mathcal{H}_1$ is a common invariant subspace of $A_1, \ldots, A_m$. 

(2) The operators \( A_{21}^{(j)} \) and \( A_{21}^{(j)} \) are zero for all \( j \), i.e., \( A_j = A_{11}^{(j)} \oplus A_{22}^{(j)} \), means that \( H_1 \) is a common reducing subspace of \( A_1, \ldots, A_m \).

(3) The \( m \)-tuple of operators \( (A_{11}^{(1)}, \ldots, A_{11}^{(m)}) \) is called the \((\text{common})\) compression of \( A = (A_1, \ldots, A_m) \) onto the subspace \( H_1 \).

If \( H \) is separable, and \( U^* A_j U = \text{diag}(a_1(j), a_2(j), \ldots) \) for each \( j \), we say that \( A = (A_1, \ldots, A_m) \) is an \( m \)-tuple of diagonal operators with diagonal entries \( (a_\ell(1), \ldots, a_\ell(m)) \) for \( \ell = 1, 2, \ldots \).

Let \( \mathcal{S} \) be a convex subset of \( \mathbb{R}^m \) (or \( \mathbb{C}^m \) identified as \( \mathbb{R}^{2m} \)) and \( x \in \mathcal{S} \). With respect to the standard dot product \( \langle , \rangle \), a nonzero vector \( v \in \mathbb{R}^m \) defines a hyperplane

\[
P(v, x) = \{ u \in \mathbb{R}^m : \langle v, u - x \rangle = 0 \}
\]

and two half spaces

\[
H_+(v, x) = \{ u \in \mathbb{R}^m : \langle v, u - x \rangle \geq 0 \} \quad \text{and} \quad H_-(v, x) = \{ u \in \mathbb{R}^m : \langle v, u - x \rangle \leq 0 \}.
\]

The hyperplane \( P(v, x) \) is called a supporting plane of \( \mathcal{S} \) at \( x \) if \( \mathcal{S} \) is a subset of either \( H_+(v, x) \) or \( H_-(v, x) \). A boundary point \( x \) of \( \mathcal{S} \) is a conical point of \( \mathcal{S} \) if there are \( m \) supporting planes of \( \mathcal{S} \) at \( x \) with linearly independent normal vectors. Clearly every extreme point of a polyhedral set is a conical point.

**Theorem 2.2.** Let \( A = (A_1, \ldots, A_m) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m \) and \( k \in \mathbb{N} \). The following conditions are equivalent.

(a) \( W_k(A) \) is polyhedral for \( \ell = 1, \ldots, k \).

(b) \( W_k(A) \) or \( \text{conv} W_k(A) \) is polyhedral.

(c) There exist \( r \in \mathbb{N} \) with \( r \geq 2k \) and a unitary \( U \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) such that for each \( j = 1, \ldots, m \),

\[
U^* A_j U = D_j \oplus B_j, \quad \text{where} \quad D_j \in M_r, \quad \text{satisfying} \quad W(A) = W(D_1, \ldots, D_m).
\]

**Proof.** We may assume that \( A \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m \). The implication (a) \( \Rightarrow \) (b) is clear.

Suppose (b) holds so that \( \text{conv} W_k(A) \) is polyhedral with \( q \) vertices \( \nu_1, \ldots, \nu_q \in \mathbb{R}^m \). For each \( p = 1, \ldots, q \), there is an orthonormal set \( S_p = \{ x_1^{(p)}, \ldots, x_k^{(p)} \} \) such that \( \nu_p = \sum_{j=1}^k \langle A x_j^{(p)}, x_j^{(p)} \rangle \). Let \( V \) be any finite dimensional subspace of \( \mathcal{H} \) containing \( \text{span} S_p \) (for any \( p = 1, \ldots, q \)), and \( \tilde{A}_j \) be the compression of \( A_j \) onto \( V \) for \( j = 1, \ldots, m \). Then for \( \tilde{A} = (A_1, \ldots, A_m) \), \( \nu_p \in \text{conv} W_k(\tilde{A}) \subseteq \text{conv} W_k(A) \) so that \( \nu_p \) is a conical point of \( \text{conv} W_k(\tilde{A}) \). By [13] Theorem 4.2, \( \text{span} S_p \) is a common reducing subspace for \( \tilde{A}_1, \ldots, \tilde{A}_m \). As this is true for any such subspace \( V \), \( \text{span} S_p \) is a common reducing subspace for \( A_1, \ldots, A_m \). Let \( W = \text{span} (S_1 \cup \cdots \cup S_q) \). It is clearly an invariant subspace for all \( A_1, \ldots, A_m \). But as they are self-adjoint, \( W \) is indeed a common reducing subspace. Now let \( \tilde{A}_j \) be the compression of \( A_j \) onto \( W \) for \( j = 1, \ldots, m \). We have

\[
\text{conv} \{ \nu_1, \ldots, \nu_q \} = \text{conv} W_k(\tilde{A}_1, \ldots, \tilde{A}_m) = \text{conv} W_k(A).
\]

By [13] Theorem 5.1, there is a unitary \( \tilde{U} \) on \( W \) such that \( \tilde{U}^* \tilde{A}_j \tilde{U} = \tilde{D}_j \oplus \tilde{B}_j \), where \( \tilde{D}_j \in M_{r_1} \) is a diagonal matrix for \( j = 1, \ldots, m \); and

\[
W_k(\tilde{D}_1, \ldots, \tilde{D}_m) = W_k(\tilde{A}_1, \ldots, \tilde{A}_m) = \text{conv} W_k(\tilde{A}_1, \ldots, \tilde{A}_m).
\]

The operator \( U = \tilde{U} \oplus I_{W^\perp} \) is unitary and satisfies our purpose.
Next, we show that $D_j \in M_r$ can be chosen with $r \geq 2k$. To this end, let $\tilde{V}$ be a subspace of dimension $2k + r_1$ containing $W$. Suppose $C_j$ is the compression of $A_j$ to $\tilde{V}$ for $j = 1, \ldots, m$. Then for $C = (C_1, \ldots, C_m)$ and $\tilde{D} = (\tilde{D}_1, \ldots, \tilde{D}_m)$,

$$W_k(\tilde{D}) \subseteq W_k(C) \subseteq W_k(A) = W_k(\tilde{D}).$$

By [13] Theorem 5.1 again, we can choose $D_k$ such that $C_k$ is the sum of the $k$ smallest.e

As this is true for all unit vectors $u$, we have a similar result without assuming that $W_k(A)$ or $\mathbf{conv} W_k(A)$ is closed. Hence (b) $\Rightarrow$ (c).

Now, suppose (c) holds. For every unit vector $u = (u_1, \ldots, u_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$,

$$\max \{ u \cdot \xi : \xi \in W_k(D) \} = \max \{ \sum_{j=1}^{m} u_j \sum_{\ell=1}^{k} (D_j x_{\ell}, x_{\ell}) : \{x_1, \ldots, x_k\} \text{ is an orthonormal set in } \mathcal{H} \}$$

is the sum of the $k$ largest eigenvalues of $D_u = \sum_{j=1}^{m} u_j D_j$. Similarly, if $A_u = \sum_{j=1}^{m} u_j A_j$, then

$$\max \{ u \cdot \xi : \xi \in W_k(A) \} = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_j(A_u).$$

So, $W_k(A) = W_k(D)$ implies that $\sum_{j=1}^{k} \lambda_j(A_u) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \lambda_j(D_u)$. Since $A_u$ is unitarily similar to a direct sum of the form $D_u \oplus B_u$, $\lambda_j(A_u) \geq \lambda_j(D_u)$ for $j = 1, \ldots, k$. We see that $\lambda_j(A_u) = \lambda_j(D_u)$ is actually the $j$th largest eigenvalue of $A_u$ for each $j$. It follows that for every $\ell = 1, \ldots, k - 1$,

$$\max \{ u \cdot \xi : \xi \in W_\ell(A) \} = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \lambda_j(A_u) = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \lambda_j(D_u) = \max \{ u \cdot \xi : \xi \in W_k(D) \}.$$

As this is true for all unit vectors $u$, $\mathbf{conv} W_\ell(A)$ and $W_\ell(D)$ have the same support plane in all directions. Also, $\mathbf{conv} W_\ell(A)$ is closed by [6] Theorem 3.1, the two sets are equal. Thus,

$$W_\ell(D) \subseteq W_\ell(A) \subseteq \mathbf{conv} W_\ell(A) = W_\ell(D),$$

and so, $W_\ell(A) = W_\ell(D)$ is polyhedral. We have (c) $\Rightarrow$ (a), and the proof is complete.

We have a similar result without assuming that $W_k(A)$ or $\mathbf{conv} W_k(A)$ is closed.

**Theorem 2.3.** Let $A = (A_1, \ldots, A_m) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The following conditions are equivalent.

(a) $\mathbf{cl} W_\ell(A)$ is polyhedral for $\ell = 1, \ldots, k$.

(b) $\mathbf{cl} W_k(A)$ or $\mathbf{cl} (\mathbf{conv} W_k(A))$ is polyhedral.

(c) There exist $r \geq 2k$, and for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is an isometry $X_n : C^r \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ such that $D_n = (X_n^* A_1 X_n, \ldots, X_n^* A_m X_n)$ is an $m$-tuple of diagonal matrices satisfying $D_n \rightarrow D$ and $W_k(D_n) \rightarrow W_k(D) = \mathbf{cl}(W_k(A))$.

**Proof.** We may assume that $A \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$. The implication (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b) is clear.

To prove (b) $\Rightarrow$ (c), suppose (b) holds so that $\mathbf{cl} (\mathbf{conv} W_k(A))$ is polyhedral with $q$ vertices $\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_q$. By Theorem 13, $\nu_j = \mu_j + (k - \ell_j) \xi_j$ with $\ell_j \in \{0, \ldots, k\}$, $\mu_j \in W_{\ell_j}(A)$ and $\xi_j \in W_{\text{ess}}(A)$. For $v = (v_1, \ldots, v_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and $p \in \mathbb{N}$, let $v I_p = (v_1 I_p, \ldots, v_m I_p)$. Set $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^p \oplus \mathcal{H}$ for $p = mk - \ell_1 - \cdots - \ell_q$.

$$Q = (Q_1, \ldots, Q_m) = \xi_1 I_{k-\ell_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus \xi_q I_{k-\ell_q} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{A} = Q \oplus A \in \mathcal{S}(\tilde{\mathcal{H}})^m.$$
Then clearly, $\text{cl} (\text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A})) \subseteq \text{cl} (\text{conv } W_k(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}))$. On the other hand, it is not difficult to adapt the finite dimensional result \cite[Theorem 4.4]{15} to get

$$W_k(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}) \subseteq \text{conv} \bigcup_{\ell=0}^{k} [W_2(Q) + W_{k-\ell}(\mathbf{A})] \subseteq \text{conv} \bigcup_{\ell=0}^{k} [W_{\text{ess}}(A) + W_{k-\ell}(\mathbf{A})] \subseteq \text{cl} (\text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A})).$$

So, $\text{cl} (\text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A})) = \text{cl} (\text{conv } W_k(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}))$. By construction, $W_k(\tilde{\mathbf{A}})$ contains all the vertices of $\text{cl} (\text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A}))$. It follows that $\text{conv } W_k(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}) = \text{cl} (\text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A}))$ is polyhedral. By Theorem \ref{thm:2.2} \tilde{\mathbf{A}} is unitarily similar to $D \oplus B$, where $D = (D_1, \ldots, D_m)$ is an $m$-tuple of diagonal matrices in $M_r$ with $r \geq 2k$, and $W_k(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}) = W_k(D)$. Suppose $D_j = \text{diag} (\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_{r_j})$. There is an orthonormal set 

$\{u_1, \ldots, u_r\}$ such that $\tilde{A}_j u_\ell = \xi_\ell u_\ell$, for each $j = 1, \ldots, m$ and $\ell = 1, \ldots, r$. Let $u_\ell = \begin{pmatrix} v_\ell^T \\ w_\ell^T \end{pmatrix}$ according to the decomposition $\tilde{\mathcal{H}} = C^p \oplus \mathcal{H}$. Then $D_j v_\ell = \xi_\ell v_\ell$ and $A_j w_\ell = \xi_\ell w_\ell$ for all $j$ and $\ell$. Now, decompose $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ as $\{v_1, \ldots, v_r\} \oplus \text{span} \{w_1, \ldots, w_r\} \oplus \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_0$, where $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_0 = \{v_1, \ldots, v_r, w_1, \ldots, w_r\}$. Using this space decomposition, we may assume that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \tilde{D}_Q \oplus \tilde{D}_A \oplus \tilde{B}$$

such that $W_k(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}) = W_k(\tilde{D}_Q \oplus \tilde{D}_A)$, where $\tilde{D}_Q$ is the compression of $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ onto $\text{span} \{v_1, \ldots, v_r\}$, $\tilde{D}_Q$ is the compression of $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ onto $\text{span} \{w_1, \ldots, w_r\}$, $\tilde{D}_Q \oplus \tilde{D}_A$ is an $m$-tuple of diagonal matrices in $M_r$ with $r \geq r$, and $\tilde{B}$ is the compression of $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ onto $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_0$. Actually, there is no harm to assume that $\tilde{D}_Q = Q$, $A = \tilde{D}_A \oplus \tilde{B}$ with $\tilde{B} = (\tilde{B}_1, \ldots, \tilde{B}_m)$, and we may reset $r = \tilde{r}$.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Also, let $\{y_1, \ldots, y_{r_1}\}$ and $\{x_1, \ldots, x_{r_2}\}$ be complete sets of orthonormal eigenvectors of $Q$ and $D_A$ respectively. Since $(Qy_1, y_1) \in W_{\text{ess}}(A)$, $(Qy_1, y_1) \in W_{\text{ess}}(B)$ as well. We can find a unit vector $x_{r_2+1} \in \{x_1, \ldots, x_{r_2}\}$ such that $\|A x_{r_2+1}, x_{r_2+1}\|_2 = \|B x_{r_2+1}, x_{r_2+1}\|_2 < 1/n$. Here $\|\cdot\|_2$ denotes the usual Euclidean norm in $\mathbb{R}^m$. Let $B_1$ be the compression of $A$ onto $\mathcal{H}_1 = \{x_1, \ldots, x_{r_2}, x_{r_2+1}A_1 x_{r_2+1}, \ldots, A_{r_1} x_{r_2+1}\}$. Then $(Qy_2, y_2) \in W_{\text{ess}}(B_1)$. So, there is a unit vector $x_{r_2+2} \in \mathcal{H}_1$ such that $\|A x_{r_2+2}, x_{r_2+2}\|_2 < 1/n$. Note that the compression of each $A_j$ onto span $\{x_1, \ldots, x_{r_2}, x_{r_2+2}\}$ is diagonal. Inductively, we are able to find an orthonormal set $\{x_1, \ldots, x_{r_2+r_1}\}$ such that $\|A x_{r_2+\ell}, x_{r_2+\ell}\|_2 < 1/n$ for all $\ell = 1, \ldots, r_1$, and the compression of each $A_j$ onto span $\{x_1, \ldots, x_{r_2+r_1}\}$ is diagonal. Denote the compression of $\mathbf{A}$ onto span $\{x_1, \ldots, x_{r_2+r_1}\}$ as $D_n$.

For each vertex $\mu_p$ of $\text{cl} (\text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A}))$, $W_k(Q \oplus D_A)$,

$$\mu_p = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} (Q z_j, z_j) + \sum_{j=\ell+1}^{k} D_A z_j,$$

where $z_1, \ldots, z_\ell \in \{y_1, \ldots, y_{r_1}\}$ and $z_{\ell+1}, \ldots, z_k \in \{x_1, \ldots, x_{r_2}\}$. By suitably replacing those $z_1, \ldots, z_\ell \in \{y_1, \ldots, y_{r_1}\}$, it is easy to find a $\nu_p \in W_k(D_n)$ such that $\|\mu_p - \nu_p\|_2 < k/n$. Now each $\mu \in \text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A})$ can be written as a convex combination $\sum_{p=1}^q \lambda_p \mu_p$ of the vertices. Then $\nu = \sum_{p=1}^q \lambda_p \nu_p$ is a point in $W_k(D_n)$ such that $\|\mu - \nu\|_2 < k/n$. As $D_n$ is a compression of $\mathbf{A}$, $W_k(D_n) \subseteq W_k(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq \text{cl} (\text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A}))$. The Hausdorff distance between the compact sets $W_k(D_n)$ and $\text{cl} (\text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A}))$ is no more than $k/n$. So, $W_k(D_n) \rightarrow \text{cl} (\text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A}))$. Moreover,

$$\text{cl} (\text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A})) \subseteq \text{cl} (\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} W_k(D_n)) \subseteq \text{cl} W_k(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq \text{cl} (\text{conv } W_k(\mathbf{A})).$$
and we get \( \text{cl} \, W_k(A) = \text{cl}(\text{conv} \, W_k(A)) \). Finally, identifying \( D_n \) with its matrix representation, then by considering a subsequence, we may assume that \( D_n = (D_1^{(n)}, \ldots, D_m^{(n)}) \) converge to \( D = (D_1, \ldots, D_m) \). Since we also have \( W_k(D_u) \to W_k(D) \), \( \text{cl} \, W_k(A) = W_k(D) \). Condition (c) follows.

Now, if (c) holds, then \( \text{cl} \, W_k(A) = W_k(D) \) is polyhedral. Condition (a) holds with \( \ell = k \). For \( \ell < k \), write for every unit vector \( u = (u_1, \ldots, u_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m \), \( A_u = \sum_{j=1}^m u_j A_j \) and \( D_u = \sum_{j=1}^m u_j D_j \). Since \( \text{cl} \, W_k(A) = W_k(D) \), we get as in the proof of Theorem 2.2. \( \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(A_u) = \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(D_u) \).

Also, as \( D_u \) is the limit of a sequence of principal submatrices of \( A_u \), \( \lambda_j(D_u) \leq \lambda_j(A_u) \) for \( j = 1, \ldots, k \), by Cauchy’s interlacing theorem. Consequently, if \( \ell \in \{1, \ldots, k\} \), then \( \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \lambda_j(A_u) = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \lambda_j(D_u) \). Since this is true for every unit vector \( u \), \( \text{cl}(\text{conv} \, W_\ell(A)) = W_\ell(D) \). On the other hand, \( W_\ell(D) \subseteq \text{cl} \, W_\ell(A) \) as \( D \) is a limit of an \( m \)-tuple of principal submatrices of \( A \). As above,

\[
W_\ell(D) \subseteq \text{cl} \, W_\ell(A) \subseteq \text{cl}(\text{conv} \, W_\ell(A)) = W_\ell(D).
\]

Hence, \( \text{cl} \, W_\ell(A) = W_\ell(D) \) is polyhedral, and condition (a) holds.

Using the ideas in the proof of Theorems 2.2 and 2.3, we have the following result. Part (a) is an extension of the result in [18] for a single matrix.

**Proposition 2.4.** Let \( A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m \) and \( k \in \mathbb{N} \).

(a) If \( \mu = (\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_m) = (\text{tr}(X^*A_1X), \ldots, \text{tr}(X^*A_mX)) \) is a conical point of \( W_k(A) \), where \( X : \mathbb{C}^k \to \mathcal{H} \) is an isometry, then the range space of \( X \) is a reducing subspace of \( A_j \) for \( j = 1, \ldots, m \), i.e., \( U^*A_jU = C_j \oplus B_j \) for \( j = 1, \ldots, m \), if \( U = [X | X^\perp] \).

(b) If \( \mu = (\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_m) \) is a conical point of \( \text{cl}(W_k(A)) \) and not in \( W_k(A) \), then there is a sequence of isometries \( X_\ell : \mathbb{C}^k \to \mathcal{H} \) for \( \ell \in \mathbb{N} \) such that

\[
\lim_{\ell \to \infty} (\text{tr}(X_\ell^*A_1X_\ell), \ldots, \text{tr}(X_\ell^*A_mX_\ell)) = \mu.
\]

**Proof.** We may assume that \( A_1, \ldots, A_m \) are self-adjoint. (a) Suppose \( \mu = \sum_{j=1}^k \langle Ax_j, x_j \rangle \in W_k(A) \) is a conical point, where \( \{x_1, \ldots, x_k\} \) is an orthonormal set. Consider the operator matrices \( A_j = \begin{pmatrix} C_j & Z_j^* \\ Z_j & B_j \end{pmatrix} \) for \( j = 1, \ldots, m \), where \( C_j \in M_k \) is the compression of \( A_j \) onto the space spanned by \( \{x_1, \ldots, x_k\} \). We will show that \( Z_j = 0 \) for all \( j \) and the result will follow. Assume without loss of generality that \( Z_1 \neq 0 \), and by abuse of notation that the \((1,1)\) entry of \( Z_1 \) is nonzero. Consider the leading principal submatrix \( T \in M_{k+1} \) of \( A_1 + iA_2 \). Then

\[
\mu_1 + i\mu_2 \in W(T) \subseteq \{ (\xi_1, \xi_2) : (\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_m) \in W(A) \}
\]

so that \( \mu_1 + i\mu_2 \) is a conical point of \( W(T) \). By the result in [18], \( T = T_1 \oplus T_2 \) with \( T_1 \in M_k \), which is a contradiction.

(b) Suppose \( \mu \) is a conical point of \( \text{cl} \, W_k(A) \). Then \( \mu \) is an extreme point of \( \text{cl}(\text{conv} \, W_k(A)) \). Thus, \( \mu = \nu + (k-\ell)\xi \) with \( \nu \in W_\ell(A) \) and \( \xi \in W_{c\ell}(A) \) for some \( \ell \in \{0, \ldots, k\} \). Let \( \hat{A} = A \oplus \xi I_{k-\ell} \). Then \( \mu \) is a conical point of \( W_k(\hat{A}) \). Using (a) and an argument similar to the proof of Theorem 2.3 we get the conclusion. \( \square \)
3. Commuting compact normal operators

In the following, we extend Theorem 1.1 to commuting compact normal operators \(A_1, \ldots, A_m \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})\). For a single operator, this has been done in [2]. For multiple operators \(A_1, \ldots, A_m\), there have been considerable interests in the commutativity of compact self-adjoint (normal) operators in terms of different kinds of joint spectra. See for example [7, 9] and [17]. Our result gives an alternative from the joint numerical range viewpoint, and use the joint eigenvalues of operators defined as follows.

Let \(A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m\). A point \(\mu = (\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_m) \in \mathbb{C}^m\) is a joint eigenvalue of \(A\) if there is a nonzero \(x \in \mathcal{H}\) such that \(A_j x = \mu_j x\) for all \(j = 1, \ldots, m\). The nonzero \(x\) is a common eigenvector corresponding to \(\mu\). Define \(\Sigma_k(A)\) to be the set of all \(\mu_1 + \cdots + \mu_k\), where \(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_k\) are joint eigenvalues of \(A\) corresponding to \(k\) linearly independent common eigenvectors \(x_1, \ldots, x_k\). This set could be empty; indeed, \(A\) may not have any joint eigenvalue at all. When \(k = 1\), \(\Sigma_1(A)\) reduces to the joint point spectrum of \(A\); for example see [7]. Suppose \(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_k\) are joint eigenvalues of \(A\) corresponding to linearly independent eigenvectors \(x_1, \ldots, x_k\). One may apply Gram-Schmidt process to \(\{x_1, \ldots, x_k\}\) to obtain an orthonormal set \(\{u_1, \ldots, u_k\}\). Then the matrix \(B_j = ((A_j u_r, u_s) \in M_k\) is in upper triangular form, and \(\mu_\ell = ((B_1)_{\ell \ell}, \ldots, (B_m)_{\ell \ell})\) for \(\ell = 1, \ldots, k\).

Thus, \((A u_\ell, u_\ell) = \mu_\ell\) for \(\ell = 1, \ldots, k\) and \(\sum_{j=1}^{k} \mu_j = \sum_{j=1}^{m} (A u_j, u_j) \in W_k(A)\). As a result, \(\Sigma_k(A) \subseteq W_k(A)\). Evidently, conditions (a) – (c) in Theorem 2.2 are equivalent to the condition:

\[ (d) \quad W_k(A) = \text{conv} \Sigma_k(A) \text{ and } \text{conv} \Sigma_k(A) \text{ is polyhedral}. \]

Suppose \(A_1, \ldots, A_m\) are commuting compact normal operators in \(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})\) and \(A = (A_1, \ldots, A_m)\). As far as its \(k\)-numerical ranges are concerned, we may assume that \(\mathcal{H}\) is separable. By [9] Proposition 1], there is a unitary \(U\) such that

\[ D_j = U^* A_j U = \text{diag} (d_j(1), d_j(2), \ldots) \]

is a diagonal operator for each \(j = 1, \ldots, m\). For \(\ell \geq 1\), let \(v(\ell) = (d_1(\ell), d_2(\ell), \ldots, d_m(\ell))\). Then for \(k \geq 1\),

\[ \Sigma_k(A) = \left\{ \sum_{\ell=1}^{k} v(\ell) : 1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \cdots < j_k \right\}. \]

For \(k \geq 1\), let \(P_k\) be the set of rank \(k\) orthogonal projections in \(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})\), and \(D_k = \{ P : P \in P_k \}\). By [12] Theorem 13], \(D_k\) consists of all \((u_1, u_2, \ldots)\) such that \(0 \leq u_j \leq 1\) for \(j = 1, \ldots, k\) and \(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} u_j = k\). Then we have

\[ W_k(A) = \left\{ \left( \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} u_j d_1(j), \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} u_j d_2(j), \ldots, \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} u_j d_m(j) \right) : (u_1, u_2, \ldots) \in D_k \right\}. \]

Suppose dim \(\mathcal{H} = N\) is finite and \(1 \leq k \leq N\). Let \(v = (1, \ldots, 1, 0, \ldots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^N\). Then,

\[ D_k = \text{conv} \{ P v : P \text{ is an } N \times N \text{ permutation matrix} \}, \]

for example see [20]. Therefore, we have

\[ (3.1) \quad W_k(A) = \text{conv} \Sigma_k(A). \]
In fact, it is known that $W_k(A) = \text{conv} \Sigma_k(A)$ for all $k = 1, \ldots, N - 1$ if and only if $\{A_1, \ldots, A_m\}$ is a commuting family; see [15] and also [16, 19]. The result can be extended to compact operators as in the following.

**Theorem 3.1.** Suppose $A = \{A_1, \ldots, A_m\} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$ is an $m$-tuple of compact operators. Then $\{A_1, \ldots, A_m\}$ is a commuting family of normal operators if and only if

$$W_k(A) = \text{conv} \Sigma_k(A) \quad \text{for all } k \geq 1.$$ 

**Proof.** Suppose $\{A_1, \ldots, A_m\}$ is a commuting family of compact normal operators. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\mathcal{H}$ is separable, $A_j = \text{diag} (d_j(1), d_j(2), \ldots)$ for $j = 1, \ldots, m$ and $v(\ell) = (d_1(\ell), \ldots, d_m(\ell)) \in \mathbb{C}^m$ for all $\ell \geq 1$. Let $\mu = \sum_{j=1}^\infty u_j v(j)$ be a point in $W_k(A)$, where $(u_1, u_2, \ldots) \in \mathcal{D}_k$.

If $u_j \neq 0$ for only finitely many $j$’s, then by (3.11), $\mu \in \text{conv} \Sigma_k(A)$. Otherwise, choose $N > k$ such that $a = \sum_{j=N+1}^\infty u_j < 1$ and consider the sum $u = \sum_{j=N+1}^\infty (u_j/a)v(j)$. It is an infinite convex combination of the points $v(j)$, $j = N + 1, \ldots$ in $\mathbb{R}^m$. By the result of [8], there exists $\ell > 0$ such that $u = \sum_{i=1}^\ell \alpha_i v(N + i)$ for some $\alpha_i \geq 0$ satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^\ell \alpha_i = 1$. We have

$$\mu = \sum_{j=1}^N u_j v(j) + au = \sum_{j=1}^N u_j v(j) + \sum_{i=1}^\ell a\alpha_i v(N + i)$$

with

$$0 \leq u_j, a\alpha_i \leq 1 \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq j \leq N, \ 1 \leq i \leq \ell \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=1}^N u_j + \sum_{i=1}^\ell a\alpha_i = k.$$ 

By (3.1) again, $\mu \in \text{conv} \Sigma_k(A)$.

Conversely, suppose $W_k(A) = \text{conv} \Sigma_k(A)$ for all $k \geq 1$. Consider the first operator $A_1$. We have $W_k(A_1) = \text{conv} \Sigma_k(A_1)$ for all $k$. Write $A_1 = G_1 + iH_1$ for self-adjoint $G_1, H_1 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. The compact self-adjoint $G_1$ can be written as

$$G_1 = \sum_{j \geq 1} a_j I_{\mathcal{H}_j} + \sum_{\ell \geq 1} b_{\ell} I_{K_\ell},$$

where $a_j$’s are the positive, and $b_{\ell}$’s the negative, eigenvalues of $G_1$. The eigenspaces $\mathcal{H}_j$’s and $K_\ell$’s are mutually orthogonal with $\dim \mathcal{H}_j = n_j$ and $\dim K_\ell = m_{\ell}$ all finite. Either sum can be empty, finite, or infinite. An empty sum is taken to be 0. We shall also assume that the eigenvalues are ordered as $a_1 > a_2 > \cdots$ and $b_1 < b_2 < \cdots$. We shall show that $\mathcal{H}_j$’s and $K_\ell$’s are all reducing subspaces of $H_1$. It follows that the null space of $G_1$ is also a reducing subspace of $H_1$, and consequently, $G_1$ and $H_1$ commute, and $A_1$ is normal.

Starting with $a_1$, let $k = \dim \mathcal{H}_1 = n_1$. Clearly, $\max \text{Re} W_k(A_1) = n_1 a_1$. Take an extreme point $\mu$ of $\text{el} W_k(A_1)$ lying on the vertical line $\text{Re} z = n_1 a_1$. Then $\mu \in W_k(A_1)$. For otherwise $\mu = \mu_1 + (k - \ell)0 = \mu_1$ for $\mu_1 \in W_\ell(A_1)$ with $\ell < k$ (Theorem 2.1), and so $\text{Re} \mu = \text{Re} \mu_1 < n_1 a_1$, a contradiction. Hence $\mu$ is an extreme point of $W_k(A_1) = \text{conv} \Sigma_k(A_1)$. We have $\mu \in \Sigma_k(A_1)$. Then, $\mu = \mu_1 + \cdots + \mu_k$ for eigenvalues $\mu_j$ of $A_1$ corresponding to linearly independent (unit) eigenvectors $x_1, \ldots, x_k$ of $A_1$. Since $\text{Re} \mu_j = \langle G_1 x_j, x_j \rangle \leq a_1$ for all $j$, $\text{Re} \mu = n_1 a_1$ implies all $x_j \in \mathcal{H}_1$. We have span$\{x_1, \ldots, x_k\} = \mathcal{H}_1$. As a linear span of eigenvectors, $\mathcal{H}_1$ is invariant under
$A_1$. It is also invariant under $H_1 = -i(A_1 - G_1)$. It is indeed a reducing subspace because $H_1$ is self-adjoint.

If $G_1$ has another positive eigenvalue $a_2$, then $H_2$ is also a reducing subspace of $G_1$. This time, we take $k = n_1 + n_2$. The same argument as above yields that $H_1 \oplus H_2$ is an invariant subspace of $A_1$.

Consequently, $H_2$ is a reducing subspace of $H_1$. Successively, we get that all $H_j$'s are reducing subspaces of $H_1$.

The same can be done for the negative eigenvalues and the corresponding eigenspaces. The only difference is to consider the left hand supporting line instead. For example, if $b_1$ is the smallest negative eigenvalue of $B$, then for $k = m_1 = \dim K_1$, \( \min \{ \Re \lambda : \lambda \in W_k(A) \} = m_1 b_1 \). By considering an extreme point of $\mathcal{C} W_k(A_1)$ lying on the vertical line $\Re \lambda = n_1 b_1$, we get that $K_1$, and then similarly, all other $K_\ell$'s, are reducing subspaces of $H_1$. As observed above, $A_1$ is normal.

Similarly, all other $A_2, \ldots, A_m$ are normal. If $A_j = G_j + iH_j$ for self-adjoint $G_j$ and $H_j$, and if $a + ib (a, b \in \mathbb{R})$ is an eigenvalue of $A_j$ with corresponding eigenvector $x$, then $G_j x = ax$ and $H_j x = bx$. Thus we have $W_k(G_1, H_1, \ldots, G_m, H_m) = \mathbf{conv} \Sigma(G_1, H_1, \ldots, G_m, H_m)$ for all $k$. For any two operators $B, C \in \{G_1, H_1, \ldots, G_m, H_m\}$, we may apply the argument above to $B + iC$ to conclude that $B$ and $C$ commute. It follows that the operators $A_1, \ldots, A_m$ commute.

In the finite dimensional case, it is known that \( \{A_1, \ldots, A_m\} \in M_n \) is a set of mutually commuting normal matrices if and only if $W_k(A_1, \ldots, A_m)$ is polyhedral for $k = 1, \ldots, n - 1$; see [15, Theorem 3.3]. The following example shows that there are commuting self-adjoint compact operators $H, G$ such that $W_k(H, G) \equiv W_k(H + iG)$ is not polyhedral.

**Example 3.2.** Let $A_0 = -I + \text{diag}(e^{i\pi/2}, e^{-i\pi/2}, e^{i\pi/3}, e^{-i\pi/3}, e^{i\pi/4}, e^{-i\pi/4}, \ldots)$, and for $k \geq 1$ $A_k = \text{diag}(i, -i, -1 + i, -1 - i) \oplus A_{k-1}$. Then $\mathcal{C} W(A_0)$ is not polyhedral as it has a smooth extreme point at 0. For $k \geq 1$, $W_k(A_k)$ is not polyhedral because the extreme points $(k - 1)i$ and $(1 - k)i$ are smooth extreme points.

To determine a condition for $W_k(A)$ to be polyhedral for all $k$, we introduce following notation. For $A = (A_1, \ldots, A_m) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$, let $A \oplus 0_\ell = (A_1 \oplus 0_\ell, \ldots, A_m \oplus 0_\ell)$, where $0_\ell$ is the zero matrix in $M_\ell$ if $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, and $0_\infty$ is the zero operator acting on $\mathcal{H}$.

**Theorem 3.3.** Let $A = (A_1, \ldots, A_m) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$ be an $m$-tuple of compact operators. Then for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

\[ \text{cl} \left( \mathbf{conv} W_k(A) \right) = \mathbf{conv} W_k(A \oplus 0_k) = \mathbf{conv} W_k(A \oplus 0_\infty). \]

Consequently, the following conditions are equivalent.

(a) For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\text{cl} W_k(A)$ is polyhedral.
(b) For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\text{cl} (\mathbf{conv} W_k(A))$ is polyhedral.
(c) The set $\{A_1, \ldots, A_m\}$ is a commuting family of normal operators, and $\mathbf{conv} \Sigma_k(A \oplus 0_\infty)$ is polyhedral for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. For $0 \leq \ell \leq k$,

\[ W_\ell(A) + (k - \ell)0 \subseteq W_k(A \oplus 0_k). \]
By Theorem 1.3

\[ \text{cl} \left( \text{conv} W_k(A) \right) = \text{conv} \bigcup_{0 \leq \ell \leq k} (W_\ell(A) + (k - \ell)0) \subseteq \text{conv} W_k(A \oplus 0_k) \subseteq \text{conv} W_k(A \oplus 0_\infty). \]

One can readily adapt the proof of [15, Theorem 4.4] to the infinite dimensional operators and show that for every rank \( k \) orthogonal projection \( P = \begin{pmatrix} P_{11} & P_{12} \\ P_{21} & P_{22} \end{pmatrix} \) with \( P_{11}, P_{22} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \), \( P_{11} \oplus P_{22} \) is a convex combination of orthogonal projections of the form \( Q_1 \oplus Q_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})) \), where \( Q_1 \) and \( Q_2 \) are orthogonal projections of rank \( \ell \) and \( k - \ell \) with \( 0 \leq \ell \leq k \). Consequently,

\[ W_k(A \oplus 0_\infty) \subseteq \bigcup_{0 \leq \ell \leq k} (W_\ell(A) + W_{k-\ell}(0_\infty)) = \text{cl} \text{conv} W_k(A). \]

Thus, \( \text{conv} W_k(A \oplus 0_k) \subseteq \text{cl} \left( \text{conv} W_k(A) \right) \) and (3.2) follows.

To prove the equivalence of conditions (a) – (c), we can focus on self-adjoint operators \( A_1, \ldots, A_m \) because we can write \( A_\ell = G_\ell + iH_\ell \) for self-adjoint \( G_\ell \) and \( H_\ell \) so that

1. \( W_k(A) \) is polyhedral if and only if \( W_k(G_1, H_1, \ldots, G_m, H_m) \) is, and
2. \( \{A_1, \ldots, A_m\} \) is a commuting family of normal operators if and only if \( \{G_1, H_1, \ldots, G_m, H_m\} \) is a commuting family by Fuglede’s theorem.

The implication (a) \( \Rightarrow \) (b) is clear.

Suppose (b) holds. For notational simplicity, we let \( A = A \oplus 0_\infty \in S(\mathcal{H})^m \), and show that the components of \( A \) commute using an argument similar to those in the proof of Theorem 3.1. Without loss of generality, we shall just show that \( A_1A_2 = A_2A_1 \). Now, \( \text{conv} W_k(A_1, A_2) \), as the projection of \( \text{conv} W_k(A) \) onto \( \mathbb{R}^2 \), is polyhedral. Since \( A_1 \) is self-adjoint and compact, it can be written as

\[ A_1 = \sum_{j \geq 1} a_j I_{\mathcal{H}_j} + \sum_{\ell \geq 1} b_\ell I_{\mathcal{K}_\ell}, \]

where \( a_j \)'s are the positive, and \( b_\ell \)'s the negative, eigenvalues of \( A_1 \), as in the proof of Theorem 3.1. We shall consider \( A = A_1 + iA_2 \) and use [18, Theorem 1] to show that \( \mathcal{H}_j \)'s and \( \mathcal{K}_\ell \)'s are all reducing subspaces of \( A_2 \). It follows that the null space of \( A_1 \) is also a reducing subspace of \( A_2 \), and consequently, \( A_1 \) and \( A_2 \) commute.

If \( A_1 \) has at least one positive eigenvalue, we start with the largest eigenvalue \( a_1 \) and let \( k = \dim \mathcal{H}_1 = n_1 \). For any unit vector \( y \in \mathcal{H}_1^+ \), let \( B = B_1 + iB_2 \) be the compression of \( A = A_1 + iA_2 \) onto the subspace \( \mathcal{H}_1 \cap \text{span}\{y\} \). Clearly,

\[ \max\{\text{Re} \lambda : \lambda \in W_k(B)\} = n_1 a_1 = \max\{\text{Re} \lambda : \lambda \in W_k(A)\}. \]

Let \( \mu \) be an extreme point of \( \text{cl} W_k(A) \) lying on the vertical line \( \text{Re} \lambda = n_1 a_1 \). Then as in the proof of Theorem 3.1 again, \( \mu \in W_k(A) \). Suppose \( \mu = \sum_{j=1}^k \langle Ax_j, x_j \rangle \) for orthonormal vectors \( x_1, \ldots, x_k \).

It is easy to see that all \( x_1, \ldots, x_k \in \mathcal{H}_1 \) and so \( \mu \in W_k(B) \). As \( W_k(B) \subseteq \text{cl} W_k(A) \), it follows that \( \mu \) is a conical point of \( W_k(B) \). By [18, Theorem 1], \( \langle Bx, y \rangle = \langle By, x \rangle = 0 \), or, \( \langle Ax, y \rangle = \langle Ay, x \rangle = 0 \), for all \( x \in \mathcal{H}_1 \). As this is true for all \( y \in \mathcal{H}_1^+ \), \( \mathcal{H}_1 \) is a reducing subspace of \( A \). It must also be a reducing subspace of \( A_2 \).
If \( A_1 \) has another positive eigenvalue \( a_2 \), then we take \( k = n_1 + n_2 \) and for any unit vector \( y \in (\mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2)^\perp \), consider the compression of \( A \) onto \( \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2 \oplus \text{span}\{y\} \). The same argument as above yields that \( \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2 \) is a reducing subspace of \( A_2 \). Consequently, \( \mathcal{H}_2 \) is a reducing subspace of \( A_2 \). Successively, we get that all \( \mathcal{H}_j \)'s are reducing subspaces of \( A_2 \). Similarly, every \( K \ell \) is also reducing for \( A \). Thus, we have \( A_1A_2 = A_2A_1 \). Therefore, \( \{A_1 \oplus 0_\infty, \ldots, A_m \oplus 0_\infty\} \), and consequently \( \{A_1, \ldots, A_m\} \), are commuting families. Condition (c) holds.

Suppose (c) holds. Since \( \{A_1, \ldots, A_m\} \) is a commuting family of normal operators, by Theorem 3.1 \( \mathcal{W}_k(A) = \text{conv} \Sigma_k(A) \) is convex for every \( k \in \mathbb{N} \). Now \( \{A_1 \oplus 0_\infty, \ldots, A_m \oplus 0_\infty\} \) is also a commuting family of normal operators. Therefore, \( \mathcal{W}_k(A \oplus 0_\infty) = \text{conv} \Sigma_k(A \oplus 0_\infty) \) is polyhedral for each \( k \in \mathbb{N} \). By (3.2), \( \text{cl}\mathcal{W}_k(A) = \text{cl}\text{conv} \mathcal{W}_k(A) = \mathcal{W}_k(A \oplus 0_\infty) \) is also polyhedral. Hence, condition (a) holds.

For finite rank operators, the result resembles that of the finite dimensional case.

**Proposition 3.4.** Let \( A = (A_1, \ldots, A_m) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m \) be an \( m \)-tuple of finite rank operators. The following conditions are equivalent.

(a) \( \{A_1, \ldots, A_m\} \) is a commuting family of normal operators, equivalently, there is a unitary operator \( U \) such that \( U^*A_jU \) is a diagonal operator for each \( j \).

(b) \( \mathcal{W}_k(A) = \text{cl}\mathcal{W}_k(A) \) is polyhedral for all \( k \in \mathbb{N} \).

(c) There is \( k \geq r \) such that \( \text{conv} \mathcal{W}_k(A) \) is polyhedral, where \( r \) is the dimension of the sum of the range spaces of \( A_1, \ldots, A_m \).

**Proof.** Suppose (a) holds. We may assume that \( A_1, \ldots, A_m \) are real diagonal operators, each has finite rank. Then \( \Sigma_k(A) \) is a finite set. By Theorem 3.1 \( \mathcal{W}_k(A) = \text{conv} \Sigma_k(A) \) is polyhedral. Hence \( \text{cl} \mathcal{W}_k(A) = \mathcal{W}_k(A) \).

The implication (b) \( \Rightarrow \) (c) is clear.

Suppose (c) holds. Then we may assume that \( A_j = B_j \oplus 0_\infty \) with \( B_j \in \mathcal{M}_r \) for \( j = 1, \ldots, m \). We may further assume that all \( B_j \)'s are Hermitian. Let \( C_j = B_j \oplus 0_{2k-r} \) for \( j = 1, \ldots, m \), \( \mathcal{B} = (B_1, \ldots, B_m) \) and \( \mathcal{C} = (C_1, \ldots, C_m) \). By (3.2), we have

\[
\text{conv} \mathcal{W}_k(A) = \text{cl}\text{conv} \mathcal{W}_k(A) = \text{conv} \mathcal{W}_k(B + 0_k) \subseteq \text{conv} \mathcal{W}_k(C) \subseteq \text{conv} \mathcal{W}_k(A).
\]

Therefore, \( \text{conv} \mathcal{W}_k(C) = \text{conv} \mathcal{W}_k(A) \) is polyhedral. For every \( 1 \leq i < j \leq m \), \( \mathcal{W}_k(C_i, C_j) = \text{conv} \mathcal{W}_k(C_i, C_j) \) is a polygon in \( \mathbb{R}^2 \). Since \( C_i, C_j \in \mathcal{M}_{2k} \), by Theorem 1.1 \( C_iC_j = C_jC_i \), which implies that \( A_iA_j = A_jA_i \). Hence, (a) holds.

4. **General operators**

Theorem 3.3 is not true if the operators \( A_1, \ldots, A_m \) are not compact. As a counterexample, we exhibit a nonnormal operator whose \( k \)-numerical range is a triangle for every \( k \).

**Example 4.1.** Let \( A = \left( \begin{array}{cc} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \oplus [I_\infty \otimes \text{diag}(1, \omega, \omega^2)] \) with \( \omega = e^{i2\pi/3} \). It is not difficult to see that \( \mathcal{W}_k(A) = \text{conv} \{k, k\omega, k\omega^2\} \) is the triangular region with vertices \( k, k\omega, k\omega^2 \). However \( A \) is not normal because of the first summand.

**Theorem 4.2.** Let \( A = (A_1, \ldots, A_m) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m \). The following conditions are equivalent.
(a) $W_k(A)$ is polyhedral for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

(b) $\text{conv } W_k(A)$ is polyhedral for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

(c) There is a unitary $U \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $U^* A_j U = D_j \oplus C_j$, where $D_j = \text{diag}(d_1^{(j)}, d_2^{(j)}, \ldots)$ and $W_k(A) = W_k(D_1, \ldots, D_m)$ is polyhedral for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. As in the proof of Theorem 2.3, we shall assume that $(A_1, \ldots, A_m) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$. The implications (c) $\Rightarrow$ (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b) are clear.

Suppose (b) holds. By Theorem 2.3, we get for each $k$ an orthonormal set of common reducing eigenvectors $S_k = \{x_1^{(k)}, \ldots, x_{n_k}^{(k)}\}$ of $A_1, \ldots, A_m$ such that the compressions $D_j^{(k)}$ of $A_j$ onto span $S_k$ satisfy $W_k(A) = W_k(D_1^{(k)}, \ldots, D_m^{(k)})$. We may assume that $S_k \subseteq S_{k+1}$ by arguing as follows. If $x_1^{(k+1)}$ is orthogonal to $S_k$, then $S_k \cup \{x_1^{(k+1)}\}$ is an orthonormal basis of span $S_k \cup \{x_1^{(k+1)}\}$. If $x_1^{(k+1)}$ is not orthogonal to some of the vectors in $S_k$, say, $x_1^{(k)}, \ldots, x_\ell^{(k)}$ for $\ell \leq n_k$, then they are all eigenvectors corresponding to the same eigenvalue of $A_j$ for each $j$. It is because eigenvectors corresponding to distinct eigenvalues are orthogonal. Delete $x_1^{(k+1)}$ if $x_1^{(k+1)} \in \text{span } S_k$; otherwise replace it by a unit vector $x$ in span $\{x_1^{(k)}, \ldots, x_\ell^{(k)}, x_1^{(k+1)}\}$ so that $S_k \cup \{x\}$ is an orthonormal basis of span $S_k \cup \{x_1^{(k+1)}\}$. This $x$ is also a reducing eigenvector of each $A_j$ corresponding to the same eigenvalue as $x_1^{(k+1)}$.

Going through all other vectors in $S_{k+1}$, we get an orthonormal set $S'_{k+1}$ containing $S_k$ such that span $S'_{k+1} = \text{span } S_k \cup S_{k+1}$. Note that $S'_{k+1}$ contains all vectors in $S_{k+1}$ that are orthogonal to $S_k$, and for a vector that is not orthogonal to $S_k$, it is either deleted or replaced. A vector that is deleted can be regarded as replaced by an eigenvector in $S_{k+1}$ corresponding to the same eigenvalue.

With the previous notations, if $x_1^{(k+1)}, \ldots, x_r^{(k+1)}$ belong to span $\{x_1^{(k)}, \ldots, x_\ell^{(k)}\}$ so that they are deleted, then $r \leq \ell$. There are always enough vectors for replacement. Renaming $S'_{k+1}$ as $S_{k+1}$, then we still have $W_{k+1}(A) = W_{k+1}(D_1^{(k+1)}, \ldots, D_m^{(k+1)})$. Thus we may assume that the sets $S_k$ are increasing. It follows that $S = \bigcup_k S_k$ is an orthonormal set of common reducing eigenvectors of $A_1, \ldots, A_m$. If $D_j$ is the compression of $A_j$ onto span $S$, then $W_k(A) = W_k(D_1, \ldots, D_m)$ is polyhedral for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, condition (c) holds. $\square$

**Theorem 4.3.** Suppose $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m$. The following are equivalent.

(a) $\text{cl } W_k(A)$ is polyhedral for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

(b) $\text{cl } (\text{conv } W_k(A))$ is polyhedral for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

(c) There exist an $m$-tuple of diagonal operators $D_1$, which is a compression of $A$ on a separable reducing subspace of $\mathcal{H}$, and another $m$-tuple of separable diagonal operators $D_2$ such that the diagonal entries of $D_2$ are extreme points of $W_{\text{ess}}(A)$, satisfying

$$\text{cl } W_k(A) = W_k(D_1 \oplus D_2)$$

is polyhedral for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. As in the proof of Theorem 2.3, we shall assume that $(A_1, \ldots, A_m) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})^m$. The implications (c) $\Rightarrow$ (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b) are clear.

Suppose (b) holds. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $v_1^k, \ldots, v_{n_k}^k$ be the vertices of $\text{cl } (\text{conv } W_k(A))$. For each vertex $v_j^k$, $1 \leq j \leq n_k$, by Theorem 4.3 there exist $0 \leq \ell \leq k$, $w_j^k \in W_\ell(A)$ and $d_j^k \in W_{\text{ess}}(A)$ such
that \( v_j = w_j^k + (k - \ell)d_j^k \). Let
\[
D_2 = \oplus_{k \geq 1} \oplus_{1 \leq j < n_k} d_j^k I_{\infty}.
\]
Then for every \( k \in \mathbb{N} \), \( \text{conv} W_k(A \oplus D_2) = \text{cl} W_k(A) \) is polyhedral for each \( k \in \mathbb{N} \). By Theorem 4.2, \( A \oplus D_2 \) is unitarily similar to \( D \oplus C \) for an \( m \)-tuple of diagonal operators \( D \) such that
\[
W_k(A \oplus (F \otimes I_{\infty})) = W_k(D)
\]
for each \( k \in \mathbb{N} \). Let \( S = \{(x_j, y_j)\} \) be an orthonormal set of common reducing eigenvectors of \( A \oplus D_2 \) corresponding to the diagonal entries of \( D \). Then \( S \) is at most countably infinite. If \( y_j = 0 \), then \( x_j \) is a common reducing eigenvector of \( A \). Let \( S_1 = \{x_j: (x_j, 0) \in S\} \). Then \( S_1 \) is orthonormal. Extending \( S_1 \) to an orthonormal basis of \( \mathcal{H} \), we have a unitary \( U \) in \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) and \( m \)-tuple of \( D_1 = (D_1, \ldots, D_m) \) of diagonal operators acting on a separable subspace of \( \mathcal{H} \) such that \( U^* A_j U = D_j \oplus B_j \) for \( j = 1, \ldots, m \). Note that the common eigenvalue \( d_j \) corresponding to each \( x_j \in S_1 \) is included in \( D_1 \). Also, it is easy to show that it suffices to use the extreme points of \( W_{\text{ess}}(A) \) to construct the diagonal operator \( D \). Then \( D_1 \) and \( D_2 \) satisfy condition (c).

One may wonder whether \( D_1 \) or \( D_2 \) in Theorem 4.3 can be replaced by finite dimensional operators. In particular, for any \( A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m \) and \( k \in \mathbb{N} \),
\[
\frac{1}{k+1} W_{k+1}(A) \subseteq \text{cl}(\text{conv} \frac{1}{k} W_k(A)) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{cl}(\text{conv} \frac{1}{k} W_k(A)) \rightarrow W_{\text{ess}}(A) \quad \text{as} \quad k \rightarrow \infty.
\]
One may wonder whether \( \text{cl}(W_k(A)) \) is polyhedral for all \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) will imply that \( W_{\text{ess}}(A) \) is polyhedral, and hence the distinct diagonal entries of \( D_2 \) form a finite set. The following example show that the answers for the above questions are all negative.

**Example 4.4.** Let \( D_1 = \text{diag} (1, e^{i\pi/2}, e^{-i\pi/2}, e^{i\pi/3}, e^{-i\pi/3}, \ldots) \), \( D_2 = \text{diag} (1, 1 + 1, 1 + 1/2, 1 + 1/3, \ldots) \), \( A_1 = D_1 \otimes I_{\infty} \) and \( A = A_1 \oplus D_2 \). Then \( W_{\text{ess}}(A) = \text{conv} \{1, e^{i\pi/2}, e^{-i\pi/2}, e^{i\pi/3}, e^{-i\pi/3}, \ldots\} \) is not a polytope. On the other hand, it is easy to see that \( W_1(A) = \text{conv} (W_1(A_1) \cup W_1(D_2)) \) is polyhedral. For \( k > 1 \), observe that \( \frac{1}{k} W_k(A_1) = \text{conv} \{1, e^{i\pi/2}, e^{-i\pi/2}, e^{i\pi/3}, e^{-i\pi/3}, \ldots\} \), same as \( W_{\text{ess}}(A) \), and \( \frac{1}{k} W_k(D_2) \) is a line segment on the real axis of the form \([1, 1 + r]\) for some \( r > 0 \). One may use [15, Theorem 4.4] and mathematical induction to show that \( \frac{1}{k} W_k(A) \) has only finitely many extreme points.

Theorems 4.2 and 4.3 characterize \( A \) such that \( S_k(A) \) is polyhedral for all \( k \in \mathbb{N} \), where \( S_k(A) \) is \( W_k(A) \), \( \text{conv} W_k(A) \), \( \text{cl} W_k(A) \), or \( \text{cl}(\text{conv} W_k(A)) \). In all cases, the condition depends on the behavior of the compression of \( A_1, \ldots, A_m \) on a certain separable subspace of \( \mathcal{H} \). Even if \( \mathcal{H} \) is separable, Example 4.4 shows that it is not easy to determine whether \( \{A_1, \ldots, A_m\} \) is a commuting normal family using the geometrical structure of \( W_k(A) \) for all \( k \in \mathbb{N} \). We are only able to obtain a result for some special families of \( \{A_1, \ldots, A_m\} \), which can be deduced from the following.

**Proposition 4.5.** Let \( A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) have a finite spectrum. Then \( A \) is normal if any one of the following condition holds.

(a) For each \( \lambda \in \sigma(A) \) there is \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( W_k(A) \) is polyhedral with a conical point \( \lambda + \sum_{j=2}^{k} \mu_j \in \Sigma_k(A) \).

(b) For each \( \lambda \in \sigma(A) \) there is \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( \text{cl} W_k(A) \) is polyhedral with a conical point \( \lambda + \sum_{j=2}^{k} \mu_j + (k - \ell)\xi \), where \( 1 \leq \ell \leq k \), \( \lambda + \sum_{j=2}^{\ell} \mu_j \in \Sigma_\ell(A) \) and \( \xi \in W_{\text{ess}}(A) \).
Proof. Suppose \( A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) has a finite spectrum. Suppose (a) holds. Let \( \lambda \in \sigma(A) \) and \( W_k(A) \) is polyhedral with a vertex of the form \( \sum_{j=1}^{k} \mu_j \in \Sigma_k(A) \), where \( \mu_1 = \lambda \). We will show that \( A \) is unitarily similar to \( \lambda I \oplus B \) such that \( \lambda \notin \sigma(B) \). By Theorem 2.2, \( A \) is unitarily similar to \( D \oplus B \) for a diagonal matrix \( D \in M_r \) such that \( W(A) = W(D) \). In particular, we may assume that \( \mu_1, \ldots, \mu_m \) are diagonal entries of \( D \). If \( \lambda \notin \sigma(B) \), then we are done. Otherwise, assume that \( \lambda \in \sigma(B) \). We may assume that the first column (of the operator matrix) of \( B \) that the first row \( \gamma \) are diagonal entries of \( D \). If \( \gamma \neq 0 \), consider the leading principal submatrix \( T \in M_{r+2} \) of \( D \oplus B \). Then the \((r+1, r+2)\) entry of \( T \) is \( \gamma \). Note that

\[
W_k(D) \subseteq W_k(T) \subseteq W_k(A) = W_k(D).
\]

We can find \( k \) diagonal entries of \( T \) including the \((r+1, r+1)\) entry, which is \( \lambda \), summing up to \( \sum_{j=1}^{k} \mu_j \) is a vertex of \( W_k(T) \). By Theorem 2.3 (a), the \((r+1, r+2)\) entry of \( T \) is zero, which is a contradiction. So, if \( \lambda \in \sigma(B) \), then \( \sigma \) is a reducing eigenvalue if \( B \). As a result, \( B = \lambda I \oplus B_1 \) such that \( \lambda \notin \sigma(B_1) \). Repeating this argument for every element in \( \sigma(A) \), we see that \( \mathcal{H} \) is a direct sum of the eigenspaces of \( A \). Thus, \( A \) is normal.

Next, suppose (b) holds. Let \( \lambda \in \Sigma(A) \), and \( \mathsf{cl} W_k(A) \) is polyhedral with a conical point \( \lambda + \sum_{j=2}^{\ell} \mu_j + (k - \ell) \xi \). By Theorem 2.3 and its proof, we see that \( \mathsf{cl} W_k(A) \) is polyhedral with \( \lambda + \sum_{j=2}^{\ell} \mu_j \) as a conical point. We may use the argument in the preceding paragraph to show that \( \lambda \) is a reducing eigenvalue of \( A \). Since this is true for all \( \lambda \in \sigma(A) \), we see that \( A \) is normal.

In Proposition 4.5 (a) and (b), one cannot just require \( W_k(A) \) is polyhedral for \( k \leq \ell \) for a finite value \( \ell \) using the information of \( \sigma(A) \). For example, suppose \( \sigma(A) = \{1, w, w^2\} \) with \( w = e^{i2\pi/3} \). For any \( \ell \in \mathbb{N} \), we can let \( A = [I_\ell \otimes \text{diag}(1, w, w^2)] \oplus \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \) to be the non-normal operator such that \( W_k(A) = \text{conv} \{k, kw, kw^2\} \) is a polygon for all \( k = 1, \ldots, \ell \), but \( W_{k+1}(A) \) is not.

**Corollary 4.6.** Let \( A = (A_1, \ldots, A_m) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^m \) be an \( m \)-tuple of self-adjoint operators. Then \( \{A_1, \ldots, A_m\} \) is a commuting family if for all choices of \( 1 \leq p < q \leq m \), \( A = A_p + iA_q \) has a finite spectrum satisfying conditions (a) or (b) of Proposition 4.5.

The following example shows that Corollary 4.6 will fail if one only assumes that \( A_1, A_2 \) are self-adjoint operators, where \( A_1, A_2 \) have finite spectrum, and for any eigenvalues \( \lambda_j \in \sigma(A_j) \) for \( j = 1, 2 \), there is \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( W_k(A_1 + iA_2) \) is polyhedral with a vertex of the form \((\lambda_1 + i\lambda_2) + \sum_{j=2}^{k} \mu_j \in \Sigma_k(A_1 + iA_2)\).

**Example 4.7.** Let \( A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \oplus (I_\infty \otimes D_1) \) and \( A_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \oplus (I_\infty \otimes D_2) \) with \( D_1 = \text{diag}(1, 1, -1, -1), \ D_2 = \text{diag}(1, -1, 1, -1) \). Then \( A_1A_2 \neq A_2A_1, \ \sigma(A_1) = \sigma(A_2) = \{1, -1\} \). Let \( A = A_1 + iA_2 \). Then for every \( k \geq 1 \), \( W_k(A) \) is the square with vertices \( \{k(1 + i), k(1 - i), k(-1 + i), k(-1 - i)\} \). Note that \( 0 \in \sigma(A_1 + iA_2) \) but a point \( \sum_{j=1}^{k} \mu_j \) is a vertex of \( W_k(A) \) if and only if \( \mu_1 = \cdots = \mu_k \in \{1 + i, 1 - i, -1 + i, -1 - i\} \).
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