

# The generalized numerical range of a set of matrices

Pan-Shun Lau, Chi-Kwong Li, Yiu-Tung Poon, and Nung-Sing Sze

## Abstract

For a given set of  $n \times n$  matrices  $\mathcal{F}$ , we study the union of the  $C$ -numerical ranges of the matrices in the set  $\mathcal{F}$ , denoted by  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$ . We obtain basic algebraic and topological properties of  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$ , and show that there are connections between the geometric properties of  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  and the algebraic properties of  $C$  and the matrices in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Furthermore, we consider the starshapedness and convexity of the set  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$ . In particular, we show that if  $\mathcal{F}$  is the convex hull of two matrices such that  $W_C(A)$  and  $W_C(B)$  are convex, then the set  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  is star-shaped. We also investigate the extensions of the results to the joint  $C$ -numerical range of an  $m$ -tuple of matrices.

AMS classification. 15A60.

Keywords. Numerical range, convex set, star-shaped set.

## 1 Introduction

Let  $M_n$  be the set of all  $n \times n$  complex matrices. The numerical range of  $A \in M_n$  is defined by

$$W(A) = \{x^*Ax : x \in \mathbb{C}^n, x^*x = 1\},$$

which is a useful tool for studying matrices and operators; for example, see [8, Chapter 22] and [9, Chapter 1]. In particular, there is an interesting interplay between the geometrical properties of  $W(A)$  and the algebraic properties of  $A$ .

In this paper, for a nonempty set  $\mathcal{F}$  of matrices in  $M_n$ , we consider

$$W(\mathcal{F}) = \cup\{W(A) : A \in \mathcal{F}\}.$$

We show that there are also interesting connections between the geometrical properties of  $W(\mathcal{F})$  and the properties of the matrices in  $\mathcal{F}$ .

The study has motivations from different topics. We mention two of them in the following. The first one arises in the study of Crouzeix's conjecture asserting that for any  $A \in M_n$ ,

$$\|f(A)\| \leq 2 \max\{|f(\mu)| : \mu \in W(A)\}$$

for any complex polynomial  $f(z)$ , where  $\|A\|$  denotes the operator norm of  $A$ , see [7]. Instead of focusing on a single matrix  $A \in M_n$ , one may consider a complex convex set  $K$  and show that

$$\|f(A)\| \leq 2 \max\{|f(\mu)| : \mu \in K\}$$

whenever  $W(A) \subseteq K$ . One readily shows that this is equivalent to the Crouzeix's conjecture. In fact, one may focus on the case when  $K$  is a convex polygon (including interior) because  $W(A)$  can always be approximated by convex polygons from inside or outside.

Another motivation comes from quantum information science. In quantum mechanics, a pure state in  $M_n$  is a rank one orthogonal projection of the form  $xx^*$  for some unit vector  $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$ , and a general state is a density matrix, which is a convex combination of pure states. For a measurement operator  $A \in M_n$ , which is usually Hermitian, the measurement of a state  $P$  is computed by  $\langle A, P \rangle = \text{tr}(AP)$ . As a result,

$$W(A) = \{x^*Ax : x \in \mathbb{C}^n, x^*x = 1\} = \{\text{tr}(Axx^*) : x \in \mathbb{C}^n, x^*x = 1\}$$

can be viewed as the set of all possible measurements on pure states for a given measurement operator  $A$ . By the convexity of the numerical range, we have

$$W(A) = \{\text{tr}(Axx^*) : x \in \mathbb{C}^n, x^*x = 1\} = \{\text{tr}(AP) : P \text{ is a general state}\}.$$

So,  $W(A)$  actually contains all possible measurements on general states for a given measurement operator  $A$ . If we consider all possible measurements under a set  $\mathcal{F}$  of measurement operators, then it is natural to study  $W(\mathcal{F})$ . In fact, if we know the set  $W(\mathcal{F})$ , we may deduce some properties about the measurement operators in  $\mathcal{F}$ . For example, one can show that

- (a)  $W(\mathcal{F}) = \{\mu\}$  if and only if  $\mathcal{F} = \{\mu I\}$ .
- (b)  $W(\mathcal{F}) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  if and only if all matrices in  $\mathcal{F}$  are Hermitian.
- (c)  $W(\mathcal{F}) \subseteq [0, \infty)$  if and only if all matrices in  $\mathcal{F}$  are positive semi-definite.

It is worth pointing out that if  $A \in M_n$  is not Hermitian, one may consider the Hermitian decomposition  $A = A_1 + iA_2$  such that  $A_1, A_2$  are Hermitian, and identify  $W(A)$  as the joint numerical range of  $(A_1, A_2)$  defined by

$$W(A_1, A_2) = \{(x^*A_1x, x^*A_2x) : x \in \mathbb{C}^n, x^*x = 1\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2.$$

One can study the joint numerical range of  $k$ -tuple of Hermitian matrices  $(A_1, \dots, A_k)$  defined by

$$W(A_1, \dots, A_k) = \{(x^*A_1x, \dots, x^*A_kx) : x \in \mathbb{C}^n, x^*x = 1\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k.$$

Accordingly, one may consider the joint numerical range  $W(\mathcal{F}) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k$  of a set  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $k$ -tuple of Hermitian matrices in  $M_n$ .

It turns out that we can study  $W(\mathcal{F})$  under a more general setting. For a matrix  $C \in M_n$ , the  $C$ -numerical range of  $A \in M_n$  is defined by

$$W_C(A) = \{\text{tr}(CU^*AU) : U \text{ is unitary}\},$$

which has been studied by many researchers in connection to different topics; see [10] and its references. In particular, the  $C$ -numerical range is useful in the study of quantum control

and quantum information; for example, see [16]. Denote by  $\{E_{11}, E_{12}, \dots, E_{nn}\}$  the standard basis for  $M_n$ . When  $C = E_{11}$ ,  $W_C(A)$  reduces to  $W(A)$ ; if  $C$  is a rank  $m$  orthogonal projection, then  $W_C(A)$  reduces to the  $m$ th-numerical range of  $A$ ; see [8, 9, 12]. For a non-empty set  $\mathcal{F}$  of matrices in  $M_n$ , we consider

$$W_C(\mathcal{F}) = \cup\{W_C(A) : A \in \mathcal{F}\}.$$

In Section 2, we study the connection between the geometric properties of  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  and the properties of the set  $\mathcal{F}$ . In Sections 3 and 4, we study conditions for  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  to be star-shaped or convex. In Section 5, we consider the joint  $C$ -numerical range of  $(A_1, \dots, A_k) \in M_n^k$  defined by

$$W_C(A_1, \dots, A_k) = \{(\operatorname{tr}(CU^*A_1U), \dots, \operatorname{tr}(CU^*A_kU)) : U \text{ is unitary}\} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^k.$$

If  $C, A_1, \dots, A_k$  are Hermitian matrices, then  $W_C(A_1, \dots, A_k) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k$ . One may see [10] for the background and references on the  $C$ -numerical range.

If  $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $C = \mu I$ , then

$$W_C(A) = \{\mu \operatorname{tr} A\} \quad \text{and} \quad W_C(A_1, \dots, A_k) = \{\mu(\operatorname{tr} A_1, \dots, \operatorname{tr} A_k)\}.$$

We will always assume that  $C$  is not a scalar matrix to avoid trivial consideration.

For convenience of discussion, we always identify  $\mathbb{C}$  with  $\mathbb{R}^2$ .

## 2 Basic properties of $W_C(A)$ and $W_C(\mathcal{F})$

We first list some basic results in the first two propositions below about the  $C$ -numerical range; see [4, 10, 13, 17, 18] and their references.

**Proposition 2.1.** *Let  $C, A \in M_n$ .*

(a) *For any unitary  $U, V \in M_n$ ,  $W_{V^*CV}(U^*AU) = W_C(A) = W_A(C)$ .*

(b) *For any  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$ ,*

$$W_C(\alpha A + \beta I) = \alpha W_C(A) + \beta \operatorname{tr} C = \{\alpha \mu + \beta \operatorname{tr} C : \mu \in W_C(A)\}.$$

(c) *The set  $W_C(A)$  is compact.*

(d) *The set  $W_C(A)$  is star-shaped with  $(\operatorname{tr} C)(\operatorname{tr} A)/n$  as a star center, i.e.,*

$$t\mu + (1-t)(\operatorname{tr} C)(\operatorname{tr} A)/n \in W_C(A) \quad \text{for any } \mu \in W_C(A) \text{ and } t \in [0, 1].$$

(e) *The set  $W_C(A)$  is convex if there is  $\gamma \in \mathbb{C}$  such that  $\tilde{C} = C - \gamma I_n$  satisfies any one of the following conditions.*

(e.1)  *$\tilde{C}$  is rank one.*

(e.2)  $\tilde{C}$  is a multiple of a Hermitian matrix.

(e.3)  $\tilde{C}$  is unitarily similar to a block matrix of the form  $(C_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq m}$  such that  $C_{11}, \dots, C_{mm}$  are square matrices possibly with different sizes, and  $C_{ij} = 0$  if  $j \neq i + 1$ .

Researchers have extended the results on classical numerical range, and showed that there is interesting interplay between the geometry of  $W_C(A)$  and the algebraic properties of  $C$  and  $A$ . A boundary point  $\nu$  of  $W_C(A)$  is a corner point if there is  $d > 0$  such that  $W_C(A) \cap \{\mu \in \mathbb{C} : |\mu - \nu| \leq d\}$  is contained in a pointed cone with  $\nu$  as a vertex.

**Proposition 2.2.** *Let  $C = (c_{ij}) \in M_n$  be a non-scalar matrix in lower triangular form with diagonal entries  $c_1, \dots, c_n$ . Suppose  $A = (a_{ij}) \in M_n$  is also in lower triangular form with diagonal entries  $a_1, \dots, a_n$ .*

- (a) *If  $\text{tr}(CA) = \sum_{j=1}^n c_j a_j$  is a boundary point of  $W_C(A)$ , then  $a_{rs} = 0$  whenever  $c_r \neq c_s$  and  $c_{pq} = 0$  whenever  $a_p \neq a_q$ . In particular, if  $C$  and  $A$  has distinct eigenvalues, then  $C$  and  $A$  will be in diagonal form, i.e.,  $C$  and  $A$  are normal.*
- (b) *If  $\nu$  is a corner point of  $W_C(A)$ , then there is a unitary  $V$  such that  $V^*AV$  is lower triangular form with diagonal entries  $a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_n}$  such that  $(j_1, \dots, j_n)$  is a permutation of  $(1, \dots, n)$  and*

$$\nu = \text{tr}(CV^*AV) = \sum_{\ell=1}^n c_\ell a_{j_\ell}.$$

- (c) *The set  $W_C(A)$  is a singleton if and only if  $A$  is a scalar matrix.*
- (d) *The set  $W_C(A)$  is a non-degenerate line segment if and only if  $C$  and  $A$  are non-scalar normal matrices having collinear eigenvalues in  $\mathbb{C}$ .*
- (e) *The set  $W_C(A)$  is a convex polygon if and only if*

$$W_C(A) = \text{conv}\{(c_1, \dots, c_n)P(a_1, \dots, a_n)^t : P \text{ is a permutation matrix}\}.$$

Now, we extend the basic properties of  $W_C(A)$  to  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$ . We always assume that  $C$  is not a scalar matrix and  $\mathcal{F}$  is a non-empty subset of  $M_n$ .

**Theorem 2.3.** *Suppose  $C \in M_n$  is non-scalar and  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq M_n$  is non-empty.*

- (a) *If  $U \in M_n$  is unitary, then  $W_C(\mathcal{F}) = W_C(U^*\mathcal{F}U)$ , where  $U^*\mathcal{F}U = \{U^*AU : A \in \mathcal{F}\}$ .*
- (b) *For any  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$ , let  $\alpha\mathcal{F} + \beta I = \{\alpha A + \beta I : A \in \mathcal{F}\}$ . Then*

$$W_C(\alpha\mathcal{F} + \beta I) = \alpha W_C(\mathcal{F}) + \beta \text{tr } C = \{\alpha\mu + \beta \text{tr } C : \mu \in W_C(\mathcal{F})\}.$$

(c) If  $\mathcal{F}$  is bounded, then so is  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$ .

(d) If  $\mathcal{F}$  is connected, then so is  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$ .

(e) If  $\mathcal{F}$  is compact, then so is  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$ .

*Proof.* (a) and (b) can be verified readily.

(c) If  $\mathcal{F}$  is bounded so that there is  $R > 0$  such that for every  $A \in M_n$  we have  $\|A\| < R$ , then

$$|\operatorname{tr}(CU^*AU)| \leq n\|C\|\|A\| < n\|C\|R.$$

Thus,  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  is bounded.

(d) Note that for any  $A \in M_n$ ,  $W_C(A)$  is star-shaped with  $(\operatorname{tr} C)(\operatorname{tr} A)/n$  as a star center. If  $\mu_1 = \operatorname{tr}(CU^*A_1U)$  and  $\mu_2 = \operatorname{tr}(CV^*A_2V)$  with  $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $U, V$  unitary, then there are a line segment with end points  $\mu_1$  and  $(\operatorname{tr} C)(\operatorname{tr} A_1)/n$ , and another line segment with end points  $\mu_2$  and  $(\operatorname{tr} C)(\operatorname{tr} A_2)/n$ . If  $\mathcal{F}$  is connected, then so are the sets  $\{\operatorname{tr} A : A \in \mathcal{F}\}$  and  $\{(\operatorname{tr} A)(\operatorname{tr} C)/n : A \in \mathcal{F}\}$ . Hence, there is a path joining  $\mu_1$  to  $(\operatorname{tr} C)(\operatorname{tr} A_1)/n$ , then to  $(\operatorname{tr} C)(\operatorname{tr} A_2)/n$  and then to  $\mu_2$ .

(e) Suppose  $\mathcal{F}$  is compact. Then  $\mathcal{F}$  is bounded and closed. By (c),  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  is also bounded. To show that  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  is closed, let  $\{\operatorname{tr}(CU_k^*A_kU_k) : k = 1, 2, \dots\}$  be a sequence in  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  converging to  $\mu_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ , where  $A_k \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $U_k$  is unitary for each  $k$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}$  is compact, there is a subsequence  $\{A_{j_k} : k = 1, 2, \dots\}$  of  $\{A_k : k = 1, 2, \dots\}$  converging to  $A_0 \in \mathcal{F}$ . We can further consider a subsequence  $\{U_{j(\ell)} : \ell = 1, 2, \dots\}$  of  $\{U_{j_k} : k = 1, 2, \dots\}$  converging to  $U_0$ . Thus

$$\{\operatorname{tr}(CU_{j(\ell)}^*A_{j(\ell)}U_{j(\ell)}) : k = 1, 2, \dots\} \rightarrow \operatorname{tr}(CU_0^*A_0U_0) = \mu_0 \in W_C(\mathcal{F}).$$

Thus,  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  is closed. As a result,  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  is compact. ■

The following examples show that none of the converses of the assertions in Theorem 2.3 (c) – (e) is valid, and there are no implications between the conditions that “ $\mathcal{F}$  is closed” and “ $W_C(\mathcal{F})$ ” is closed.

**Example 2.4.** (a) Suppose  $C \in M_n$  is non-scalar and has trace zero, and  $\mathcal{F} = \{\mu I : \mu \in \mathbb{C}\}$ . Then  $W_C(\mathcal{F}) = \{0\}$  is bounded and compact, but  $\mathcal{F}$  is not bounded.

(b) Suppose  $C \in M_n$  is non-scalar, and  $\mathcal{F} = \{A_0, A_1\}$  such that  $A_0 = 0$  and  $A_1 = xy^*$  for a pair of orthonormal vectors  $x, y$ . Then  $W_C(A_0) = \{0\}$  and  $W_C(\mathcal{F}) = W_C(A_1)$  is a circular disk center at the origin with radius

$$R = \max\{|u^*Cv| : \{u, v\} \text{ is an orthonormal set}\}.$$

Thus,  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  is connected, but  $\mathcal{F}$  is not.

(c) Let  $\mathcal{F} = \text{conv}\mathcal{G}$  with

$$\mathcal{G} = \{2E_{12}\} \cup \{\text{diag}(e^{ir}, e^{-ir}) : r \text{ is a rational number}\}.$$

Then  $\mathcal{F}$  is not closed but  $W(\mathcal{F}) = W(2E_{12})$  is closed.

(d) Let  $\mathcal{F} = \left\{ \text{diag} \left( 0, x + \frac{i}{x} \right) : x > 0 \right\} \cup \{\text{diag}(0, 0)\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{F}$  is closed, but

$$W(\mathcal{F}) = \{x + iy : x, y > 0, xy \leq 1\} \cup \{0\}$$

is not closed.

Next, we consider the connection between the geometrical properties of  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  and the properties of  $C$  and  $\mathcal{F}$ . Note that for any subset  $\mathcal{S}$  of  $\mathbb{C}$ , if  $\text{tr} C \neq 0$  and  $\mathcal{F} = \{\mu I / \text{tr} C : \mu \in \mathcal{S}\}$ , then we have  $W_C(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{S}$ . Thus, the geometrical shape of  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  may be quite arbitrary. Also, if  $C = \mu I$  is a scalar matrix, then  $W_C(\mathcal{F}) = \{\mu \text{tr} A : A \in \mathcal{F}\}$ . Again,  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  does not contain much information about the matrices in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Nevertheless, we have the following.

**Theorem 2.5.** *Suppose  $C \in M_n$  is non-scalar, and  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq M_n$  is non-empty. The following conditions hold.*

(a) *The set  $W_C(\mathcal{F}) = \{\mu\}$  if and only if  $\mathcal{F} = \{\nu I : \nu \text{tr} C = \mu\}$ .*

(b) *The set  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  is a subset of a straight line  $L$  if and only if*

(i)  *$\mathcal{F} \subseteq \{\nu I : \nu \in \mathbb{C}, \nu \text{tr} C \in L\}$ , or*

(ii) *there are complex units  $\alpha, \gamma \in \mathbb{C}$  such that*

*$\gamma(C - (\text{tr} C)I/n)$  and  $\alpha(A - (\text{tr} A)I/n)$  are Hermitian for all  $A \in \mathcal{F}$ ,*

*and  $\{(\text{tr} C)(\text{tr} A)/n : A \in \mathcal{F}\}$  is collinear.*

(c) *The set  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  is a convex polygon if and only if  $W_C(\mathcal{F}) = \text{conv}\{v_1, \dots, v_m\}$  where each  $v_j$  is of the forms  $(c_1, \dots, c_n)(a_1, \dots, a_n)^t$ . Here  $c_1, \dots, c_n$  are eigenvalues of  $C$ , and  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  are eigenvalues of some  $A_j \in \mathcal{F}$ .*

*Proof.* Condition (a) follows from the fact that  $W_C(A) = \{\mu\}$  if and only if  $A = \nu I$  with  $\nu \text{tr} C = \mu$ .

(b) Suppose  $W_C(\mathcal{F}) \subseteq L$ . If  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \{\mu I : \mu \in \mathbb{C}\}$ , then clearly  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \{\nu I : \nu \text{tr} C \in L\}$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}$  contains a non-scalar matrix  $A$ . Then  $W_C(A)$  must be a non-degenerate line segment contained in  $L$ . Therefore  $C, A$  are normal with collinear eigenvalues in  $\mathbb{C}$ , see [10, (7.3)]. There exist complex units  $\alpha, \gamma \in \mathbb{C}$  such that  $\gamma(C - (\text{tr} C)I/n)$  and  $\alpha(A - (\text{tr} A)I/n)$  are Hermitian. If  $B \in \mathcal{F}$  is a scalar matrix, then  $\alpha(B - (\text{tr} B)I/n) = 0$  which is Hermitian. Now assume  $B \in \mathcal{F}$  is non-scalar. Let  $\tilde{C} = \gamma(C - (\text{tr} C)I/n)$ . Then

$$W_{\tilde{C}}(\alpha(B - (\text{tr} B)I/n)) = \gamma \alpha W_C(B) + \mu_B \subseteq \{\gamma \alpha z + \mu_B : z \in L\},$$

for some constant  $\mu_B \in \mathbb{C}$ , and

$$W_{\tilde{C}}(\alpha(A - (\text{tr } A)I/n)) = \gamma\alpha W_C(A) + \mu_A \subseteq \{\gamma\alpha z + \mu_A : z \in L\},$$

for some constant  $\mu_A \in \mathbb{C}$ . Hence  $W_{\tilde{C}}(\alpha(B - (\text{tr } B)I/n))$  is a subset of a line segment parallel to  $W_{\tilde{C}}(\alpha(A - (\text{tr } A)I/n)) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ . As  $0 \in W_{\tilde{C}}(\alpha(B - (\text{tr } B)I/n))$ , we have  $W_{\tilde{C}}(\alpha(B - (\text{tr } B)I/n)) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ . Therefore,  $\alpha(B - (\text{tr } B)I/n)$  is Hermitian. The last assertion follows from  $\{(\text{tr } C)(\text{tr } A)/n : A \in \mathcal{F}\} \subseteq W_C(\mathcal{F}) \subseteq L$ . The sufficiency can be verified readily.

(c) Suppose  $W_C(\mathcal{F}) = \text{conv}\{v_1, \dots, v_m\}$  is a convex polygon. Then for every  $v_j$ , there is  $A_j \in \mathcal{F}$  such that  $v_j = \text{tr}(CU_j^* A_j U_j) \in W_C(A_j)$  for some unitary  $U_j \in M_n$ . Since  $W_C(A_j) \subseteq W_C(\mathcal{F})$ , we see that  $v_j$  is a vertex point of  $W_C(A_j)$ . It follows that  $v_j$  has the form  $(c_1, \dots, c_n)(a_1, \dots, a_n)^t$ , where  $c_1, \dots, c_n$  are eigenvalues of  $C$  and  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  are eigenvalues of  $A_j$  arranged in some suitable order. The converse of the assertion is clear. ■

### 3 Star-shapedness and Convexity

In this section, we study the star-shapedness and convexity of  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$ . If  $\mathcal{F}$  is not connected, then  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  may not be connected so that  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  is not star-shaped or convex. One might hope that if  $\mathcal{F}$  is star-shaped or convex, then  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  will inherit the properties. However, the following examples show that  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  may fail to be convex (star-shaped, resp.) even if  $\mathcal{F}$  is convex (star-shaped, resp.).

**Example 3.1.** Let  $C = E_{11}$ ,  $A = \text{diag}(1+i, 1-i)$  and  $\mathcal{F} = \text{conv}\{A, -A\}$ . Then

$$W_C(\mathcal{F}) = W(\mathcal{F}) = \bigcup_{t \in [0,1]} W(tA + (1-t)(-A)) = \bigcup_{s \in [-1,1]} sW(A).$$

As  $W(A) = \text{conv}\{1+i, 1-i\}$ , we have  $W_C(\mathcal{F}) = \text{conv}\{0, 1+i, 1-i\} \cup \text{conv}\{0, -1-i, -1+i\}$  which is not convex, see Figure 1.




Figure 1

**Example 3.2.** Let  $C = E_{11}$ ,  $A = \text{diag}(1+i, 1-i)$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_1 = \text{conv}\{A, -A\}$  and  $\mathcal{F}_2 = \text{conv}\{A, -A + 4I\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_2$  is star-shaped with star-center  $A$ . Since  $tA + (1-t)(-A + 4I) = (1-2t)(2I - A) + 2I$ , we have

$$W(\mathcal{F}_2) = \bigcup_{t \in [0,1]} W((1-2t)(-A + 2I) + 2I) = \bigcup_{s \in [-1,1]} sW(-A + 2I) + 2.$$

Note that  $W(-A + 2I) = \text{conv}\{1 + i, 1 - i\} = W(A)$ . Then  $W(\mathcal{F}_2) = W(\mathcal{F}_1) + 2$  and

$$W_C(\mathcal{F}) = W(\mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_2) = W(\mathcal{F}_1) \cup W(\mathcal{F}_2)$$

equals  $\text{conv}\{0, -1 + i, -1 - i\} \cup \text{conv}\{0, 2, 1 - i, 1 + i\} \cup \text{conv}\{2, 3 + i, 3 - i\}$  which is not star-shaped, see Figure 2.




Figure 2

Notice that in Example 3.1,  $\mathcal{F}$  is convex and  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  is star-shaped with star-center at the origin. One may ask if  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  is always star-shaped for a convex set  $\mathcal{F}$ . We will study this question in the following, and pay special attention on the case where  $\mathcal{F} = \text{conv}\{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$  for some  $A_1, \dots, A_m \in M_n$ .

Denote by  $S_C(A)$  the set of all star-centers of  $W_C(A)$  and  $\mathcal{U}_n$  the group of all  $n \times n$  unitary matrices. We begin with the following result showing that  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  is star-shaped if  $C$  or  $\mathcal{F}$  satisfies some special properties.

**Proposition 3.3.** *Suppose  $C \in M_n$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  is a convex matrix set.*

- (a) *If  $\mathcal{F}$  contains a scalar matrix  $\mu I$ , then  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  is star-shaped with  $\mu \text{tr} C$  as a star center.*
- (b) *Suppose the intersection of all (or any three of)  $S_C(A)$  with  $A \in \mathcal{F}$  is nonempty. Then  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  is star-shaped with  $\mu$  as a star center for any  $\mu \in \cap\{S_C(A) : A \in \mathcal{F}\}$ .*
- (c) *If  $\text{tr} C = 0$ , then  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  is star-shaped with  $0$  as a star-center.*
- (d) *If all matrices in  $\mathcal{F}$  have the same trace  $\nu$ , then  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  is star-shaped with  $\nu \text{tr} C$  as a star-center.*

*Proof.* (a) Suppose  $\mathcal{F}$  contains a scalar matrix  $\mu I$  and  $B \in \mathcal{F}$ . Then

$$\text{conv}\{\mu \text{tr} C, W_C(B)\} \subseteq W_C(\text{conv}\{\mu I, B\}) \subseteq W_C(\mathcal{F}).$$

The result follows.

(b) Suppose  $\mu \in \cap\{S_C(A) : A \in \mathcal{F}\}$ . Then for any  $\nu \in W_C(\mathcal{F})$ , there is  $B \in \mathcal{F}$  such that  $\nu \in W_C(B)$ . As  $\mu \in S_C(B)$ , the line segment joining  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  will lie in  $W_C(B) \subseteq W_C(\mathcal{F})$ . Thus,  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  is star-shaped with  $\mu$  as a star center.



If  $S_C(A_0) \cap S_C(A_1) \cap S_C(A_2) \neq \emptyset$  for any  $A_0, A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ , then  $\bigcap \{S_C(A) : A \in \mathcal{F}\} \neq \emptyset$  by Helly's Theorem. So, the result follows from the preceding paragraph.

(c) Note that  $\frac{1}{n}(\text{tr } C)(\text{tr } A) \in S_C(A)$  for any  $C, A \in M_n$ , see [4] or Proposition 2.1 (d). If  $\text{tr } C = 0$ , then  $0 \in \bigcap \{S_C(A) : A \in \mathcal{F}\}$  is a star-center of  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  by (b).

(d) The assumption implies that  $\nu \text{tr } C$  is the common star-center of  $W_C(A)$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{F}$ . Thus, the result follows from (b).  $\blacksquare$

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $C, A, B \in M_n$  and  $\mathcal{F} = \text{conv}\{A, B\}$ . If  $\mu \in S_C(A) \cap S_C(B)$ , then  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  is star-shaped with star-center  $\mu$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\zeta \in W_C(\mathcal{F})$ . There are  $V \in \mathcal{U}_n$  and  $0 \leq t \leq 1$  such that  $\zeta = \text{tr}(CV^*(tA + (1-t)B)V)$ . It suffices to show  $\text{conv}\{\mu, \text{tr}(CV^*AV), \text{tr}(CV^*BV)\} \subseteq W_C(\mathcal{F})$ . For any  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{C}$ , we let  $\Delta(a, b, c) = \text{conv}\{a, b\} \cup \text{conv}\{b, c\} \cup \text{conv}\{a, c\}$ , i.e., the triangle (without the interior) with the vertices  $a, b, c$ . Let  $U_A \in \mathcal{U}_n$  such that  $\text{tr}(CU_A^*AU_A) = \mu$ . As  $\mu \in S_C(A) \cap S_C(B)$  we have

$$\text{conv}\{\text{tr}(CV^*AV), \mu\} \cup \text{conv}\{\text{tr}(CV^*BV), \mu\} \subseteq W_C(\mathcal{F}).$$

Moreover we have

$$\text{conv}\{\text{tr}(CV^*AV), \text{tr}(CV^*BV)\} = \{\text{tr}(CV^*(tA + (1-t)B)V) : 0 \leq t \leq 1\} \subseteq W_C(\mathcal{F}).$$

Hence  $\Delta(\text{tr}(CV^*AV), \text{tr}(CV^*BV), \mu) \subseteq W_C(\mathcal{F})$ . We shall show that

$$\text{conv}\{\text{tr}(CV^*AV), \text{tr}(CV^*BV), \mu\} \subseteq W_C(\mathcal{F}). \quad (3.1)$$

If  $\Delta(\text{tr}(CV^*AV), \text{tr}(CV^*BV), \mu)$  is a line segment or a point, then eq. (3.1) holds clearly. Now assume that  $\Delta(\text{tr}(CV^*AV), \text{tr}(CV^*BV), \mu)$  is non-degenerate. As  $\mathcal{U}_n$  is path-connected, we define a continuous function  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_n$  with  $f(0) = V$  and  $f(1) = U_A$ . For  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ , let  $V_A(t) = \text{tr}(Cf(t)^*Af(t))$  and  $V_B(t) = \text{tr}(Cf(t)^*Bf(t))$ . Note that for any  $t \in [0, 1]$ , we have

$$\Delta(t) = \Delta(V_A(t), V_B(t), \mu) \subseteq W_C(\mathcal{F}).$$




Figure 3:  $\Delta(0)$  and  $\Delta(t)$  are triangles in the red and green, respectively. In particular,  $\Delta(1)$  degenerates to a line segment in purple.

For any  $\zeta \in \text{conv}\Delta(0)$ , see Figure 3, let

$$t_0 = \max\{t : \zeta \in \text{conv}\Delta(s) \text{ for all } 0 \leq s \leq t\}.$$

Since  $\Delta(1)$  degenerates, by continuity of  $f$ , we have  $\zeta \in \Delta(t_0) \subseteq W_C(\mathcal{F})$ . Hence the result follows.  $\blacksquare$

One can extend Lemma 3.4 to a more general situation.

**Theorem 3.5.** *Let  $C \in M_n$  and  $\mathcal{G}$  be a (finite or infinite) family of matrices in  $M_n$ . If  $\mu \in \bigcap_{A \in \mathcal{G}} S_C(A)$ , then  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  is star-shaped with star-center  $\mu$  for  $\mathcal{F} = \text{conv}\mathcal{G}$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.4, the result holds if  $\mathcal{G}$  has 2 elements. Suppose  $|\mathcal{G}| \geq 3$  and  $\mu \in \bigcap_{A \in \mathcal{G}} S_C(A)$ . Let  $\zeta \in W_C(\mathcal{F})$ . Then there exist  $A_1, \dots, A_m \in \mathcal{G}$ ,  $t_1, \dots, t_m > 0$  with  $t_1 + \dots + t_m = 1$  and  $U \in \mathcal{U}_n$  such that  $\zeta = \text{tr}(CU^*(t_1A_1 + \dots + t_mA_m)U)$ . Let  $\zeta_i = \text{tr}(CU^*A_iU)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . Then  $\zeta \in \text{conv}\{\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m\}$ . The half line from  $\mu$  through  $\zeta$  intersects a line segment joining some  $\zeta_i, \zeta_j$  with  $1 \leq i \leq j \leq m$  such that  $\zeta \in \text{conv}\{\mu, \zeta_i, \zeta_j\}$ . By Lemma 3.4, we have  $\text{conv}\{\mu, \zeta_i, \zeta_j\} \subseteq W_C(\text{conv}\{A_i, A_j\}) \subseteq W_C(\mathcal{F})$ .  $\blacksquare$

Note that if  $W_C(A)$  is convex, then  $W_C(A) = S_C(A)$ . So, if  $W_C(A)$  is convex for every  $A \in \mathcal{G}$ , and if  $\mu \in \bigcap_{A \in \mathcal{G}} W_C(A)$ , then  $\mu$  is a star-center of  $W_C(\text{conv}(\mathcal{G}))$ . Checking the condition that  $W_C(A)$  is convex for every  $A \in \mathcal{G}$  may not be easy. On the other hand, if  $C \in M_n$  is such that  $W_C(A)$  is always convex, then one can skip the checking process, and we have the following.

**Corollary 3.6.** *Suppose  $C \in M_n$  satisfies any one of the conditions (e.1)—(e.3) in Proposition 2.1 (e). If  $\mathcal{G} \subseteq M_n$  and  $\mu \in \bigcap_{A \in \mathcal{G}} W_C(A)$ , then  $\mu$  is a star-center of  $W_C(\text{conv}\mathcal{G})$ .*

Next, we show that if  $W_C(A)$  and  $W_C(B)$  are convex, then  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  is star-shaped for  $\mathcal{F} = \text{conv}\{A, B\}$  even when  $W_C(A) \cap W_C(B) = \emptyset$ .

**Theorem 3.7.** *Let  $C \in M_n$ . Suppose  $A, B \in M_n$  such that  $W_C(A)$  and  $W_C(B)$  are convex sets with empty intersection. Let  $\mathcal{F} = \text{conv}\{A, B\}$ .*

*If  $W_C(A) \cup W_C(B)$  lies on a line, then  $W_C(\mathcal{F}) = \text{conv}\{W_C(A), W_C(B)\}$  is convex.*

*Otherwise, there are two non-parallel lines  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  intersecting at  $\mu$  such that for each  $j = 1, 2$ ,  $L_j$  is a common supporting line of  $W_C(A)$  and  $W_C(B)$  separating the two convex sets (i.e.,  $W_C(A)$  and  $W_C(B)$  lying on opposite closed half spaces determined by  $L_j$ ); the set  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  is star-shaped with star-center  $\mu$ , see Figure 4.*




Figure 4

*Proof.* Assume  $W_C(A) \cup W_C(B)$  lies on a line. As  $\mathcal{F}$  is connected, by Theorem 2.3,  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  is connected. We have

$$W_C(A) \cup W_C(B) \subseteq W_C(\mathcal{F}) \subseteq \text{conv}\{W_C(A), W_C(B)\}.$$

Therefore,  $W_C(\mathcal{F}) = \text{conv}\{W_C(A), W_C(B)\}$  which is convex.

Otherwise, we may assume that  $W_C(A)$  lies on the left open half plane and  $W_C(B)$  lies on the right open half plane. For  $t \in [-\pi, \pi]$ , let  $L(t)$  be the support line of  $W_C(A)$  with (outward pointing) normal  $n(t) = (\cos t, \sin t)$ . Let  $P(t) = L(t) \cap W_C(A)$ . Therefore, for each  $t \in [-\pi, \pi]$  and  $p \in P(t)$ , we have  $n(t) \cdot (w - p) \leq 0$  for all  $w \in W_C(A)$ . Let  $q(t) = \min\{n(t) \cdot (w - p) : w \in W_C(B), p \in P(t)\}$ . Then we have  $q(0) > 0$  and  $q(-\pi) = q(\pi) < 0$ . Hence, there exist  $-\pi < t_1 < 0 < t_2 < \pi$  such that  $q(t_1) = q(t_2) = 0$ . Then  $L_j = L(t_j)$  for  $j = 1, 2$  will satisfy the requirement.

We claim that  $L(t_1)$  and  $L(t_2)$  in (a) cannot be parallel. Otherwise, we must have  $t_1 = t_2 + \pi$ . Therefore,  $n(t_1) = -n(t_2)$  and  $W_C(A), W_C(B) \subset L_1 = L_2$ , is a contradiction. Since  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  are not parallel, they intersect at a point  $\mu$ .

Now, we show that  $\mu$  is a star-center of  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$ . We may apply a suitable affine transform to  $A$  and  $B$ , and assume that  $\mu = 0$ ,  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  are the  $x$ -axis and  $y$ -axis respectively. We may further assume that  $W_C(A)$  lies in the first quadrant and  $W_C(B)$  lies in the third quadrant. For any  $\zeta \in W_C(\mathcal{F})$ , there are  $V \in \mathcal{U}_n$  and  $0 \leq t \leq 1$  such that  $\zeta = \text{tr}(CV^*(tA + (1-t)B)V)$ . Denote  $\zeta_A = \text{tr}(CV^*AV)$  and  $\zeta_B = \text{tr}(CV^*BV)$ . We claim that  $\text{conv}\{\zeta_A, \zeta_B, 0\} \subseteq W_C(\mathcal{F})$ . Once the claim holds, we have  $\{s\zeta + (1-s) \cdot 0 : 0 \leq s \leq 1\} \subseteq \text{conv}\{\zeta_A, \zeta_B, 0\} \subseteq W_C(\mathcal{F})$ . Then the star-shapedness of  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  follows.

We now show the claim. We denote by  $\overline{\zeta_1\zeta_2}$  the line segment with end points  $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ . By symmetry, we may assume that the line segment  $\overline{\zeta_A\zeta_B}$  intersects the  $y$ -axis at  $(0, b)$  with  $b \geq 0$ . The situation is depicted in Figure 5a and Figure 5b.

We shall first show that  $\text{conv}\{\zeta_B, bi, 0\} \subseteq W_C(\mathcal{F})$ . Let  $y_B$  be a point in the intersection of  $W_C(B)$  and the  $y$ -axis,  $U_B \in \mathcal{U}_n$  be such that  $y_B = \text{tr}(CU_B^*BU_B)$ . Let  $y_A = \text{tr}(CU_B^*AU_B)$ . Then by the convexity of  $W_C(A)$ ,  $W_C(B)$  and  $\mathcal{F}$ , we have

$$Q((\zeta_A, y_A); (\zeta_B, y_B)) := \overline{\zeta_A y_A} \cup \overline{\zeta_B y_B} \cup \overline{\zeta_A \zeta_B} \cup \overline{y_A y_B} \subseteq W_C(\mathcal{F}).$$




Figure 5

Note that  $Q((\zeta_A, y_A); (\zeta_B, y_B))$  is either a quadrilateral or a union of two triangle, see Figure 5a and Figure 5b. In both case,  $\Delta(\zeta_B, bi, 0)$  lies inside the region determined by the closed curve  $Q((\zeta_A, y_A); (\zeta_B, y_B))$ . Now consider a continuous function  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_n$  with  $f(0) = V$  and  $f(1) = U_B$ . Then for  $t \in [0, 1]$ , let  $\zeta'_A(t) = \text{tr}(Cf(t)^*Af(t))$  and  $\zeta'_B(t) = \text{tr}(Cf(t)^*Bf(t))$ , we have

$$Q((\zeta'_A(t), y_A); (\zeta'_B(t), y_B)) := \overline{\zeta'_A(t)y_A} \cup \overline{\zeta'_B(t)y_B} \cup \overline{\zeta'_A(t)\zeta'_B(t)} \cup \overline{y_A y_B} \subseteq W_C(\mathcal{F}).$$

Note that  $Q((\zeta'_A(1), y_A); (\zeta'_B(1), y_B))$  degenerates, by continuity of  $f$ , for any point  $\zeta$  enclosed by the closed curve  $Q((\zeta_A, y_A); (\zeta_B, y_B))$ , there exists  $0 \leq t_0 \leq 1$  such that  $\zeta \in Q((\zeta'_A(t_0), y_A); (\zeta'_B(t_0), y_B)) \subseteq W_C(\mathcal{F})$ . Hence,  $\text{conv}\{\zeta_B, bi, 0\} \subseteq W_C(\mathcal{F})$ . By symmetry, one can show that  $\text{conv}\{\zeta_A, a, 0\} \subseteq W_C(\mathcal{F})$  where  $a$  is the intersection point of  $\overline{\zeta_A \zeta_B}$  and  $x$ -axis. Hence,  $\text{conv}\{\zeta_A, \zeta_B, 0\} = \text{conv}\{\zeta_A, a, 0\} \cup \text{conv}\{\zeta_B, bi, 0\} \subseteq W_C(\mathcal{F})$ . The claim follows. ■

## 4 Additional results on star-shapedness and convexity

It is not easy to extend Theorem 3.7. The following example shows that if  $W_C(A)$  and  $W_C(B)$  are not convex, then  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  may not be star-shaped for  $\mathcal{F} = \text{conv}\{A, B\}$  even when  $W_C(A) \cap W_C(B) \neq \emptyset$ .

**Example 4.1.** Let  $w = e^{2\pi i/3}$  and  $C = \text{diag}(1, w, w^2)$ . Suppose  $A = C - \frac{1}{6}I$ ,  $B = e^{\pi i/3}C + \frac{1}{6}I$  and  $\mathcal{F} = \text{conv}\{A, B\}$ . Then  $W_{C+I}(\mathcal{F})$  is not star-shaped.

To prove our claim, for  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ , let

$$A(t) = tA + (1-t)B = (t + (1-t)e^{\pi i/3})C + \frac{1-2t}{6}I.$$

$$\begin{aligned} W_{C+I}(A(t)) &= W_{C+I}\left((t + (1-t)e^{\pi i/3})C + \frac{1-2t}{6}I\right) \\ &= (t + (1-t)e^{\pi i/3})W_C(C) + \left(t + (1-t)e^{\pi i/3} + \frac{1-2t}{6}\right)\text{tr}C + \frac{1-2t}{2} \\ &= (t + (1-t)e^{\pi i/3})W_C(C) + \frac{1-2t}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$W_{C+I}(\mathcal{F}) = \bigcup \left\{ (t + (1-t)e^{\pi i/3})W_C(C) + \frac{1-2t}{2} : 0 \leq t \leq 1 \right\}.$$

By [14],  $W_C(C)$  is star-shaped with the origin as the unique star-center. Moreover  $W_C(C) = e^{2\pi i/3}W_C(C)$  and its boundary is given by

$$\Gamma = \{2e^{i\theta} + e^{-2i\theta} : -\pi \leq \theta \leq \pi\}.$$

Hence,  $W_{C+I}(A(t))$  is star-shaped with  $\frac{1-2t}{2}$  as the unique star-center and its boundary is given by

$$\Gamma(t) = \{(t + (1-t)e^{\pi i/3})(2e^{i\theta} + e^{-2i\theta}) : -\pi \leq \theta \leq \pi\}. \quad (4.2)$$

For  $0 \leq t \leq 1$  and  $-\pi \leq \theta \leq \pi$ , define

$$\begin{aligned} f(\theta, t) &= (t + (1-t)e^{\pi i/3})(2e^{i\theta} + e^{-2i\theta}) + \frac{1-2t}{2} \\ &= \frac{1+t}{2}(2\cos\theta + \cos 2\theta) - \frac{1-t}{2}\sqrt{3}(2\sin\theta - \sin 2\theta) + \frac{1-2t}{2} \\ &\quad + i \left( \frac{1-t}{2}\sqrt{3}(2\cos\theta + \cos 2\theta) + \frac{1+t}{2}(2\sin\theta - \sin 2\theta) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Using this description, we can plot  $W_{C+I}(\mathcal{F})$  as follows.

First consider the plot of  $\Gamma(0)$  and  $\Gamma(1)$ , which are the boundaries of  $W_{C+I}(B)$  and  $W_{C+I}(A)$  respectively, see Figure 6.




Figure 6:  $W_{C+I}(A) \cup W_{C+I}(B)$

The “vertices” of  $\Gamma(0)$  and  $\Gamma(1)$  are given by

$$f\left(-\frac{2\pi}{3}, 0\right) = 2 - \frac{3\sqrt{3}}{2}i \quad f(0, 0) = 2 + \frac{3\sqrt{3}}{2}i \quad f\left(\frac{2\pi}{3}, 0\right) = -\frac{5}{2}$$

$$f\left(-\frac{2\pi}{3}, 1\right) = -2 - \frac{3\sqrt{3}}{2}i \quad f(0, 1) = \frac{5}{2} \quad f\left(\frac{2\pi}{3}, 1\right) = -2 + \frac{3\sqrt{3}}{2}i.$$

As  $t$  increases from 0 to 1,  $\Gamma(t)$  changes from  $W_{C+I}(B)$  to  $W_{C+I}(A)$ , For  $\theta = -\frac{2\pi}{3}, 0, \frac{2\pi}{3}$ , the vertex  $f(\theta, t)$  moves along the line segment from  $f(\theta, 0)$  to  $f(\theta, 1)$ , see Figure 7.




Figure 7:  $W_{C+I}(\mathcal{F})$

Therefore, we see that  $W_{C+I}(\mathcal{F})$  is the union of  $W_{C+I}(A)$ ,  $W_{C+I}(B)$  and three triangles,  $\triangle\left(0.5, 2.5, 2 + \frac{3\sqrt{3}}{2}i\right)$ ,  $\triangle\left(-0.5, -2.5, -2 + \frac{3\sqrt{3}}{2}i\right)$ ,  $\triangle\left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}i, 2 - \frac{3\sqrt{3}}{2}i, -2 - \frac{3\sqrt{3}}{2}i\right)$ , see Figure 8.




Figure 8:  $W_{C+I}(\mathcal{F})$

Suppose  $W_{C+I}(\mathcal{F})$  is star-shaped. By symmetry,  $W_{C+I}(\mathcal{F})$  has a star-center  $c$  on the imaginary axis. The line segment joining  $c$  and  $f(0, 0)$  must lie below the tangent line to  $\Gamma(0)$  at  $f(0, 0) = 2 + \frac{3\sqrt{3}}{2}i$ . By direct calculation, this tangent line is the line through 0.5 and  $f(0, 0)$ . Similarly, The line segment joining  $c$  and  $f(1, 0)$  must lie above the tangent line to  $\Gamma(1)$  at  $f(1, 0) = 2.5$ . By direct calculation, this tangent line is the line through 0.5 and  $f(1, 0)$ . Since these two tangent lines intersect at 0.5, no  $c$  on the imaginary axis will satisfy the above conditions.

In the following, we present an example of  $C, A_1, A_2, A_3 \in M_n$  such that  $W_C(A_1), W_C(A_2), W_C(A_3)$  are convex and  $W_C(A_1) \cap W_C(A_2) \cap W_C(A_3) = \emptyset$ , but  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  is not star-shaped for  $\mathcal{F} = \text{conv}\{A_1, A_2, A_3\}$ . In particular, we choose  $C = E_{11}$  so that  $W_C(\mathcal{F}) = W(\mathcal{F})$ .

To describe our example, we first show that the set  $W(\mathcal{F})$  is connected to the concept of product numerical range arising in the study of quantum information theory, [15].

Let  $A \in M_m \otimes M_n = M_m(M_n)$ , the product numerical range of  $A$  is

$$W^\otimes(A) = \{(u \otimes v)^* A (u \otimes v) : u \in \mathbb{C}^m, v \in \mathbb{C}^n\}.$$

We note that  $W^\otimes(A)$  depends on order of the factors  $M_m$  and  $M_n$  in the representation of  $M_{mn} = M_m \otimes M_n$ .

**Theorem 4.2.** *Let  $A_1, \dots, A_m \in M_n$  and  $\mathcal{F} = \text{conv}\{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$ . Then*

$$W(\mathcal{F}) = W^\otimes(\oplus_{i=1}^m A_i).$$

*Proof.* Let  $\mu \in W(\mathcal{F})$ . Then there exist  $t_1, \dots, t_m \geq 0$  with  $\sum_{i=1}^m t_i = 1$  and  $v \in \mathbb{C}^n$  such that  $\mu = v^* (\sum_{i=1}^m t_i A_i) v$ . Let  $u = (\sqrt{t_1}, \dots, \sqrt{t_m})^t$ . Then  $\mu = (u \otimes v)^* (\oplus_{i=1}^m A_i) (u \otimes v) \in W^\otimes(\oplus_{i=1}^m A_i)$ .

Conversely, suppose  $\mu \in W^\otimes(\oplus_{i=1}^m A_i)$ . Then there exist unit vectors  $u \in \mathbb{C}^m$ ,  $v \in \mathbb{C}^n$  such that  $\mu = (u \otimes v)^* (\oplus_{i=1}^m A_i) (u \otimes v)$ . Let  $u = (u_1, \dots, u_m)^t$ . Set  $t_i = |u_i|^2$  for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . Then  $\mu = v^* (\sum_{i=1}^m t_i A_i) v \in W(\mathcal{F})$ .  $\blacksquare$

Now, we describe the follow example showing that  $W(\mathcal{F})$  is not necessarily star-shaped for  $\mathcal{F} = \text{conv}\{A_1, A_2, A_3\}$  if  $W(A_1) \cap W(A_2) \cap W(A_3) = \emptyset$ .

**Example 4.3.** Suppose  $A = \text{diag}(e^{i\frac{\pi}{3}}, e^{-i\frac{\pi}{3}}, 0.95e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}})$ . Let  $A_1 = e^{i\frac{\pi}{3}}A$ ,  $A_2 = e^{-i\frac{\pi}{3}}A$  and  $A_3 = 0.95e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}}A$ . Then by Theorem 4.2,  $W(\text{conv}\{A_1, A_2, A_3\})$  is equal to

$$W^\otimes(\oplus_{i=1}^m A_i) = W^\otimes(A \otimes A) = W(A) \cdot W(A) = \{\mu_1 \mu_2 : \mu_1, \mu_2 \in W(A)\}.$$

By the result in [11, Example 3.1],  $W(A) \cdot W(A)$  is not star-shaped.

We note that in this example,  $W(A_i) \cap W(A_j) \neq \emptyset$  for all  $i, j$ , but  $W(A_1) \cap W(A_2) \cap W(A_3) = \emptyset$ . Therefore, in some sense, the condition in Theorem 3.5 is optimal.

While Theorem 3.5 and Theorem 3.7 provide some sufficient conditions for the star-shapedness of  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$ , it is a challenging problem to determine whether  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  is star-shaped or not for a given  $C \in M_n$  and  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq M_n$ .

**Proposition 4.4.** *Suppose  $\mathcal{F} = \text{conv}\{A_1, \dots, A_m\} \subseteq M_n$ . For each unit vector  $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$ , let  $\mathcal{A}_x = \text{diag}(x^* A_1 x, \dots, x^* A_m x)$ , and let  $\hat{\mathcal{F}} = \{\mathcal{A}_x : x \in \mathbb{C}^n, x^* x = 1\}$ . Then*

$$W(\mathcal{F}) = W(\hat{\mathcal{F}}) = W(\text{conv}\hat{\mathcal{F}}).$$

*Proof.* Let  $\mu \in W(\mathcal{F})$ . Then there exist  $t_1, \dots, t_m \geq 0$ ,  $t_1 + \dots + t_m = 1$  and a unit vector  $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$  such that  $\mu = x^* (t_1 A_1 + \dots + t_m A_m) x = t_1 x^* A_1 x + \dots + t_m x^* A_m x \in W(\hat{\mathcal{F}})$ . Therefore,  $W(\mathcal{F}) \subseteq W(\hat{\mathcal{F}})$ .

Clearly,  $W(\hat{\mathcal{F}}) \subseteq W(\text{conv}\hat{\mathcal{F}})$ . Finally, we show that  $W(\text{conv}\hat{\mathcal{F}}) \subseteq W(\mathcal{F})$ . To see this, let  $\mu \in W(\text{conv}\hat{\mathcal{F}})$ , i.e.,

$$\mu = y^* \left( \sum_{j=1}^r t_j D_j \right) y$$

for a unit vector  $y = (y_1, \dots, y_m)^t$ , some  $D_j = \text{diag}(x_j^* A_1 x_j, \dots, x_j^* A_m x_j) \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}$  with  $j = 1, \dots, r$  and  $t_1, \dots, t_r > 0$ ,  $t_1 + \dots + t_r = 1$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu &= \sum_{\ell=1}^m |y_\ell|^2 \sum_{j=1}^r t_j x_j^* A_\ell x_j = \sum_{j=1}^r t_j \left( x_j^* \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^m |y_\ell|^2 A_\ell \right) x_j \right) \\ &\in \text{conv}(W(A_0)) = W(A_0) \subseteq W(\mathcal{F}) \end{aligned}$$

where  $A_0 = \sum_{\ell=1}^m |y_\ell|^2 A_\ell \in \mathcal{F}$ . ■

**Example 4.5.** Suppose that  $A_1 = \text{diag}(1, e^{i\frac{\pi}{3}})$ ,  $A_2 = \text{diag}(e^{i\frac{2\pi}{3}}, e^{i\pi})$ ,  $A_3 = \text{diag}(e^{i\frac{4\pi}{3}}, e^{i\frac{5\pi}{3}})$  and  $\mathcal{F} = \text{conv}\{A_1, A_2, A_3\}$ . Then  $W(A_1) \cap W(A_2) \cap W(A_3) = \emptyset$ . So the condition in Theorem 3.5 is not satisfied. However, by direct computation, we have

$$\hat{\mathcal{F}} = \left\{ \text{diag} \left( t + (1-t)e^{i\frac{\pi}{3}}, e^{i\frac{2\pi}{3}}(t + (1-t)e^{i\frac{\pi}{3}}), e^{i\frac{4\pi}{3}}(t + (1-t)e^{i\frac{\pi}{3}}) \right) : 0 \leq t \leq 1 \right\},$$

where  $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$  is defined as in Proposition 4.4. Therefore,  $0 \in \cap_{A \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}} W(A)$ . Hence, by Proposition 4.4 and Theorem 3.5,  $W(\mathcal{F}) = W(\hat{\mathcal{F}})$  is star-shaped.

Recall that  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  may fail to be convex even if  $\mathcal{F}$  is convex and  $W_C(A)$  is convex for all  $A \in \mathcal{F}$ . In the following, we give a necessary and sufficient condition for  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  to be convex. First, it is easy to see that  $W_C(A) \subseteq W_C(\mathcal{F})$  for every  $A \in \mathcal{F}$ . Thus,  $\text{conv}\{\cup_{A \in \mathcal{F}} W_C(A)\}$  is the smallest convex set containing  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$ . As a result, we have the following observation.

**Proposition 4.6.** *Let  $C \in M_n$  and  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq M_n$ . Then  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  is convex if and only if*

$$W_C(\mathcal{F}) = \text{conv} \left\{ \bigcup_{A \in \mathcal{F}} W_C(A) \right\}.$$

**Proposition 4.7.** *Suppose  $C \in M_n$ ,  $\mathcal{G} \subseteq M_n$  and  $\mathcal{F} = \text{conv}\mathcal{G}$  with  $|\mathcal{G}| \geq 3$ . Then for every  $\mu \in W_C(\mathcal{F})$ , there are matrices  $A_1, A_2, A_3 \in \mathcal{G}$  and a unitary matrix  $U$  such that  $\mu \in \text{conv}\{\text{tr}(CU^*A_1U), \text{tr}(CU^*A_2U), \text{tr}(CU^*A_3U)\}$ . If  $\mu$  is a boundary point of  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$ , then there are  $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{G}$  and a unitary  $V$  such that  $\mu \in \text{conv}\{\text{tr}(CV^*B_1V), \text{tr}(CV^*B_2V)\}$ .*

*Proof.* For any  $\mu \in W_C(\mathcal{F})$ , we have  $\mu = t_1 \text{tr}(CU^*A_1U) + \dots + t_r \text{tr}(CU^*A_rU)$  for some unitary matrix  $U$  and  $A_1, \dots, A_r \in \mathcal{G}$  with  $t_1, \dots, t_r > 0$  summing up to 1. So,  $\mu \in \text{conv}\{\text{tr}(CU^*A_1U), \dots, \text{tr}(CU^*A_rU)\}$ . Thus,  $\mu$  lies in the convex hull of no more than three of the points in  $\{\text{tr}(CU^*A_1U), \dots, \text{tr}(CU^*A_rU)\}$ . In case  $\mu$  is a boundary point of  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$ ,



then  $\mu$  must be a boundary point of the set  $\text{conv}\{\text{tr}(CU^*A_1U), \dots, \text{tr}(CU^*A_rU)\}$ . Thus,  $\mu$  list in the convex hull of no more than two points in the set  $\{\text{tr}(CU^*A_1U), \dots, \text{tr}(CU^*A_rU)\}$ . The assertion follows.  $\blacksquare$

**Theorem 4.8.** *Suppose  $C \in M_n$ ,  $\mathcal{G} \subseteq M_n$  is compact and  $\mathcal{F} = \text{conv}(\mathcal{G})$ . The following are equivalent.*

- (a)  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  is convex.
- (b)  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  is simply connected and every boundary point  $\mu \in \text{conv}W_C(\mathcal{F})$  has the form  $\text{tr}(CU^*(tA + (1-t)B)U)$  for some unitary matrix  $U$ ,  $t \in [0, 1]$  and  $A, B \in \mathcal{G}$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  is convex. Then it is clearly simply connected. Now,  $\text{conv}W_C(\mathcal{F})$  and  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  have the same boundary. By Proposition 4.7, every boundary point of  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  is a convex combination of  $\text{tr}(CU^*AU)$ ,  $\text{tr}(CU^*BU)$  with  $A, B \in \mathcal{G}$ .

Conversely, suppose (b) holds. We only need to show that each boundary point  $\mu$  of  $\text{conv}(W_C(\mathcal{F}))$  lies in  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$ , which is true by Proposition 4.7 and assumption (b).  $\blacksquare$

## 5 Extension to the joint $C$ -numerical range

Let  $A = A_1 + iA_2 \in M_n$ , where  $A_1, A_2 \in M_n$  are Hermitian matrices. Then  $W(A)$  can be identified as the joint numerical range of  $(A_1, A_2)$  defined by

$$W(A_1, A_2) = \{(x^*A_1x, x^*A_2x) : x \in \mathbb{C}^n, x^*x = 1\}.$$

One may consider whether our results can be extended to the joint numerical range of an  $m$ -tuple of Hermitian matrices  $(A_1, \dots, A_m)$  defined by

$$W(A_1, \dots, A_m) = \{(x^*A_1x, \dots, x^*A_mx) : x \in \mathbb{C}^n, x^*x = 1\}.$$

Some of the results on classical numerical range are not valid for the joint numerical range. For instance, the joint numerical range of three matrices may not be convex if  $n = 2$ .

For  $A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ ,  $A_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ ,  $A_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$ , we have

$$W(A_1, A_2, A_3) = \{(a, b, c) : a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}, a^2 + b^2 + c^2 = 1\}.$$

The following is known, see [1, 12].

1. Suppose  $A_1, A_2, A_3 \in M_2$  are Hermitian matrices such that  $\{I_2, A_1, A_2, A_3\}$  is linearly independent. Then  $W(A_1, A_2, A_3)$  is an ellipsoid without interior in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ .
2. If  $n \geq 3$  and  $A_1, A_2, A_3 \in M_n$  are Hermitian matrices, then  $W(A_1, A_2, A_3)$  is convex.

3. Suppose  $A_1, A_2, A_3 \in M_n$  such that  $\{I_2, A_1, A_2, A_3\}$  is linearly independent. Then there is  $A_4 \in M_n$  such that  $W(A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4)$  is not convex.

There has been study of topological and geometrical properties of  $W(A_1, \dots, A_m)$ . Researchers also consider the joint  $C$ -numerical range of  $(A_1, \dots, A_m)$  defined by

$$W_C(A_1, \dots, A_m) = \{(\operatorname{tr}(CU^*A_1U), \dots, \operatorname{tr}(CU^*A_mU)) : U \text{ unitary}\} \quad (5.3)$$

for a Hermitian matrix  $C$ , for example [5, 6]. In particular, it is known that  $W_C(A_1, A_2, A_3)$  is convex for any Hermitian matrices  $C, A_1, A_2, A_3 \in M_n$  if  $n \geq 3$ , see [2]. Of course, one can also consider the  $C$ -numerical range of  $(A_1, \dots, A_m)$  for general matrices  $C, A_1, \dots, A_m \in M_n$  defined as in Equation (5.3).

Denote by  $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_m)$  an  $m$ -tuple of matrices in  $M_n$ . Let  $\mathbf{F}$  be a non-empty subset of  $M_n^m$ . We consider

$$W_C(\mathbf{F}) = \bigcup \{W_C(\mathbf{A}) : \mathbf{A} \in \mathbf{F}\}.$$

Evidently, when  $\mathbf{F} = \{\mathbf{A}\}$ , then  $W_C(\mathbf{F}) = W_C(\mathbf{A})$ .

## 5.1 Basic results

We begin with the following results.

**Proposition 5.1.** *Let  $C \in M_n$  be non-scalar, and let  $\mathbf{F}$  be a non-empty subset of  $M_n^m$ .*

1. *For any unitary  $U, V \in M_n$ , we have  $W_C(\mathbf{F}) = W_{V^*CV}(U^*\mathbf{F}U)$ , where*

$$U^*\mathbf{F}U = \{(U^*A_1U, \dots, U^*A_mU) : (A_1, \dots, A_m) \in \mathbf{F}\}.$$

2. *Let  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $\gamma_1 \neq 0$ . If  $\hat{C} = \gamma_1 C + \gamma_2 I_n$ , then for any  $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_m) \in M_n^m$ ,*

$$W_{\hat{C}}(\mathbf{A}) = \{\gamma_1(a_1, \dots, a_m) + \gamma_2(\operatorname{tr} A_1, \dots, \operatorname{tr} A_m) : (a_1, \dots, a_m) \in W_C(\mathbf{A})\}.$$

3. *For any  $T = (t_{ij}) \in M_m$  and  $f = (f_1, \dots, f_m)^t$ , we can define an affine map  $R$  on  $\mathbb{C}^m$  by  $v \mapsto Tv + f$ , and extend the affine map to  $M_n^m$  by mapping  $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_m)$  to  $\mathbf{B} = (B_1, \dots, B_m)$  with  $B_i = \sum_{j=1}^m t_{ij}A_j + f_i I_n$ . Then*

$$W_C(\mathbf{B}) = \{(b_1, \dots, b_m) : (b_1, \dots, b_m)^t = T(a_1, \dots, a_m)^t + (\operatorname{tr} C)(f_1, \dots, f_m)^t, (a_1, \dots, a_m) \in W_C(\mathbf{A})\}.$$

Consequently,

$$R(W_C(\mathbf{F})) = W_C(R(\mathbf{F})).$$

4. *The linear span of  $\{A_j - (\operatorname{tr} A_j)/n : j = 1, \dots, m\}$  has dimension  $k$  if and only if  $W_C(\mathbf{F}) \subseteq \mathbf{V} + f$  for a  $k$ -dimensional subspace  $\mathbf{V} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^m$  and a vector  $f \in \mathbb{C}^m$ . In particular,  $W_C(\mathbf{F})$  is a singleton  $\{(\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)\}$  if and only if  $\mathcal{F} = \{(\mu_1 I, \dots, \mu_m I)\}$  with  $(\operatorname{tr} C)(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m) = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)$ .*

Note that if  $C \in M_n$  is Hermitian, then  $W_C(A_1, \dots, A_m) \subseteq \mathbb{C}^m$  can be identified as  $W_C(X_1, Y_1, X_2, Y_2, \dots, X_m, Y_m) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{2m}$ , where  $X_j = (A_j + A_j^*)/2$  and  $Y_j = (A_j - A_j^*)/(2i)$ . One can obtain a “real version” of Proposition 5.1 using real scalars  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$ , real matrix  $T$ , real vector  $f$ , etc.

One can prove the following when  $W_C(\mathbf{F})$  is a polyhedral set in  $\mathbb{C}^m$ , i.e., a convex combination of a finite set of vertices.

**Proposition 5.2.** *Suppose  $C \in M_n$  is non-scalar, and  $\mathbf{F}$  is a non-empty set of  $M_n^m$ . If  $W_C(\mathbf{F})$  is polyhedral, then every vertex has the form  $(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m)$  with  $\mu_j = \text{tr } V^*CVU^*A_jU$ , where  $(A_1, \dots, A_m) \in \mathbf{F}$ ,  $U, V \in M_n$  are unitary so that  $V^*CV, U^*A_1U, \dots, U^*A_mU$  are in lower triangular matrices with diagonal entries*

$$c_1, \dots, c_n, a_1(1), \dots, a_n(1), \dots, a_1(m), \dots, a_n(m)$$

and  $\mu_j = \sum_{\ell=1}^n c_\ell a_\ell(j)$ . Furthermore, if  $c_1, \dots, c_n$  are distinct, then

$$V^*CV, U^*A_1U, \dots, U^*A_mU$$

are diagonal matrices.

If  $C$  has distinct eigenvalues, and if  $W_C(\mathbf{A})$  has a conical point  $(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m)$  on the boundary, i.e., there is a pointed cone  $K \subseteq \mathbb{C}^m \cong \mathbb{R}^{2m}$  with vertex  $(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m)$  such that

$$W_C(\mathbf{A}) \cap \{(\mu_1 + \nu_1, \dots, \mu_m + \nu_m) : |\nu_j| \leq \varepsilon\} \subseteq K$$

for some sufficiently small  $\varepsilon > 0$ , then  $\{C, A_1, \dots, A_m\}$  is a commuting family of normal matrices, and  $\text{conv}W_C(\mathbf{A})$  is a polyhedral set, see [3].

Note that if there is  $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbf{F}$  such that  $W_C(\mathbf{B})$  is a singleton, a subset of a straight line, or a convex polygon, then we can apply the results on  $W_C(\mathbf{B})$  to deduce that  $C$  and  $\mathbf{B}$  has special structure. Then we can deduce results on  $W_C(\mathbf{F})$ .

We can obtain some topological properties  $W_C(\mathbf{F})$ .

**Proposition 5.3.** *Let  $C \in M_n$  be non-scalar, and  $\mathbf{F} \subseteq M_n^m$  be a nonempty set.*

1. *If  $\mathcal{F}$  is bounded, then so is  $W_C(\mathbf{F})$ .*
2. *If  $\mathcal{F}$  is connected, then so is  $W_C(\mathbf{F})$ .*
3. *If  $\mathcal{F}$  is compact, then so is  $W_C(\mathbf{F})$ .*

*Proof.* The proof of the boundedness and compactness are similar to those for  $W_C(\mathcal{F})$  in Section 2. To prove connectedness, for any  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \in \mathbf{F}$  and unitary  $U_0, U_1 \in M_n$ , there is a path joining  $U_t$  with  $t \in [0, 1]$  joining  $U_0$  and  $U_1$ , and hence there is a path joining  $(\text{tr } U_0^*CU_0A_1, \dots, \text{tr } U_0^*CU_0A_m)$  to  $(\text{tr } U_1^*CU_1A_1, \dots, \text{tr } U_1^*CU_1A_m)$ , which is connected to  $(\text{tr } U_1^*CU_1B_1, \dots, \text{tr } U_1^*CU_1B_m)$ . ■

## 5.2 Star-shapedness and convexity

Here we consider whether  $W(\mathbf{F})$  is star-shaped or convex. It is known that if  $C \in M_n$  is Hermitian, then  $W_C(A_1, A_2, A_3)$  is convex for any Hermitian  $A_1, A_2, A_3 \in M_n$  with  $n \geq 3$ , see [2]. One may wonder whether Theorem 3.5 admits an extension to this setting. The following example shows that the answer is negative.

**Example 5.4.** *Let*

$$\mathbf{A}_t = \left( \left( \begin{array}{ccc} t & & \\ & t & \\ & & 1-t \end{array} \right), \left( \begin{array}{ccc} 1-t & & \\ & t & \\ & & 1-t \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{ccc} 0 & & \\ & t & \\ & & 1-t \end{array} \right) \right), \quad t \in [0, 1].$$

*Notice that  $\text{conv}\{\mathbf{A}_0, \mathbf{A}_1\} = \{\mathbf{A}_t : 0 \leq t \leq 1\}$ . Moreover,  $(0, 0, 0) \in W(\mathbf{A}_0) \cap W(\mathbf{A}_1)$ , but  $(0, 0, 0)$  is not a star-center of  $W(\text{conv}\{\mathbf{A}_0, \mathbf{A}_1\})$  as  $(1/2, 1/2, 0) \in W(\mathbf{A}_{1/2})$ , however,  $\text{conv}\{(0, 0, 0), (1/2, 1/2, 0)\} \not\subseteq W(\text{conv}\{\mathbf{A}_0, \mathbf{A}_1\})$ . Nevertheless,  $(1/2, 1/2, 1/2) \in W(\mathbf{A}_t)$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ , and hence  $(1/2, 1/2, 1/2)$  is a star-center of  $W(\text{conv}\{\mathbf{A}_0, \mathbf{A}_1\})$ . Actually, one can show that  $W(\mathbf{A}_t) = \text{conv}\{(t, 1-t, 0), (t, t, t), (1-t, 1-t, 1-t)\}$ .*

Here is an example showing that  $W(\mathbf{A})$  may not be star-shaped in general.

**Example 5.5.** *Let  $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, A_2, A_3)$  with  $A_1 = \text{diag}(0, 1, 0)$ ,  $A_2 = \text{diag}(1, 0, -1)$ ,  $A_3 = I_3$  and let  $\mathbf{B} = (B_1, B_2, B_3)$  with  $B_1 = \text{diag}(1, 0, 0)$ ,  $B_2 = \text{diag}(0, -1, 1)$ ,  $B_3 = 0_3$ . If  $\mathbf{F} = \text{conv}\{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}\}$ , then  $W(\mathbf{F})$  is the union of the triangular disk with vertices*

$$(1-t, t, t), (t, t-1, t), (0, 1-2t, t).$$

*Let  $g : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  be given by  $g((a, b, c)) = (a, -b, 1-c)$ . We have*

$$g((1-t, t, t)) = (1-t, -t, 1-t) = (1-t, (1-t) - 1, 1-t)$$

$$g((t, t-1, t)) = (t, 1-t, 1-t) = (1 - (1-t), (1-t), (1-t))$$

$$g((0, 1-2t, t)) = (0, 2t-1, 1-t) = (0, 1-2(1-t), (1-t))$$

*Therefore,  $g(W(\mathbf{F})) = W(\mathbf{F})$ . Moreover, we claim that  $W(\mathbf{F})$  is not star-shaped.*

Suppose the contrary that  $W(\mathbf{F})$  is star-shaped with  $(a, b, t_0)$  be a star-center. Then  $(a, -b, 1-t_0)$  is also a star-center. As the set of all star-center of a star-shaped set is convex. We may now assume without loss of generality that  $b = 0$  and  $t_0 = 1/2$ . Assume now  $a > 0$ . By assumption, for all  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ ,  $t(a, 0, 1/2) + (1-t)(1, 0, 0) = (1-t(1-a), 0, t/2) \in W(\mathbf{F})$ . By direct computation, given  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ , we have

$$\max\{\alpha \in \mathbb{R} : (\alpha, 0, t) \in W(\mathbf{F})\} = t^2 + (1-t)^2 = 1 - 2t + 2t^2.$$

However for sufficient small  $t > 0$

$$1 - t(1-a) > 1 - t(1-t^2/2) > (t/2)^2 + (1-t/2)^2,$$

which contradicts that  $(1 - t(1 - a), 0, t/2) \in W(\mathbf{F})$ . Therefore, we have  $a = 0$ . However  $(0, 0, 1/2)$  is not a star-center as

$$\frac{1}{3}(0, 0, 1/2) + \frac{2}{3}(0, 0, 1) = \left(0, 0, \frac{5}{6}\right) \notin \text{conv} \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{6}, \frac{5}{6}, \frac{5}{6}\right), \left(\frac{5}{6}, -\frac{1}{6}, \frac{5}{6}\right), \left(0, -\frac{2}{3}, \frac{5}{6}\right) \right\}.$$

Therefore,  $W(\mathbf{F})$  is not star-shaped.

It is challenging to determine conditions on  $\mathbf{F}$  so that  $W(\mathbf{F})$  is star-shaped.

## Acknowledgment

Our study was inspired by some discussion at the AIM workshop on Crouzeix's conjecture, July 30 - August 5, 2017, AIM, San Jose. The second and the third authors would like to express their thanks to the organizer and the colleagues at AIM for the well-organized and stimulating workshop.

Li is an honorary professor of the Shanghai University, and an affiliate member of the Institute for Quantum Computing, University of Waterloo; his research was supported by the USA NSF DMS 1331021, the Simons Foundation Grant 351047, and NNSF of China Grant 11571220. Research of Sze and Lau were supported by a PolyU central research grant G-YBKR and a HK RGC grant PolyU 502512. The HK RGC grant also supported the post-doctoral fellowship of Lau at the Hong Kong Polytechnic University.

## References

- [1] Y. Au Yeung and Y.T. Poon, A remark on the convexity and positive definiteness concerning Hermitian matrices, Southeast Bull. Math. 3 (1979), 85-92.
- [2] Y. Au Yeung and N.K. Tsing, An extension of the Hausdorff-Toeplitz theorem on the numerical range, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 89 (1983), 215-218.
- [3] P. Binding and C. K. Li, Joint ranges of hermitian matrices and simultaneous diagonalization, Linear Algebra Appl. 151 (1991), 157-168.
- [4] W.S. Cheung and N.K. Tsing, The  $C$ -numerical range of matrices is star-shaped, Linear and Multilinear Algebra 41 (1996), 245-250.
- [5] M.T. Chien and H. Nakazato, Strict convexity of the joint  $c$ -numerical range, Linear Algebra Appl. 438 (2013), 1305-1321.
- [6] M.D. Choi, C.K. Li and Y.T. Poon, Some convexity features associated with unitary orbits, Canad. J. Math. 55 (2003), 91-111.
- [7] M. Crouzeix, Bounds for analytical functions of matrices, Integral Equations Operator Theory 48 (2004), 461-477.

- [8] P.R. Halmos, A Hilbert Space Problem Book, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1982.
- [9] R.A. Horn and C.R. Johnson, Topics in Matrix Analysis, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991.
- [10] C.K. Li,  $C$ -numerical ranges and  $C$ -numerical radii, Linear and Multilinear Algebra 37 (1994), 51-82.
- [11] C.K. Li, D.C. Pelejo, Y.T. Poon and K.Z. Wang, Minkowski product of convex sets and product numerical range, Operators and Matrices, 10 (2016), 945-965.
- [12] C.K. Li and Y.T. Poon, Convexity of the joint numerical range, SIAM J. Matrix. Anal. Appl. 21 (2000), 668-678.
- [13] C.K. Li and N.K. Tsing, Matrices with circular symmetry on their unitary orbits and  $C$ -numerical ranges, Proc. of Amer. Math. Soc. 111 (1991), 19-28.
- [14] H. Nakazato, The  $C$ -numerical range of a  $3 \times 3$  normal matrix, Nihonkai Math. J. 17 (2006), 187-197.
- [15] Z. Puchala, P. Gawron, J.A. Miszczak, L. Skowronek, M.D. Choi, and K. Zyczkowski, Product numerical range in a space with tensor product structure, Linear Algebra Appl. 434 (2011), 327-342.
- [16] T. Schulte-Herbrüggen, G. Dirr, U. Helmke and S.J. Glaser The significance of the  $C$ -numerical range and the local  $C$ -numerical range in quantum control and quantum information, Linear and Multilinear Algebra 56 (2008), 3-26.
- [17] N.K. Tsing, The constraint bilinear form and the  $C$ -numerical range, Linear Algebra Appl. 56 (1984), 195-162.
- [18] R. Westwick, A theorem on numerical range, Linear and Multilinear Algebra 2 (1975), 311-315.

### Addresses

(P.S. Lau) Department of Applied Mathematics, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hung Hom, Hong Kong. (panshun.lau@polyu.edu.hk)

(C.K. Li) Department of Mathematics, College of William & Mary, Williamsburg, VA 23185. (ckli@math.wm.edu)

(Y.T. Poon) Department of Mathematics, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011. (ytpoon@iastate.edu)

(N.S. Sze) Department of Applied Mathematics, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hung Hom, Hong Kong. (raymond.sze@polyu.edu.hk)