

SPECTRUM MAXIMIZING PRODUCTS ARE NOT GENERICALLY UNIQUE

JAIRO BOCHI AND PIOTR LASKAWIEC

ABSTRACT. It is widely believed that typical finite families of $d \times d$ matrices admit finite products that attain the joint spectral radius. This conjecture is supported by computational experiments and it naturally leads to the following question: are these spectrum maximizing products typically unique, up to cyclic permutations and powers? We answer this question negatively. As discovered by Horowitz around fifty years ago, there are products of matrices that always have the same spectral radius despite not being cyclic permutations of one another. We show that the simplest Horowitz products can be spectrum maximizing in a robust way; more precisely, we exhibit a small but nonempty open subset of pairs of 2×2 matrices (A, B) for which the products A^2BAB^2 and B^2ABA^2 are both spectrum maximizing.

1. INTRODUCTION

The *joint spectral radius* of a family of linear operators was introduced by Rota and Strang [42] in 1960 and later became a topic of intense research. It measures the maximal asymptotic growth rate of products of matrices drawn from the family; more precisely:

Definition 1.1. Let \mathcal{A} be a bounded set of real or complex $d \times d$ matrices. The *joint spectral radius* (JSR in short) of \mathcal{A} is given by:

$$\text{JSR}(\mathcal{A}) := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\Pi \in \mathcal{A}^{*k}} \|\Pi\|^{\frac{1}{k}}, \quad (1.1)$$

where \mathcal{A}^{*k} denotes the collection of all products of elements of \mathcal{A} with length k .

The limit (1.1) exists as a consequence of Fekete's lemma and is independent of the matrix norm $\|\cdot\|$. In the case that \mathcal{A} is a singleton $\{A\}$, Gelfand's formula tells us that the JSR coincides with the spectral radius:

$$\rho(A) := \max\{|\lambda| : \lambda \text{ is an eigenvalue of } A\}, \quad (1.2)$$

and so it is easy to compute. The situation is completely different for two or more matrices. The JSR is no longer a semialgebraic function: see [25]. It was shown in [46] that the JSR of a pair of integer matrices cannot be computed in polynomial time, unless $P = NP$. Worse than that, among pairs of rational matrices, it is an undecidable problem whether $\text{JSR} \leq 1$, in the sense that no algorithm is able to reliably answer such question in a finite amount of time: see [4].

Date: January, 2023.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 15A18 (primary); 15A60, 20G05, 37H15 (secondary).

Still, computable bounds for the JSR are available. As noted in [10, Lemma 3.1], the JSR of a bounded family \mathcal{A} can be squeezed between two sequences:

$$\sup_{\Pi \in \mathcal{A}^{*k}} \rho(\Pi)^{\frac{1}{k}} \leq \text{JSR}(\mathcal{A}) \leq \sup_{\Pi \in \mathcal{A}^{*k}} \|\Pi\|^{\frac{1}{k}}. \quad (1.3)$$

The upper bound converges to the JSR as $k \rightarrow \infty$, by its very definition (1.1). As for the lower bound, convergence may fail, but the situation can be remedied by taking a limsup:

$$\text{JSR}(\mathcal{A}) = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\Pi \in \mathcal{A}^{*k}} \rho(\Pi)^{\frac{1}{k}}; \quad (1.4)$$

this is the Berger–Wang theorem [2] (see [7] for a recent improved version). Therefore one can use the inequalities (1.3) to approximate the JSR: see e.g. [24, § 2.3.3] for discussion of some computational issues.

From now on, let us restrict the discussion to finite families $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$, in which case we write $\text{JSR}(\mathcal{A}) = \text{JSR}(A_1, \dots, A_n)$. In favorable circumstances, the bounds in (1.3) may become equalities, and then the computation of the JSR is greatly simplified. Under mild conditions on the set of matrices \mathcal{A} , it admits an *extremal norm*, that is, a norm on \mathbb{R}^d for which the second inequality in (1.3) becomes an equality with $k = 1$: see [25] or [24, § 2.1.2].

The situation where the first inequality in (1.3) becomes an equality is central to this note. It is convenient to focus our attention on products $\Pi = A_{i_1} \cdots A_{i_k}$ that are *primitive*, that is, the word $i_1 \cdots i_k$ is not a power of a shorter word.

Definition 1.2. Let $\Pi \in \mathcal{A}^{*k}$ be a primitive product of length k . We say that Π is a *spectrum maximizing product* (SMP in short) if

$$\text{JSR}(\mathcal{A}) = \rho(\Pi)^{\frac{1}{k}}. \quad (1.5)$$

At an early stage, it was hoped that every finite family of matrices would have an SMP [27]. This came to be known as the *finiteness conjecture* which was eventually refuted by Bousch and Mairesse [6]; later constructions were offered by several authors [3, 26, 17, 22]. On the other hand, the counterexamples seem to form a small set, and Maesumi [30, Conjecture 8] conjectured that Lebesgue-almost every finite family of matrices has an SMP. The conjecture seems to be confirmed by experiments: see [14, 32].

One way of certifying that a certain product $\Pi \in \mathcal{A}^{*k}$ is spectrum maximizing for a given family \mathcal{A} is to find a norm $\|\cdot\|$ for which $\rho(\Pi)^{\frac{1}{k}} = \sup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \|A\|$ and then apply (1.3) to conclude simultaneously that Π is a SMP and $\|\cdot\|$ is an extremal norm. Thus, the problem boils down to efficiently finding such extremal norms, and the most efficient implementation is due to Guglielmi and Protasov [14, 15]. See also [47, 40, 32] for further information.

When it terminates, the Guglielmi–Protasov algorithm not only validates a product as an SMP, but it also ensures it is *robust* in the sense that if the matrices in the (finite) family \mathcal{A} are slightly perturbed, the same product is still spectrum maximizing. So it seems plausible that the counterexamples to the finiteness conjecture form a *nowhere dense* set of zero Lebesgue measure.

Cyclic permutations of an SMP are also SMPs. Ignoring such repetitions, experimentally found SMPs are usually unique. This raises the following question:

Question 1.3. *Does Lebesgue-almost every finite family of matrices have a unique SMP, up to cyclic permutations?*

This sort of problem pertains to the wider field of *ergodic optimization*. The JSR of a bounded family of matrices \mathcal{A} is the maximal Lyapunov exponent of a related linear cocycle over a shift dynamics: see [5] and references therein. In this context, there always exist at least one *Lyapunov-maximizing measure*, meaning a shift-invariant probability measure with maximal Lyapunov exponent, and if such a measure is supported on a periodic orbit then the family of matrices admits an SMP. Furthermore, cyclic permutations of an SMP correspond to exactly the same measure. Therefore Question 1.3 is asking about typical existence of a unique finitely-supported Lyapunov-maximizing measure.

Ergodic optimization is more developed in the commutative situation where one seeks to maximize Birkhoff averages instead of Lyapunov exponents. In that situation, Hunt and Ott [20] conjectured that having a unique maximizing measure supported on a periodic orbit should be a typical property, at least for sufficiently chaotic underlying dynamical systems. Contreras [9] has proved a positive result in that direction, using however a topological notion of typicality. On the other hand, uniqueness of maximizing measures (finitely supported or not) was proved to be a typical property in topological and probabilistic senses by Jenkinson [21, Theorem 3.2] and Morris [35], respectively.

In this state of affairs, it came as a surprise to us that Question 1.3 actually has a negative answer. Our starting point is the following curious algebraic observation:

Lemma 1.4. *For all pairs of 2×2 (real or complex) matrices A, B , the two matrix products*

$$A^2BAB^2 \quad \text{and} \quad B^2ABA^2 \tag{1.6}$$

have the same eigenvalues.

Note that this lemma is not immediate, since the words (1.6) are not cyclic permutations of one another; actually, for 3×3 matrices, it is not true that $\rho(A^2BAB^2) \equiv \rho(B^2ABA^2)$. Lemma 1.4 is the simplest manifestation of a more general phenomenon uncovered by Horowitz about fifty years ago; we will elaborate on this in Section 3. The main result of this note is that the products (1.6) can be robust SMPs, and in particular Question 1.3 has a negative answer. More precisely:

Theorem 1.5. *There exists a nonempty open set \mathcal{U} in $\mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R})^2$ such that for all $(A, B) \in \mathcal{U}$, the products A^2BAB^2 and B^2ABA^2 are spectrum maximizing. Furthermore, there are no other SMPs other than their cyclic permutations.*

2. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.5 by exhibiting an explicit example. The proof ultimately relies on finitely many algebraic inequalities, which can be checked numerically on any computer algebra system.

2.1. Proof of Lemma 1.4. As already mentioned, Lemma 1.4 is known: indeed, it follows from [19, eq. (5.2b)]. It was rediscovered at least once: see [43, p.12]. For the convenience of the reader, let us reproduce the proof from [38].

Proof of the lemma. Given 2×2 matrices A, B , consider $C := AB - BA$. Since $\text{tr } C = 0$, Cayley–Hamilton theorem tells us that C^2 is a scalar multiple of identity.

In particular, $\text{tr } C^3 = \text{tr } C = 0$. On the other hand,

$$C^3 = (ABABAB - BABABA) + (-ABABBA - ABBAAB - BAABAB) + (ABBABA + BAABBA + BABAAB), \quad (2.1)$$

and the products in each set of parentheses are cyclic permutations of one another. Taking the trace we obtain

$$-3 \text{tr}(A^2BAB^2) + 3 \text{tr}(B^2ABA^2) = 0, \quad (2.2)$$

so A^2BAB^2 and B^2ABA^2 have the same trace. Since these two 2×2 matrices also have the same determinant, they have the same eigenvalues. \square

In fact, Lemma 1.4 is just the simplest instance of a more general phenomenon, which we explain in Section 3.

2.2. The example. We begin by defining the following pair of matrices:

$$A_0 := \begin{bmatrix} 0.81427 & -0.32898 \\ 0.73419 & 0.50393 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad B_0 := \begin{bmatrix} -0.06078 & 1.01008 \\ -0.88368 & -0.26830 \end{bmatrix} \quad (2.3)$$


The dominant eigenvalue of the product $A_0^2 B_0 A_0 B_0^2$ is approximately -0.99998 . Then, we define two new matrices:

$$A := \frac{A_0}{\rho(A_0^2 B_0 A_0 B_0^2)^{1/6}} \quad \text{and} \quad B := \frac{B_0}{\rho(A_0^2 B_0 A_0 B_0^2)^{1/6}}. \quad (2.4)$$

Actually A and B coincides with A_0 and B_0 up to 5 digits. It follows from Lemma 1.4 that the matrix products (1.6) (as well as their cyclic permutations) have dominant eigenvalue exactly -1 . Next, we consider the following eigenvectors

$$v_9 \approx \begin{bmatrix} 0.99945 \\ 0.03309 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad v_6 \approx \begin{bmatrix} 0.91509 \\ -0.77628 \end{bmatrix} \quad (2.5)$$

of the matrices B^2ABA^2 and BAB^2A^2 , respectively, both associated to the leading eigenvalue -1 , with Euclidean lengths exactly 1 and 1.2, respectively. Then, we compute 14 other vectors by taking successive images of v_9 and v_6 under A and $\pm B$, as specified by the (disconnected) graph below.



Lastly, we enlarge our list by including all opposite vectors $v_{19} := -v_1, \dots, v_{36} := -v_{18}$.

Lemma 2.1. *The points v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{36} are the cyclically ordered vertices of a convex 36-gon S .*

The lemma is easily verified using a computer algebra system. The polygon S is shown in Fig. 1. The largest interior angle is approximately 177.6° at the vertices v_{18}, v_{36} .




FIGURE 1. The polygon S and its images $A(S)$ (red) and $B(S)$ (blue).

Lemma 2.2. *Given a vertex v_i , its image Av_i (resp. Bv_i) either is another vertex v_j or it belongs to the interior of S .*

This lemma can also be verified using a computer. The closest call is the image Av_8 (or its opposite), which is approximately 10^{-3} away from the boundary of S .

The lemma implies that $AS \subseteq S$ and $BS \subseteq S$. In particular, any product Π of A 's and B 's satisfies $\Pi(S) \subseteq S$, and therefore the norm $\|\Pi\|$ is bounded by a constant. That is, the pair $\{A, B\}$ is *product bounded*. Hence, $\text{JSR}(A, B) \leq 1$. On the other hand, $\text{JSR}(A, B) \geq \rho(A^2BAB^2) = 1$. Therefore, $\text{JSR}(A, B) = 1$ and so the products (1.6) are SMPs. The next step is to prove that they are (essentially) unique.

Lemma 2.3. *Consider a sequence of matrices $(A_k)_{k \geq 1}$ composed of A 's and B 's, and let $\Pi_k := A_k \cdots A_1$. Then:*

- (a) *either $\Pi_k(S)$ is contained in the interior of S for some k ,*
- (b) *or the sequence (A_k) is periodic of period 6, and Π_6 is a cyclic permutation of either A^2BAB^2 or B^2ABA^2 .*

Proof. Assume that alternative (a) does not hold, that is, for all k , the image $\Pi_k(S)$ is not contained in the interior of S . It follows from Lemma 2.2 that for each $k \geq 1$ there must be at least one vertex v_{i_k} that maps to another vertex v_{j_k} , i.e.,

$$\Pi_k(v_{i_k}) = v_{j_k}. \quad (2.7)$$

By the pigeonhole principle, some vertex v_{m_0} appears infinitely often in the sequence $(v_{i_k})_{k \geq 1}$. Recall from Lemma 2.2 that once a vertex is mapped to an interior point, it must stay in it under any product of A and B . Hence for all k , $\Pi_k(v_{m_0})$ must be another vertex of S , say,

$$\Pi_k(v_{m_0}) = v_{m_k}. \quad (2.8)$$

Equivalently, $v_{m_k} = A_k(v_{m_{k-1}})$ for all $k \geq 1$. Replacing some vertices by their opposites if necessary, what we obtain is an infinite path in the graph (2.6). However, every such path consists of winding around one of the two cycles. It follows that alternative (b) in the lemma holds. \square

The lemma has the following simple corollary:

Lemma 2.4. *Let Π be a primitive product of A 's and B 's that is not a cyclic permutation of either A^2BAB^2 or B^2ABA^2 . Then, $\Pi^k(S)$ is contained in the interior of S for some k .*

Proof. Given a primitive word Π of length ℓ , write it as $\Pi = A_\ell \cdots A_1$ where each A_i is either A or B . Now extend $(A_k)_{k=1}^\ell$ to a periodic sequence $(A_k)_{k \geq 1}$ of period ℓ , and apply Lemma 2.3 to this sequence. If case (a) holds, then we have nothing to prove. So, assume we are in case (b), that is, the sequence $(A_k)_{k \geq 1}$ also has period 6, and $C := A_6 \cdots A_1$ is a cyclic permutation of either A^2BAB^2 or B^2ABA^2 . In particular, $\Pi^6 = C^\ell$. Since both Π and C are primitive, it follows from uniqueness of degrees and roots (see [29]) that $\ell = 6$ and $\Pi = C$. \square

Lemma 2.4 shows that any primitive Π that is not a cyclic permutation of one of the two products (1.6) has $\rho(\Pi) < 1$ and so it cannot be a SMP for the family $\{A, B\}$. This proves uniqueness. So, coming back to the original pair (A_0, B_0) defined in (2.3), we see that it has SMPs (1.6), and no other SMPs other than their cyclic permutations. The same conclusions remain valid if the matrices are slightly perturbed. Indeed, the vertices v_i will move continuously, so Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2 still hold. Furthermore, Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4 are just abstract consequences, so they also persist. The proof of Theorem 1.5 is concluded.

2.3. Additional information. Fig. 1 indicates that our example is delicate. In fact, the normalized spectral radii of the product A^3BA^2B is 0.99936, and it turns out that if we add 0.005 to the $(2, 1)$ entry of the matrix B , then this product becomes the unique SMP (modulo cyclic permutations, of course). The set \mathcal{U} we have found in our proof of Theorem 1.5 seems to have a quite small inradius.

Let us mention a few direct extensions of our result:

- Theorem 1.5 obviously holds for k -tuples of 2×2 real matrices, for any $k \geq 2$; indeed, if the other $k - 2$ matrices are sufficiently small, then they do not affect the SMPs.
- For the matrices A, B we defined, the pair of products (1.6) is actually *dominant* in the sense of Guglielmi and Protasov [15, p. 25].
- It follows directly from Lemma 2.3 that the *Mather set* (see Morris [34]) of our pair of matrices is the union of two periodic orbits. This means that there no other maximizing measures apart from those two coming from the periodic orbits corresponding to (1.6).

Our result is relevant for the study of Barabanov norms. Recall that a vector norm $\|\cdot\|$ on \mathbb{R}^d is a *Barabanov norm* for a bounded family $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{R})$ if

$$\forall v \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \sup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \|Av\| = \text{JSR}(\mathcal{A}) \|v\|, \quad (2.9)$$

which is a stronger property than being an extremal norm. By the theorem of Dranishnikov–Konyagin–Protasov [41], every irreducible family \mathcal{A} with unit JSR admits a centrally symmetric convex body C in \mathbb{R}^d with the property that the closed convex hull of $\bigcup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} A(C)$ equals C . Specializing to the pair $(A, B) \in \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R})^2$ discussed here, the polygon S has this property. It follows from a duality result of Plischke and Wirth [39] that the norm $\|\cdot\|$ in \mathbb{R}^2 whose unit ball is the polar of the polygon S is a Barabanov norm for the pair of transpose matrices (A^t, B^t) . Recall that the eigenvectors (2.5) were chosen so that the ratio of their lengths is exactly 1.2. However, any sufficiently close ratio would have worked, leading to a slightly different (non-similar) polygon S , and therefore to a non-homothetic Barabanov norm for (A^t, B^t) . To summarize, there exists a nonempty open subset \mathcal{U}^t of $\mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R})^2$ such that each pair in \mathcal{U}^t admits Barabanov norms, but these Barabanov norms are *not* unique modulo rescalings.

2.4. Complex matrices. Our main theorem holds true for complex matrices as well:

Theorem 2.5. *There exists a nonempty open set \mathcal{U} in $\mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{C})^2$ such that for all $(A, B) \in \mathcal{U}$, the products A^2BAB^2 and B^2ABA^2 are spectrum maximizing. Furthermore, there are no other SMPs other than their cyclic permutations.*

Before giving the proof, we need to recall a few notions (see [16] for further information).

Definition 2.6. A set $S \subseteq \mathbb{C}^2$ is *absolutely convex* if it is convex and it is invariant under multiplication by complex numbers of modulus 1.

Definition 2.7. The *absolute convex hull* of a finite set $F \subseteq \mathbb{C}^2$, denoted $\text{absco}(F)$, is the smallest absolutely convex set that contains F .

In other words, the absolute convex hull of a set is the intersection of all absolutely convex sets that contain it. It can be also be expressed as:

$$\text{absco}(S) = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i v_i : v_1, \dots, v_n \in S, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{C}, \sum_{i=1}^n |\lambda_i| \leq 1 \right\}. \quad (2.10)$$

Proof of Theorem 2.5. We follow the same strategy as in the proof of Theorem 1.5 but with slight modifications. Let A and B be our real matrices (2.4) and let \tilde{A} and \tilde{B} be complex perturbations. Without loss of generality, assume that these

perturbations are normalized so that $\rho(\tilde{A}^2\tilde{B}\tilde{A}\tilde{B}^2) = 1$. We can proceed with the same process of creating 36 vectors $\tilde{v}_i, \dots, \tilde{v}_{36}$, following the same graph (2.6), just as in the real case. Let T be the absolute convex hull of the points \tilde{v}_i . Note that the starting vectors \tilde{v}_9 and \tilde{v}_6 are not uniquely determined. However, the indeterminacy is given by multiplication by complex numbers of modulus 1, and therefore does not influence the set T .

We claim that $\tilde{A}T \subseteq T$ and $\tilde{B}T \subseteq T$. By linearity, it is sufficient to show that $\tilde{A}\tilde{v}_j \in T$ and $\tilde{B}\tilde{v}_j \in T$ for all j . We will consider images under \tilde{A} only, as the case of \tilde{B} is entirely analogous.

Given j , by Lemma 2.2, there are two possibilities: either $Av_j = v_i$ for some i , or $Av_j \in \text{int}(S)$, where S is the real polygon. In the first case, we must have $\tilde{A}\tilde{v}_j = \tilde{v}_i$, since the perturbed vectors are defined using the same graph. In particular, $\tilde{A}\tilde{v}_j$ belongs to the set T , as we wanted to show.

Now consider the case where $Av_j \in \text{int}(S)$. We can slice our convex centrally symmetric polygon S into triangles T_k with vertices $(0,0), v_k, v_{k+1}$, where indices are meant modulo 36. Fix a slice T_k containing Av_j . Then there are unique numbers $\alpha \geq 0, \beta \geq 0$ such that

$$Av_j = \alpha v_k + \beta v_{k+1} \quad (2.11)$$

and $\alpha + \beta < 1$. As long as the perturbations are small enough, we know there must also be a unique real solution $(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta})$ to the linear system:

$$\tilde{A}\tilde{v}_j = \tilde{\alpha}\tilde{v}_k + \tilde{\beta}\tilde{v}_{k+1}, \quad (2.12)$$

and this solution will satisfy $|\tilde{\alpha}| + |\tilde{\beta}| < 1$. By (2.10), $\tilde{A}\tilde{v}_j \in T$, as we wanted to prove.

We have shown that $\tilde{A}T \subseteq T$ and $\tilde{B}T \subseteq T$. It follows that $\text{JSR}(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}) \leq 1$. Since $\rho(\tilde{A}^2\tilde{B}\tilde{A}\tilde{B}^2) = 1$, we have, just as in the real case, $\text{JSR}(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}) = 1$, as desired. \square

3. ON THE COINCIDENCE OF EIGENVALUES

In this section, we will see that Lemma 1.4 is not an algebraic accident.

3.1. Fricke polynomials. Let \mathbb{F}_2^+ denote the free semigroup on generators a, b , that is, the set of all finite words in the letters a, b with the operation of concatenation. Let $\mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{C})$ denote the semigroup of complex $d \times d$ matrices. If $w \in \mathbb{F}_2^+$ and $A, B \in \mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{C})$, then we denote by $w(A, B)$ the matrix product obtained by replacing the letters a, b in the word w by the matrices A, B . That is, $w \mapsto w(A, B)$ is the unique homomorphism from \mathbb{F}_2^+ to $\mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{C})$ that maps a to A and b to B .

Proposition 3.1. *For every $w \in \mathbb{F}_2^+$, there exists a polynomial F_w with integer coefficients in five variables such that, for all 2×2 matrices A, B , we have*

$$\text{tr } w(A, B) = F_w(\text{tr } A, \text{tr } B, \text{tr } AB, \det A, \det B). \quad (3.1)$$

This fact (or actually, its more general version for the free group \mathbb{F}_2) is known since the 19th century: see [19, 31, 13]. Nevertheless, for the convenience of the reader, let us give a proof, essentially following an observation of Sylvester [45]:

Proof. Let us write

$$x = \text{tr } A, \quad y = \text{tr } B, \quad z = \text{tr } AB, \quad u = \det A, \quad v = \det B. \quad (3.2)$$

By the Cayley-Hamilton (CH) theorem,

$$A^2 - xA + uI = 0, \quad B^2 - yB + vI = 0. \quad (3.3)$$

Also, by the multilinear CH theorem [12, eq. (4)] (itself a direct consequence of the regular CH theorem),

$$AB + BA - yA - xB + (xy - z)I = 0. \quad (3.4)$$

By using these three equations repeatedly, we can express any product $w(A, B)$ of A 's and B 's as a linear combination of the four matrices I, A, B, AB , with the coefficients being polynomials with integer coefficients in the variables x, y, z, u, v . Since the trace is linear, the proposition follows. \square

Since the trace and determinant are homogeneous functions on $\mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{C})$ of respective degrees 1 and 2, it follows that every polynomial $F_w(x, y, z, u, v)$ is weighted homogeneous with weights $(1, 0, 1, 2, 0)$ and also with weights $(0, 1, 1, 0, 2)$. It follows that the three-variable polynomial $F_w(x, y, z, 1, 1)$ uniquely determines the full polynomial $F_w(x, y, z, u, v)$. We call F_w a *Fricke polynomial*.

While the proof of Proposition 3.1 suggests a method for the computation of the Fricke polynomials, it is not the most efficient one. See the references mentioned above for better algorithms; see also [23] for a general formula and [8] for an online calculator of Fricke polynomials.

3.2. Isospectral products and chiral pairs.

Definition 3.2. We say that two words in \mathbb{F}_2^+ are *isospectral* if they have identical Fricke polynomials.

Clearly, every cyclic permutation of a word is isospectral to it. But the converse is false, since the words a^2bab^2 and b^2aba^2 have the same Fricke polynomial, namely $(xyz - x^2v - y^2u + uv)z$.

The terminology in Definition 3.2 is justified by the following fact:

Lemma 3.3. *Let $w, w' \in \mathbb{F}_2^+$ be isospectral words. Then, for all $A, B \in \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{C})$, the matrices $w(A, B)$ and $w'(A, B)$ have the same eigenvalues, with the same multiplicities.*

Proof. Note that $\text{tr } w(\lambda I, \mu I) = 2\lambda^m \mu^n$, where m and n are respectively the number of occurrences of the letters a and b in the word w . In particular, n and m are determined by the Fricke polynomial F_w . That is, if w' is isospectral to w , then it is a permutation of w . It follows that for all pairs of matrices A and B , the products $w(A, B)$ and $w'(A, B)$ have not only the same trace, but also the same determinant, which implies the lemma. \square

If $w \in \mathbb{F}_2^+$, that is, w is a word in the letters a, b , then the *reverse* or *mirror image* of w is the word $\tilde{w} \in \mathbb{F}_2^+$ obtained by writing the letters of w in opposite order. So w is a palindrome if and only if $\tilde{w} = w$.

Proposition 3.4. *Every word $w \in \mathbb{F}_2^+$ is isospectral to its mirror image \tilde{w} .*

This proposition is due to Southcott [44, Theorem 6.3]. Let us provide a direct proof:

Proof. For any two matrices A, B , the two matrix products $w(A, B)$ and $\tilde{w}(A, B)$ have the same determinant, and to prove the proposition we need to show that they have the same trace. That is, we need to show that the Fricke polynomials $F_{\tilde{w}}$ and F_w are identical. Note that:

$$\tilde{w}(A, B) = [w(A^\dagger, B^\dagger)]^\dagger, \quad (3.5)$$

where the superscript denotes matrix transposition. Using the fact that transposition preserves trace and determinant, we have:

$$\text{tr } \tilde{w}(A, B) = \text{tr } w(A^\dagger, B^\dagger) \quad (3.6)$$

$$= F_w(\text{tr } A^\dagger, \text{tr } B^\dagger, \text{tr } A^\dagger B^\dagger, \det A^\dagger, \det B^\dagger) \quad (3.7)$$

$$= F_w(\text{tr } A, \text{tr } B, \underbrace{\text{tr } BA}_{\text{tr } AB}, \det A, \det B) \quad (3.8)$$

$$= \text{tr } w(A, B), \quad (3.9)$$

proving that $F_{\tilde{w}} \equiv F_w$. \square

Proposition 3.4 directly implies not only Lemma 1.4 but many other similar relations. The proposition is only interesting if the mirror is *not* a cyclic permutation of the original word. Thus we introduce the following definition.

Definition 3.5. We call a word $w \in \mathbb{F}_2^+$ *chiral* if \tilde{w} is not a cyclic permutation of w .

The shortest chiral words have length 6, and are exactly $w = a^2bab^2$, $\tilde{w} = b^2aba^2$, and their cyclic permutations. Modulo cyclic permutations and interchanging the two letters, there exists only one chiral pair of length 7, namely a^3bab^2 and b^2aba^3 . As the length increases, chiral words become increasingly frequent. For example, 61% of the words of length 10 and 97% of the words of length 20 are chiral (see [37]).

3.3. Further notes. Proposition 3.4 is only the tip of the isospectrality iceberg. Another way of producing isospectral words is as follows: if w_1 and w_2 are isospectral, and we substitute the letters a and b by any pair of words, then we obtain another pair of isospectral words. For instance, performing the substitution $a \rightarrow ab$ and $b \rightarrow ba$ on the shortest chiral pair $w_1 = a^2bab^2$ and $w_2 = \tilde{w}_1 = b^2aba^2$, we obtain the words

$$abab^2a^2b^2aba \quad \text{and} \quad baba^2b^2a^2bab, \quad (3.10)$$

which are isospectral despite not being cyclic permutations nor mirror images of one another. As remarked in [28, § 4.3], there is no shorter pair with those properties.

It seems to be a difficult problem to describe in purely combinatorial terms the relation of isospectrality on the semigroup \mathbb{F}_2^+ . As for the free group \mathbb{F}_2 , Horowitz [19, Example 8.2] proved that the isospectrality equivalence classes can be arbitrarily large. See [1, Conjecture 4.1] for a possible description of such classes.

Let us note that Proposition 3.4 still holds for the group \mathbb{F}_2 , but it fails if three or more letters are used, or if the matrices are 3×3 or bigger.

Concerning higher dimension, it is an open problem whether there exists a pair of words $w_1, w_2 \in \mathbb{F}_2^+$ that are not cyclic permutations of one another and satisfy $\text{tr } w_1(A, B) = \text{tr } w_2(A, B)$ for all $A, B \in \text{SL}_3(\mathbb{C})$: see [28, § 4.3]. If such words exist, they are rather long.

4. SEARCHING FOR MATRIX PAIRS WITH SPECIFIC SMPs

4.1. The procedure. The example exhibited in Section 2 was found by computer search. Let us describe the procedure, which can be adapted to similar problems.

We start with a list of the Fricke polynomials of all Lyndon words on two letters up to a certain length ℓ ; we took $\ell = 14$, so 2538 polynomials. Instead of generating pairs of random matrices, we generate random values of the five variables (x, y, z, u, v) as in (3.2), with a conveniently chosen probability distribution. Some 5-tuples are not realizable by a pair of real matrices (a precise description being provided by Proposition 4.1 below), and these can be discarded. For each random 5-tuple we can quickly compute the spectral radii of all (or some) products of length up to ℓ . Since are looking for an example for which the shortest chiral words (1.6) are SMPs, most of these 5-tuples will be discarded. For each viable candidate found, we produce actual matrices with the prescribed traces and determinants (3.2), and then apply the Guglielmi and Protasov's invariant polytope algorithm [15] to confirm whether the pair of matrices does in fact make the products (1.6) spectrum maximizing. In our experiments, the probability of finding an example seemed to be of the order of 10^{-7} .

4.2. More examples on non-unique SMPs. We include more examples of the 5-tuples (x, y, z, u, v) which can be used to generate matrices A, B for which (1.6) are SMPs. The last column indicates that an invariant polytope with $2n$ vertices was found.

x	y	z	u	v	n
3.38477	-0.84501	5.58856	4.29803	5.99245	18
-3.76601	-0.49459	-8.13153	3.52510	8.71249	20
-2.14985	-3.94227	-9.79878	9.82991	8.78874	21
-1.07836	-3.14648	-5.28373	5.52706	4.04793	24
1.84711	-3.98136	9.30530	9.43685	7.54361	24

We also have examples where the length 7 chiral pair A^3BAB^2 and B^2ABA^3 are the unique SMPs:

x	y	z	u	v	n
-0.28009	2.51662	-9.78050	7.09393	3.76472	34
-2.41561	4.01089	-10.27036	8.39182	4.16903	40

4.3. Realizability of traces and determinants. For every 5-tuple (x, y, z, u, v) of complex numbers, it is easy to find complex 2×2 matrices satisfying the equations (3.2) (see [13, p. 6] for the case $u = v = 1$). The situation of real matrices is more complicated, however:

Proposition 4.1. *Given $(x, y, z, u, v) \in \mathbb{R}^5$, there exist a pair of matrices $(A, B) \in \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R})^2$ solving the system of equations*

$$\operatorname{tr} A = x, \quad \operatorname{tr} B = y, \quad \operatorname{tr} AB = z, \quad \det A = u, \quad \det B = v \quad (4.1)$$

if and only if the symmetric matrix

$$M := \begin{bmatrix} u & x/2 & z/2 \\ x/2 & 1 & y/2 \\ z/2 & y/2 & v \end{bmatrix} \quad (4.2)$$

is not positive definite.

Recalling Sylvester's criterion for positive definiteness in terms of the positivity of any nested sequence of principal minors [18, Theorem 7.2.5], we see that the realizable 5-tuples for the equations (4.1) can be described for instance as:

$$\min(4u - x^2, 4uv - z^2 - vx^2 - uy^2 + xyz) \leq 0. \quad (4.3)$$

Proof of Proposition 4.1. Fix matrices A , B and compute the corresponding five numbers (4.1) and the matrix M from (4.2). Consider the following matrix pencil on three real variables:

$$P(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) := \xi_1 A + \xi_2 I + \xi_3 \operatorname{adj}(B) = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11}\xi_1 + \xi_2 + b_{22}\xi_3 & a_{12}\xi_1 & -b_{12}\xi_3 \\ a_{21}\xi_1 & -b_{21}\xi_3 & a_{22}\xi_1 + \xi_2 + b_{22}\xi_3 \end{bmatrix} \quad (4.4)$$

where $\operatorname{adj}(B)$ is the adjugate of B . By inspection (or using [11, eq. (7), p. 9]), the matrix of the quadratic form

$$Q(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) := \det P(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) \quad (4.5)$$

is exactly M . By dimension counting, we can find real numbers ξ_1, ξ_2, ξ_3 , not all of them zero, such that the first column of the matrix $P(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3)$ vanishes, and in particular $Q(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) = 0$. So the quadratic form Q cannot be positive definite, proving the “only if” part of the proposition.

For the converse, consider a positive definite matrix M of the form (4.2), and let us exhibit a solution (A, B) for the system of equations (4.1).

First, consider the case where $4u - x^2 \leq 0$. Then we can find real numbers λ_1, λ_2 whose sum is x and whose product is u . Take $A = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \mu \\ 0 & \lambda_2 \end{bmatrix}$, where μ is a free parameter. On the other hand, choose a matrix $B = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix}$ with $\operatorname{tr} B = y$ and $\det B = v$, taking the precaution that $c \neq 0$. Then

$$\operatorname{tr} AB = \lambda_1 a + \mu c + \lambda_2 d. \quad (4.6)$$

So there exists μ meeting the condition $\operatorname{tr} AB = z$, and we found a solution for the system (4.1).

The case where $4v - y^2 \leq 0$ is entirely analogous, reversing the roles of the two matrices.

Finally, assume that $4u - x^2 > 0$ and $4v - y^2 > 0$. In this case, $\det M \leq 0$, otherwise the matrix M would be positive definite by Sylvester's criterion. Let

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} x/2 & -\sqrt{u - x^2/4} \\ \sqrt{u - x^2/4} & x/2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} y/2 & -\mu^{-1}\sqrt{v - y^2/4} \\ \mu\sqrt{v - y^2/4} & y/2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (4.7)$$

where μ is a free parameter. These matrices have the desired traces and determinants, so we only need to worry about the trace of their product:

$$\operatorname{tr} AB = \frac{xy}{2} - (\mu + \mu^{-1}) \sqrt{u - \frac{x^2}{4}} \sqrt{v - \frac{y^2}{4}}. \quad (4.8)$$

Equating this to z , we obtain a quadratic equation $a\mu^2 + b\mu + c = 0$, where

$$a = c = \sqrt{u - \frac{x^2}{4}} \sqrt{v - \frac{y^2}{4}}, \quad b = z - \frac{xy}{2}. \quad (4.9)$$

As a computation shows, the discriminant $b^2 - 4ac$ is exactly $-4 \det M$, hence nonnegative. So a real solution μ exists. Note that $\mu \neq 0$, so our matrices A and B are well-defined, and solve equations (4.1). \square

5. QUESTIONS

Our findings suggest a few questions. We keep the tangible setting of pairs of real 2×2 matrices.

Definition 5.1. Let us say that a pair of matrices has the *relative uniqueness* property if it admits at least one SMP, and all SMPs are isospectral to each other.

Then a “corrected” version of Question 1.3 is:

Question 5.2. *Does the relative uniqueness property hold for Lebesgue-almost every pair of matrices?*

Of course, this question is at least as hard as Maesumi’s conjecture.

Next, we pose a different kind of problem.

Question 5.3. *Which words in two letters can be SMPs of a pair of 2×2 matrices with the relative uniqueness property?*

For example, every finite sturmian word appears as a unique SMP of some pair of matrices: see [36]. The same is true for words of the form $a^m b^n$, though we do not want to extend this note by including a proof. On the opposite direction, it seems reasonable to expect that many (if not most) words do *not* have the property alluded in Question 5.3, but nevertheless we are currently unable to exhibit a single one.

As mentioned in the introduction, even if a pair of matrices does not admit a SMP (that is, it is a counterexample to the finiteness conjecture), it always admits a Lyapunov-maximizing measure μ , which is a ergodic shift-invariant probability measure on the space of infinite strings of two letters.

Question 5.4. *Suppose that μ is a non-atomic ergodic measure for the shift, and let M_μ be the set of pair of matrices for which μ is Lyapunov-maximizing. Does M_μ have empty interior?*

An analogous result for Birkhoff averages is due to Yuan and Hunt [48], and in fact was one of the first theoretical results in commutative ergodic optimization.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Alexander Christie, Sean Lawton, and Peter Selinger for sharing information about trace identities. We thank Thomas Mejstrik for helpful discussions and assistance with his invariant polytope software [33]. We thank Ian D. Morris for several valuable comments and suggestions.

REFERENCES

- [1] ANDERSON, JAMES W. – Variations on a theme of Horowitz. In: Komori, Y. (ed.) et al., *Kleinian groups and hyperbolic 3-manifolds*. Proceedings of the Warwick workshop, Warwick, UK, September 11–14, 2001. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Lond. Math. Soc. Lect. Note Ser. 299, 307–341 (2003). [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on page 10.)
- [2] BERGER, MARC A.; WANG, YANG – Bounded semigroups of matrices. *Linear Algebra Appl.* 166, 2127 (1992). [DOI](#) [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on page 2.)
- [3] BLONDEL, VINCENT D.; THEYS, JACQUES; VLADIMIROV, ALEXANDER A. – An elementary counterexample to the finiteness conjecture. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.* 24, no. 4, 963–970 (2003). [DOI](#) [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on page 2.)
- [4] BLONDEL, VINCENT; TSITSIKLIS, JOHN – The boundedness of all products of a pair of matrices is undecidable. *Syst. Control Lett.* 41, no. 2, 135–140 (2000). [DOI](#) [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on page 1.)

- [5] BOCHI, JAIRO – Ergodic optimization of Birkhoff averages and Lyapunov exponents. Sirakov, Boyan (ed.) et al., *Proceedings of the ICM 2018*, Volume III. Invited lectures. Hackensack, NJ: World Scientific. 1825–1846 (2018). [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on page 3.)
- [6] BOUSCH, THIERRY; MAIRESSE, JEAN – Asymptotic height optimization for topical IFS, Tetris heaps, and the finiteness conjecture. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 15, 77–111 (2002). [DOI](#) [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on page 2.)
- [7] BREUILLARD, EMMANUEL. – On the joint spectral radius. In: Avila, Rassias, and Sinai (eds), *Analysis at Large*. Springer, Cham. 1–16 (2022). [DOI](#) [Zbl](#) (Cited on page 2.)
- [8] CHAS, MOIRA – [www.math.stonybrook.edu/~moira/NewApps/Fricke Polynomial/fricke.html](http://www.math.stonybrook.edu/~moira/NewApps/Fricke%20Polynomial/fricke.html) (Cited on page 9.)
- [9] CONTRERAS, GONZALO. – Ground states are generically a periodic orbit. *Invent. Math.* 205, no. 2, 383–412 (2016). [DOI](#) [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on page 3.)
- [10] DAUBECHIES, INGRID; LAGARIAS, JEFFREY C. – Sets of matrices all infinite products of which converge. *Linear Algebra Appl.* 161, 227–263 (1992). [DOI](#) [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on page 2.)
- [11] FENCHEL, WERNER – *Elementary geometry in hyperbolic space*. De Gruyter Studies in Mathematics, 11. Berlin etc.: Walter de Gruyter & Co. (1989). [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on page 12.)
- [12] FORMANEK, EDWARD – Polynomial identities and the Cayley-Hamilton theorem. *Math. Intell.* 11, no. 1, 37–39 (1989). [DOI](#) [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on page 9.)
- [13] GOLDMAN, WILLIAM M. – An exposition of results of Fricke and Vogt. [arXiv:math/0402103](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0402103) (Cited on pages 8 and 11.)
- [14] GUGLIELMI, NICOLA; PROTASOV, VLADIMIR – Exact computation of joint spectral characteristics of linear operators. *Found. Comput. Math.* 13 (2013), no. 1, 37–97. [DOI](#) [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on page 2.)
- [15] GUGLIELMI, NICOLA; PROTASOV, VLADIMIR – Invariant polytopes of sets of matrices with applications to regularity of wavelets and subdivisions. *SIAM J. Matr. Anal. Appl.* 37 (2016), no. 1, 18–52. [DOI](#) [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on pages 2, 7, and 11.)
- [16] GUGLIELMI, NICOLA; ZENNARO, MARINO – Balanced complex polytopes and related vector and matrix norms. *J. Convex Anal.* 14, no. 4, 729–766 (2007). [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on page 7.)
- [17] HARE, KEVIN G.; MORRIS, IAN D.; SIDOROV, NIKITA; THEYS, JACQUES – An explicit counterexample to the Lagarias-Wang finiteness conjecture. *Adv. Math.* 226 (2011), 4667–4701. [DOI](#) [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on page 2.)
- [18] HORN, ROGER A.; JOHNSON, CHARLES R. – *Matrix analysis*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (2013). [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on page 12.)
- [19] HOROWITZ, ROBERT D. – Characters of free groups represented in the two-dimensional special linear group. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.* 25, 635–649 (1972). [DOI](#) [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on pages 3, 8, and 10.)
- [20] HUNT, BRIAN R.; OTT, EDWARD – Optimal periodic orbits of chaotic systems occur at low period. *Phys. Rev. E* 54, no. 1, 328–337 (1996). [DOI](#) (Cited on page 3.)
- [21] JENKINSON, OLIVER – Ergodic optimization. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* 15, no. 1, 197–224 (2006). [DOI](#) [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on page 3.)
- [22] JENKINSON, OLIVER; POLLICOTT, MARK – Joint spectral radius, Sturmian measures and the finiteness conjecture. *Ergodic Theory Dyn. Syst.* 38, no. 8, 3062–3100 (2018). [DOI](#) [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on page 2.)
- [23] JØRGENSEN, TROELS – Traces in 2-generator subgroups of $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$. *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.* 84, 339–343 (1982). [DOI](#) [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on page 9.)
- [24] JUNGERS, RAPHAËL – *The joint spectral radius: Theory and applications*. Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences, 385. Berlin: Springer-Verlag (2009). [MR](#) (Cited on page 2.)
- [25] KOZYAKIN, V.S. – Algebraic unsolvability of problem of absolute stability of desynchronized systems. *Autom. Remote Control* 51, no. 6, 754–759 (1990). [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on pages 1 and 2.)
- [26] KOZYAKIN, V. – A dynamical systems construction of a counterexample to the finiteness conjecture. *Proceedings of the 44th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control* (2005), pp. 2338–2343. [DOI](#) (Cited on page 2.)
- [27] LAGARIAS, JEFFREY C.; WANG, YANG – The finiteness conjecture for the generalized spectral radius of a set of matrices. *Linear Algebra Appl.* 214 (1995), 17–42. [DOI](#) [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on page 2.)
- [28] LAWTON, SEAN; LOUDER, LARSEN; MCREYNOLDS, D.B. – Decision problems, complexity, traces, and representations. *Groups Geom. Dyn.* 11, no. 1, 165–188 (2017). [DOI](#) [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on page 10.)

- [29] LISCHKE, GERHARD – Primitive words and roots of words. *Acta Univ. Sapientiae, Inform.* 3, no. 1, 5–34 (2011). [Zbl](#) (Cited on page 6.)
- [30] MAESUMI, MOHSEN. – Optimal norms and the computation of joint spectral radius of matrices. *Linear Algebra Appl.* 428, 2324–2338 (2008). [DOI](#) [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on page 2.)
- [31] MAGNUS, W. – The uses of 2 by 2 matrices in combinatorial group theory. A survey. *Result. Math.* 4, 171–192 (1981). [DOI](#) [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on page 8.)
- [32] MEJSTRIK, THOMAS – Algorithm 1011: Improved invariant polytope algorithm and applications. *ACM Trans. Math. Softw.* 46, no. 3, Article no. 29, 26 p. (2020). [DOI](#) [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on page 2.)
- [33] MEJSTRIK, THOMAS – ttoolboxes software, <http://gitlab.com/tommsch/ttoolboxes>. (Cited on page 13.)
- [34] MORRIS, IAN D. – Mather sets for sequences of matrices and applications to the study of joint spectral radii. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.* (3) 107, no. 1, 121–150 (2013). [DOI](#) [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on page 7.)
- [35] MORRIS, IAN D. – Prevalent uniqueness in ergodic optimisation. *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.* 149, no. 4, 1631–1639 (2021). [DOI](#) [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on page 3.)
- [36] MORRIS, IAN D.; SIDOROV, NIKITA – On a devil’s staircase associated to the joint spectral radii of a family of pairs of matrices. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* 15, no. 5, 1747–1782 (2013). [DOI](#) [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on page 13.)
- [37] *The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences*, sequences [A1371](#) and [A1037](#). (Cited on page 10.)
- [38] PGASSIAT – $\text{tr}(AABABB) = \text{tr}(AABBAB)$ for 2×2 matrices. *Mathematics StackExchange*, <http://math.stackexchange.com/q/29078> (version: 2011-12-04). (Cited on page 3.)
- [39] PLISCHKE, ELMAR; WIRTH, FABIAN – Duality results for the joint spectral radius and transient behavior. *Linear Algebra Appl.* 428, no. 10, 2368–2384 (2008). [DOI](#) [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on page 7.)
- [40] PROTASOV, VLADIMIR Y. – The Barabanov norm is generically unique, simple, and easily computed. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* 60, no. 4, 2246–2267 (2022). [DOI](#) [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on page 2.)
- [41] PROTASOV, V. YU. – The joint spectral radius and invariant sets of linear operators (in Russian). *Fundam. Prikl. Mat.* 2, no. 1, 205–231 (1996). [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on page 7.)
- [42] ROTA, GIAN-CARLO; STRANG, W. GILBERT – A note on the joint spectral radius. *Kon. Nederl. Acad. Wet. Proc.* 63 (1960), 379–381. [DOI](#) [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on page 1.)
- [43] SELINGER, PETER – Finite dimensional Hilbert spaces are complete for dagger compact closed categories. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.* 8 (2012), paper no. 6, 12 pp. [DOI](#) [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on page 3.)
- [44] SOUTHCOTT, J.B. – Trace polynomials of words in special linear groups. *J. Aust. Math. Soc., Ser. A* 28, 401–412 (1979). [DOI](#) [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on page 9.)
- [45] SYLVESTER, J.J. – On the involution of two matrices of the second order. *British Association Report, Southport* (1883). In: *The Collected Mathematical Papers of James Joseph Sylvester*, volume IV, Baker, H.F. (ed.), Cambridge University Press (1912), pp. 115–117. [Zbl](#) (Cited on page 8.)
- [46] TSITSIKLIS, JOHN N.; BLONDEL, VINCENT D. – The Lyapunov exponent and joint spectral radius of pairs of matrices are hard - when not impossible - to compute and to approximate. *Math. Control Signals Syst.* 10, no. 1, 31–40 (1997). [DOI](#) [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on page 1.)
- [47] VANKEERBERGHE, GUILLAUME; HENDRICKX, JULIEN; JUNGERS, RAPHAËL M. – JSR: a toolbox to compute the joint spectral radius. *HSCC’14 – Proceedings of the 17th ACM international conference on hybrid systems: computation and control* New York, NY: Association for Computing Machinery. 151–156 (2014). [DOI](#) [Zbl](#) (Cited on page 2.)
- [48] YUAN, GUOCHENG; HUNT, BRIAN R. – Optimal orbits of hyperbolic systems. *Nonlinearity* 12, no. 4, 1207–1224 (1999). [DOI](#) [Zbl](#) [MR](#) (Cited on page 13.)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
 Email address: bochi@psu.edu, ppl15146@psu.edu