

First order spectral perturbation theory of square singular matrix polynomials*

Fernando De Terán^{a†} and Froilán M. Dopico^b

May 20, 2009

^a Departamento de Matemáticas, Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, Avda. Universidad 30, 28911 Leganés, Spain. (fteran@math.uc3m.es)

^b Instituto de Ciencias Matemáticas CSIC-UAM-UC3M-UCM and Departamento de Matemáticas, Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, Avda. Universidad 30, 28911 Leganés, Spain. (dopico@math.uc3m.es).

Abstract

We develop first order eigenvalue expansions of one-parametric perturbations of square singular matrix polynomials. Although the eigenvalues of a singular matrix polynomial $P(\lambda)$ are not continuous functions of the entries of the coefficients of the polynomial, we show that for most perturbations they are indeed continuous. Given an eigenvalue λ_0 of $P(\lambda)$ we prove that, for generic perturbations $M(\lambda)$ of degree at most the degree of $P(\lambda)$, the eigenvalues of $P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda)$ admit convergent series expansions near λ_0 and we describe the first order term of these expansions in terms of $M(\lambda_0)$ and certain particular bases of the left and right null spaces of $P(\lambda_0)$. In the important case of λ_0 being a semisimple eigenvalue of $P(\lambda)$ any bases of the left and right null spaces of $P(\lambda_0)$ can be used, and the first order term of the eigenvalue expansions takes a simple form. In this situation we also obtain the limit vector of the associated eigenvector expansions.

Key words. matrix polynomial eigenvalue problem, perturbation, Puiseux expansions, singular matrix polynomials

AMS subject classification. 15A18, 47A56, 65F15, 65F22

1 Introduction

We consider square matrix polynomials of degree ℓ

$$P(\lambda) = A_0 + \lambda A_1 + \cdots + \lambda^\ell A_\ell,$$

with $A_i \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ and $A_\ell \neq 0$. The matrix polynomial $P(\lambda)$ is *singular* if $\det P(\lambda)$ is identically zero as a polynomial in λ . Otherwise $P(\lambda)$ is *regular*. The *normal rank* of $P(\lambda)$ —from now

*This work was partially supported by the Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia of Spain through grant MTM-2006-06671 and the PRICIT program of Comunidad de Madrid through grant SIMUMAT (S-0505/ESP/0158) (Froilán M. Dopico), and by the Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia of Spain through grant MTM-2006-05361 (Fernando De Terán).

[†]Corresponding author

on, denoted by $\text{nrank } P(\lambda)$ —is the dimension of the largest non identically zero minor of $P(\lambda)$, and a *finite eigenvalue* of $P(\lambda)$ is a number $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\text{rank } P(\lambda_0) < \text{nrank } P(\lambda).$$

If $P(\lambda)$ is regular then the finite eigenvalues of $P(\lambda)$ are the roots of the polynomial $\det P(\lambda)$, but this is no longer true for singular matrix polynomials. As a consequence, the eigenvalues of regular matrix polynomials are continuous functions of the entries of the matrix coefficients of the polynomial, because the roots of a scalar polynomial are continuous functions of the coefficients of the polynomial. This continuity is lost for the eigenvalues of singular matrix polynomials. See [8] for examples in the case of polynomials of degree one.

We think that this lack of continuity in the eigenvalues is one of the main reasons why eigenvalue perturbation theory for singular matrix polynomials—and, in particular, for singular matrix pencils—has not been addressed jointly with eigenvalue perturbation theory for regular polynomials. In fact, the literature about perturbations of the regular polynomial eigenvalue problem has increased appreciably in the past few years (see, for example [22, 14, 4, 2, 12, 16] and the references therein). This has not had a counterpart for singular matrix polynomials, and we do not know any reference dealing with perturbations of eigenvalues of singular matrix polynomials of degree greater than one. On the other hand, the eigenvalues of singular matrix polynomials appear in several applications, as for instance in Linear Systems and Control Theory (see, for example [9, 25, 24]), and, therefore, the study of their perturbations is of interest.

We will see in this paper that we can reduce the perturbation analysis of the eigenvalues of a singular matrix polynomial to the study of the perturbations of the roots of a scalar polynomial as in the regular case. In order to explain this fact we will make use of the notions of algebraic geometry underlying eigenvalue perturbation theory. We will consider small perturbations of the singular $n \times n$ matrix polynomial $P(\lambda)$ of the form $\epsilon M(\lambda)$, where ϵ is a small parameter and $M(\lambda)$ is also an $n \times n$ matrix polynomial. For most perturbations $M(\lambda)$ the perturbed polynomial

$$P(\lambda, \epsilon) = P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda) \tag{1}$$

is regular, so its eigenvalues are the roots (in λ) of $\det P(\lambda, \epsilon)$. We may see the polynomial equation $f(\lambda, \epsilon) := \det P(\lambda, \epsilon) = 0$ as an algebraic curve in \mathbb{C}^2 . If $f(\lambda, 0)$ were not identically zero, then around each root, λ_0 , of $f(\lambda, 0)$ there would exist a certain number of *branches*, i.e., power series expansions in ϵ , denoted by $\lambda(\epsilon)$, satisfying $\lambda(0) = \lambda_0$ and $f(\lambda(\epsilon), \epsilon) \equiv 0$ [15, § 12.1]. These branches are usually called *Puiseux branches*. However, in our case, $f(\lambda, 0) \equiv 0$ because $P(\lambda)$ is singular, and we need to *regularize* the problem before considering *Puiseux branches*. To this purpose, we will prove that there exists a natural number k such that the polynomial $f(\lambda, \epsilon)$ can be written as

$$f(\lambda, \epsilon) = \epsilon^k \tilde{f}(\lambda, \epsilon),$$

where $\tilde{f}(\lambda, \epsilon)$ is a polynomial such that $\tilde{f}(\lambda, 0)$ is not identically zero for generic perturbations $M(\lambda)$. Then, the problem is regularized by considering, for $\epsilon \neq 0$, the polynomial equation $\tilde{f}(\lambda, \epsilon) = 0$ instead of $f(\lambda, \epsilon) = 0$. More precisely, we will show that the set of roots of $\tilde{f}(\lambda, \epsilon)$ includes branches $\lambda(\epsilon)$ such that $\lambda(0)$ are the eigenvalues of $P(\lambda)$. The set of perturbations $M(\lambda)$ such that the eigenvalues of $P(\lambda)$ change continuously with ϵ consists of those perturbations for which $\tilde{f}(\lambda, 0)$ is not identically zero for a certain value of the exponent k . We will see that this set is *generic* in the set of all perturbations $M(\lambda)$ of degree at most the degree of $P(\lambda)$. The precise meaning of this sentence is that this set is the complementary of a certain proper algebraic manifold in the vector space of matrix polynomials of degree at most the degree of $P(\lambda)$.

Once the existence of expansions around the eigenvalues of $P(\lambda)$ is established through the condition $\tilde{f}(\lambda, 0) \not\equiv 0$, we will study the first order terms in these expansions. We will

consider first the most important case of a semisimple eigenvalue λ_0 of $P(\lambda)$ of geometric multiplicity g . This case is covered in Theorem 3, which is the main result in this paper. There, we will see that, generically, there are g eigenvalues of $P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda)$ with expansions

$$\lambda(\epsilon) = \lambda_0 + c\epsilon + o(\epsilon), \quad (2)$$

where the leading coefficients $c \in \mathbb{C}$ in (2) are the eigenvalues of a certain regular matrix pencil that can be easily constructed through $M(\lambda_0)$ and arbitrary bases of the left and right nullspaces of the matrix $P(\lambda_0)$. If $P(\lambda)$ is a regular matrix polynomial and λ_0 is simple, then Theorem 3 reduces to the well-known formula $c = -(vM(\lambda_0)u)/(vP'(\lambda_0)u)$, where v and u are, respectively, left and right eigenvectors of $P(\lambda)$ associated with λ_0 [22, p. 345]. We defer to Section 6 the study of the first order terms of the perturbation expansions of arbitrary defective eigenvalues. The reason is that these terms are obtained by means of the eigenvalues of certain matrix pencils that are very difficult to construct in practice. Therefore the applicability of these results is limited, although they are interesting from a theoretical point view.

A different approach to study the perturbation of eigenvalues of matrix polynomials is through the use of *linearizations*. Linearizations have shown to be a useful tool in the regular Polynomial Eigenvalue Problem and they have been the object of intense research in the past few years (see [13] and [16] and the references therein). Linearizations of square singular matrix polynomials have been considered recently in [3, 6, 7]. The set of linearizations studied in [7] allow us to recover the complete eigenstructure of the matrix polynomial, in particular all the eigenvalues. With this approach the singular Polynomial Eigenvalue Problem is translated into a singular Generalized Eigenvalue Problem, but a main unsolved question in this context is to compare the conditioning of these two problems. The first step towards the answer of this question is to know how the eigenvalues change in these two problems and to compare both results. The present paper and the precedent one [8] go in this direction. For regular matrix polynomials a detailed comparison between the conditioning of the eigenvalues of the matrix polynomial and the conditioning of the eigenvalues of certain families of linearizations has been performed in [13]. On the contrary, in the singular case there is an intrinsic difficulty in defining the condition number of eigenvalues due to the fact that arbitrarily small perturbations may produce arbitrarily large changes in the eigenvalues, and the problem remains open.

Eigenvectors are not defined for singular matrix polynomials, even for simple eigenvalues. In the case of polynomials of degree one, it is known that the concept of *reducing subspace* is the correct one to be used [23]. A counterpart idea for singular polynomials of higher degree has not been established. As a consequence, a *generic* perturbation theory for eigenvectors of singular matrix polynomials cannot be developed. However, by taking into account that the perturbed polynomial (1) is generically regular, its eigenvectors, $v(\epsilon)$, are perfectly defined, and it is natural to ask how are these eigenvectors related to properties of the unperturbed polynomial $P(\lambda)$ when ϵ is close to zero. We answer this question in Section 5 by determining $v(0)$.

Our work is the natural generalization of the results in reference [8] to singular matrix polynomials of degree greater than one. Although the techniques used in [8] are closely related to the ones that we will use in this work, there is also a fundamental difference: the Kronecker Canonical Form of matrix pencils [10] plays a relevant role in [8], while this is not the case in this work because an analogous canonical form is not defined for matrix polynomials. In addition, the present work is based on results contained in the reference by Langer and Najman [18], where the authors determined the first order term of the eigenvalue expansions for one-parametric perturbations of *regular* analytic matrix functions. It can be said briefly that, after regularizing the problem as described above, our work consists in applying the techniques introduced in [18], and in developing some algebraic concepts that allow us to express the first order terms in a compact way in the case of semisimple eigenvalues. Our expression of the first order terms is influenced by the work of Lancaster, Markus, and Zhou [17] on semisimple eigenvalues of regular analytic matrix functions.

Finally, we stress again that although eigenvalue perturbation theory of singular pencils has been studied before in [8], and in a few previous works by Sun [20, 21], Demmel and Kågström [5], and Stewart [19], we do not know any reference about perturbation theory of eigenvalues of singular matrix polynomials of arbitrary degree.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the basic definitions and notation. The existence of eigenvalue expansions is studied in Section 3. The generic first order terms of the expansions of semisimple eigenvalues are derived in Section 4. The limits when ϵ tends to zero of the eigenvectors of the perturbed regular polynomial $P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda)$ are considered in Section 5. Results for arbitrary eigenvalues are discussed in Section 6. The final Section 7 includes some comments on the extension of the present work to singular matrix functions analytic in a neighborhood of a given eigenvalue.

2 Definitions and notation

In this section we introduce the basic tools and definitions used in the paper. Given an $n \times n$ matrix polynomial $P(\lambda)$ there exist two $n \times n$ matrix polynomials $U(\lambda)$ and $V(\lambda)$ with nonzero constant determinant such that

$$U(\lambda)P(\lambda)V(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} U_1(\lambda) \\ U_2(\lambda) \end{bmatrix} P(\lambda) [V_1(\lambda) \ V_2(\lambda)] \equiv \begin{bmatrix} D_S(\lambda) & 0 \\ 0 & 0_{d \times d} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

where $D_S(\lambda) = \text{diag}(h_1(\lambda), \dots, h_r(\lambda))$, and the dimensions of $U_1(\lambda)$ and $V_1(\lambda)$ are chosen accordingly. The diagonal entries of $D_S(\lambda)$, $h_i(\lambda)$, $i = 1, \dots, r$, are nonzero monic polynomials satisfying $h_i(\lambda) | h_{i+1}(\lambda)$, i.e., $h_i(\lambda)$ divides $h_{i+1}(\lambda)$, for $i = 1, \dots, r-1$ [10, Ch. VI] [11, Ch. S1]. These polynomials are called the *invariant polynomials* of $P(\lambda)$, and the diagonal matrix in the right hand side of (3) is called the *Smith canonical form* of $P(\lambda)$. This form is unique. Notice that the normal rank of $P(\lambda)$ is the number, r , of invariant polynomials. If each

$$h_i(\lambda) = (\lambda - \lambda_1)^{\nu_{i1}} \cdots (\lambda - \lambda_q)^{\nu_{iq}}, \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, r, \quad (4)$$

is decomposed in powers of different irreducible factors, then those factors among $(\lambda - \lambda_1)^{\nu_{i1}}, \dots, (\lambda - \lambda_q)^{\nu_{iq}}, \dots, (\lambda - \lambda_1)^{\nu_{r1}}, \dots, (\lambda - \lambda_q)^{\nu_{rq}}$ with $\nu_{ij} > 0$ are called the *elementary divisors of $P(\lambda)$* . The roots of the invariant polynomials of $P(\lambda)$ are the finite eigenvalues of $P(\lambda)$, so each elementary divisor is associated with a finite eigenvalue (its root). Based on the elementary divisors we introduce the following definitions.

Definition 1 *Let λ_0 be a finite eigenvalue of the matrix polynomial $P(\lambda)$. Then the number of elementary divisors of $P(\lambda)$ associated with λ_0 is the geometric multiplicity of λ_0 , and the sum of the degrees of these elementary divisors is the algebraic multiplicity of λ_0 . The eigenvalue λ_0 is semisimple if all the elementary divisors associated with λ_0 are linear.*

It is easy to see that the geometric multiplicity of λ_0 is equal to the difference $\text{nrnk } P(\lambda) - \text{rank } P(\lambda_0)$.

We will say that $P(\lambda)$ has an *infinite eigenvalue* if the *dual polynomial* $P^\sharp(\lambda) = \lambda^\ell P(1/\lambda)$ has a zero eigenvalue, and the elementary divisors of $P(\lambda)$ associated with the infinite eigenvalue are the elementary divisors of $P^\sharp(\lambda)$ associated with zero. In this paper, we will focus on finite eigenvalues, although similar results can be obtained for the infinite eigenvalue by considering the dual polynomials. The reader is invited to read [8, Section 5.3] to see how this can be accomplished in matrix pencils.

Let g be the geometric multiplicity of the finite eigenvalue λ_0 of $P(\lambda)$, and $0 < m_1 \leq m_2 \leq \dots \leq m_g$ be the degrees of the elementary divisors associated with λ_0 . Then, after an elementary permutation, the Smith canonical form in the right hand side of (3) can be written as

$$\text{diag}((\lambda - \lambda_0)^{m_1} q_1(\lambda), \dots, (\lambda - \lambda_0)^{m_g} q_g(\lambda), q_{g+1}(\lambda), \dots, q_r(\lambda), 0, \dots, 0),$$

Lemma 1 a) Let $\{v_1(\lambda), \dots, v_d(\lambda)\}$ and $\{\tilde{v}_1(\lambda), \dots, \tilde{v}_d(\lambda)\}$ be two polynomial bases of $\mathcal{N}(P)$ and $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$ be a fixed number. If the sets $\{v_1(\mu), \dots, v_d(\mu)\}$ and $\{\tilde{v}_1(\mu), \dots, \tilde{v}_d(\mu)\}$ are linearly independent, then $\text{Span}\{v_1(\mu), \dots, v_d(\mu)\} = \text{Span}\{\tilde{v}_1(\mu), \dots, \tilde{v}_d(\mu)\}$.

b) Let $\{u_1(\lambda), \dots, u_d(\lambda)\}$ and $\{\tilde{u}_1(\lambda), \dots, \tilde{u}_d(\lambda)\}$ be two polynomial bases of $\mathcal{N}_T(P)$ and $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$ be a fixed number. If the sets $\{u_1(\mu), \dots, u_d(\mu)\}$ and $\{\tilde{u}_1(\mu), \dots, \tilde{u}_d(\mu)\}$ are linearly independent, then $\text{Span}\{u_1(\mu), \dots, u_d(\mu)\} = \text{Span}\{\tilde{u}_1(\mu), \dots, \tilde{u}_d(\mu)\}$.

Remark 1 Lemma 1 is still true if the vector subspaces $\mathcal{N}(P)$ and $\mathcal{N}_T(P)$ of $\mathbb{C}^n(\lambda)$ are replaced with any arbitrary vector subspaces of $\mathbb{C}^n(\lambda)$. Nonetheless, we have preferred to enunciate it for the right and left null spaces of $P(\lambda)$ because we are only interested in these particular subspaces.

If μ is not an eigenvalue of the singular matrix polynomial $P(\lambda)$ then the subspaces considered in Lemma 1 are the corresponding null spaces, i.e., $\text{Span}\{v_1(\mu), \dots, v_d(\mu)\} = \mathcal{N}(P(\mu))$ and $\text{Span}\{u_1(\mu), \dots, u_d(\mu)\} = \mathcal{N}_T(P(\mu))$. This is not true if μ is an eigenvalue of $P(\lambda)$, and in this case $\text{Span}\{v_1(\mu), \dots, v_d(\mu)\}$ and $\text{Span}\{u_1(\mu), \dots, u_d(\mu)\}$ are proper subspaces of $\mathcal{N}(P(\mu))$ and $\mathcal{N}_T(P(\mu))$, respectively. Anyway, Lemma 1 allows us to establish the following definition.

Definition 3 Let $P(\lambda)$ be an $n \times n$ singular matrix polynomial and λ_0 be an eigenvalue of $P(\lambda)$. Let $\{v_1(\lambda), \dots, v_d(\lambda)\}$ (resp. $\{u_1(\lambda), \dots, u_d(\lambda)\}$) be a polynomial basis of $\mathcal{N}(P)$ (resp. $\mathcal{N}_T(P)$) such that $\{v_1(\lambda_0), \dots, v_d(\lambda_0)\}$ (resp. $\{u_1(\lambda_0), \dots, u_d(\lambda_0)\}$) is linearly independent. The vector subspace $\text{Span}\{v_1(\lambda_0), \dots, v_d(\lambda_0)\} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ (resp. $\text{Span}\{u_1(\lambda_0), \dots, u_d(\lambda_0)\}$) will be called the right singular space of $P(\lambda)$ at λ_0 (resp. left singular space of $P(\lambda)$ at λ_0).

Let us relate the singular spaces of $P(\lambda)$ with the matrices $U(\lambda)$ and $V(\lambda)$ transforming $P(\lambda)$ into its Smith canonical form as in (3). Since both $U(\lambda)$ and $V(\lambda)$ are nonsingular, it is immediate to see that the last d rows of $U(\lambda)$ and the last d columns of $V(\lambda)$ are bases of, respectively, $\mathcal{N}_T(P)$ and $\mathcal{N}(P)$. Lemma 2 below uses this fact to obtain bases of the left and right singular spaces of $P(\lambda)$ at λ_0 . From these bases we will get bases of the complete spaces $\mathcal{N}_T(P(\lambda_0))$ and $\mathcal{N}(P(\lambda_0))$ by adding some vectors from $U(\lambda_0)$ and $V(\lambda_0)$.

Lemma 2 Let $P(\lambda)$ be an $n \times n$ singular matrix polynomial with local Smith form $\Delta(\lambda)$ at

the eigenvalue λ_0 given by (6). Let $W(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} w_1(\lambda) \\ \vdots \\ w_n(\lambda) \end{bmatrix}$ and $V(\lambda) = [v_1(\lambda) \ \dots \ v_n(\lambda)]$

be the matrices transforming $P(\lambda)$ into $\Delta(\lambda)$, where $w_i(\lambda)$ denotes a row vector and $v_i(\lambda)$ a column vector for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then the following statements hold.

- a) The sets of vectors $\{w_{n-d+1}(\lambda_0), \dots, w_n(\lambda_0)\}$ and $\{v_{n-d+1}(\lambda_0), \dots, v_n(\lambda_0)\}$ are bases of, respectively, the left and the right singular spaces of $P(\lambda)$ at λ_0 .
- b) The sets of vectors $\{w_1(\lambda_0), \dots, w_g(\lambda_0), w_{n-d+1}(\lambda_0), \dots, w_n(\lambda_0)\}$ and $\{v_1(\lambda_0), \dots, v_g(\lambda_0), v_{n-d+1}(\lambda_0), \dots, v_n(\lambda_0)\}$ are bases of, respectively, $\mathcal{N}_T(P(\lambda_0))$ and $\mathcal{N}(P(\lambda_0))$.

Proof. We will only prove the result for the left basis, because the arguments for the right one are similar. The last d rows of $U(\lambda)$ in (3) constitute a polynomial basis of $\mathcal{N}_T(P)$ and, since $U(\lambda_0)$ is nonsingular, Lemma 1 implies that the last d rows of $U(\lambda_0)$ are a basis of the left singular space of $P(\lambda)$ at λ_0 . Recall that

$$W(\lambda_0) = \text{diag}(1/q_1(\lambda_0), \dots, 1/q_r(\lambda_0), 1, \dots, 1)U(\lambda_0),$$

so the last d rows of $W(\lambda_0)$ are equal to the last d rows of $U(\lambda_0)$, and therefore they also form a basis of the left singular space of $P(\lambda)$ at λ_0 .

The claim b) follows from the definition of the local Smith form at λ_0 in (6) and the fact that $W(\lambda_0)$ and $V(\lambda_0)$ are nonsingular. \square

2.2 A particular relationship for semisimple eigenvalues

In Section 4 we will make use of the specific result for semisimple eigenvalues presented in Lemma 3.

Lemma 3 *Let $W(\lambda)$ and $V(\lambda)$ be as in the statement of Lemma 2 and assume, in addition, that the eigenvalue λ_0 of $P(\lambda)$ is semisimple. Then*

$$\begin{bmatrix} w_1(\lambda_0) \\ \vdots \\ w_g(\lambda_0) \\ w_{n-d+1}(\lambda_0) \\ \vdots \\ w_n(\lambda_0) \end{bmatrix} P'(\lambda_0) \begin{bmatrix} v_1(\lambda_0) & \dots & v_g(\lambda_0) & v_{n-d+1}(\lambda_0) & \dots & v_n(\lambda_0) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I_g & \\ & 0_{d \times d} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Proof. Taking derivatives in the identity $W(\lambda)P(\lambda)V(\lambda) = \Delta(\lambda)$, where $\Delta(\lambda)$ is given by (7), we achieve

$$W'(\lambda)P(\lambda)V(\lambda) + W(\lambda)P'(\lambda)V(\lambda) + W(\lambda)P(\lambda)V'(\lambda) = \Delta'(\lambda). \quad (8)$$

By using Lemma 2 b) we obtain $w_i(\lambda_0)P(\lambda_0) = 0$ and $P(\lambda_0)v_i(\lambda_0) = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, g, n - d + 1, \dots, n$, and from (7) that

$$\Delta'(\lambda_0) = \begin{bmatrix} I_g & \\ & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Now the result follows from evaluating at λ_0 the equation (8). \square

Let us illustrate the definitions introduced in this section with an example.

Example 1 *Let $P(\lambda)$ be the following 3×3 singular matrix polynomial of degree two:*

$$P(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda^2 & \lambda & 0 \\ \lambda & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \lambda^2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

This polynomial has normal rank equal to 2 and the simple finite eigenvalue $\lambda_0 = 0$ of geometric multiplicity 1.

Polynomial bases of the left and the right null spaces $\mathcal{N}_T(P)$ and $\mathcal{N}(P)$ are given, respectively, by $y(\lambda) = [1 \ -\lambda \ 0]$ and $x(\lambda) = [\lambda \ -\lambda^2 \ 1]^T$.

Since $y(0)$ and $x(0)$ are nonzero vectors, the left singular space of $P(\lambda)$ at 0 is spanned by $y(0) = [1 \ 0 \ 0]$ and the right singular space of $P(\lambda)$ at 0 is spanned by $x(0) = [0 \ 0 \ 1]^T$. We can complete these bases to bases of the whole null spaces of $P(0)$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{N}_T(P(0)) = \text{span} \left\{ [0 \ -1 \ 1], [1 \ 0 \ 0] \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{N}(P(0)) = \text{span} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} -1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\}.$$

The local Smith form of $P(\lambda)$ at $\lambda_0 = 0$ is

$$\Delta(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda & & \\ & 1 & \\ & & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

and we have $W(\lambda)P(\lambda)V(\lambda) = \Delta(\lambda)$, with

$$W(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & -\lambda & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad V(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 & \lambda \\ \lambda & 1 & -\lambda^2 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Notice that the previous bases of $\mathcal{N}_T(P(0))$ and $\mathcal{N}(P(0))$ are given by, respectively, $\{w_1(0), w_3(0)\}$ and $\{v_1(0), v_3(0)\}$.

3 Existence of eigenvalue expansions

This section is devoted to one of the central problems of the present paper, i.e., to study the existence of perturbation expansions near the eigenvalues of a singular $n \times n$ matrix polynomial $P(\lambda)$. Our approach is similar to the one followed in [8, Section 3] for matrix pencils, and the reader is referred to [8] for some details that are omitted here.

Given a singular $n \times n$ matrix polynomial $P(\lambda)$ we will obtain sufficient conditions on the perturbation polynomial $M(\lambda)$ that guarantee that all the eigenvalues of $P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda)$ can be expanded as (fractional) power series in ϵ , and that when these series are evaluated at $\epsilon = 0$ all the eigenvalues (finite and infinite) of $P(\lambda)$ are obtained, together with some other numbers or infinities that are not eigenvalues of $P(\lambda)$ and are fully determined by the perturbation $M(\lambda)$. This result will be presented in Theorem 1, which is the generalization of Theorem 1 in [8] to square singular matrix polynomials. Before, we need to establish the technical Lemma 4 that proves that the sufficient condition for the existence of expansions holds simultaneously in a matrix polynomial and its dual. This implies that the existence of expansions of finite and infinite eigenvalues are simultaneously guaranteed.

Lemma 4 *Let $P(\lambda)$ be an $n \times n$ matrix polynomial of degree ℓ with Smith canonical form given by (3), $P^\sharp(\lambda)$ be its dual polynomial, and $M(\lambda)$ be another $n \times n$ matrix polynomial. Let us consider the Smith canonical form of $P^\sharp(\lambda)$,*

$$\tilde{U}(\lambda)P^\sharp(\lambda)\tilde{V}(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{U}_1(\lambda) \\ \tilde{U}_2(\lambda) \end{bmatrix} P^\sharp(\lambda) [\tilde{V}_1(\lambda) \tilde{V}_2(\lambda)] \equiv \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{D}_S(\lambda) & 0 \\ 0 & 0_{d \times d} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

partitioned in blocks with dimensions as those in (3). Then $\det(U_2(\lambda)M(\lambda)V_2(\lambda)) \neq 0$ if and only if $\det(\tilde{U}_2(\lambda)M^\sharp(\lambda)\tilde{V}_2(\lambda)) \neq 0$.

Proof. Note first that the definition of dual polynomial implies that $\mathcal{N}(P(\mu)) = \mathcal{N}(P^\sharp(1/\mu))$ and $\mathcal{N}_T(P(\mu)) = \mathcal{N}_T(P^\sharp(1/\mu))$, for any number $0 \neq \mu \in \mathbb{C}$. Recall also that λ_0 is an eigenvalue of $P(\lambda)$ if and only if $1/\lambda_0$ is an eigenvalue of $P^\sharp(\lambda)$.

Let $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$ be a number such that $\mu \neq 0$ and μ is not an eigenvalue of $P(\lambda)$. In this case the columns of $V_2(\mu)$ (resp. the rows of $U_2(\mu)$) form a basis of $\mathcal{N}(P(\mu))$ (resp. of $\mathcal{N}_T(P(\mu))$) and the columns of $\tilde{V}_2(1/\mu)$ (resp. the rows of $\tilde{U}_2(1/\mu)$) form a basis of $\mathcal{N}(P^\sharp(1/\mu))$ (resp. of $\mathcal{N}_T(P^\sharp(1/\mu))$). As a consequence there exist nonsingular $d \times d$ matrices T and S such that $\tilde{V}_2(1/\mu) = V_2(\mu)T$ and $\tilde{U}_2(1/\mu) = S U_2(\mu)$. So

$$\begin{aligned} \det(U_2(\mu)M(\mu)V_2(\mu)) \neq 0 &\iff \det(\tilde{U}_2(1/\mu)M(\mu)\tilde{V}_2(1/\mu)) \neq 0 \\ &\iff \det(\tilde{U}_2(1/\mu)M^\sharp(1/\mu)\tilde{V}_2(1/\mu)) \neq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $M(\mu) = \mu^k M^\sharp(1/\mu)$ with k the degree of $M(\lambda)$.

Finally observe that $p(\lambda) = \det(U_2(\lambda)M(\lambda)V_2(\lambda))$ and $\tilde{p}(\lambda) = \det(\tilde{U}_2(\lambda)M^\sharp(\lambda)\tilde{V}_2(\lambda))$ are polynomials in λ . Therefore $p(\lambda)$ is not the zero polynomial if and only if $p(\mu) \neq 0$ for a number μ such that $\mu \neq 0$ and μ is not an eigenvalue of $P(\lambda)$. Analogously $\tilde{p}(\lambda)$ is not the zero polynomial if and only if $\tilde{p}(\gamma) \neq 0$ for a number γ such that $\gamma \neq 0$ and γ is not an eigenvalue of $P^\sharp(\lambda)$ \square

Theorem 1 *Let $P(\lambda)$ be an $n \times n$ singular matrix polynomial of degree ℓ whose Smith canonical form is given by (3), and $M(\lambda)$ be another $n \times n$ matrix polynomial of degree at most ℓ , and such that $\det(U_2(\lambda)M(\lambda)V_2(\lambda)) \neq 0$. Then*

1. *There exists a constant $b > 0$ such that the matrix polynomial $P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda)$ is regular whenever $0 < |\epsilon| < b$.*
2. *For $0 < |\epsilon| < b$ the finite eigenvalues of $P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda)$ are the roots of a polynomial in λ , $p_\epsilon(\lambda)$, whose coefficients are polynomials in ϵ . In addition, when $\epsilon = 0$,*

$$p_0(\lambda) = \det(D_S(\lambda)) \det(U_2(\lambda)M(\lambda)V_2(\lambda)). \quad (10)$$

3. Let ϵ be such that $0 < |\epsilon| < b$. Then the $n\ell$ eigenvalues¹, $\{\lambda_1(\epsilon), \dots, \lambda_{n\ell}(\epsilon)\}$, of $P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda)$ can be expanded as (fractional) power series in ϵ . Some of these series may have terms with negative exponents and tend to ∞ as ϵ tends to zero. The rest of the series converge in a neighborhood of $\epsilon = 0$.
4. If the finite eigenvalues of $P(\lambda)$ are $\{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_s\}$, where common elements are repeated according to their algebraic multiplicity, then there exists a subset $\{\lambda_{i_1}(\epsilon), \dots, \lambda_{i_s}(\epsilon)\}$ of $\{\lambda_1(\epsilon), \dots, \lambda_{n\ell}(\epsilon)\}$ such that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lambda_{i_j}(\epsilon) = \mu_j \quad j = 1, \dots, s.$$

5. If the polynomial $P(\lambda)$ has an infinite eigenvalue with algebraic multiplicity p , then there exist $\{\lambda_{l_1}(\epsilon), \dots, \lambda_{l_p}(\epsilon)\}$ such that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lambda_{l_j}(\epsilon) = \infty \quad j = 1, \dots, p.$$

Proof. The proof is exactly the same as the one of Theorem 1 in [8], only by changing matrix pencils by matrix polynomials. We include it here for the sake of completeness.

Let us partition $U(\lambda) M(\lambda) V(\lambda)$ conformally with (3) as

$$U(\lambda) M(\lambda) V(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} B_{11}(\lambda) & B_{12}(\lambda) \\ B_{21}(\lambda) & B_{22}(\lambda) \end{bmatrix}.$$

This means that $B_{22}(\lambda) = U_2(\lambda) M(\lambda) V_2(\lambda)$. Thus

$$\det(P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda)) = C \det \begin{bmatrix} D_S(\lambda) + \epsilon B_{11}(\lambda) & \epsilon B_{12}(\lambda) \\ \epsilon B_{21}(\lambda) & \epsilon B_{22}(\lambda) \end{bmatrix},$$

where C is the nonzero constant $C = 1/\det(U(\lambda) V(\lambda))$. Then

$$\det(P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda)) = C \epsilon^d \det \begin{bmatrix} D_S(\lambda) + \epsilon B_{11}(\lambda) & B_{12}(\lambda) \\ \epsilon B_{21}(\lambda) & B_{22}(\lambda) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let us define the polynomial in λ

$$p_\epsilon(\lambda) \equiv \det \begin{bmatrix} D_S(\lambda) + \epsilon B_{11}(\lambda) & B_{12}(\lambda) \\ \epsilon B_{21}(\lambda) & B_{22}(\lambda) \end{bmatrix},$$

whose coefficients are polynomials in ϵ , and write

$$\det(P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda)) = C \epsilon^d p_\epsilon(\lambda). \quad (11)$$

It is obvious that when $\epsilon = 0$

$$p_0(\lambda) = \det(D_S(\lambda)) \det(B_{22}(\lambda)). \quad (12)$$

We know that $\det(D_S(\lambda)) \neq 0$, and, therefore, $\det(B_{22}(\lambda)) \neq 0$ implies that $P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda)$ is regular in a punctured disk $0 < |\epsilon| < b$. This is obvious by continuity: if $\det(D_S(\mu)) \det(B_{22}(\mu)) \neq 0$ for some fixed number μ , then $p_\epsilon(\mu) \neq 0$ for ϵ small enough, since $p_\epsilon(\mu)$ is continuous as a function of ϵ . In addition, whenever $0 < |\epsilon| < b$, equation (11) implies that z is a finite eigenvalue of $P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda)$ if and only if $p_\epsilon(z) = 0$. So, the first and second items in Theorem 1 are proved.

Notice that we have reduced the original perturbation eigenvalue problem to the study of the variation of the roots of $p_\epsilon(\lambda)$ as ϵ tends to zero. But since the coefficients are polynomials in ϵ , this is a classical problem solved by Algebraic Function Theory [15]. In particular the

¹It is well known that any $n \times n$ regular matrix polynomial of degree ℓ has exactly $n\ell$ eigenvalues, if finite and infinite eigenvalues are counted with their multiplicities [11].

third item is a consequence of this theory (for infinite eigenvalues similar arguments can be applied to zero eigenvalues of dual polynomials). We just comment that if the degree of $p_\epsilon(\lambda)$ in λ is δ_1 and the degree of $\det(D_S(\lambda)) \det(B_{22}(\lambda))$ is $\delta_2 < \delta_1$, then $\delta_1 - \delta_2$ roots of $p_\epsilon(\lambda)$ tend to infinity when ϵ tends to zero². The fourth item is again a consequence of Algebraic Function Theory and (12), since those roots that remain finite have as limits the roots of $\det(D_S(\lambda)) \det(B_{22}(\lambda))$, and the roots of $\det(D_S(\lambda))$ are precisely the finite eigenvalues of $P(\lambda)$.

The last item can be proved by applying the previous results to the zero eigenvalue of the dual polynomial of $P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda)$, and taking into account that $\lambda_i(\epsilon)$ is an eigenvalue of $P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda)$ if and only if $1/\lambda_i(\epsilon)$ is an eigenvalue of the dual polynomial. \square

It can be seen from the proof of Theorem 1 that if the degree of the perturbation polynomial $M(\lambda)$ in the statement is $\tilde{\ell} > \ell$ then the result would be true, with the exception that $P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda)$ would have a number of eigenvalues equal to $n\tilde{\ell}$. We have enunciated the result with the restriction of $M(\lambda)$ having degree smaller than or equal to the degree of $P(\lambda)$, because we think that it is the natural situation in perturbation theory of matrix polynomials. Moreover, in this case, once $P(\lambda)$ is fixed, $\det(U_2(\lambda) M(\lambda) V_2(\lambda)) \neq 0$ is a generic condition on the set of perturbation polynomials $M(\lambda) = B_0 + \lambda B_1 + \dots + \lambda^\ell B_\ell$ of degree at most ℓ , because it does not hold only on the algebraic manifold defined by equating to zero all the coefficients of the polynomial $p(\lambda) = \det(U_2(\lambda) M(\lambda) V_2(\lambda))$. These coefficient are multivariate polynomials in the entries of B_0, B_1, \dots, B_ℓ .

4 Expansions for semisimple eigenvalues

In Section 3 we have obtained a global condition for the existence of expansions near all eigenvalues of $P(\lambda)$. In this section we focus on a given semisimple eigenvalue λ_0 of the singular square matrix polynomial $P(\lambda)$. We will obtain a specific generic condition for the existence of eigenvalue expansions near λ_0 . Assuming this condition holds, we will derive simple expressions for the first order terms of the expansions of those eigenvalues of the perturbed polynomial $P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda)$ whose limit is λ_0 when ϵ tends to zero.

Our main results will be based on the following construction. Throughout this section, λ_0 is a semisimple eigenvalue, of geometric multiplicity g , of the square singular matrix polynomial $P(\lambda)$. Let $\{w_{n-d+1}, \dots, w_n\}$ and $\{v_{n-d+1}, \dots, v_n\}$ be bases of, respectively, the left and the right singular spaces of $P(\lambda)$ at λ_0 . Then we can complete these bases to, respectively, a basis of $\mathcal{N}_T(P(\lambda_0))$ and a basis of $\mathcal{N}(P(\lambda_0))$:

$$\{w_1, \dots, w_g, w_{n-d+1}, \dots, w_n\} \quad \text{and} \quad \{v_1, \dots, v_g, v_{n-d+1}, \dots, v_n\}.$$

Recall that the vectors w_i are row vectors, whereas v_j are column vectors. Using these vectors we build up the matrices

$$\begin{bmatrix} W_1 \\ W_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ \vdots \\ w_g \\ w_{n-d+1} \\ \vdots \\ w_n \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad [V_1 \ V_2] = [v_1 \ \dots \ v_g \mid v_{n-d+1} \ \dots \ v_n], \quad (13)$$

with respective dimensions $(g+d) \times n$ and $n \times (g+d)$. Note that the vectors in item b) of Lemma 2 are particular cases of the bases in (13). The following result generalizes Lemma 3.

²This happens if $p_\epsilon(\lambda) = \sum_{k=0}^{\delta_1} q_k(\epsilon) \lambda^k$, where $q_k(\epsilon)$ are polynomials in ϵ such that $q_{\delta_1}(0) = q_{\delta_1-1}(0) = \dots = q_{\delta_2+1}(0) = 0$ but $q_{\delta_1}(\epsilon) \neq 0$. For all sufficiently small values of ϵ we have $q_{\delta_1}(\epsilon) \neq 0$, because the polynomial $q_{\delta_1}(\epsilon)$ has only a finite number of roots.

Lemma 5 Let $\begin{bmatrix} W_1 \\ W_2 \end{bmatrix}$ and $[V_1 \ V_2]$ be the matrices defined in (13). Then $W_1 P'(\lambda_0) V_2 = 0$, $W_2 P'(\lambda_0) V_1 = 0$, $W_2 P'(\lambda_0) V_2 = 0$, and $W_1 P'(\lambda_0) V_1$ is nonsingular.

Proof. Let $W(\lambda)$ and $V(\lambda)$ be as in the statement of Lemma 2. Then, there exist some matrices R_{11}, R_{12}, R_{22} and S_{11}, S_{21}, S_{22} , with $R_{11}, R_{22}, S_{11}, S_{22}$ nonsingular, such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} W_1 \\ W_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} R_{11} & R_{12} \\ 0 & R_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_1(\lambda_0) \\ \vdots \\ w_g(\lambda_0) \\ w_{n-d+1}(\lambda_0) \\ \vdots \\ w_n(\lambda_0) \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$[V_1 \ V_2] = [v_1(\lambda_0) \ \dots \ v_g(\lambda_0) \ v_{n-d+1}(\lambda_0) \ \dots \ v_n(\lambda_0)] \begin{bmatrix} S_{11} & 0 \\ S_{21} & S_{22} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Now, using Lemma 3, we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} W_1 \\ W_2 \end{bmatrix} P'(\lambda_0) [V_1 \ V_2] = \begin{bmatrix} R_{11} S_{11} & \\ & 0_{d \times d} \end{bmatrix},$$

and this concludes the proof. \square

From the matrices in (13) we define the $(g+d) \times (g+d)$ matrix,

$$\Phi = \begin{bmatrix} W_1 \\ W_2 \end{bmatrix} M(\lambda_0) [V_1 \ V_2]. \quad (14)$$

Associated with Φ we introduce the $(g+d) \times (g+d)$ matrix pencil

$$\mathcal{P}(\zeta) = \Phi + \zeta \begin{bmatrix} W_1 \\ W_2 \end{bmatrix} P'(\lambda_0) [V_1 \ V_2], \quad (15)$$

and note that, by virtue of Lemma 5,

$$\begin{bmatrix} W_1 \\ W_2 \end{bmatrix} P'(\lambda_0) [V_1 \ V_2] = \begin{bmatrix} W_1 P'(\lambda_0) V_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let us illustrate these definitions with an example.

Example 2 Let $P(\lambda)$ be the same polynomial as in Example 1 and set

$$M(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda & 1 & 1 - \lambda^2 \\ 2 + \lambda & 5 & \lambda^2 \\ 1 & 2\lambda & 4 + \lambda \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let also $W(\lambda)$ and $V(\lambda)$ be as in Example 1. Then for the unique finite eigenvalue $\lambda_0 = 0$ of $P(\lambda)$,

$$\Phi = \begin{bmatrix} w_1(0) \\ w_3(0) \end{bmatrix} M(0) [v_1(0) \ v_3(0)] = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 4 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$\mathcal{P}(\zeta) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 4 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} + \zeta \begin{bmatrix} w_1(0) \\ w_3(0) \end{bmatrix} P'(0) [v_1(0) \ v_3(0)] = \begin{bmatrix} 1 + \zeta & 4 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Lemma 6 states some relevant properties of the pencil $\mathcal{P}(\zeta)$ that are used in subsequent developments.

Lemma 6 Let Φ be the matrix defined in (14) and $\mathcal{P}(\zeta)$ the pencil in (15). Then the following statements hold.

- 1) $\mathcal{P}(\zeta)$ is regular and has exactly g finite eigenvalues if and only if the $d \times d$ matrix $W_2M(\lambda_0)V_2$ is nonsingular.
- 2) Assume that $W_2M(\lambda_0)V_2$ is nonsingular, then the g finite eigenvalues of $\mathcal{P}(\zeta)$ are all different from zero if and only if Φ is nonsingular.

Proof. Let us express

$$\Phi = \begin{bmatrix} C_{11} & C_{12} \\ C_{21} & W_2M(\lambda_0)V_2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

By Lemma 5 we have

$$\mathcal{P}(\zeta) = \Phi + \zeta \begin{bmatrix} W_1 \\ W_2 \end{bmatrix} P'(\lambda_0) \begin{bmatrix} V_1 & V_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} C_{11} + \zeta W_1P'(\lambda_0)V_1 & C_{12} \\ C_{21} & W_2M(\lambda_0)V_2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Therefore,

$$\det \mathcal{P}(\zeta) = \zeta^g \det(W_1P'(\lambda_0)V_1) \det(W_2M(\lambda_0)V_2) + \zeta^{g-1}b_{g-1} + \dots + \det \Phi, \quad (16)$$

where the coefficients b_{g-1}, \dots, b_1 in the previous polynomial are of no interest in this argument. Since $W_1P'(\lambda_0)V_1$ is nonsingular by Lemma 5, both claims follow easily. \square

Note that the pencil $\mathcal{P}(\zeta)$ depends on the particular choice of bases $\{W_1, W_2\}$ and $\{V_1, V_2\}$ of $\mathcal{N}_T(P(\lambda_0))$ and $\mathcal{N}(P(\lambda_0))$ that are used, but the property of $W_2M(\lambda_0)V_2$ being nonsingular is independent of the particular bases W_2 and V_2 of, respectively, the left and the right singular spaces of $P(\lambda)$ at λ_0 . The invertibility of $W_2M(\lambda_0)V_2$ plays an essential role in Theorem 2 below, and this result implies Theorem 3 which is the main result in this paper. Observe also that $\det(W_2M(\lambda_0)V_2) \neq 0$ implies that the assumption $\det(U_2(\lambda)M(\lambda)V_2(\lambda)) \neq 0$ in Theorem 1 holds.

Theorem 2 Let $P(\lambda)$ be an arbitrary $n \times n$ matrix polynomial and $M(\lambda)$ be another matrix polynomial of the same dimension. Let λ_0 be a finite semisimple eigenvalue of $P(\lambda)$ of geometric multiplicity g , $W = [W_1^T W_2^T]^T$ be a matrix whose rows form a basis of $\mathcal{N}_T(P(\lambda_0))$, and $V = [V_1 V_2]$ be a matrix whose columns form a basis of $\mathcal{N}(P(\lambda_0))$, where the rows of W_2 (resp. the columns of V_2) form a basis of the left (resp. the right) singular space of $P(\lambda)$ at λ_0 . Let also Φ be the matrix defined in (14) and $\mathcal{P}(\zeta)$ be the pencil defined in (15). If $W_2M(\lambda_0)V_2$ is nonsingular, then the perturbed matrix polynomial $P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda)$ is regular and has exactly g eigenvalues in a neighborhood of $\epsilon = 0$ satisfying

$$\lambda_j(\epsilon) = \lambda_0 + \zeta_j \epsilon + o(\epsilon) \quad j = 1, \dots, g, \quad (17)$$

where ζ_1, \dots, ζ_g are the finite eigenvalues of the pencil $\mathcal{P}(\zeta)$. If, in addition, Φ is nonsingular, then ζ_1, \dots, ζ_g are all nonzero and all the expansions near λ_0 have leading exponent equal to one. If $g = 1$, i.e., λ_0 is simple, then W_1 has only one row vector and V_1 only one column vector, and (17) simplifies to

$$\lambda(\epsilon) = \lambda_0 - \frac{\det(WM(\lambda_0)V)}{(W_1P'(\lambda_0)V_1) \cdot \det(W_2M(\lambda_0)V_2)} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2). \quad (18)$$

Proof. The property of $W_2M(\lambda_0)V_2$ being nonsingular is independent of the choice of bases W_2 and V_2 of the left and the right singular spaces of $P(\lambda)$ at λ_0 . In addition, the eigenvalues of the matrix pencil $\mathcal{P}(\zeta)$ are also independent of the bases $\{W_1, W_2\}$ and $\{V_1, V_2\}$. This means that we may consider the particular bases of $\mathcal{N}_T(P(\lambda_0))$ and $\mathcal{N}(P(\lambda_0))$ given by the rows and the columns (respectively) of the matrices $W(\lambda)$ and $V(\lambda)$ in the statement of Lemma 2. Recall also that these bases verify Lemma 3.

With this choice of bases is obvious that the invertibility of $W_2M(\lambda_0)V_2$ implies that $\det(U_2(\lambda)M(\lambda)V_2(\lambda)) \neq 0$ in Theorem 1 holds, and that the polynomial $p_0(\lambda)$ in (10) has

exactly g roots equal to λ_0 . Therefore, Theorem 1 guarantees that $P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda)$ is regular in a neighborhood of $\epsilon = 0$ and has exactly g eigenvalues whose expansions tend to λ_0 when ϵ tends to zero. Let us determine the first terms of these expansions.

The proof is similar to the one of Theorem 2 in [8], and it is based on the local Smith form. We restrict ourselves to the case $\lambda_0 = 0$. If $\lambda_0 \neq 0$, we just make a shift $\mu = \lambda - \lambda_0$ in the local Smith form: $W(\lambda - \lambda_0 + \lambda_0)P(\lambda - \lambda_0 + \lambda_0)V(\lambda - \lambda_0 + \lambda_0) = \Delta(\lambda - \lambda_0 + \lambda_0)$, define $\widetilde{W}(\mu) := W(\mu + \lambda_0)$, $\widetilde{V}(\mu) := V(\mu + \lambda_0)$, $\widetilde{P}(\mu) := P(\mu + \lambda_0)$, and $\widetilde{\Delta}(\mu) := \Delta(\mu + \lambda_0)$, and, finally, consider $\widetilde{W}(\mu)\widetilde{P}(\mu)\widetilde{V}(\mu) = \widetilde{\Delta}(\mu)$. Note that $\widetilde{W}(0) = W(\lambda_0)$ and $\widetilde{V}(0) = V(\lambda_0)$.

Assuming that $\lambda_0 = 0$, we consider the transformation to the local Smith form at $\lambda_0 = 0$,

$$W(\lambda)(P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda))V(\lambda) = \Delta(\lambda) + \epsilon W(\lambda)M(\lambda)V(\lambda) \equiv \widehat{\Delta}(\lambda) + G(\lambda, \epsilon), \quad (19)$$

where

$$\widehat{\Delta}(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda I_g & & \\ & 0 & \\ & & 0_{d \times d} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad G(\lambda, \epsilon) = \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon G_{11}(\lambda) & \epsilon G_{12}(\lambda) & \epsilon G_{13}(\lambda) \\ \epsilon G_{21}(\lambda) & I + \epsilon G_{22}(\lambda) & \epsilon G_{23}(\lambda) \\ \epsilon G_{31}(\lambda) & \epsilon G_{32}(\lambda) & \epsilon G_{33}(\lambda) \end{bmatrix}$$

are partitioned conformally, and $[G_{ij}(\lambda)]_{i,j=1}^3 = W(\lambda)M(\lambda)V(\lambda)$. Therefore, if $P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda)$ is regular, its finite eigenvalues are the roots of

$$f(\lambda, \epsilon) = \det(P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda)) = \delta(\lambda)\epsilon^d \widetilde{f}(\lambda, \epsilon),$$

where

$$\widetilde{f}(\lambda, \epsilon) = \det(\widehat{\Delta}(\lambda) + \widetilde{G}(\lambda, \epsilon))$$

and

$$\widetilde{G}(\lambda, \epsilon) = \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon G_{11}(\lambda) & \epsilon G_{12}(\lambda) & G_{13}(\lambda) \\ \epsilon G_{21}(\lambda) & I + \epsilon G_{22}(\lambda) & G_{23}(\lambda) \\ \epsilon G_{31}(\lambda) & \epsilon G_{32}(\lambda) & G_{33}(\lambda) \end{bmatrix}.$$

In addition, the function $\delta(\lambda)$ is given by $\delta(\lambda) = p(\lambda)q(\lambda)$ where, $\det(W(\lambda)) = 1/p(\lambda)$ and $\det(V(\lambda)) = 1/q(\lambda)$. So $\delta(\lambda)$ is a polynomial such that $\delta(0) \neq 0$ and that does not depend on the perturbation $M(\lambda)$. These facts imply that for $\epsilon \neq 0$, the polynomial $P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda)$ is regular if and only if $\widetilde{f}(\lambda, \epsilon) \neq 0$, and that, in this case, the eigenvalues of $P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda)$ whose limit is $\lambda_0 = 0$ as ϵ tends to zero are those zeros, $\lambda(\epsilon)$, of $\widetilde{f}(\lambda, \epsilon)$ whose limit is 0. Obviously, $\widetilde{f}(\lambda, \epsilon)$ is a rational function in λ , where the coefficients of the numerator are polynomials in ϵ , and the denominator is precisely $\delta(\lambda)$. So, $\widetilde{f}(\lambda, \epsilon)$ can be also seen as a polynomial in ϵ whose coefficients are rational functions in λ . Let us study more carefully the function $\widetilde{f}(\lambda, \epsilon)$.

In the first place, note that

$$\Phi = \begin{bmatrix} G_{11}(0) & G_{13}(0) \\ G_{31}(0) & G_{33}(0) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad W_2 M(0) V_2 = G_{33}(0). \quad (20)$$

We now make use of the Lemma in [18, p. 799] on determinants of the type $\det(D + G)$ with D diagonal, to expand $\widetilde{f}(\lambda, \epsilon)$ as

$$\widetilde{f}(\lambda, \epsilon) = \det \widetilde{G}(\lambda, \epsilon) + \sum \lambda^s \det \widetilde{G}(\lambda, \epsilon) (\{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_s\}^c), \quad (21)$$

where for any matrix C , $C(\{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_s\}^c)$ denotes the matrix obtained by removing from C the rows and columns with indices ν_1, \dots, ν_s . The sum runs over all $s \in \{1, \dots, g\}$ and all ν_1, \dots, ν_s such that $1 \leq \nu_1 < \dots < \nu_s \leq g$. Finally, note that

$$\det \widetilde{G}(\lambda, \epsilon) = \epsilon^g (\det \Phi + Q_0(\lambda, \epsilon)), \quad (22)$$

for $Q_0(\lambda, \epsilon)$ rational with $Q_0(0, 0) = 0$, and

$$\det \widetilde{G}(\lambda, \epsilon) (\{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_s\}^c) = \epsilon^{g-s} (\det \Phi (\{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_s\}^c) + Q_{\nu_1 \dots \nu_s}(\lambda, \epsilon)), \quad (23)$$

with $Q_{\nu_1 \dots \nu_s}(\lambda, \epsilon)$ rational and $Q_{\nu_1 \dots \nu_s}(0, 0) = 0$. In particular,

$$\det \tilde{G}(\lambda, \epsilon)(\{1, \dots, g\}^c) = \det G_{33}(0) + Q_{1, \dots, g}(\lambda, \epsilon).$$

From now on, it suffices to repeat the arguments in [18, pp. 799-800] by taking into account that in this case, $\det G_{33}(0) \neq 0$ because $W_2 M(0) V_2$ is nonsingular and, so, the point $(g, 0)$ appears in the Newton Polygon of $\tilde{f}(\lambda, \epsilon)$. This means that there are g eigenvalue expansions near $\lambda_0 = 0$. On the other hand, Φ nonsingular implies that also $(0, g)$ is in the Newton Polygon of $\tilde{f}(\lambda, \epsilon)$, so there is a line segment (whose extremal points are $(g, 0)$ and $(0, g)$), with slope equal to -1 and horizontal length equal to g . This implies the existence of exactly g expansions with leading exponent equal to 1 and whose leading coefficients are the ones described in the statement.

The expansion (18) in the case $g = 1$ follows from (16). The only point to justify is why $o(\epsilon)$ is replaced by $O(\epsilon^2)$. This follows from the fact that the polynomial (10) has only one root equal to zero, and so the corresponding root of $p_\epsilon(\lambda)$ is analytic in ϵ [15]. \square

The leading term of the eigenvalue expansion (18) for simple eigenvalues generalizes the already known expression for simple eigenvalues of regular matrix polynomials [22, p. 345], i.e.,

$$\lambda(\epsilon) = \lambda_0 - \epsilon \frac{wM(\lambda_0)v}{wP'(\lambda_0)v} + O(\epsilon^2),$$

where w and v are, respectively, the left and right eigenvectors associated with λ_0 .

Let us illustrate the application of Theorem 2 with an example.

Example 3 *We continue with Example 2. Here $W_2 M(0) V_2 = 1$ is nonsingular, or, equivalently, the pencil $\mathcal{P}(\zeta)$ is regular and has only one finite eigenvalue $\zeta_1 = -1$. This means that there is an unique eigenvalue of $P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda)$ approaching $\lambda_0 = 0$ of the form*

$$\lambda_1(\epsilon) = -\epsilon + O(\epsilon^2).$$

To ascertain the quality of this approximation, we have computed the eigenvalues of the pencil $P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda)$, for $\epsilon = 10^{-4}, 10^{-6}, 10^{-8}$ and 10^{-10} , solving the polynomial equation $\det(P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda)) = 0$ in the variable precision arithmetic of MATLAB with 64 decimal digits of precision, and rounding the results to 4, 6, 8, and 10 digits respectively. The root $\lambda_1(\epsilon)$ closest to zero in each of these cases is

$\epsilon = 10^{-4}$	$\epsilon = 10^{-6}$	$\epsilon = 10^{-8}$	$\epsilon = 10^{-10}$
$-0.9994 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$-0.999994 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$-0.99999994 \cdot 10^{-8}$	$-0.9999999994 \cdot 10^{-10}$

The main assumption and the expansions in Theorem 2 depend on bases of the left and right singular spaces of $P(\lambda)$ at λ_0 . This is an important drawback, because these bases may be difficult to calculate since they are defined through bases of certain vector spaces over the field of rational functions $\mathbb{C}(\lambda)$. Fortunately this can be avoided and, based on Lemma 6 and Theorem 2, it is possible to provide sufficient conditions for the existence of expansions near λ_0 and give also an expression for the leading coefficient using any bases of the null spaces of the matrix $P(\lambda_0)$, that can be computed with classical procedures of Numerical Linear Algebra. This is presented in Theorem 3 that is the most useful result in this work.

Theorem 3 *Let $P(\lambda)$ be an arbitrary $n \times n$ matrix polynomial (singular or not), $M(\lambda)$ be another polynomial of the same dimension, and λ_0 be a finite semisimple eigenvalue of $P(\lambda)$ of geometric multiplicity g . Denote by W a matrix whose rows form any basis of $\mathcal{N}_T(P(\lambda_0))$ and by V a matrix whose columns form any basis of $\mathcal{N}(P(\lambda_0))$. Then*

1. *The pencil $WM(\lambda_0)V + \zeta WP'(\lambda_0)V$ is generically regular and has exactly g finite eigenvalues, i.e., this holds for all matrix polynomials $M(\lambda)$ whose degree is at most the degree of $P(\lambda)$ except those in an algebraic manifold of positive codimension.*

2. If the pencil $WM(\lambda_0)V + \zeta WP'(\lambda_0)V$ is regular and has exactly g finite eigenvalues equal to ζ_1, \dots, ζ_g , then there are exactly g eigenvalues of $P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda)$ such that

$$\lambda_j(\epsilon) = \lambda_0 + \zeta_j \epsilon + o(\epsilon), \quad j = 1, \dots, g, \quad (24)$$

as ϵ tends to zero. If $g = 1$, i.e., λ_0 is a simple eigenvalue, then $o(\epsilon)$ can be replaced by $O(\epsilon^2)$ in the previous expansions.

Proof. In the first place, notice that the eigenvalues and the regularity of the pencil $WM(\lambda_0)V + \zeta WP'(\lambda_0)V$ are independent of the bases W and V of the left and right null spaces of $P(\lambda_0)$, because any change of bases simply transforms the pencil into a strictly equivalent pencil. Therefore, we can choose $W = \begin{bmatrix} W_1 \\ W_2 \end{bmatrix}$ and $V = \begin{bmatrix} V_1 & V_2 \end{bmatrix}$ be bases as the ones in Theorem 2. With this choice $WM(\lambda_0)V + \zeta WP'(\lambda_0)V$ is precisely $\mathcal{P}(\zeta)$ in (15). Lemma 6 states that $W_2M(\lambda_0)V_2$ is nonsingular if and only if $WM(\lambda_0)V + \zeta WP'(\lambda_0)V$ is regular with exactly g finite eigenvalues. On the other hand, the condition of $W_2M(\lambda_0)V_2$ being nonsingular is generic because $\det(W_2M(\lambda_0)V_2)$ is a multivariate polynomial in the entries of the coefficients of $M(\lambda)$, so the first item is proved. The second item is an immediate consequence of Theorem 2 and Lemma 6. \square

It is worth to compare Theorem 3 with the first paragraph of the statement of Theorem 6 in [17]. In both cases, the first order term of the eigenvalue expansions around a semisimple eigenvalue are determined, and in both cases this is done through the eigenvalues of a certain matrix pencil constructed in a similar way. The main difference is that in [17], the perturbed matrix functions $L(\lambda, \epsilon)$ are regular in $\epsilon = 0$ and in a neighborhood of this value (more restrictive than in Theorem 3) and analytic (not necessarily polynomials, and so, more general than our Theorem 3). With the notation in [17], the pencil whose eigenvalues determine the first order coefficients of the eigenvalue expansions near λ_0 is $\mathcal{P}(\zeta) = W(\zeta \frac{\partial L}{\partial \lambda}(\lambda_0, 0) + \frac{\partial L}{\partial \epsilon}(\lambda_0, 0))V$, where W and V are bases of, respectively, $\mathcal{N}_T(L(\lambda_0, 0))$ and $\mathcal{N}(L(\lambda_0, 0))$.

For those readers particularly interested in the case of regular matrix polynomials, we include the following corollary, which is obtained from Theorem 2 by assuming that $P(\lambda)$ is regular.

Corollary 1 *Let $P(\lambda)$ be an $n \times n$ regular matrix polynomial and $M(\lambda)$ be another matrix polynomial of the same dimension. Let λ_0 be a finite semisimple eigenvalue of $P(\lambda)$ of geometric multiplicity g , W be a matrix whose rows form a basis of $\mathcal{N}_T(P(\lambda_0))$, and V be a matrix whose columns form a basis of $\mathcal{N}(P(\lambda_0))$. Let also $\mathcal{P}(\zeta) = W(M(\lambda_0) + \zeta P'(\lambda_0))V$. Then the perturbed matrix polynomial $P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda)$ has exactly g eigenvalues in a neighborhood of $\epsilon = 0$ satisfying*

$$\lambda_j(\epsilon) = \lambda_0 + \zeta_j \epsilon + o(\epsilon) \quad j = 1, \dots, g,$$

where ζ_1, \dots, ζ_g are the finite eigenvalues of the pencil $\mathcal{P}(\zeta)$. If, in addition, the matrix $WM(\lambda_0)V$ is nonsingular, then ζ_1, \dots, ζ_g are all nonzero and all the expansions near λ_0 have leading exponent equal to one. If $g = 1$, i.e., λ_0 is simple, then $W = w$ has only one row vector and $V = v$ has only one column vector, and the previous formula simplifies to

$$\lambda(\epsilon) = \lambda_0 - \frac{wM(\lambda_0)v}{wP'(\lambda_0)v} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2).$$

5 Approximate eigenvectors for semisimple eigenvalues

This section is closely related to [8, Section 6], and the reader is referred to this reference for some technical details that are omitted here. We consider in this section only right eigenvectors. Counterpart results for left eigenvectors can be established in a similar way.

Eigenvectors are not well defined for singular matrix polynomials [5, p. 145], [8]. However, for $\epsilon \neq 0$, the perturbed polynomial $P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda)$ is generically regular, has simple eigenvalues, well defined associated eigenvectors, and, given a semisimple eigenvalue λ_0 of

$P(\lambda)$ of geometric multiplicity g , Theorem 3 guarantees the existence of exactly g eigenvalue expansions of $P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda)$ near λ_0 for most perturbations $M(\lambda)$. The (right) eigenvectors, $v_j(\epsilon)$, $j = 1, \dots, g$, associated to these g eigenvalues can be expanded as power series of ϵ [8, Lemma 7]. We will determine, under generic perturbations, $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} v_j(\epsilon)$, $j = 1, \dots, g$, and, as a consequence, we will see that these limits belong to $\mathcal{N}(P(\lambda_0))$. This is presented in Theorem 4, an analog, for singular matrix polynomials, of the second part of Theorem 6 in [17].

Theorem 4 *Let $P(\lambda)$ be an arbitrary $n \times n$ matrix polynomial (singular or not), $M(\lambda)$ be another polynomial of the same dimension, and λ_0 be a finite semisimple eigenvalue of $P(\lambda)$ of geometric multiplicity g . Denote by W a matrix whose rows form any basis of $\mathcal{N}_T(P(\lambda_0))$ and by V a matrix whose columns form any basis of $\mathcal{N}(P(\lambda_0))$. Let us assume that the pencil*

$$WM(\lambda_0)V + \zeta WP'(\lambda_0)V$$

is regular, and has exactly g finite eigenvalues ζ_1, \dots, ζ_g different from zero, such that $\zeta_i \neq \zeta_j$ if $i \neq j$, with associated right eigenvectors c_1, \dots, c_g . Then in a punctured neighborhood $0 < |\epsilon| < b$ the eigenvectors $v_1(\epsilon), \dots, v_g(\epsilon)$ of $P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda)$ corresponding to the eigenvalues (24) satisfy

$$v_j(\epsilon) = V c_j + O(\epsilon), \quad j = 1, \dots, g.$$

Proof. As in the proof of Theorem 3 the result is independent of the bases W and V . Therefore, we can choose $W = \begin{bmatrix} W_1 \\ W_2 \end{bmatrix}$ and $V = \begin{bmatrix} V_1 & V_2 \end{bmatrix}$ be the bases in Lemma 2, that also satisfy Lemma 3. Observe that the assumptions of Theorem 4 guarantee that the matrices $W_2 M(\lambda_0) V_2$ and Φ defined in (14) are nonsingular by Lemma 6. For each eigenvalue $\lambda_j(\epsilon)$ in (24), we consider, for $\epsilon \neq 0$, the corresponding eigenvector $v_j(\epsilon)$. It can be shown as in [8, Lemma 7] that this eigenvector is analytic at $\epsilon = 0$, so we can write $v_j(\epsilon) = v_j + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} u_{jk} \epsilon^k$. Our task is to determine v_j .

For simplicity, we take $\lambda_0 = 0$ as in the proof of Theorem 2. Again the proof is based on the local Smith form (7), which is well defined and analytic in a neighborhood of $\lambda_0 = 0$. To take advantage of this local Smith form we replace $v_j(\epsilon)$ with

$$z_j(\epsilon) = V(\lambda_j(\epsilon))^{-1} v_j(\epsilon), \quad (25)$$

which satisfies

$$[\Delta(\lambda_j(\epsilon)) + \epsilon \widetilde{M}(\lambda_j(\epsilon))] z_j(\epsilon) = 0, \quad (26)$$

where

$$\widetilde{M}(\lambda_j(\epsilon)) = W(\lambda_j(\epsilon)) M(\lambda_j(\epsilon)) V(\lambda_j(\epsilon)).$$

Notice that one can easily recover $v_j = v_j(0)$ from $z_j(0)$, since $v_j(0) = V(0) z_j(0)$. We partition $\widetilde{M}(\lambda_j(\epsilon))$ as a 3×3 block matrix according to the three diagonal blocks of $\Delta(\lambda)$ specified in partition (7), and denote, as in the proof of Theorem 2, $[G_{ik}(\lambda_j(\epsilon))]_{i,k=1}^3 \equiv \widetilde{M}(\lambda_j(\epsilon))$. The vector $z_j(\epsilon)$ is partitioned accordingly, and (26) can be written as

$$\left(\begin{bmatrix} \lambda_j(\epsilon) I_g & & \\ & I & \\ & & 0_{d \times d} \end{bmatrix} + \epsilon \begin{bmatrix} G_{11}(\lambda_j(\epsilon)) & G_{12}(\lambda_j(\epsilon)) & G_{13}(\lambda_j(\epsilon)) \\ G_{21}(\lambda_j(\epsilon)) & G_{22}(\lambda_j(\epsilon)) & G_{23}(\lambda_j(\epsilon)) \\ G_{31}(\lambda_j(\epsilon)) & G_{32}(\lambda_j(\epsilon)) & G_{33}(\lambda_j(\epsilon)) \end{bmatrix} \right) \begin{bmatrix} z_j^{(1)}(\epsilon) \\ z_j^{(2)}(\epsilon) \\ z_j^{(3)}(\epsilon) \end{bmatrix} = 0. \quad (27)$$

For $\epsilon = 0$ this equation reduces to $z_j^{(2)}(0) = 0$. The rows corresponding to the first and third rows of blocks are

$$\lambda_j(\epsilon) z_j^{(1)}(\epsilon) + \epsilon(G_{11}(\lambda_j(\epsilon)) z_j^{(1)}(\epsilon) + G_{12}(\lambda_j(\epsilon)) z_j^{(2)}(\epsilon) + G_{13}(\lambda_j(\epsilon)) z_j^{(3)}(\epsilon)) = 0 \quad (28)$$

$$G_{31}(\lambda_j(\epsilon)) z_j^{(1)}(\epsilon) + G_{32}(\lambda_j(\epsilon)) z_j^{(2)}(\epsilon) + G_{33}(\lambda_j(\epsilon)) z_j^{(3)}(\epsilon) = 0. \quad (29)$$

Notice that the terms of lower order in ϵ of $\lambda_j(\epsilon)$ are of the form $\zeta_j \epsilon$, for $j = 1, \dots, g$, with $\zeta_j \neq 0$. So we can divide (28) and (29) by ϵ and take the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ to obtain (see (20))

$$\left(\zeta_j \begin{bmatrix} I_g & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \Phi \right) \begin{bmatrix} z_j^{(1)}(0) \\ z_j^{(3)}(0) \end{bmatrix} = 0.$$

The result now follows from (25). \square

6 Expansions for arbitrary eigenvalues

In this last section, we consider the first order terms of the expansions around arbitrary eigenvalues, i.e., the eigenvalue λ_0 of $P(\lambda)$ is not necessarily semisimple. In this general case it is not possible to prove a counterpart of Theorem 3 valid for any bases of $\mathcal{N}_T(P(\lambda_0))$ and $\mathcal{N}(P(\lambda_0))$, and we cannot avoid the use of specific bases of these subspaces that are defined through certain vectors with entries in the field of rational functions $\mathbb{C}(\lambda)$. As a consequence, the first order terms that we will obtain are very difficult to compute in practice. Additional notation has to be introduced before stating Theorem 5, the main result in this section.

To start with, recall that Theorem 1 is valid for arbitrary eigenvalues, therefore, for generic perturbations $M(\lambda)$, there exist (fractional) power expansions of the eigenvalues of $P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda)$ near any eigenvalue λ_0 of $P(\lambda)$. We will use again the local Smith form of $P(\lambda)$ at λ_0 given by (6), and we rename the degrees of the elementary divisors associated with λ_0 as

$$\underbrace{\{n_1, \dots, n_1\}}_{r_1}, \dots, \underbrace{\{n_q, \dots, n_q\}}_{r_q} \equiv \{m_1, \dots, m_g\}, \quad (30)$$

where we assume that,

$$0 < n_1 < n_2 < \dots < n_q. \quad (31)$$

The natural numbers n_1, n_2, \dots, n_q are sometimes called the *partial multiplicities* of λ_0 . Note that the algebraic and geometric multiplicities of λ_0 are given, respectively, by

$$a = \sum_{i=1}^q r_i n_i \quad \text{and} \quad g = \sum_{i=1}^q r_i.$$

Let us define the sequence

$$f_j = \sum_{i=j}^q r_i, \quad j = 1, \dots, q, \quad \text{and} \quad f_{q+1} = 0,$$

so $f_1 = g$. We consider also the following submatrices of the matrices $W(\lambda_0)$ and $V(\lambda_0)$ in (5):

$$W_{1j} = (W(\lambda_0))(g - f_j + 1 : g, :) \quad \text{and} \quad V_{1j} = (V(\lambda_0))(:, g - f_j + 1 : g), \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, q,$$

$$W_2 = (W(\lambda_0))(n - d + 1 : n, :) \quad \text{and} \quad V_2 = (V(\lambda_0))(:, n - d + 1 : n),$$

where we use MATLAB's notation for submatrices. According to the notation in (13) and Lemma 2, observe that $W_{11} = W_1$ and $V_{11} = V_1$. Note also that the rows of $[W_1^T \ W_2^T]^T$ (resp. the columns of $[V_1 \ V_2]$) form a very specific basis of $\mathcal{N}_T(P(\lambda_0))$ (resp. of $\mathcal{N}(P(\lambda_0))$). Now, we can build up the matrices

$$\Phi_j = \begin{bmatrix} W_{1j} \\ W_2 \end{bmatrix} M(\lambda_0) [\ V_{1j} \ V_2 \], \quad j = 1, \dots, q, \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_{q+1} = W_2 M(\lambda_0) V_2. \quad (32)$$

The matrix Φ_1 coincides with Φ defined in (14), therefore Φ_j is the $(f_j + d) \times (f_j + d)$ lower right principal submatrix of Φ . Finally, we define

$$E_j = \text{diag}(I_{r_j}, 0_{(f_{j+1}+d) \times (f_{j+1}+d)}), \quad j = 1, \dots, q. \quad (33)$$

Now, we are in the position to state the main result of this section, which is the generalization to matrix polynomials of [8, Theorem 2], that is only valid for pencils.

Theorem 5 *Let $P(\lambda)$ be an arbitrary $n \times n$ matrix polynomial (singular or not), and $M(\lambda)$ another polynomial of the same dimension. Let λ_0 be a finite eigenvalue of $P(\lambda)$ such that the degrees of the elementary divisors associated with λ_0 satisfy (30) and (31). Let Φ_j , $j = 1, \dots, q+1$, and E_j , $j = 1, \dots, q$, be the matrices defined in (32) and (33). If $\det \Phi_{j+1} \neq 0$ for some $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$, let ξ_1, \dots, ξ_{r_j} be the r_j finite eigenvalues of the pencil $\Phi_j + \zeta E_j$, and $(\xi_t)_s^{1/n_j}$, $s = 1, \dots, n_j$, be the n_j branches of the n_j th root. Then, in a neighborhood of $\epsilon = 0$, the polynomial $P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda)$ has $r_j n_j$ eigenvalues satisfying*

$$\lambda_j^{rs}(\epsilon) = \lambda_0 + (\xi_t)_s^{1/n_j} \epsilon^{1/n_j} + o(\epsilon^{1/n_j}), \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, r_j, \quad s = 1, 2, \dots, n_j, \quad (34)$$

where ϵ^{1/n_j} is the principal branch of the n_j th root of ϵ . Moreover, the polynomial $P(\lambda) + \epsilon M(\lambda)$ is regular in the same neighborhood for $\epsilon \neq 0$. If, in addition, $\det \Phi_j \neq 0$, then all ξ_t in (34) are nonzero, and (34) are all the expansions near λ_0 with leading exponent $1/n_j$.

Proof. The proof follows closely the one of [8, Theorem 2]. We omit the details for the sake of brevity. \square

Theorem 5, as well as Theorems 2 and 3, can be adapted to cover the perturbation expansions of infinite eigenvalues by considering the dual polynomials, see [8, Corollary 1] for more details.

7 Future work

Some of the results presented in this work can be extended to singular analytic matrix functions. In the first place, the existence of eigenvalue expansions can be studied in the spirit of section 3 if only one eigenvalue λ_0 is considered. This restriction comes from the fact that singular analytic matrix functions have a local Smith form at λ_0 [1], but not a global Smith form. Thus, eigenvalue expansions might be developed in terms of this local Smith form under certain conditions, as we did in Sections 4 and 6. However, some relevant obstacles arise in this approach. The first of these obstacles is the absence of an intrinsic appropriate concept extending the notion of left and right singular subspaces and the second obstacle is related to the notion of genericity. It should be noted that our notion of genericity (see the last paragraph in section 3) requires the existence of a finite set of parameters (in our case, the entries of the coefficient matrices of the perturbation polynomial), whereas the coefficients of a (local) analytic matrix function cannot be described in terms of a finite set of parameters. First order spectral perturbation theory of singular analytic matrix functions will be addressed in a subsequent work.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank an anonymous referee for valuable comments which led to an improved version of the original manuscript.

References

- [1] J. A. Ball, I. Gohberg, L. Rodman, Interpolation of Rational Matrix Functions, Oper. Theory Adv. Appl. 45, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1990.
- [2] M. Berhanu, The Polynomial Eigenvalue Problem, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK, 2005.
- [3] R. Byers, V. Mehrmann, H. Xu, Trimmed linearizations for structured matrix polynomials, Linear Algebra Appl., 429 (2008), 2373–2400.

- [4] J-P. Dedieu, F. Tisseur, Perturbation theory for homogeneous polynomial eigenvalue problems, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 358 (2003) 71–94.
- [5] J. W. Demmel, B. Kågström, Computing stable eigendecompositions of Matrix Pencils, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 88/89 (1987) 139–186.
- [6] F. De Terán, F. M. Dopico, Sharp lower bounds for the dimension of linearizations of matrix polynomials, *Electron. J. Linear Algebra*, 17 (2008), 518–531.
- [7] F. De Terán, F. M. Dopico, D. S. Mackey, Linearizations of singular matrix polynomials and the recovery of minimal indices, to appear in *Electron. J. Linear Algebra*. Available at <http://eprints.ma.man.ac.uk/1251/>
- [8] F. De Terán, F. M. Dopico, J. Moro, First order spectral perturbation theory of square singular matrix pencils, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 429 (2008) 548–576.
- [9] G. D. Forney, Minimal bases of rational vector spaces, with applications to multivariable linear systems, *SIAM J. Control*, 13 (1975) 493–520.
- [10] F. R. Gantmacher, *The Theory of Matrices*, AMS Chelsea, Providence, RI, 1998.
- [11] I. Gohberg, P. Lancaster, L. Rodman, *Matrix Polynomials*, Academic Press, New York, 1982.
- [12] N. J. Higham, R-C. Li, F. Tisseur, Backward error of polynomial eigenproblems solved by linearization, *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 29, no. 4 (2007) 1218–1241.
- [13] N. J. Higham, D. S. Mackey, F. Tisseur, The conditioning of linearizations of matrix polynomials, *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 28, (2006) 1005–1028.
- [14] N. J. Higham, F. Tisseur, Bounds for eigenvalues of matrix polynomials, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 358 (2003) 5–22.
- [15] E. Hille, *Analytic Function Theory*, Vol. II, 2nd ed., Chelsea, New York, 1987.
- [16] D. Kressner, M. J. Peláez, J. Moro, Structured Hölder condition numbers for multiple eigenvalues, *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 31 (2009), 175–201.
- [17] P. Lancaster, A. S. Markus, F. Zhou, Perturbation theory for analytic matrix functions: the semisimple case, *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 25 (2003) 606–626.
- [18] H. Langer, B. Najman, Remarks on the perturbation of analytic matrix functions III, *Integr. Equat. Oper. Th.*, 15 (1992) 796–806.
- [19] G. W. Stewart, Perturbation theory for rectangular matrix pencils, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 208/209 (1994) 297–301.
- [20] J. G. Sun, Orthogonal projections and the perturbation of the eigenvalues of singular pencils, *J. Comp. Math.*, 1 (1983) 63–74.
- [21] J. G. Sun, Gerschgorin type theorem and the perturbation of the eigenvalues of a singular pencil, *Chinese J. Num. Math. Appl.*, 10:1 (1988) 1–13. (*Math. Num. Sin.*, 7:3 (1985) 253–264)
- [22] F. Tisseur, Backward error and condition of polynomial eigenvalue problems, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 309 (2000) 339–361.
- [23] P. Van Dooren, Reducing subspaces: Definitions, properties, and algorithms, in: B. Kågström and A. Ruhe (Eds.), *Matrix Pencils*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 973, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983, pp. 58–73.
- [24] P. Van Dooren, P. Dewilde, The eigenstructure of an arbitrary polynomial matrix: Computational aspects, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 50 (1983) 545–579.
- [25] G. Verghese, P. Van Dooren, T. Kailath, Properties of the system matrix of a generalized state-space system, *Int. J. Control*, 30, no. 2 (1979) 235–243.