

# LEMMA OF THE MONTH #4 NO SIMILARITY-INVARIANT MATRIX NORM

NATHANIEL JOHNSTON<sup>1</sup>

[www.nathanieljohnston.com/...no-similarity-invariant-matrix-norm/](http://www.nathanieljohnston.com/...no-similarity-invariant-matrix-norm/)

A norm  $\|\cdot\|$  on  $M_n$  is said to be *weakly unitarily-invariant* if  $\|UXU^*\| = \|X\|$  for all  $U, X \in M_n$  with  $U$  unitary. There are many weakly unitarily-invariant norms (such as the trace norm, operator norm, Frobenius norm, and numerical radius). As a natural strengthening of the concept of a weakly unitarily-invariant norm, one might wonder if there are any norms that are *similarity-invariant*; that is, that satisfy  $\|SXS^{-1}\| = \|X\|$  for all  $S, X \in M_n$  with  $S$  invertible. It turns out that no such norm exists, as the following lemma shows. This lemma appeared as Exercise IV.4.1 in [1].

**Lemma 1** (No Similarity-Invariant Norm). *Let  $f : M_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a function satisfying  $f(SXS^{-1}) = f(X)$  for all  $S, X \in M_n$  with  $S$  invertible. Then  $f$  is not a norm.*

*Proof.* Assume that  $f$  is a norm satisfying the hypothesis. Let  $a > 0$  be real and consider the following  $2 \times 2$  matrices (the same technique works for  $n > 2$ ):

$$N := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad S := \begin{bmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then  $SNS^{-1} = aN$ . If  $f$  were a norm, it would follow that  $af(N) = f(aN) = f(SNS^{-1}) = f(N)$ , so  $a = 1$ . Since  $a > 0$  was arbitrary, we have reached a contradiction.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] R. Bhatia, *Matrix analysis*. Volume 169 of Graduate texts in mathematics (1997).

<sup>1</sup>DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS & STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH, GUELPH, ON, CANADA N1G 2W1