

Reading Report: Numerical Ranges of Non-Normal Random Matrices

Elliptic Ginibre and Non-Hermitian Wishart Ensembles

S.-S. Byun and J. Y. Park arXiv:2602.20469

Daily arXiv Theory Report

February 26, 2026

1 Core Question

For a non-normal matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$, the *numerical range* (or field of values)

$$W(A) := \{\langle Ay, y \rangle : \|y\|_2 = 1\}$$

is a convex compact subset of \mathbb{C} that always contains the spectrum but, unlike the spectrum, also encodes non-normal effects such as pseudospectral behaviour and sensitivity to perturbations.

Question. What is the limiting shape of $W(A)$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ for three fundamental families of non-Hermitian random matrices that interpolate between the Hermitian and fully non-Hermitian regimes—namely the *elliptic Ginibre*, *chiral elliptic Ginibre*, and *non-Hermitian Wishart* ensembles?

2 Main Statements at a Glance

Write $\mathcal{E}_{a,b}$ for the filled ellipse $\{(x,y) : (x/a)^2 + (y/b)^2 \leq 1\}$, and d_H for Hausdorff distance.

Theorem 1 (Elliptic Ginibre, Theorem 1.1(i)). *Let X_e be the $N \times N$ elliptic Ginibre matrix with non-Hermiticity parameter $\tau \in [0, 1]$:*

$$X_e = \frac{\sqrt{1+\tau}}{2}(G + G^*) + \frac{\sqrt{1-\tau}}{2}(G - G^*),$$

where G is the standard complex Ginibre matrix (i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{C}}(0, 1/N)$ entries). Then, almost surely,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} d_H(W(X_e), \mathcal{E}_{a,b}) = 0, \quad a = \sqrt{2(1+\tau)}, \quad b = \sqrt{2(1-\tau)}.$$

Theorem 2 (Chiral Elliptic Ginibre, Theorem 1.1(ii)). *Let X_{ce} be the $(2N + \nu) \times (2N + \nu)$ chiral elliptic Ginibre matrix with parameters $\tau \in [0, 1]$ and $\alpha = \lim \nu/N \geq 0$. Then, almost surely,*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} d_H(W(X_{ce}), \mathcal{E}_{a,b}) = 0, \quad a = \frac{\sqrt{1+\tau}(\sqrt{1+\alpha} + 1)}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad b = \frac{\sqrt{1-\tau}(\sqrt{1+\alpha} + 1)}{\sqrt{2}}.$$

Theorem 3 (Non-Hermitian Wishart, Theorem 1.2). *Let $X_w = X_1 X_2^*$ be the $N \times N$ non-Hermitian Wishart matrix with parameters $\tau \in [0, 1]$ and $\alpha = \lim \nu/N \geq 0$. Then, almost surely,*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} d_H(W(X_w), \tilde{\mathcal{E}}(\tau, \alpha)) = 0,$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}(\tau, \alpha) = \bigcap_{0 \leq \theta \leq 2\pi} H_\theta$ and each half-plane $H_\theta = e^{-i\theta}\{z : \operatorname{Re} z \leq \lambda(\theta)\}$ is determined by the largest real root $\lambda(\theta)$ of an explicit quartic polynomial $D_\theta(x)$ (see below). In particular, $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ is **not** an ellipse for $\alpha > 0$.

3 A Concrete Example

Standard Ginibre matrix ($\tau = 0$). Then $X_e = G$ and the theorem gives

$$W(G) \xrightarrow{d_H} \mathcal{E}_{\sqrt{2}, \sqrt{2}} = D(\sqrt{2}),$$

the centred disc of radius $\sqrt{2}$. This recovers the classical result of Collins–Gawron–Litvak–Życzkowski (2014). Note that the *spectrum* converges to the unit disc (circular law), so the numerical range is strictly larger by a factor of $\sqrt{2}$.

Product of two Ginibre matrices ($\tau = 0, \alpha = 0$ Wishart). The quartic simplifies to $16x^4 + (a^2 - 8a - 11)x^2 - (2a + 1)^3|_{a=0} = 16x^4 - 11x^2 - 1$; the numerical range converges to a disc of radius

$$B = \sqrt{\frac{-(-11) + 5\sqrt{5}}{8}} = \sqrt{\frac{11 + 5\sqrt{5}}{8}} \approx 1.665.$$

Compare with $(\sqrt{2})^2 = 2$; the submultiplicativity bound $r(X^2) \leq r(X)^2$ is not tight.

4 Setup and Key Definitions

Elliptic Ginibre matrix. Let $G = (g_{ij})_{N \times N}$ with $g_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{C}}(0, 1/N)$ i.i.d. The elliptic Ginibre matrix with correlation parameter $\tau \in [0, 1]$ is

$$X_e = \frac{\sqrt{1+\tau}}{2}(G + G^*) + \frac{\sqrt{1-\tau}}{2}(G - G^*).$$

At $\tau = 0$ this is the (full) Ginibre matrix; at $\tau = 1$ the GUE. The eigenvalue distribution converges to the uniform measure on the ellipse $\{(x/(1+\tau))^2 + (y/(1-\tau))^2 \leq 1\}$ (the *elliptic law*).

Chiral elliptic Ginibre matrix. From two independent $N \times (N + \nu)$ Gaussian matrices P, Q (entries $\sim \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{C}}(0, 1/(2N))$), form

$$X_1 = \sqrt{1+\tau}P + \sqrt{1-\tau}Q, \quad X_2 = \sqrt{1+\tau}P - \sqrt{1-\tau}Q,$$

and define the $(2N + \nu) \times (2N + \nu)$ block matrix $X_{ce} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & X_1 \\ X_2^* & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. The parameter $\alpha = \lim \nu/N$ controls a Hermitian–non-Hermitian transition and a connected/disconnected phase transition for the eigenvalue droplet.

Non-Hermitian Wishart matrix. $X_w = X_1 X_2^*$ with X_1, X_2 as above. At $\tau = 1$ this is the classical Laguerre (Wishart) ensemble; at $\tau = 0$ the product of two independent rectangular Ginibre matrices.

Numerical range via half-plane intersection (Toeplitz–Hausdorff). For any $A \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$,

$$W(A) = \bigcap_{0 \leq \theta \leq 2\pi} H_{\theta, N}, \quad H_{\theta, N} = e^{-i\theta} \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \operatorname{Re} z \leq \lambda_{\max}(\theta, N)\},$$

where $\lambda_{\max}(\theta, N)$ is the largest eigenvalue of the Hermitian matrix $\operatorname{Re}(e^{i\theta}A)$. Thus the problem of determining the numerical range reduces to understanding $\lambda_{\max}(\theta, N)$ for each angle θ .

The quartic $D_\theta(x)$ for the Wishart case. Set $c = \cos \theta$ and define

$$D_\theta(x) = a_4x^4 + a_3x^3 + a_2x^2 + a_1x + a_0,$$

$$a_4 = 16(1 - \tau^2 + c^2\tau^2), \quad a_3 = -32c\tau(\alpha + 2)/(1 - \tau^2 + c^2\tau^2) \cdot a_4/a_4,$$

(the full coefficients are given in equations (1.16)–(1.17) of the paper). This quartic always has exactly two real roots (Lemma 3.1), and $\lambda(\theta)$ is the larger root.

5 Main Results (Bulleted)

- **Elliptic Ginibre:** The numerical range converges a.s. to the ellipse $\mathcal{E}_{\sqrt{2(1+\tau)}, \sqrt{2(1-\tau)}}$. The semi-axes $a(\tau), b(\tau)$ interpolate between $a = b = \sqrt{2}$ (disc, $\tau = 0$) and $a = 2, b = 0$ (interval $[-2, 2]$, $\tau = 1$, GUE).
- **Chiral elliptic Ginibre:** The numerical range converges a.s. to an ellipse with semi-axes scaled by $(\sqrt{1+\alpha} + 1)/\sqrt{2}$. When $\alpha > 0$, the eigenvalue droplet may split into two components, but the numerical range (being convex) is always a single ellipse that is the convex hull of the droplet in the Hermitian limit.
- **Non-Hermitian Wishart:** The numerical range converges a.s. to a convex domain $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}(\tau, \alpha)$ described as the intersection of half-planes parametrised by θ , with boundary determined by the quartic D_θ . This domain is *not* an ellipse (proved analytically via a resultant/discriminant argument).
- **Special case (product of Ginibre matrices):** The numerical range of G_1G_2 (two independent Ginibre) coincides asymptotically with that of G^2 (power of a single Ginibre). This extends to products/powers with the same total number of factors.
- **Universality:** For the elliptic Ginibre case, the result extends beyond Gaussian entries to general Wigner-type entries (via universality of the largest eigenvalue of Hermitian parts). The Wishart case relies more essentially on Gaussianity (rotational invariance argument).

6 Proof Sketch

The strategy is uniform across all three models: reduce the numerical range problem to understanding the largest eigenvalue of a θ -rotated Hermitian part.

Step 1. Half-plane representation. By the Toeplitz–Hausdorff characterisation, $W(A) = \bigcap_\theta H_{\theta, N}$ where $H_{\theta, N}$ is determined by $\lambda_{\max}(\theta, N) = \|\operatorname{Re}(e^{i\theta} A)\|$. Hence, if $\lambda_{\max}(\theta, N) \rightarrow \lambda(\theta)$ pointwise a.s., one can upgrade to uniform convergence (Lipschitz argument in Lemma 2.2) and conclude $W(A) \rightarrow \bigcap_\theta H_\theta$ in Hausdorff distance.

Step 2. Elliptic Ginibre: rotation yields rescaled GUE. Compute $\operatorname{Re}(e^{i\theta} X_e)$; it is a Wigner matrix with variance $(1+\tau) \cos^2 \theta + (1-\tau) \sin^2 \theta$ per off-diagonal entry divided by $2N$. By the classical a.s. convergence of the largest eigenvalue ($\rightarrow 2\sigma$), one gets

$$\lambda_{\max}(\theta, N) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \sqrt{2(1+\tau) \cos^2 \theta + 2(1-\tau) \sin^2 \theta} = \sqrt{a^2 \cos^2 \theta + b^2 \sin^2 \theta},$$

which is exactly the support function of the ellipse $\mathcal{E}_{a,b}$. Apply Proposition 2.1 (the “elliptic numerical range” lemma).

Step 3. Chiral elliptic Ginibre: Gaussian invariance reduces to Wishart edge. The key identity is

$$\sqrt{1+\tau} \cos \theta P + i\sqrt{1-\tau} \sin \theta Q \stackrel{d}{=} \sqrt{(1+\tau) \cos^2 \theta + (1-\tau) \sin^2 \theta} P,$$

using the rotational invariance of complex Gaussian vectors. Therefore $\text{Re}(e^{i\theta} X_{ce})$ has the same spectrum (up to scaling) as $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & P \\ P^* & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, whose norm is $\sqrt{\lambda_+^{\text{MP}}} = \sqrt{1+\alpha} + 1)/\sqrt{2}$ (right edge of Marchenko–Pastur). The rest follows from Proposition 2.1.

Step 4. Non-Hermitian Wishart: spectral decomposition + free probability.

- (a) Compute $\text{Re}(e^{i\theta} X_w) = R S(\theta) R^*$ where $R = (P \ Q)$ and $S(\theta) = T(\theta) \otimes I_M$ is a deterministic Hermitian matrix with eigenvalues $\lambda_{\pm}(\theta) = \tau \cos \theta \pm \sqrt{1 - \tau^2 \sin^2 \theta}$.
- (b) By Gaussian unitary invariance, $R U(\theta)^* \stackrel{d}{=} R$, so

$$\text{Re}(e^{i\theta} X_w) \stackrel{d}{=} \lambda_+(\theta) PP^* + \lambda_-(\theta) QQ^*.$$

This is a sum of two *independent* (rescaled) Wishart matrices.

- (c) By asymptotic freeness + strong convergence of extremal eigenvalues, the largest eigenvalue of this sum is determined by the free additive convolution $\mu_\theta \boxplus \nu_\theta$ of two rescaled Marchenko–Pastur laws.
- (d) Using the R -transform additivity ($R_{\mu \boxplus \nu} = R_\mu + R_\nu$) and the known R -transform of Marchenko–Pastur, derive a cubic equation for the Cauchy transform. The discriminant of this cubic, as a function of z , is exactly the quartic $D_\theta(z)$.
- (e) The edge of the support (= largest eigenvalue limit) is the largest real root $\lambda(\theta)$ of D_θ .
- (f) Apply Lemma 2.2.

Step 5. Non-ellipticity of the Wishart numerical range. Suppose for contradiction that $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ were an ellipse. Then D_θ would factor into two quadratics with coefficients matching the ellipse’s support function. Comparing coefficients forces algebraic relations between α and τ that cannot hold for all parameter values—contradiction.

Step 6. Exactness of the quartic (Lemma 3.1). To show D_θ has exactly two real roots: compute the resultant $\text{Res}(D_\theta, D'_\theta)$. It factors as a product involving a polynomial $F(\alpha, \tau, \sin^2 \theta)$ that is shown to be strictly positive (its u -derivative is a quadratic with negative discriminant, forcing monotonicity, and $F|_{u=1} > 0$). Hence D_θ can never have a double root, so exactly two real roots.

References

S.-S. Byun and J. Y. Park, *Numerical ranges of non-normal random matrices: elliptic Ginibre and non-Hermitian Wishart ensembles*, arXiv:2602.20469 (2025).