

# Order of operators determined by operator mean

Masaru Nagisa  
Graduate School of Science,  
Chiba University

## 1 Introduction

This is a joint work with Prof. M. Uchiyama.

Let  $J$  be an open interval of  $\mathbb{R}$ . We define  $H_n, H_n(J)$  and  $H_n^+$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} H_n &= \{A \in \mathbb{M}_n(\mathbb{C}) \mid A = A^*\} \\ H_n(J) &= \{A \in H_n \mid \text{Sp}(A) \subset J\} \\ H_n^+ &= H_n([0, \infty)). \end{aligned}$$

We call  $f$  an operator monotone function on  $J$  if we have  $f(A) \leq f(B)$  for any  $A, B \in H_n(J)$  with  $A \leq B$ . The following functions are well known as typical examples of operator monotone functions:

$$\begin{aligned} f(t) &= t^p \quad (0 \leq p < 1) \quad \text{on } J = [0, \infty), \\ f(t) &= \frac{at + b}{ct + d} \quad (a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{R}, ad - bc = 1) \quad \text{on } J = (-\infty, -d/c) \text{ or } (-d/c, \infty). \end{aligned}$$

For the operator monotone function  $f$  on  $J$ , it does not necessarily follow that

$$A, B \in H_n(J), f(A) \leq f(B) \Rightarrow A \leq B.$$

So we consider the following condition for  $C \in H_n(J)$  and  $A, B \in H_n$ :

$$f(C + tA) \leq f(C + tB) \quad \text{for any } 0 < t < \epsilon, \tag{*}$$

where  $\epsilon$  is a sufficiently small positive number. One of our problems is to determine the condition for  $f$  or for  $C$ , which deduces  $A \leq B$  from the condition(\*).

By Kubo-Ando theory [5], it is known that an operator mean  $\sigma$  is related to the operator monotone function  $f$  on  $[0, \infty)$  with  $f(1) = 1$ , that is, for  $A, B \in H_n((0, \infty))$ , the operator mean  $A\sigma B$  of  $A$  and  $B$  is represented as the following form:

$$A\sigma B = A^{1/2} f(A^{-1/2} B A^{-1/2}) A^{1/2}.$$

So we can naturally consider the following condition for  $X, Y \in H_n((0, \infty))$  and  $A, B \in H_n$  which is similar to above problem:

$$Y\sigma(tA + X) \leq Y\sigma(tB + X) \quad \text{for any } 0 < t < \epsilon, \tag{**}$$

where  $\epsilon$  is a sufficiently small positive number. Our results is as follows:

**Theorem 1.** *The condition (\*\*) implies  $A \leq B$  is equivalent to that  $X$  is a scalar multiple of  $Y$  or the operator monotone function  $f$  associated with  $\sigma$  has the form*

$$f(t) = \frac{at + b}{ct + d}.$$

## 2 Outline of Proof

We show the following:

**Fact 1.** When  $X = cY$  for some positive scalar  $c$ , (\*\*) implies  $A \leq B$ .

**Fact 2.** When the operator monotone function  $f$  has the following form:

$$f(t) = \frac{at + b}{ct + d} \quad a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{R}, \quad ad - bc > 0,$$

(\*\*) implies  $A \leq B$ .

**Fact 3.** When  $X$  is not scalar multiple of  $Y$  and  $f$  does not have the form  $f(t) = \frac{at + b}{ct + d}$ , then there exist positive operators  $A$  and  $B$  such that  $A \not\leq B$  and they satisfy the condition (\*\*) for  $X, Y$  and  $f$ .

Combining these facts, we can get Theorem 1. So we will explain these facts.

Let  $f$  be an operator monotone function on  $J$ . For  $A \in H_n(J)$ , we denote the Fréchet derivative of  $f$  at  $A$  by  $Df(A)$ , that is,

$$\lim_{\|H\| \rightarrow 0} \frac{\|f(A + H) - f(A) - Df(A)(H)\|}{\|H\|} = 0.$$

We remark  $Df(A)$  a bounded real linear operator on  $H_n$ . We also denote the directional derivative of  $f$  at  $A$  in the direction  $B$  by  $Df(A)(B)$ , that is,

$$Df(A)(B) = \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} f(A + tB).$$

We choose some unitary  $U$  such that

$$\Lambda = U^*AU = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \lambda_n \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then it is known that

$$Df(A)(B) = U(f^{[1]}(\Lambda) \circ (U^*BU))U^*,$$

where  $f^{[1]}(\Lambda) = (f^{[1]}(\lambda_i, \lambda_j))$ ,

$$f^{[1]}(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) = \begin{cases} \frac{f(\lambda_i) - f(\lambda_j)}{\lambda_i - \lambda_j} & \lambda_i \neq \lambda_j \\ f'(\lambda_i) & \lambda_i = \lambda_j \end{cases}$$

and the notation  $\circ$  means Schur product of matrices.

Since  $f$  is operator monotone,  $f^{[1]}(\Lambda)$  becomes positive. When  $A = cI$ ,

$$f^{[1]}(cI) = \begin{pmatrix} f'(c) & \cdots & f'(c) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ f'(c) & \cdots & f'(c) \end{pmatrix}$$

is positive and of rank 1. It is also known that the operator monotone function  $f$  has the form

$$f(t) = \frac{at + b}{ct + d},$$

if  $f^{[1]}(\Lambda)$  is of rank 1 for some  $\Lambda \neq cI$  (see [3]).

The following proposition is a key idea of this paper:

**Proposition 2.** For  $A = (a_{ij}) \in H_n^+$ , we consider the map  $S_A : H_n \ni B \mapsto A \circ B \in H_n$ . Then the following are equivalent:

- (1) For  $B \in H_n$ ,  $S_A(B) \geq 0 \Rightarrow B \geq 0$ .
- (2)  $A$  is of strict rank 1, that is, there exists  $\gamma = (\gamma_1 \ \gamma_2 \ \cdots \ \gamma_n)$  such that  $A = \gamma^* \gamma$  and  $\gamma_1 \gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_n \neq 0$ .
- (3)  $S_A(H_n^+) = H_n^+$ .
- (4) For any  $k, l$  ( $1 \leq k, l \leq n$ ),  $a_{kk} > 0$  and  $a_{kk}a_{ll} - a_{kl}a_{lk} = 0$ .

We can prove (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (4)  $\Rightarrow$  (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (1). This proof has been written in [6]. Here we give only the part (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (4)  $\Rightarrow$  (2), because the rest part of proof is not so difficult.

**Proof.** (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (4) When  $a_{kk} = 0$ , we define  $B = (b_{ij})$  as follows:

$$b_{ij} = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } (i, j) = (k, k) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Since  $B \not\geq 0$  and  $S_A(B) = A \circ B = 0 \geq 0$ , this contradicts to the assumption. So  $a_{kk} > 0$  for all  $k$ .

The positivity of  $A$  implies that

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_{kk} & a_{kl} \\ a_{lk} & a_{ll} \end{pmatrix} \geq 0,$$

in particular,  $a_{kk}a_{ll} - a_{kl}a_{lk} \geq 0$ . We assume that  $a_{kk}a_{ll} - a_{kl}a_{lk} > 0$ . We define  $B = (b_{ij})$  as follows:

$$b_{ij} = \begin{cases} \frac{|a_{kl}|}{a_{kk}} & \text{if } (i, j) = (k, k) \\ \frac{|a_{kl}|}{a_{ll}} & \text{if } (i, j) = (l, l) \\ 1 & \text{if } (i, j) = (k, l) \text{ or } (l, k) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Since  $|a_{kl}|^2 = a_{kl}a_{lk} < a_{kk}a_{ll}$ , we have  $B \not\geq 0$ . But we have

$$(A \circ B)_{ij} = \begin{cases} |a_{kl}| & \text{if } (i, j) = (k, k) \text{ or } (l, l) \\ a_{kl} & \text{if } (i, j) = (k, l) \\ a_{lk} & \text{if } (i, j) = (l, k) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

and  $A \circ B \geq 0$ . This contradicts to the assumption. So we can get the following:

$$a_{kk}, a_{ll} > 0, a_{kk}a_{ll} = a_{kl}a_{lk} (= |a_{kl}|^2).$$

(4)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) Define  $r_k > 0$  ( $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ) by the following relation:

$$a_{kk} = r_k^2.$$

Then, for any  $k$  and  $l$ , we can choose  $\theta(k, l) \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$a_{kl} = r_k r_l e^{i\theta(k, l)},$$

and we may assume that the following relation:

$$e^{i\theta(k, l)} = e^{-i\theta(l, k)}, \quad e^{i\theta(k, k)} = 1.$$

If we show the relation

$$e^{i\theta(k, l)} e^{i\theta(l, m)} = e^{i\theta(k, m)}$$

for any  $k, l$  and  $m$ , then we can see that  $A$  is of strict rank 1 as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{pmatrix} r_1 \\ r_2 e^{-i\theta(1,2)} \\ \vdots \\ r_n e^{-i\theta(1,n)} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} r_1 & r_2 e^{i\theta(1,2)} & \dots & r_n e^{i\theta(1,n)} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} r_1 \\ r_2 e^{i\theta(2,1)} \\ \vdots \\ r_n e^{i\theta(n,1)} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} r_1 & r_2 e^{i\theta(1,2)} & \dots & r_n e^{i\theta(1,n)} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} r_1^2 & r_1 r_2 e^{i\theta(1,2)} & \dots & r_1 r_n e^{i\theta(1,n)} \\ r_2 r_1 e^{i\theta(2,1)} & r_2^2 e^{i\theta(2,1)} e^{i\theta(1,2)} & \dots & r_2 r_n e^{i\theta(2,1)} e^{i\theta(1,n)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ r_n r_1 e^{i\theta(n,1)} & r_n r_2 e^{i\theta(n,1)} e^{i\theta(1,2)} & \dots & r_n^2 e^{i\theta(n,1)} e^{i\theta(1,n)} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} r_1^2 & r_1 r_2 e^{i\theta(1,2)} & \dots & r_1 r_n e^{i\theta(1,n)} \\ r_2 r_1 e^{i\theta(2,1)} & r_2^2 & \dots & r_2 r_n e^{i\theta(2,n)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ r_n r_1 e^{i\theta(n,1)} & r_n r_2 e^{i\theta(n,2)} & \dots & r_n^2 \end{pmatrix} = A. \end{aligned}$$

It suffices to show the relation  $e^{i\theta(k,l)}e^{i\theta(l,m)} = e^{i\theta(k,m)}$  in the case of each two of  $k, l, m$  are different. By the positivity of  $A$ , we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_{kk} & a_{kl} & a_{km} \\ a_{lk} & a_{ll} & a_{lm} \\ a_{mk} & a_{ml} & a_{mm} \end{pmatrix} \geq 0.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} a_{kk} & a_{kl} & a_{km} \\ a_{lk} & a_{ll} & a_{lm} \\ a_{mk} & a_{ml} & a_{mm} \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} r_k^2 & r_k r_l e^{i\theta(k,l)} & r_k r_m e^{i\theta(k,m)} \\ r_l r_k e^{i\theta(l,k)} & r_l^2 & r_l r_m e^{i\theta(l,m)} \\ r_m r_k e^{i\theta(m,k)} & r_m r_l e^{i\theta(m,l)} & r_m^2 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} r_k e^{i\theta(k,l)} & & \\ & r_l & \\ & & r_m e^{i\theta(m,l)} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & \alpha \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \bar{\alpha} & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} r_k e^{i\theta(l,k)} & & \\ & r_l & \\ & & r_m e^{i\theta(l,m)} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\alpha = e^{-i\theta(k,l)} e^{-i\theta(l,m)} e^{i\theta(k,m)},$$

we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & \alpha \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \bar{\alpha} & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \geq 0.$$

Remarking that  $|\alpha| = 1$  and

$$0 \leq \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & \alpha \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \bar{\alpha} & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 2 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 2 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle = \alpha + \bar{\alpha} - 2,$$

we can get  $\alpha = 1$ . So we have the desired relation.  $\square$

We now consider the condition, for  $C \in H_n(J)$  and  $A, B \in H_n$ :

$$f(C + tA) \leq f(C + tB) \quad \text{for any } 0 < t < \epsilon. \quad (*)$$

Since

$$\frac{f(C + tA) - f(C)}{t} \leq \frac{f(C + tB) - f(C)}{t},$$

we have  $Df(C)(A) \leq Df(C)(B)$ , i.e.,  $Df(C)(B - A) \geq 0$ . As stated above  $f^{[1]}(C)$  is of strict rank 1 when  $C = cI$  or  $f(t)$  has the form  $(at + b)/(ct + d)$ . Using the property (1) in Proposition 2, we have the following:

**Fact 1'**. When  $C = cI$  for some scalar in  $J$ , (\*) implies  $A \leq B$ .

**Fact 2'**. When the operator monotone function  $f$  on  $J$  has the following form:

$$f(t) = \frac{at + b}{ct + d} \quad a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{R}, \quad ad - bc > 0,$$

(\*) implies  $A \leq B$ .

When  $f$  does not have the form  $(at + b)/(ct + d)$ ,  $f^{[1]}(\Lambda)$  is not of rank 1 for  $\Lambda = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & \mu \end{pmatrix}$  ( $\lambda \neq \mu \in J$ ). This means  $f'(\lambda)f'(\mu) > f^{[1]}(\lambda, \mu)^2$ . So we choose  $H = \begin{pmatrix} h_{11} & h_{12} \\ h_{21} & h_{22} \end{pmatrix} \in H_2$  with  $h_{11}, h_{22} > 0$  and

$$h_{11}h_{22} < |h_{12}|^2 < \frac{f'(\lambda)f'(\mu)}{f^{[1]}(\lambda, \mu)^2} h_{11}h_{22}.$$

Then  $H \not\leq 0$  and  $Df(\Lambda)(H) = f^{[1]}(\Lambda) \circ H > 0$ . Let  $A, B \geq 0$  with  $H = B - A$ . Since

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < Df(\Lambda)(H) &= Df(\Lambda)(B) - Df(\Lambda)(A) \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \left( \frac{f(tB + \Lambda) - f(\Lambda)}{t} - \frac{f(tA + \Lambda) - f(\Lambda)}{t} \right) \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(tB + \Lambda) - f(tA + \Lambda)}{t}, \end{aligned}$$

there exists  $\epsilon > 0$  such that

$$f(tB + \Lambda) - f(tA + \Lambda) \geq 0$$

for  $0 < t < \epsilon$ . In the case,  $A \not\leq B$  because  $H \not\leq 0$ .

Using the embedding

$$H_2 \ni \begin{pmatrix} x_{11} & x_{12} \\ x_{21} & x_{22} \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_{11} & x_{12} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ x_{21} & x_{22} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in H_n,$$

we can prove the following:

**Fact 3'.** When  $C$  is not scalar operator in  $H_n(J)$  and  $f$  does not have the form  $f(t) = \frac{at + b}{ct + d}$ , then there exist positive operators  $A$  and  $B$  such that  $A \not\leq B$  and they satisfy the condition (\*).

Using the relation of an operator monotone function  $f$  on  $(0, \infty)$  with  $f(1) = 1$  and the operator mean  $\sigma$  related with  $f$ , i.e.,

$$A\sigma B = B^{1/2}f(A^{-1/2}BA^{-1/2})B^{1/2},$$

we can prove **Fact  $i$**  from **Fact  $i'$**  ( $i = 1, 2, 3$ ).

## References

- [1] R. Bhatia, *Matrix Analysis*, Grad. Texts in Math. 169, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1997.

- [2] R. Bhatia, *Positive Definite Matrices*, Princeton Ser. Appl. Math. Princeton University Press, 2007.
- [3] W. F. Donoghue, Jr., *Monotone matrix functions and analytic continuation*, Springer-Verlag, 1974.
- [4] F. Hiai, *Matrix Analysis: Matrix monotone functions, matrix means, and majorization*, Interdecip. Inform. Sci. 16 (2010) 139–248.
- [5] F. Kubo and T. Ando, *Means of positive linear operators*, Math. Ann. 246(1980), 205–224.
- [6] M. Nagisa and M. Uchiyama, *Order of operators determined by operator mean*, to appear in Tohoku Math. J.
- [7] M. Uchiyama, *A converse of Loewner-Heinz inequality, geometric mean and spectral order*, to appear in Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc.

Graduate School of Science  
Chiba University  
Chiba 263-8522  
JAPAN  
E-mail address: [nagisa@math.s.chiba-u.ac.jp](mailto:nagisa@math.s.chiba-u.ac.jp)

千葉大学・大学院理学研究科 渚 勝