

Operator Norm Inequality and Positive Definiteness of Some Functions

Imam Nugraha Albania

*Department of Mathematics Education,
Indonesia University of Education*

This is a joint work with Professor NAGISA Masaru.

1. Notation

The continuous function $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is said to be positive definite if for any positive integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and for any $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{R}$, the following $n \times n$ matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \varphi(x_1 - x_1) & \varphi(x_1 - x_2) & \cdots & \varphi(x_1 - x_n) \\ \varphi(x_2 - x_1) & \varphi(x_2 - x_2) & \cdots & \varphi(x_2 - x_n) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \varphi(x_n - x_1) & \varphi(x_n - x_2) & \cdots & \varphi(x_n - x_n) \end{pmatrix} \geq 0,$$

that is, $\sum_{i,j=1}^n \alpha_i \overline{\alpha_j} \varphi(x_i - x_j) \geq 0$ for all $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{C}$. By definition, $\varphi(0) \geq 0$, $\varphi(-x) = \overline{\varphi(x)}$, and $|\varphi(x)| \leq \varphi(0)$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Typical example of positive definite function is $\varphi(x) = e^{\sqrt{-1}ax}$, where $a \in \mathbb{R}$. This can be seen because of the identity

$$(\varphi(x_i - x_j))_{i,j=1}^n = (e^{\sqrt{-1}a(x_i - x_j)})_{i,j=1}^n = \begin{pmatrix} e^{\sqrt{-1}ax_1} \\ e^{\sqrt{-1}ax_2} \\ \vdots \\ e^{\sqrt{-1}ax_n} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} e^{\sqrt{-1}ax_1} \\ e^{\sqrt{-1}ax_2} \\ \vdots \\ e^{\sqrt{-1}ax_n} \end{pmatrix}^*.$$

It is known as Bochner's theorem that the function φ is positive definite if there exists a positive finite measure μ on \mathbb{R} such that

$$\varphi(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{ixt} d\mu(t).$$

2. Introduction and Main Results

It is known that

$$\left\| H^{\frac{1}{2}} X K^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \leq \frac{1}{2} \| H X + X K \|,$$

where H, K, X are operators on Hilbert space and H, K are positive and invertible. To show this operator norm inequality, we consider two functions as follows:

$$M(s, t) = (st)^{\frac{1}{2}} = t \left(\frac{s}{t} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = t f \left(\frac{s}{t} \right)$$

and

$$N(s, t) = \frac{s+t}{2} = t \left(\frac{\frac{s}{t} + 1}{2} \right) = t g \left(\frac{s}{t} \right),$$

that is $f(t) = t^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $g(t) = \frac{t+1}{2}$. Then, we have

$$\frac{f(e^{2x})}{g(e^{2x})} = \frac{e^x}{\frac{e^{2x}+1}{2}} = \frac{1}{\frac{e^x+e^{-x}}{2}} = \frac{1}{\cosh x} = \frac{2 \sinh x}{\sinh 2x}.$$

It is known that $\frac{2 \sinh x}{\sinh 2x}$ is positive definite. By [3], this fact is equivalent to the operator norm inequality

$$\left\| H^{\frac{1}{2}} X K^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \leq \frac{1}{2} \| H X + X K \|,$$

where $\| \bullet \|$ is any unitarily invariant norm and usual operator norm $\| \bullet \|$ is one of example of unitarily invariant norms. Borrowing notation in [3], we can write the above operator norm inequality as follows:

$$\| M(H, K) X \| \leq \frac{1}{2} \| N(H, K) X \|.$$

For $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \dots \geq a_n > 0$ and $b_1 \geq b_2 \geq \dots \geq b_n > 0$, we define the function

$$h(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{b_i \sinh a_i x}{a_i \sinh b_i x}.$$

The following statements had proved in [1]:

- (1) If $\sum_{i=1}^k a_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^k b_i$ for any $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, then h is positive definite.
- (2) If $a_1 > b_1$, then h is not positive definite.
- (3) If $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i > \sum_{i=1}^n b_i$, then h is not positive definite.

For $a \geq b > 0$ and $c \geq d > 0$, we set

$$M(s, t) = (st)^{\frac{1-a+b}{2}} \frac{b(s^a - t^a)}{a(s^b - t^b)}$$

and

$$N(s, t) = (st)^{\frac{1-c+d}{2}} \frac{d(s^c - t^c)}{c(s^d - t^d)}.$$

By the facts (1), (2) and (3), we have that the following three statements are equivalent.

- (a) $c \geq a$ and $b + c \geq a + d$.
- (b) $\frac{\sinh ax \sinh dx}{\sinh bx \sinh cx}$ is positive definite.
- (c) $\|M(H, K)X\| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|N(H, K)X\|$, where H, K, X are operators on Hilbert space and H, K are positive and invertible.

The following two functions does not satisfies the assumption of (1), (2) and (3):

$$h_1(x) = \frac{\sinh 8x \sinh 6x \sinh x}{\sinh 9x \sinh 4x \sinh 4x}$$

and

$$h_2(x) = \frac{\sinh 8x \sinh 6x \sinh 3x}{\sinh 9x \sinh 4x \sinh 4x}.$$

It is proved in [1] that h_1 is positive definite whereas h_2 is not positive definite. We can get the following statement and the non positive definiteness of h_2 can be extended as stated in Corollary 2.

Theorem 1. [2] If φ (not necessarily continuous) is positive definite on \mathbb{R} and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(nx) = \varphi(0)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, then φ is constant.

Corollary 2. If h is non-constant satisfying

$$a_1 + a_2 + \cdots + a_n = b_1 + b_2 + \cdots + b_n$$

and

$$a_1 \times a_2 \times \cdots \times a_n = b_1 \times b_2 \times \cdots \times b_n,$$

then h is not positive definite.

3. Proof of the Main Results

We define that the function φ is positive definite on \mathbb{Z} if for any natural numbers n , $\sum_{i,j=1}^n \alpha_i \overline{\alpha_j} \varphi(x_i - x_j) \geq 0$, where $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{C}$ and $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{Z}$. It is known as Herglotz's theorem that φ is positive definite function on \mathbb{Z} if there exists positive finite measure μ on \mathbb{T} (as a dual of \mathbb{Z}) such that

$$\varphi(n) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}nx} d\mu(x) \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Here, $[0, 1) \cong \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ will identify \mathbb{T} .

Before we begin our proof, we will show that

$$\mu(\{0\}) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2N+1} \sum_{n=-N}^N \varphi(n). \quad (\dagger)$$

To prove this, it suffices to show that if $\mu(\{0\}) = 0$, then

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2N+1} \sum_{n=-N}^N \varphi(n) = 0$$

by considering $\mu - \mu(\{0\})\delta_0$ instead of μ , where δ_0 is a Dirac measure at 0. So, we are going to assume that $\mu(\{0\}) = 0$.

Since $|\sin x| \leq |x|$ and $\frac{2x}{\pi} \leq \sin x$ ($0 \leq x \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$), then

$$\frac{1}{2N+1} \left| \frac{\sin(2N+1)\pi x}{\sin \pi x} \right| \leq \frac{1}{2N+1} \times \frac{(2N+1)\pi x}{\frac{2\pi x}{\pi}} = \frac{\pi}{2} \text{ if } 0 \leq x \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

For a sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \left| \frac{1}{2N+1} \sum_{n=-N}^N \varphi(n) \right| &= \left| \frac{1}{2N+1} \sum_{n=-N}^N \int_0^1 e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}nx} d\mu(x) \right| \\
 &= \left| \int_0^1 \frac{1}{2N+1} \frac{\sin(2N+1)\pi x}{\sin \pi x} d\mu(x) \right| \\
 &\leq \int_{-\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon} \left| \frac{1}{2N+1} \frac{\sin(2N+1)\pi x}{\sin \pi x} \right| d\mu(x) \\
 &\quad + \int_{\varepsilon}^{1-\varepsilon} \left| \frac{1}{2N+1} \frac{\sin(2N+1)\pi x}{\sin \pi x} \right| d\mu(x) \\
 &\leq \frac{\pi}{2} \mu((-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)) + \frac{1}{(2N+1) \sin \pi \varepsilon} \mu(\mathbb{T}).
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{2N+1} \sum_{n=-N}^N \varphi(n) \right| \leq \frac{\pi}{2} \mu((-\varepsilon, \varepsilon))$. Since ε is arbitrary and $\mu(\{0\}) = 0$, then $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2N+1} \sum_{n=-N}^N \varphi(n) = 0$.

Lemma 3. Let $\varphi : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be positive definite and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(n) = \varphi(0)$. Then, φ is constant.

Proof. Let $\varphi(n) = \int_0^1 e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}nx} d\mu(x)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then, $\varphi(0) = \mu(\mathbb{T})$. Furthermore, by (†) and since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(n) = \varphi(0)$, then $\mu(\{0\}) = \varphi(0)$. This means that μ is a non-negative scalar multiple of Dirac measure at 0 and so, $\varphi(n) = \varphi(0)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. Given $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we can consider the complex-valued function φ_x on \mathbb{Z} in which

$$\varphi_x(n) = \varphi(nx).$$

We have that φ_x is positive definite and since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(nx) = \varphi(0)$, then by Lemma 3, φ_x is constant and since x is arbitrarily chosen, then φ is constant.

Proof of Corollary 2. By the assumption we have

$$h(x) = \frac{\sinh a_1 x \sinh a_2 x \cdots \sinh a_n x}{\sinh b_1 x \sinh b_2 x \cdots \sinh b_n x}$$

Consider that

$$\begin{aligned} h(0) &= \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} h(x) \\ &= \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{\sinh a_1 x \sinh a_2 x \cdots \sinh a_n x}{\sinh b_1 x \sinh b_2 x \cdots \sinh b_n x} \\ &= \frac{a_1 \times a_2 \times \cdots \times a_n}{b_1 \times b_2 \times \cdots \times b_n} \\ &= 1 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} h(x) &= \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(e^{a_1 x} - e^{-a_1 x})(e^{a_2 x} - e^{-a_2 x}) \cdots (e^{a_n x} - e^{-a_n x})}{(e^{b_1 x} - e^{-b_1 x})(e^{b_2 x} - e^{-b_2 x}) \cdots (e^{b_n x} - e^{-b_n x})} \\ &= \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{e^{(a_1 + a_2 + \cdots + a_n)x} (1 - e^{-2a_1 x})(1 - e^{-2a_2 x}) \cdots (1 - e^{-2a_n x})}{e^{(b_1 + b_2 + \cdots + b_n)x} (1 - e^{-2b_1 x})(1 - e^{-2b_2 x}) \cdots (1 - e^{-2b_n x})} \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

This means

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h(nx) = 1 \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Since h is non-constant, then by Theorem 1, h is not positive definite.

References

- [1] Albania. I. N and Nagisa. M, *Some Families of Operator Norm Inequalities*, Linear Algebra and Its Application. 534(2017), 102-121.
- [2] Albania. I. N and Nagisa. M, *Positive Definite Sequences with Constant Modulus*, Scientiae Mathematicae Japonicae. Editione Electronica, whole number 30, e-2017-17.
- [3] Hiai. F and Kosaki. H, *Means for Matrices and Comparison of Their Norms*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 48(1999), 899-936.
- [4] Hiai. F and Petz. D, *Introduction to Matrix Analysis and Applications*, Springer, 2014.

Department of Mathematics Education

Indonesia University of Education

Jl. Dr. Setiabudhi 229 Bandung, West Java 40154

e-mail address: *albania@upi.edu*, *phantasion@gmail.com*