Mathematics

DOI: 10.3934/math. 2024207
Received: 20 November 2023
Revised: 27 December 2023
Accepted: 04 January 2024
Published: 15 January 2024

Research article

# Some matrix inequalities related to norm and singular values 

Xiaoyan Xiao ${ }^{1}$, Feng Zhang ${ }^{1, *}$, Yuxin Cao ${ }^{2}$ and Chunwen Zhang ${ }^{2}$<br>${ }^{1}$ Department of Mathematics, Southeast University Chengxian College, Nanjing 210000, China<br>${ }^{2}$ Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Southeast University Chengxian College, Nanjing 210000, China

* Correspondence: Email: fzhang1024@163.com.


#### Abstract

In this short note, we presented a new proof of a weak log-majorization inequality for normal matrices and obtained a singular value inequality related to positive semi-definite matrices. What's more, we also gave an example to show that some conditions in an existing norm inequality are necessary.
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## 1. Introduction

Let $M_{n}$ be the space of $n \times n$ complex matrices. If $A$ is a Hermitian element of $M_{n}$, then we enumerate its eigenvalues as $\lambda_{1}(A) \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_{n}(A)$ (see [1] for more details). The singular values of $A \in M_{n}$ are defined to be the nonnegative square roots of the eigenvalues of $A^{*} A$, where $A^{*}$ denotes the conjugate transpose of a matrix $A$, i.e., $s_{i}(A)=\lambda_{i}(|A|)(1 \leq i \leq n)$ for $|A|=\left(A^{*} A\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. The notation $A \geq(>) 0$ is used to mean that $A$ is positive semi-definite (positive definite).

Given a real vector $x=\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, \cdots, x_{n}\right) \in R^{n}$, we rearrange its components as $x_{[1]} \geq x_{[2]} \geq \cdots \geq x_{[n]}$. For $x=\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, \cdots, x_{n}\right), y=\left(y_{1}, y_{2}, \cdots, y_{n}\right) \in R^{n}$, we say $x$ is weakly majorized by $y\left(x<_{w} y\right)$ if $\sum_{i=1}^{k} x_{[i]} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} y_{[i]}$ for $k=1,2, \cdots, n$. If $x<_{w} y$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{i}=\sum_{i=1}^{n} y_{i}$ hold, we say $x$ is majorized by $y$ and denote $x<y$.

For $x=\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, \cdots, x_{n}\right)$ with $x_{i} \geq 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$, we write $x \in R_{+}^{n}$. Let $x, y \in R_{+}^{n}$. The weak $\log$-majorization $x<_{w \log } y$ can be defined as

$$
\prod_{i=1}^{k} x_{[i]} \leq \prod_{i=1}^{k} y_{[i]}, k=1,2, \cdots, n .
$$

The log-majorization $x<_{\log } y$ holds if, and only if, $x<_{w \log } y$ and $\prod_{i=1}^{n} x_{i}=\prod_{i=1}^{n} y_{i}$.

Let $A, B \geq 0$. The weak $\log$-majorization inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
s(A+z B)<_{w \log } s(A+|z| B) \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

for any complex number $z$ was proved by Zhan [2].
Next, in [3], the inequality (1.1) was extended to the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
s\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}\right) \prec_{w \log } s\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left|A_{i}\right|\right) \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $A_{i}$ are normal matrices, $i=1,2, \cdots, m$.
For $t \in[0,1]$, the $t$-geometric mean of $A, B \in M_{n}$ with $A, B$ are positive definite and defined as $A \#_{t} B=A^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(A^{-\frac{1}{2}} B A^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{t} A^{\frac{1}{2}}([4])$. Their geometric mean is $A \# B=A^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(A^{-\frac{1}{2}} B A^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and a matrix Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for positive definite matrices $A_{i}$ and $B_{i}(i=1,2, \cdots, n)$ is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{i} \# B_{i} \leq\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{i}\right) \#\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} B_{i}\right) \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

also, see [5].
A norm $\|\cdot\|$ on $M_{n}$ is called unitarily invariant if $\|U A V\|=\|A\|$ for any $A \in M_{n}$ and any unitary $U, V \in M_{n}$. Fan's dominance principle [5] illustrates the relevance of majorization in matrix theory: For $A, B$ in $M_{n}$, the weak majorization $s(A)<_{w} s(B)$ means $\|A\| \leq\|B\|$ for all unitarily invariant norms $\|\cdot\|$ (see [4] for more details).

Norm inequality for sums of positive semi-definite matrices shown by M. Hayajneh, S. Hayajneh, and F. Kittaneh [6] can be stated as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}^{\frac{1}{2}} B_{i}^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{2}\right\| \leq\left\|\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} B_{i}\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right\| \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $A_{i}, B_{i} \in M_{n}(i=1,2, \cdots, m)$ are positive semi-definite matrices and $A_{i}$ commutes $B_{i}$ for each $i$. Inequality (1.4) is a refinement of the following inequality obtained by Audenaert [7]:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}^{\frac{1}{2}} B_{i}^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{2}\right\| \leq\left\|\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} B_{i}\right)\right\| . \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Zhao and Jiang [8] derived a generalization of inequality (1.4),

$$
\begin{equation*}
s^{r}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(A_{i} B_{i}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \prec_{w \log } s\left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}\right)^{\frac{r}{4}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} B_{i}\right)^{\frac{r}{2}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}\right)^{\frac{r}{4}}\right) \tag{1.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $r \geq 1$.
Let $A, B \in M_{n}$ be positive semi-definite and suppose that $\frac{1}{p}+\frac{1}{q}=1, p, q>1, a \in(0,1)$. Wu proved in [9] that if $r \geq \max \left\{\frac{1}{p}, \frac{1}{q}\right\}$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\||A B|^{2 r}\right\| \leq\left[\frac{1}{4 a(1-a)}\right]^{r}\left\|(a A+(1-a) B)^{2 r p}\right\|^{\frac{1}{p}}\left\|((1-a) A+a B)^{2 r q}\right\|^{\frac{1}{q}} . \tag{1.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is natural to raise the question that if $r<\max \left\{\frac{1}{p}, \frac{1}{q}\right\}$, then does inequality (1.7) hold or not?
Zhang [3] utilized the compound matrix technique to derive inequality (1.2). In this paper, we present a new proof of inequality (1.2). We also give a generalization of inequality (1.6). Finally, we present some numerical examples to show that inequality (1.7) is not always true when $r<\max \left\{\frac{1}{p}, \frac{1}{q}\right\}$.

## 2. Main results

We begin this section with the following lemmas, which play an important role in our discussion.
Lemma 1. [5] Let $A \in M_{n}$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\prod_{j=1}^{k} s_{j}(A)=\max \left|\operatorname{det} W^{*} A W\right| \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the maximum is taken over all $n \times k$ matrices $W$ such that $W^{*} W=I$.
Lemma 2. [8] Let $\left(\begin{array}{cc}A & X \\ X^{*} & B\end{array}\right) \geq 0$, then

$$
|\operatorname{det}(X)| \leq \operatorname{det}\left(A^{\frac{1}{2}} B^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)
$$

Lemma 3. [10] Let $p>0, t \in[0,1]$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda^{p}\left(A \#_{t} B\right)<_{w \log } \lambda\left(B^{\frac{p t}{2}} A^{(1-t) p} B^{\frac{p}{2}}\right) \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

We give a new proof of inequality (1.2).
Theorem 4. Let $A_{i} \in M_{n}$ be normal matrices $A_{i}(i=1,2, \cdots, m)$, then

$$
s\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}\right) \prec_{w \log } s\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left|A_{i}\right|\right) .
$$

Proof. An application of the polar decomposition reveals $\left(\begin{array}{cc}\left|A_{i}^{*}\right| & A_{i} \\ A_{i}^{*} & \left|A_{i}\right|\end{array}\right) \geq 0$ for any $i$. Hence,

$$
\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left|A_{i}^{*}\right| & \sum_{i=1}^{m} A_{i} \\
\sum_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}^{*} & \sum_{i=1}^{m}\left|A_{i}\right|
\end{array}\right)=\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\left|A_{i}^{*}\right| & A_{i} \\
A_{i}^{*} & \left|A_{i}\right|
\end{array}\right)
$$

is positive semi-definite. It follows from $\left|A_{i}^{*}\right|=\left|A_{i}\right|$ that $\left(\begin{array}{cc}\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left|A_{i}\right| & \sum_{i=1}^{m} A_{i} \\ \sum_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}^{*} & \sum_{i=1}^{m}\left|A_{i}\right|\end{array}\right) \geq 0$.
For all $n \times k$ matrices $W$ with $W^{*} W=I$,

$$
\left(\begin{array}{cc}
W^{*}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left|A_{i}\right|\right) W & W^{*}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}\right) W \\
W^{*}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}^{*}\right) W & W^{*}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left|A_{i}\right|\right) W
\end{array}\right) \geq 0 .
$$

Using Lemmas 1 and 2 , we obtain

$$
\prod_{j=1}^{k} s_{j}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}\right)=\max \left|\operatorname{det} W^{*}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}\right) W\right|
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \leq \max \left|\operatorname{det} W^{*}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left|A_{i}\right|\right) W\right| \\
& =\prod_{j=1}^{k} s_{j}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left|A_{i}\right|\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Next, we give a generalization of inequality (1.6).
Theorem 5. Let $A_{i}, B_{i} \in M_{n}$ be positive semi-definite matrices, then

$$
\prod_{j=1}^{k} s_{j}^{r}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} A_{i} \# B_{i}\right) \leq \prod_{j=1}^{k} s_{j}\left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}\right)^{\frac{r}{4}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} B_{i}\right)^{\frac{r}{2}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}\right)^{\frac{r}{4}}\right)
$$

for $r>0$.
Proof. We first consider the case $A_{i}, B_{i}>0(i=1,2, \cdots, m)$.
Using inequality (1.3), we get

$$
\prod_{j=1}^{k} s_{j}^{r}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} A_{i} \# B_{i}\right) \leq \prod_{j=1}^{k} s_{j}^{r}\left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}\right) \#\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} B_{i}\right)\right)
$$

for $k=1,2, \cdots, n$.
It follows from Lemma 3 that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\prod_{j=1}^{k} s_{j}^{r}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} A_{i} \# B_{i}\right) & \leq \prod_{j=1}^{k} \lambda_{j}^{r}\left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}\right) \#\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} B_{i}\right)\right) \\
& \leq \prod_{j=1}^{k} \lambda_{j}\left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}\right)^{\frac{r}{4}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} B_{i}\right)^{\frac{r}{2}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}\right)^{\frac{r}{4}}\right) \\
& =\prod_{j=1}^{k} s_{j}\left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}\right)^{\frac{r}{4}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} B_{i}\right)^{\frac{r}{2}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}\right)^{\frac{r}{4}}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

for $k=1,2, \cdots, n$.
For the general case, by replacing $A_{i}$ and $B_{i}$ by $\varepsilon I_{n}+A_{i}$ and $\varepsilon I_{n}+B_{i}(\varepsilon>0)$ for $i=1,2, \cdots, m$, respectively, and repeating the same process as above, we obtain that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \prod_{j=1}^{k} s_{j}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(\varepsilon I_{n}+A_{i}\right) \#\left(\varepsilon I_{n}+B_{i}\right)\right) \\
\leq & \prod_{j=1}^{k} s_{j}\left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} \varepsilon I_{n}+A_{i}\right)^{\frac{r}{4}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} \varepsilon I_{n}+B_{i}\right)^{\frac{r}{2}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} \varepsilon I_{n}+A_{i}\right)^{\frac{r}{4}}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

By continuity, we get the desired inequality.

Finally, we show that

$$
\left\||A B|^{2 r}\right\| \leq\left[\frac{1}{4 a(1-a)}\right]^{r}\left\|(a A+(1-a) B)^{2 r p}\right\|^{\frac{1}{p}}\left\|((1-a) A+a B)^{2 r q}\right\|^{\frac{1}{q}}
$$

isn't always true if $r<\max \left\{\frac{1}{p}, \frac{1}{q}\right\}$.
Using $\lambda_{j}(A B) \leq \lambda_{j}\left(\frac{A^{\frac{1}{2}}+B^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2}\right)^{4}$ (see [11]), we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{j=1}^{k}\left[\lambda_{j}\left(A B^{2} A\right)\right]^{r} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{k}\left[\lambda_{j}\left(\frac{A+B}{2}\right)\right]^{4 r} \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $r=\frac{1-2 \varepsilon}{2}\left(0<\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}\right)$.
Inequality (2.3) is equivalent to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{j=1}^{k} s_{j}\left(B A^{2} B\right)^{r} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{k} s_{j}\left(\frac{A+B}{2}\right)^{4 r}, k=1,2, \cdots, n . \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Inequality (2.4) can be rewritten as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{j=1}^{k} s_{j}\left(|A B|^{1-2 \varepsilon}\right) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{k} s_{j}\left(\left|\frac{A+B}{2}\right|^{2-4 \varepsilon}\right) \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $1 \leq k \leq n$. By Ky Fan's dominance principce [5], we see inequality (2.5) is equivalent to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\||A B|^{1-2 \varepsilon}\right\| \leq\left\|\left(\frac{A+B}{2}\right)^{2-4 \varepsilon}\right\| . \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Inequality (2.6) implies inequality (1.7) is true if $p=q=2, a=\frac{1}{2}$, and $r<\max \left\{\frac{1}{p}, \frac{1}{q}\right\}$.
Example 6. Let $A=\left[\begin{array}{ll}1 & 2 \\ 2 & 7\end{array}\right], B=\left[\begin{array}{cc}1 & -1 \\ -1 & 4\end{array}\right], a=0.12$, and $r=0.22$ in inequality (1.7).
By calculating, we obtain $s_{1}^{r}\left(B A^{2} B\right)+s_{2}^{r}\left(B A^{2} B\right) \approx 4.9044$ and

$$
\left[\frac{1}{4 a(1-a)}\right]^{r}\left(s_{1}^{r}(a A+(1-a) B)+s_{2}^{r}(a A+(1-a) B)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(s_{1}^{r}((1-a) A+a B)+s_{2}^{r}((1-a) A+a B)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}
$$

$$
\approx 2.8895
$$

Therefore, inequality (1.7) isn't true in this case.

## 3. Conclusions

Matrix inequalities play important roles in linear algebra and it is of interest to study the properties of Positive semi-definite matrix. In this paper, we have presented a norm inequalities related to normal matrices by using block matrix technique. Next, a weak majorization inequality for $t$-geometric mean was established. Lastly, a numerical example has been provided to illustrate the necessity of a condition in an existing inequality.
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