

NUMERICAL RADIUS INEQUALITIES FOR SQUARE-ZERO AND IDEMPOTENT OPERATORS

HWA-LONG GAU, CHIN-YING HUANG AND PEI YUAN WU

(communicated by C.-K. Li)

Abstract. We show that if A is a square-zero or an idempotent operator on a Hilbert space and B commutes with A , then $w(AB) \leq \min\{w(A)\|B\|, \|A\|w(B)\}$ holds, where $w(\cdot)$ and $\|\cdot\|$ denote, respectively, the numerical radius and operator norm of an operator

Let A be a bounded linear operator on a complex Hilbert space H . The *numerical range* $W(A)$ and *numerical radius* $w(A)$ of A are, by definition,

$$W(A) = \{\langle Ax, x \rangle : x \in H, \|x\| = 1\}$$

and

$$w(A) = \sup\{|z| : z \in W(A)\},$$

respectively, where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and $\|\cdot\|$ are the inner product and its corresponding norm in H . By the celebrated Hausdorff–Toeplitz theorem, $W(A)$ is always a convex subset of the plane. It is bounded and, when H is finite dimensional, it is even compact. Its closure contains the spectrum of A . The numerical radius satisfies $\|A\|/2 \leq w(A) \leq \|A\|$. For other properties, the reader may consult [2, Chapter 22] or [1].

In 1969, Holbrook [3] asked whether, for commuting operators A and B , the inequality $w(AB) \leq w(A)\|B\|$ holds. He showed that this is indeed the case when A and B doubly commute (i.e., $AB = BA$ and $AB^* = B^*A$) (cf. [3, Theorem 3.4]). There are many other cases in which we do have this inequality. It came as a surprise when in 1988 Müller [5] gave an example of two 12-by-12 commuting matrices A and B with $w(AB) > w(A)\|B\|$. Recently, we prove, as a consequence of a more general result, that if A is a quadratic operator and B commutes with A , then $w(AB) \leq w(A)\|B\|$ is true (cf. [8, Theorem 5]). Whether the inequality $w(AB) \leq \|A\|w(B)$ also holds is left open as the arguments in [8] do not seem to be extendable to cover this case. The purpose of the present paper is to show that $w(AB) \leq \min\{w(A)\|B\|, \|A\|w(B)\}$ is true

Mathematics subject classification (2000): 47A12.

Key words and phrases: Numerical range, numerical radius, square-zero operator, idempotent operator.

The researches of the first and third authors were partially supported by the National Science Council of the Republic of China under projects NSC 96-2115-M-008-006 and NSC 96-2115-M-009-013-MY3, respectively.

for A a square-zero or an idempotent operator and B commuting with A . Recall that an operator A is *quadratic* if it satisfies $A^2 + \alpha A + \beta I = 0$ for some scalars α and β . A is *square-zero* (resp., *idempotent*) if $A^2 = 0$ (resp., $A^2 = A$). The proofs here are more down-to-earth, not involving, e.g., the Sz.-Nagy–Foiş functional model for contractions.

We start with the following result which describes the spectrum, canonical model, norm and numerical range of a quadratic operator. It is from [7].

PROPOSITION 1. *Let A be a quadratic operator satisfying $A^2 + \alpha A + \beta I = 0$. Then*

- (a) *the spectrum of A consists of the zeros a and b of the quadratic polynomial $z^2 + \alpha z + \beta$ as eigenvalues,*
- (b) *A is unitarily equivalent to an operator of the form*

$$aI_1 \oplus bI_2 \oplus \begin{bmatrix} aI_3 & D \\ 0 & bI_3 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $D > 0$ (i.e., $\langle Dx, x \rangle > 0$ for any nonzero vector x),

- (c) $\|A\| = \left\| \begin{bmatrix} a & \|D\| \\ 0 & b \end{bmatrix} \right\|$ if A is not a scalar operator, and
- (d) $W(A)$ is the (open or closed) elliptic disc with foci a and b and the length of the minor axis $\|D\|$.

The numerical radius inequality for a square-zero operator is easier to prove.

PROPOSITION 2. *If A is square-zero and B commutes with A , then*

$$w(AB) \leq \min\{w(A)\|B\|, \|A\|w(B)\}.$$

Proof. Since $(AB)^2 = A^2B^2 = 0$, Proposition 1 (c) and (d) imply that $W(AB)$ is the (open or closed) circular disc centered at the origin with radius $\|AB\|/2$. Thus

$$w(AB) = \frac{1}{2}\|AB\| \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\|A\|\right)\|B\| \leq w(A)\|B\|.$$

Similarly, we have $w(AB) \leq \|A\|w(B)$. \square

The next result, our main theorem, gives the numerical radius inequality for idempotent operators.

THEOREM 3. *If A is idempotent and B commutes with A , then*

$$w(AB) \leq \min\{w(A)\|B\|, \|A\|w(B)\}.$$

Proof. Assume that $A \neq 0, I$ and $\dim \ker(A - I) \leq \dim \ker A$. The case for $\dim \ker(A - I) > \dim \ker A$ can be dealt with analogously. From Proposition 1 (b),

we may further assume that $A = \begin{bmatrix} I & D' \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ on $H = H_1 \oplus H_2$ with $H_1 \subseteq H_2$, where $D' = [D\ 0] : H_2 = H_1 \oplus (H_2 \ominus H_1) \rightarrow H_1$ and $D > 0$ on H_1 . Let

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} B_{11} & B_{12} \\ B_{21} & B_{22} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{on } H = H_1 \oplus H_2.$$

Since A and B commute, we have

$$AB = \begin{bmatrix} B_{11} + D'B_{21} & B_{12} + D'B_{22} \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} B_{11} & B_{11}D' \\ B_{21} & B_{21}D' \end{bmatrix} = BA.$$

Hence $B_{21} = 0$ and $B_{12} = B_{11}D' - D'B_{22}$ and thus

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} B_{11} & B_{11}D' - D'B_{22} \\ 0 & B_{22} \end{bmatrix}.$$

By the spectral theorem for normal operators, there are diagonal operators D_n (meaning D_n is unitarily equivalent to a diagonal matrix) such that D_n converges to D in norm. For each n , let $D'_n = [D_n\ 0]$,

$$A_n = \begin{bmatrix} I & D'_n \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad B_n = \begin{bmatrix} B_{11} & B_{11}D'_n - D'_nB_{22} \\ 0 & B_{22} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then A_n and B_n commute and $A_n \rightarrow A$ and $B_n \rightarrow B$ in norm. If we can show that $w(A_nB_n) \leq \min\{w(A_n)\|B_n\|, \|A_n\|w(B_n)\}$ for all n , then, since the norm and numerical radius of operators are continuous (cf. [2, Problem 220] for the latter), we will have the asserted inequality for A and B . Hence without loss of generality we may assume that $D = \text{diag}(d_1, d_2, \dots)$ is diagonal with $d_1 \geq d_n$ for all n . (Here we are also assuming that H_1 is separable; a slight modification of the arguments below to accommodate the uncountable sum applies to the nonseparable case.) Letting

$$\tilde{A} = \begin{bmatrix} I & d_1I & 0 \\ & 0 & 0 \\ & & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{B} = \begin{bmatrix} B_{11} & & \\ & B_{11} & \\ & & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

on $H = H_1 \oplus H_1 \oplus (H_2 \ominus H_1)$, we now show that $w(AB) \leq w(\tilde{A}\tilde{B})$. Indeed, note that

$$AB = \begin{bmatrix} B_{11} & B_{11}D' \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

and hence

$$w(AB) = \sup \{ |\langle B_{11}x, x \rangle + \langle B_{11}D'y, x \rangle| : \|x\|^2 + \|y\|^2 = 1 \}.$$

Letting $u = \langle B_{11}x, x \rangle$, $y = [y_1\ y_2\ \dots]^T$ and $B_{11}^*x = [z_1\ z_2\ \dots]^T$, we have

$$|\langle B_{11}x, x \rangle + \langle B_{11}D'y, x \rangle| = \left| u + \sum_n d_n y_n \bar{z}_n \right|.$$

For each n , let θ_n be a real number such that $\arg(y_n \bar{z}_n e^{i\theta_n}) = \arg u$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \left| u + \sum_n d_n y_n \bar{z}_n \right| &\leq |u| + \sum_n d_n |y_n \bar{z}_n| \\ &\leq |u| + d_1 \sum_n |y_n \bar{z}_n e^{i\theta_n}| = \left| u + d_1 \sum_n y_n \bar{z}_n e^{i\theta_n} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} w(AB) &\leq \sup \left\{ \left| \langle B_{11}x, x \rangle + d_1 \sum_n (y_n e^{i\theta_n}) \bar{z}_n \right| : \|x\|^2 + \|y\|^2 = 1 \right\} \\ &= \sup \{ |\langle B_{11}x, x \rangle + d_1 \langle B_{11}\tilde{y}, x \rangle| : \|x\|^2 + \|\tilde{y}\|^2 = 1 \} \\ &= w(\widetilde{AB}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{y} = [y_1 e^{i\theta_1} \ y_2 e^{i\theta_2} \ \dots]^T$. Since \tilde{A} and \tilde{B} doubly commute, [3, Theorem 3.4] implies that $w(\widetilde{AB}) \leq \min \{w(\tilde{A})\|\tilde{B}\|, \|\tilde{A}\|w(\tilde{B})\}$. But

$$w(\tilde{A}) = w\left(\begin{bmatrix} 1 & d_1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}\right) = w(A)$$

and

$$\|\tilde{A}\| = \left\| \begin{bmatrix} 1 & d_1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\| = \|A\|$$

by Proposition 1 (d) and (c), and $w(\tilde{B}) = w(B_{11}) \leq w(B)$ and $\|\tilde{B}\| = \|B_{11}\| \leq \|B\|$. We conclude from above that

$$w(AB) \leq w(\widetilde{AB}) \leq \min \{w(A)\|B\|, \|A\|w(B)\}. \quad \square$$

In conclusion, three remarks are in order: (1) Proposition 2 and Theorem 3 for the finite matrix case were contained in the Master thesis [4] of the second author supervised by the third. (2) Although in the proof of Theorem 3 the reduction to the diagonal D is still valid for general quadratic operators, other parts there seem difficult to be extended to cover the general case. (3) It was shown in [6] that $w(AB) \leq \|A\|w(B)$ holds for A satisfying $A^2 = aI$ for some scalar a and B commuting with A . The proof there is quite different from above.

REFERENCES

[1] K. GUSTAFSON AND D. K. M. RAO, *Numerical Range. The Field of Values of Linear Operators and Matrices*, Springer, New York, 1997.
 [2] P. R. HALMOS, *A Hilbert Space Problem Book*, 2nd ed., Springer, New York, 1981.
 [3] J. A. R. HOLBROOK, *Multiplicative properties of the numerical radius in operator theory*, J. Reine Angew. Math., 237 (1969), 166–174.
 [4] C.-Y. HUANG, *Numerical Radius Inequalities for Square-zero and Idempotent Matrices*, Master thesis, National Chiao Tung Univ., 2005.

- [5] V. MÜLLER, *The numerical radius of a commuting product*, Michigan Math. J., 35 (1988), 255–260.
- [6] D. K. M. RAO, *Rango numerico de operadores conmutativos*, Rev. Colombiana Mat., 27 (1994), 231–233.
- [7] S.-H. TSO AND P. Y. WU, *Matricial ranges of quadratic operators*, Rocky Mountain J. Math., 29 (1999), 1139–1152.
- [8] P. Y. WU, H.-L. GAU AND M. C. TSAI, *Numerical radius inequality for C_0 contractions*, Linear Algebra Appl. (to appear).

(Received August 30, 2007)

Hwa-Long Gau
Dept. of Mathematics
National Central University
Chung-Li 320
Taiwan

e-mail: hlgau@math.ncu.edu.tw

Chin-Ying Huang
Dept. of Applied Mathematics
National Chiao Tung University
Hsinchu 300
Taiwan

Pei Yuan Wu
Dept. of Applied Mathematics
National Chiao Tung University
Hsinchu 300
Taiwan

e-mail: pywu@math.nctu.edu.tw