

INTERPOLATING BETWEEN THE ARITHMETIC–GEOMETRIC MEAN AND CAUCHY–SCHWARZ MATRIX NORM INEQUALITIES

KOENRAAD M. R. AUDENAERT

(Communicated by R. Bhatia)

Abstract. We prove an inequality for unitarily invariant norms that interpolates between the Arithmetic-Geometric Mean inequality and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality.

1. Introduction

In this paper we prove the following inequality for unitarily invariant matrix norms:

THEOREM 1. *Let $\|\cdot\|$ be any unitarily invariant norm. For all $n \times n$ matrices X and Y , and all $q \in [0, 1]$,*

$$\| \|XY^*\|^2 \leq \| \|qX^*X + (1-q)Y^*Y\| \| \| (1-q)X^*X + qY^*Y\|. \quad (1)$$

For $q = 0$ or $q = 1$, this reduces to the known Cauchy-Schwarz (CS) inequality for unitarily invariant norms [3, (IX.32)], [2], [6]

$$\| \|XY^*\|^2 \leq \| \|X^*X\| \| \|Y^*Y\|.$$

For $q = 1/2$ on the other hand, this yields the arithmetic-geometric mean (AGM) inequality [3, (IX.22)], [4]

$$\| \|XY^*\| \leq \frac{1}{2} \| \|X^*X + Y^*Y\|.$$

Thus, inequality (1) interpolates between the AGM and CS inequalities for unitarily invariant norms.

In Section 2 we prove an eigenvalue inequality that may be of independent interest. The proof of Theorem 1 follows easily from this inequality, in combination with standard majorisation techniques; this proof is given in Section 3.

Mathematics subject classification (2010): 15A60.

Keywords and phrases: Eigenvalue inequality, matrix norm inequality.

We acknowledge support by an Odysseus grant from the Flemish FWO. We are grateful to Professor Bhatia for pointing out a serious mistake in an earlier circulated version of this paper.

2. Main technical result

For any $n \times n$ matrix A with real eigenvalues, we will denote these eigenvalues sorted in non-ascending order by $\lambda_k(A)$. Thus $\lambda_1(A) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(A)$. Singular values will be denoted as $\sigma_k(A)$, again sorted in non-ascending order.

Our main technical tool in proving Theorem 1 is the following eigenvalue inequality, which may be of independent interest:

THEOREM 2. *Let A and B be $n \times n$ positive semidefinite matrices. Let q be a number between 0 and 1, and let $C(q) := qA + (1 - q)B$. Then, for all $k = 1, \dots, n$,*

$$\lambda_k(AB) \leq \lambda_k(C(q)C(1 - q)). \quad (2)$$

Putting $A = X^*X$ and $B = Y^*Y$, for $n \times n$ matrices X and Y , and noting that

$$\lambda_k^{1/2}(AB) = \lambda_k^{1/2}(YX^*XY^*) = \sigma_k(XY^*),$$

we can write (2) as a singular value inequality:

$$\sigma_k^2(XY^*) \leq \lambda_k((qX^*X + (1 - q)Y^*Y)((1 - q)X^*X + qY^*Y)). \quad (3)$$

For $p = 1/2$, Theorem 2 gives

$$\lambda_k^{1/2}(AB) \leq \frac{1}{2} \lambda_k(A + B) \quad (4)$$

and (3) becomes the well-known AGM inequality for singular values [3, inequality (IX.20)]

$$\sigma_k(XY^*) \leq \frac{1}{2} \sigma_k(X^*X + Y^*Y).$$

The following modification of inequality (2), proven by Drury for the case $q = 1/2$ [5], does not hold for all $q \in [0, 1]$:

$$\sigma_k(AB) \leq \sigma_k(C(q)C(1 - q)).$$

We are grateful to Swapan Rana for informing us about counterexamples.

Proof. We first reduce the statement of the theorem to a special case using a technique that is due to Ando [1] and that was also used in [5, Section 4].

Throughout the proof, we will keep k fixed. If either A or B has rank less than k , then $\lambda_k(AB) = 0$ and (2) holds trivially. We will therefore assume that A and B have rank at least k . By scaling A and B we can ensure that $\lambda_k(AB) = 1$.

We will now try and find a positive semidefinite matrix B' of rank exactly k with $B' \leq B$ and such that AB' has k eigenvalues equal to 1 and all others equal to 0. By hypothesis, AB and hence $A^{1/2}BA^{1/2}$ have at least k eigenvalues larger than or equal to 1. Therefore, there exists a rank- k projector P satisfying $P \leq A^{1/2}BA^{1/2}$. Let B' be a rank- k matrix such that $A^{1/2}B'A^{1/2} = P$. If A is invertible, we simply have $B' =$

$A^{-1/2}PA^{-1/2}$; otherwise the generalised inverse of A is required. Then $B' \leq B$ and AB' has the requested spectrum.

Passing to an eigenbasis of B' , we can decompose B' as the direct sum $B' = B_{11} \oplus [0]_{n-k}$, where B_{11} is a $k \times k$ positive definite block. In that same basis, we partition A conformally with B' as $A = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{12}^* & A_{22} \end{pmatrix}$. Since $A^{1/2}B'A^{1/2} = P$ is a rank k projector, so is

$$R := (B')^{1/2}A(B')^{1/2} = (B_{11})^{1/2}A_{11}(B_{11})^{1/2} \oplus [0]_{n-k}.$$

The top-left block of R is a $k \times k$ matrix, and R is a rank- k projector. Therefore, that block must be identical to the $k \times k$ identity matrix: $(B_{11})^{1/2}A_{11}(B_{11})^{1/2} = I$. This implies that A_{11} is invertible and $B_{11} = (A_{11})^{-1}$. We therefore have, in an eigenbasis of B' ,

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{12}^* & A_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \quad B' = \begin{pmatrix} (A_{11})^{-1} & \\ & 0 \end{pmatrix} \leq B.$$

Clearly, $C'(q) := qA + (1 - q)B'$ satisfies $C'(q) \leq C(q)$, so that

$$\lambda_k(C'(q)C'(1 - q)) \leq \lambda_k(C(q)C(1 - q)),$$

while still $\lambda_k(AB') = \lambda_k(AB) = 1$. It is now left to show that $\lambda_k(C'(q)C'(1 - q)) \geq 1$.

A further reduction is possible. Let

$$A' = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{12}^* & A_{12}(A_{11})^{-1}A_{12} \end{pmatrix},$$

which has rank k and satisfies $0 \leq A' \leq A$. Let also $C''(q) := qA' + (1 - q)B'$, for which $0 \leq C''(q) \leq C'(q)$. Then $\lambda_k(C''(q)C''(1 - q)) \leq \lambda_k(C'(q)C'(1 - q))$.

Introducing $F := A_{11} > 0$, $G := A_{12}A_{12}^* \geq 0$ and $s := (1 - q)/q > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} C''(q) &= q \begin{pmatrix} F & A_{12} \\ A_{12}^* & A_{12}^*F^{-1}A_{12} \end{pmatrix} + (1 - q) \begin{pmatrix} F^{-1} & \\ & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= q \begin{pmatrix} I & \\ & A_{12}^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} F + sF^{-1} & I \\ I & F^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I & \\ & A_{12} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda_k(C''(q)C''(1 - q)) \\ &= q(1 - q)\lambda_k \left(\begin{pmatrix} I & \\ & G \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} F + sF^{-1} & I \\ I & F^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I & \\ & G \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} F + s^{-1}F^{-1} & I \\ I & F^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where each factor is a $2k \times 2k$ matrix. Noting that

$$\begin{pmatrix} F + sF^{-1} & I \\ I & F^{-1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} s^{1/2}F^{-1/2} & F^{1/2} \\ 0 & F^{-1/2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} s^{1/2}F^{-1/2} & 0 \\ F^{1/2} & F^{-1/2} \end{pmatrix},$$

we then have $\lambda_k(C''(q)C''(1-q)) = q(1-q)\lambda_k(Z^*Z) = q(1-q)\sigma_k^2(Z)$, where

$$Z = \begin{pmatrix} s^{1/2}F^{-1/2} & 0 \\ F^{1/2} & F^{-1/2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I \\ G \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} s^{-1/2}F^{-1/2} & F^{1/2} \\ 0 & F^{-1/2} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} F^{-1} & s^{1/2} \\ s^{-1/2} & F+H \end{pmatrix},$$

and $H := F^{-1/2}GF^{-1/2} \geq 0$. The singular values of Z are the same as those of

$$X := \begin{pmatrix} s^{1/2} & F^{-1} \\ F+H & s^{-1/2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

By the Fan-Hoffman theorem [3, Proposition III.5.1], the singular values of X are bounded below by the ordered eigenvalues of the Hermitian part of X : $\sigma_j(X) \geq \lambda_j((X+X^*)/2)$ for $j = 1, \dots, 2k$. Thus,

$$\lambda_k(C''(q)C''(1-q)) \geq q(1-q)\lambda_k^2(Y),$$

$$\text{with } Y := \begin{pmatrix} s^{1/2} & K \\ K & s^{-1/2} \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } K := (F+H+F^{-1})/2.$$

Clearly, $K \geq (F+F^{-1})/2 \geq I$. It is easily checked that the k largest eigenvalues of Y are given by

$$\lambda_j(Y) = \frac{1}{2} \left(s^{1/2} + s^{-1/2} + \sqrt{(s^{1/2} + s^{-1/2})^2 - 4 + 4\lambda_j^2(K)} \right), \quad j = 1, \dots, k.$$

As this expression is a monotonously increasing function of $\lambda_j(K)$, and $\lambda_j(K) \geq 1$, we obtain the lower bound $\lambda_k(Y) \geq s^{1/2} + s^{-1/2}$. Then, finally,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_k(C''(q)C''(1-q)) &\geq q(1-q) (s^{1/2} + s^{-1/2})^2 \\ &= q(1-q) \left(\left(\frac{1-q}{q} \right)^{1/2} + \left(\frac{q}{1-q} \right)^{1/2} \right)^2 \\ &= (1-q+q)^2 = 1, \end{aligned}$$

from which it follows that $\lambda_k(C'(q)C'(1-q)) \geq 1$. \square

3. Proof of Theorem 1

Using Theorem 2 and some standard arguments, the promised norm inequality is easily proven.

Proof. For all positive semidefinite matrices A and B , and any $r > 0$, we have the weak majorisation relation

$$\lambda^r(AB) \prec_w \lambda^r(A) \cdot \lambda^r(B),$$

where ‘ \cdot ’ denotes the elementwise product for vectors. This relation follows from combining the fact that AB has non-negative eigenvalues with Weyl’s majorant inequality [3, (II.23)],

$$|\lambda(AB)|^r \prec_w \sigma^r(AB)$$

and with the singular value majorisation relation ([3], inequality (IV.41))

$$\sigma^r(AB) \prec_w \sigma^r(A) \cdot \sigma^r(B).$$

From (3) we immediately get, for any $r > 0$,

$$\sigma^{2r}(XY^*) \prec_w \lambda^r((qX^*X + (1 - q)Y^*Y) ((1 - q)X^*X + qY^*Y)).$$

Hence,

$$\sigma^{2r}(XY^*) \prec_w \lambda^r(qX^*X + (1 - q)Y^*Y) \cdot \lambda^r((1 - q)X^*X + qY^*Y).$$

If we now apply Hölder’s inequality for symmetric gauge functions Φ ,

$$\Phi(|x \cdot y|) \leq \Phi(|x|^p)^{1/p} \Phi(|y|^{p'})^{1/p'},$$

where $x, y \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and $1/p + 1/p' = 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\sigma^{2r}(XY^*)) &\leq \Phi(\lambda^r(qX^*X + (1 - q)Y^*Y) \cdot \lambda^r((1 - q)X^*X + qY^*Y)) \\ &\leq \Phi(\lambda^{rp}(qX^*X + (1 - q)Y^*Y))^{1/p} \Phi(\lambda^{rp'}((1 - q)X^*X + qY^*Y))^{1/p'}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for any unitarily invariant norm,

$$||| |XY^*|^{2r} ||| \leq ||| (qX^*X + (1 - q)Y^*Y)^{rp} |||^{1/p} ||| ((1 - q)X^*X + qY^*Y)^{rp'} |||^{1/p'}.$$

Theorem 1 now follows by setting $r = 1/2$ and $p = p' = 2$. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] T. ANDO, *Matrix Young inequalities*, Operator Theory: Advances and Applications, **75** (1), 33–38, (1995).
- [2] R. BHATIA, *Perturbation inequalities for the absolute value map in norm ideals of operators*, Journal of Operator Theory, **19** (1), 129–136, (1988).
- [3] R. BHATIA, *Matrix Analysis*, Springer, Heidelberg, (1997).
- [4] R. BHATIA AND F. KITTANEH, *On the singular values of a product of operators*, SIAM J. Matrix Analysis, **11** (2), 272–277, (1990).
- [5] S. W. DRURY, *On a question of Bhatia and Kittaneh*, Linear Algebra Appl., **437** (7), 1955–1960, (2012).
- [6] R. HORN AND R. MATTHIAS, *Cauchy-Schwarz inequalities associated with positive semidefinite matrices*, Linear Algebra Appl., **142** (1), 63–82, (1990).

(Received December 7, 2014)

Koenraad M. R. Audenaert
 Department of Mathematics, Royal Holloway University of London
 Egham TW20 0EX, United Kingdom
 and
 Department of Physics and Astronomy, Ghent University
 S9, Krijgslaan 281, B-9000 Ghent, Belgium
 e-mail: koenraad.audenaert@rhul.ac.uk