



HAL
open science

On the set of upper bounds for a finite family of self-adjoint operators

Gilles Cassier, Mohand Ould Ali

► **To cite this version:**

Gilles Cassier, Mohand Ould Ali. On the set of upper bounds for a finite family of self-adjoint operators. Theta, Bucharest. 25th International Conference on Operator Theory, Jun 2014, Timisoara, Romania. 18, pp.1-14, 2016, Theta Series in Advanced Mathematics. hal-00980617

HAL Id: hal-00980617

<https://hal.science/hal-00980617>

Submitted on 18 Apr 2014

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

On the set of upper bounds for a finite family of self-adjoint operators

Gilles Cassier and Mohand Ould Ali

April 18, 2014

Abstract

We study the structure and properties of the weak closed set of all upper bounds of a finite family of self-adjoint operators for Löwner ordering. Firstly, we prove that we can find an upper bound satisfying additional constraints. Secondly, we give two characterizations of minimal upper bounds. Finally, we furnish a complete description of pairs of positive operators such that the sum is a minimal upper bound.

Keywords: Self-adjoint operators, Löwner ordering, minimal upper bounds.
AMS Subject Class 2010. Primary 47A63, 47B65; Secondary 06A06.

1 Introduction

Let H be a separable complex Hilbert space and $B(H)$ be the Banach algebra of all continuous linear operators from H into H . Let T be in $B(H)$, we denote by $\mathcal{N}(T)$ the kernel of the operator T and by $\mathcal{R}(T)$ the range of T . We say that $T \in B(H)$ is a positive operator if T is a self-adjoint operator for which the inner product $\langle Tx|x \rangle \geq 0$ for all x in H . This notion of positivity induces a partial ordering on the subspace of self-adjoint operators, called Löwner order, defined as follows: for A, B in $B(H)$, we write $A \leq B$ if A, B are self-adjoint and $B - A$ is positive. If T is a compact operator acting on H , then $|T| = (T^*T)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is a compact positive operator. The eigenvalues μ_1, μ_2, \dots of $|T|$, arranged in decreasing order and repeated according to multiplicity, form a sequence of numbers approaching 0. These numbers are called the characteristic numbers of the operator T ; we write $\mu_k(T)$ for the k -th characteristic number of T . Let p be a positive real number, the Schatten class $\mathcal{S}_p(H)$ is the set of all operators such that $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu_k(T)^p < +\infty$. The function $T \rightarrow \|T\|_p = (\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu_k(T)^p)^{\frac{1}{p}}$ is a norm on $\mathcal{S}_p(H)$, and $\mathcal{S}_p(H)$ equipped with this norm is a Banach space. We denote by $\mathcal{S}_{\infty}(H)$ the Banach space of all compact operators. Recall that $\mathcal{S}_p(H)$ is a bilateral ideal in the algebra $B(H)$ for any $p \in]0, +\infty]$. The theory of positive operators was intensely studied by many authors (see, for instance [1], [3]). It is a crucial tool for studying a lot of problems in operator theory, especially to obtain nice inequalities and good estimates. A natural question arises in this context: What can be said about minimal upper bounds of a finite family of self-adjoint operators?

In Section 2, this investigation aims at the identification of an upper bound T of two self-adjoint operators less than the identity operator which satisfies also the constraint inequality $T \leq I$. More generally, we show that whenever R and S are two self-adjoint operators in a

proper non-zero two sided ideal \mathcal{I} of $B(H)$ such that $R, S \leq I$. Then we can find a positive operator T in \mathcal{I} such that $R, S \leq T \leq I$.

The next section is devoted to study of set of all upper bounds of a finite family of self-adjoint operators. In the first part, we give a complete characterization of minimal elements in this set. We deduce a necessary and sufficient condition to ensure that the sum of the two considered self-adjoint operators is a minimal upper bound. Finally, we prove that the set of minimal upper bounds coincides with the set of extremal points of the convex set of all upper bounds of a finite family of self-adjoint operators.

In Section 4, we give a complete description of couple (R, S) of positive operators such that the sum is a minimal upper bound. The first characterization is given by a nice factorization of R and S with two orthogonal projections and a positive operator satisfying additional conditions. The second one is related to a matrix representation of R and S .

Notice that from each result related to upper bounds of a finite family of self-adjoint operators, we can easily deduce the corresponding result for the lower bounds of this family.

2 Upper bounds of two self-adjoint operators under constraints

One of the central problem in [4] is finding the so-called "natural" lower bound or upper bound of two self-adjoint operators. In the present section, by a different way, we study the existence of lower bound or upper bound under additional conditions. Let \mathcal{I} be a proper non-zero two sided ideal in $B(H)$. The following result shows that we can find a maximum in \mathcal{I} for two self-adjoint operators belonging in \mathcal{I} satisfying an additional constraint.

Theorem 1. *Let H be an infinite dimensional Hilbert space and R, S be two self-adjoint operators in a proper non-zero two sided ideal \mathcal{I} of $B(H)$ such that $R, S \leq I$. Then there exists a positive operator T in \mathcal{I} such that $R, S \leq T \leq I$.*

Proof. Since \mathcal{I} is a bilateral ideal of $B(H)$, using the Borelian functional calculus we can see that R and S can be decomposed under the form $R = R_+ - R_-$ and $S = S_+ - S_-$ where the four involving operators R_+, R_-, S_+, S_- are positive, less than the identity operator and belong to \mathcal{I} . Suppose that we can find a positive operator $T \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $R_+, S_+ \leq T \leq I$, then we clearly have $R \leq R_+ \leq T \leq I$ and $S \leq S_+ \leq T \leq I$. Thus, we have reduced the problem to the case where $0 \leq R, S \leq I$. From now on, we will assume that.

Suppose $1 \in \sigma(R)$, we set $E = \mathcal{N}(I - R)$ and we consider the matrices of R and S with respect to the direct orthogonal sum $H = E \oplus E^\perp$. We easily see that they can be written under the form

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} I_E & 0 \\ 0 & R_1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } S = \begin{pmatrix} A & L \\ L^* & B \end{pmatrix}.$$

If T is a positive operator such that $R, S \leq T \leq I$, it is necessarily of the form

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} I_E & 0 \\ 0 & X \end{pmatrix}.$$

We can find such T if and only if the two following conditions are satisfied:

$$R_1 \leq X \leq I_{E^\perp} \tag{1}$$

and

$$\begin{pmatrix} I_E - A & -L \\ -L^* & X - B \end{pmatrix} \geq 0. \quad (2)$$

Condition (2) is successively equivalent to:

$$\begin{cases} t^2 \langle (I_E - A)x|x \rangle - 2t \operatorname{Re} \langle Ly|x \rangle + \langle (X - B)y|y \rangle \geq 0 \\ \forall (x, y, t) \in E \times E^\perp \times \mathbb{R}; \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} [\langle Ly|x \rangle]^2 \leq \langle ((1 + \varepsilon)I_E - A)x|x \rangle \langle (X - B)y|y \rangle \\ \forall (x, y, \varepsilon) \in E \times E^\perp \times \mathbb{R}_+^*; \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} I_E - A \geq 0, \left\| [(1 + \varepsilon)I_E - A]^{-\frac{1}{2}} Ly \right\|^2 \leq \langle (X - B)y|y \rangle \\ \forall (y, \varepsilon) \in E^\perp \times \mathbb{R}_+^*; \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} I_E - A \geq 0, (X - B) \geq 0, \\ \forall \varepsilon > 0, L^* [(1 + \varepsilon)I_E - A]^{-1} L \leq (X - B); \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

which in turn is equivalent to the following assertion:

$$I_E - A \geq 0 \text{ and } X \geq B + \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} L^* [(1 + \varepsilon)I_E - A]^{-1} L.$$

The last limit exists because a monotone function of positive operators on \mathbb{R}_+^* , which is uniformly norm-bounded (here by inequalities (3)), is necessarily strongly convergent at 0. We set $K = \lim L^* [(1 + \varepsilon)I_E - A]^{-1} L$. Using the fact that $I - S \geq 0$, in the same manner we get

$$I_{E^\perp} - B \geq L^* [(1 + \varepsilon)I_E - A]^{-1} L,$$

for any positive ε .

We denote by $\mathcal{I}_{E^\perp} = \{P_{E^\perp} T P_{E^\perp}; T \in \mathcal{I}\}$ the compression of the ideal \mathcal{I} , where P_{E^\perp} stands for the orthogonal projection onto the closed subspace E^\perp . Setting $S_1 = B + K$, we see that we have to find $X \in \mathcal{I}_{E^\perp}$ such that

$$I_{E^\perp} \geq X \geq R_1, S_1,$$

where $R_1 = P_{E^\perp} R P_{E^\perp} \in B(E^\perp)$ and $S_1 = B + K = P_{E^\perp} S P_{E^\perp} + K \in B(E^\perp)$. Recall that a proper non-zero two sided ideal of $B(H)$ necessarily contains the space $\mathcal{F}(H)$ of all finite rank operators and is contained in the closed subspace $\mathcal{K}(H) = \mathcal{S}_\infty(H)$ of all compact operators (see [8], Proposition 2.1 and Corollary 2.3). On the one hand, since $S \in \mathcal{I}$, it implies that E is a finite dimensional space, hence $K \in \mathcal{F}(H) \subseteq \mathcal{I}$. Consequently, we easily see that S_1 belongs to \mathcal{I}_{E^\perp} . By straightforward computations, we can also show that $R_1 \in \mathcal{I}_{E^\perp}$. On the other hand, we have

$$0 \leq \|S\| I - S = \begin{pmatrix} \|S\| I_E - A & -L \\ -L^* & \|S\| I_{E^\perp} - B \end{pmatrix},$$

which leads to

$$\|S\| I_{E^\perp} \geq B + \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} L^* [(\|S\| + \varepsilon)I_E - A]^{-1} L.$$

Observe that $[(\|S\| + \varepsilon)I_E - A]^{-1} \geq [(1 + \varepsilon)I_E - A]^{-1}$, and therefore we have $\|S\| I_{E^\perp} \geq B + K = S_1$. We derive that $\|S_1\| \leq \|S\|$. Notice that \mathcal{I}_{E^\perp} is necessarily a proper non-zero two

sided ideal of $B(E^\perp)$, so replacing R by R_1 , S by S_1 and \mathcal{I} by \mathcal{I}_{E^\perp} , we have reduced our problem to the case where $\|R\| < 1$, and $0 \leq R, S \leq I$.

Assume that $1 \in \sigma(S_1)(S_1 \rightarrow S)$, this time operators are decomposed with respect to the direct orthogonal sum $H = \mathcal{N}(I - S) \oplus \overline{\mathcal{R}(I - S)}$. Using the same process, we would find $X \in \mathcal{I}_{E^\perp}$ such that

$$\begin{cases} I \geq X \geq R_1, S_1 \\ \|R_1\| \leq \|R\| < 1 \text{ and } \|S_1\| < 1. \end{cases}$$

Then, the problem is reduced to the case where $R, S \in \mathcal{I}$, $\|R\| < 1$ and $\|S\| < 1$. And now, let us introduce the closed subspace defined by setting

$$E_n = \bigvee_{k \leq n} [\mathcal{N}(\mu_k(S)I - S) + \mathcal{N}(\mu_k(R)I - R)],$$

for every $n \geq 1$ and consider the matrices of R and S relatively to the orthogonal direct sum $H = E_n \oplus E_n^\perp$:

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} R'_n & U_n \\ U_n^* & R''_n \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } S = \begin{pmatrix} S'_n & V_n \\ V_n^* & S''_n \end{pmatrix}$$

We search T under the form

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & X_n \end{pmatrix}.$$

The conditions required are

$$\begin{cases} X_n \geq R''_n + U_n^*(I - R'_n)^{-1}U_n \\ X_n \geq S''_n + V_n^*(I - S'_n)^{-1}V_n \\ X_n \leq I. \end{cases}$$

We set

$$Y_n = R''_n + S''_n + U_n^*(I - R'_n)^{-1}U_n + V_n^*(I - S'_n)^{-1}V_n,$$

Since \mathcal{I} is a bilateral ideal, taking X_n to Y_n we see that all computations made ensure that T is in \mathcal{I} . Consequently, the only thing remaining to show is that Y_n could be chosen such that $\|Y_n\| < 1$.

Lemma 2. *Let T be a compact operator acting on a Hilbert space H and $(P_n)_{n \geq 0}$ a sequence of orthogonal projections which strongly converges to 0. Then the sequences $(\|P_n T\|)$ and $(\|T P_n\|)$ both converge to zero.*

Proof. Since T is a compact operator, the operator $P_n T$ is also compact, hence we can find a unit vector x_n in H such that $\|P_n T\| = \|P_n T x_n\|$. We proceed per absurdum, suppose that $\|P_n T\|$ does not converge to 0, then there exist $\delta > 0$ and a subsequence $(x_{\varphi(n)})$, weakly convergent to some x in the closed unit ball of H , such that $\|P_{\varphi(n)} T x_{\varphi(n)}\| \geq \delta$. Since T is a compact operator and P_n strongly converges to zero, we derive successively $\|T x_{\varphi(n)} - T x\| \rightarrow 0$ and $\|P_{\varphi(n)} T\| = \|P_{\varphi(n)} T x_{\varphi(n)}\| \leq \|T x_{\varphi(n)} - T x\| + \|P_{\varphi(n)} T x\| \rightarrow 0$, a contradiction. Thus, the sequence $(\|P_n T\|)$ converges to zero. The operator T^* is also compact, hence $\|T P_n\| = \|P_n T^*\|$ also goes to zero. \square

We turn now to the end of the proof of Theorem 1. By straightforward calculations it is verified that

$$\|Y_n\| \leq \|R_n''\| + \|S_n''\| + \frac{\|U_n\|^2}{1 - \|R\|} + \frac{\|V_n\|^2}{1 - \|S\|}. \quad (4)$$

Due to the positiveness of the operator S , we have $|\langle U_n y | x \rangle|^2 \leq \langle R_n' x | x \rangle \langle R_n' y | y \rangle$ for all $(x, y) \in E_n \times E_n^\perp$, hence $\|U_n\| \leq \sqrt{\|R_n'\|} \sqrt{\|R_n''\|}$. Similarly, we get $\|V_n\| \leq \sqrt{\|S_n'\|} \sqrt{\|S_n''\|}$. Then, from inequality (4) we obtain

$$\|Y_n\| \leq \|R_n''\| + \|S_n''\| + \frac{\|R_n'\| \|R_n''\|}{1 - \|R\|} + \frac{\|S_n'\| \|S_n''\|}{1 - \|S\|}$$

which can be rewritten under the form

$$\|Y_n\| \leq \|P_n R P_n\| + \|P_n S P_n\| + \frac{\|Q_n R Q_n\| \|P_n R P_n\|}{1 - \|R\|} + \frac{\|Q_n S Q_n\| \|P_n S P_n\|}{1 - \|S\|}, \quad (5)$$

where P_n and Q_n stand respectively for the orthogonal projections onto E_n^\perp and E_n . Notice that P_n strongly goes to zero. Since a proper non-zero two sided ideal is necessarily contained in $\mathcal{K}(H)$, we see that R and S are compact operators, then applying Lemma 2 we deduce from inequality (5) that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|Y_n\| = 0$. Therefore, to end the proof of Theorem 1, it suffices to choose an integer n large enough such that $\|Y_n\| < 1$ and to set $X_n = Y_n$. \square

Remark 3. Notice that the method used in the proof gives a constructive way to find such a upper bound in any proper non-zero two sided ideal of $B(H)$.

Since every Schatten class is a proper non-zero two sided ideal of $B(H)$, we get the following result.

Corollary 4. Let R and S two self-adjoint operators in \mathcal{S}_p ($0 < p \leq +\infty$) such that $R, S \leq I$. Then there exists a positive operator T in \mathcal{S}_p such that $R, S \leq T \leq I$.

Corollary 5. Let R and S two self-adjoint operators in $B(H)$ such that $R, S \leq I$. Then there exists a positive operator T in $B(H)$ such that $R, S \leq T \leq I$.

Proof. In the finite dimensional case, we proceed as in the proof of Theorem 1, the only differences are that $\mathcal{I} = B(H)$ and that the number of steps is finite. In the infinite dimensional case, we can easily find two sequences (R_n) and (S_n) of positive operators in $\mathcal{S}_\infty = \mathcal{K}(H)$ which are respectively strongly convergent to R and S and such that $0 \leq R_n \leq I$ and $0 \leq S_n \leq I$. By previous corollary, there exists T_n in $\mathcal{K}(H)$ such that $0 \leq R_n \leq T_n \leq I$ and $0 \leq S_n \leq T_n \leq I$. Any weak limit point of the sequence (T_n) satisfies the desired conclusion. \square

If S is a self-adjoint operator, we write

$$m(S) = \inf \{ \lambda, \lambda \in \sigma(S) \} \text{ and } M(S) = \sup \{ \lambda, \lambda \in \sigma(S) \}.$$

Corollary 6. Let A_1, \dots, A_n be n self-adjoint operators in $B(H)$. Then there exists a minimal upper bound T in $B(H)$ such that $\sigma(T) \subseteq [\max(m(A_1), \dots, m(A_n)), \max(M(A_1), \dots, M(A_n))]$.

Proof. For simplicity, we consider the case of two self-adjoint operators A, B in $B(H)$. Taking into account that the statement is translation invariant (translation by a scalar multiple of the identity), we may assume that $\max(M(A), M(B)) > 0$. Set $M = \max(M(A), M(B))$ and consider the two self-adjoint operators $A_0 = \frac{A}{M}$ and $B_0 = \frac{B}{M}$. Since $A_0, B_0 \leq I$, by applying Corollary 5 we see that there exists a operator $T_0 \in B(H)$ such that $A_0, B_0 \leq T_0 \leq I$. Thus, the operator $T_1 = MT_0$ satisfies the following constraint $A, B \leq T_1 \leq MI$. A straightforward application of Zorn's lemma with Löwner order ensures that there exists a minimal upper bound $T \in B(H)$ of A, B such that $T \leq T_0$. Therefore, we have $\max(m(A), m(B))I \leq T \leq MI$. The conclusion follows immediately. \square

Remark 7. We can remark that the previous spectral result is not valid for any minimal upper bound of two self-adjoint operators. It suffices to consider the two following matrices acting on \mathbb{C}^2 :

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Combining Corollary 6, Corollary 4 from [6] and Theorem 3.2 from [7], we can obtain the next result.

Corollary 8. Let A_1, \dots, A_n be n positive operators in $B(H)$ satisfying $\sigma(A_k) \subseteq [m, M]$ for some scalars $0 < m < M$ ($k = 1, \dots, n$). Let f be a increasing continuous convex function from $[m, M]$ into \mathbb{R}_+^* , and $\omega_k \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $\sum_{k=1}^n \omega_k = 1$. Then, there exist a maximal lower bound S and a minimal upper bound T of A_1, \dots, A_n such that

$$\frac{1}{\lambda(m, M, f)} f(S) \leq \sum_{k=1}^n \omega_k f(A_k) \leq \lambda(m, M, f) f(T)$$

holds for

$$\lambda(m, M, f) = \max \left\{ f(m) + \frac{t-m}{M-m} \frac{f(M) - f(m)}{f(t)}; t \in [m, M] \right\}.$$

Proof. Since f is convex, for any $t \in [m, M]$ we have $f(t) = \sup_{i \in I} L_i(t)$ where $\{L_i; i \in I\}$ is a set of affine functions which are under the function f . Taking into account that f is increasing, we may suppose that $L_i(t) = u_i t + v_i$ with $u_i \geq 0$. We denote by E^T the spectral measure associated with T . Applying Corollary 6, we easily get the existence of a minimal upper bound T in $B(H)$ such that $\sigma(T) \subseteq [m, M]$. Let x be a unit vector and set $x_k = \sqrt{\omega_k} x$. On the one hand, applying Corollary 4 from [6], we get

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \omega_k \langle f(A_k) x | x \rangle = \sum_{k=1}^n \langle f(A_k) x_k | x_k \rangle \leq \lambda f \left(\sum_{k=1}^n \omega_k \langle A_k x | x \rangle \right)$$

where $\lambda = \lambda(m, M, f)$. On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} L_i \left(\sum_{k=1}^n \omega_k \langle A_k x | x \rangle \right) &= \sum_{k=1}^n \omega_k u_i \langle A_k x | x \rangle \leq u_i \langle T x | x \rangle + v_i \\ &= \int_m^M (u_i t + v_i) dE_{x,x}^T(t) \leq \int_m^M f(t) dE_{x,x}^T(t) = \langle f(T) x | x \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum on the left side and combining these two steps, we obtain

$$\left\langle \left[\sum_{k=1}^n \omega_k f(A_k) \right] x | x \right\rangle \leq \lambda \langle f(T)x | x \rangle.$$

It gives the right inequality in Corollary 8.

By applying twice Jensen's inequality, we get

$$f\left(\sum_{k=1}^n \omega_k \langle A_k x | x \rangle\right) \leq \sum_{k=1}^n \omega_k f\left(\int_m^M t dE_{x,x}^{A_k}\right) \leq \sum_{k=1}^n \omega_k \int_m^M f(t) dE_{x,x}^{A_k} = \sum_{k=1}^n \omega_k \langle f(A_k)x | x \rangle. \quad (6)$$

Since $u_\alpha \geq 0$ and S is a maximal upper bound with its spectrum included in $[m, M]$, we immediately see that

$$f\left(\sum_{k=1}^n \omega_k \langle A_k x | x \rangle\right) \geq L_\alpha \left(\sum_{k=1}^n \omega_k \langle A_k x | x \rangle\right) \geq L_\alpha(\langle Sx | x \rangle).$$

Taking the supremum with respect to α , we deduce

$$f\left(\sum_{k=1}^n \omega_k \langle A_k x | x \rangle\right) \geq f(\langle Sx | x \rangle). \quad (7)$$

By Corollary 4 from [6], for the case of a single operator, we have

$$f(\langle Sx | x \rangle) \geq \frac{1}{\lambda} \langle f(S)x | x \rangle. \quad (8)$$

The left inequality in Corollary 8 follows directly from (6), (7) and (8). \square

3 Characterizations of minimal upper bounds

The following result gives a complete characterization of minimal upper bounds of a finite family of self-adjoint operators in terms of operator ranges.

Theorem 9. *Let A_1, \dots, A_p be a finite family of self-adjoint operators and T be an upper bound of A_1, \dots, A_p . Then T is minimal if and only if $\mathcal{R}(\sqrt{T - A_1}) \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{R}(\sqrt{T - A_p}) = \{0\}$.*

Proof. Suppose that an upper bound T of A_1, \dots, A_p is not minimal, then there exists a positive operator $C \neq T$ such that $0 \leq A_i \leq C \leq T$ for any $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$. Thus, the positive operator $R = T - C \neq 0$ satisfies the inequalities $R \leq T - A_i$ for every $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$. Let u be a unit vector such that $Ru \neq 0$. Observe that $(\sqrt{R}u) \otimes (\sqrt{R}u) = \sqrt{R}(u \otimes u)\sqrt{R} \leq R$. Then, we can suppose that $R = u \otimes u$ is a rank one operator. Let j be a fixed integer belonging to $\{1, \dots, p\}$. Since $R \leq T - A_j$ we have $|\langle x | u \rangle|^2 \leq \|\sqrt{T - A_j}x\|^2$ for any $x \in H$. Let us define the operator Z_0 on $\mathcal{R}(\sqrt{T - A_j})$ by setting

$$Z_0(\sqrt{T - A_j}x) = \langle x | u \rangle \frac{u}{\|u\|}.$$

Thus, Z_0 is a contraction which could be extended on $\overline{\mathcal{R}(\sqrt{T - A_j})}$ by a contraction denoted \widetilde{Z}_0 . Now, we define the contraction Z on $H = \mathcal{N}(\sqrt{T - A_j}) \oplus \overline{\mathcal{R}(\sqrt{T - A_j})}$ by setting $Z(a \oplus b) = \widetilde{Z}_0 b$. Notice that $\mathcal{R}(Z) = \mathcal{R}(\widetilde{Z}_0) = \overline{\mathcal{R}(Z_0)} \subseteq \mathbb{C}u$ and hence Z is a rank one operator which can be written under the form $Z = u \otimes v$ where $\|u\|\|v\| \leq 1$ and $v \neq 0$. It follows that we have

$$\langle x|u \rangle \frac{u}{\|u\|} = Z_0 \sqrt{T - A_j} x = Z \sqrt{T - A_j} x \mathbb{R} \leq R \leq T \leq I = \langle \sqrt{T - A_j} x | v \rangle u = \langle x | \sqrt{T - A_j} v \rangle u.$$

On the one hand, taking x to u , we get $\langle u | \sqrt{T - A_j} v \rangle u = \|u\| u$, which implies that $\sqrt{T - A_j} v \neq 0$. On the other hand, we have $0 \leq \|u\|^{-1} u \otimes u = Z \sqrt{T - A_j} = \sqrt{T - A_j} Z^* = \sqrt{T - A_j} v \otimes u$, saying that $\|u\|^{-1} \langle x|u \rangle u = \langle x|u \rangle \sqrt{T - A_j} v$ for all x in H . For $x = u$, we get $\|u\| u = \langle u|u \rangle \sqrt{T - A_j} v = \|u\|^2 \sqrt{T - A_j} v = \|u\| \sqrt{T - A_j} v$, hence $u = \sqrt{T - A_j} v \in \mathcal{R}(\sqrt{T - A_j})$. Since j is an arbitrary element of $\{1, \dots, p\}$, we can conclude that $\mathcal{R}(\sqrt{T - A_1}) \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{R}(\sqrt{T - A_p}) \neq \{0\}$.

Assume that $\mathcal{R}(\sqrt{T - A_1}) \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{R}(\sqrt{T - A_p}) \neq \{0\}$ and let u_0 be a non-null vector in the vectorial subspace $\mathcal{R}(\sqrt{T - A_1}) \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{R}(\sqrt{T - A_p})$. We can write $u_0 = \sqrt{T - A_1}(a_1) = \dots = \sqrt{T - A_p}(a_p)$ where a_1, \dots, a_p are non-null vectors in H . Then, we choose a positive real number t such that $t(\|a_1\| \vee \dots \vee \|a_p\|) \leq 1$ and we set $u = tu_0 = \sqrt{T - A_1}(ta_1) = \dots = \sqrt{T - A_p}(ta_p)$. For any $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, we clearly have $u \otimes u = \sqrt{T - A_i}(ta_i) \otimes (ta_i) \sqrt{T - A_i} \leq T - A_i$. Thus, the operator $R = T - u \otimes u$ is an upper bound of A_1, \dots, A_p , it is less than T and different from T . Hence T is not a minimal upper bound of A_1, \dots, A_p . \square

Remark 10. Let A and B be two self-adjoint operators, then $T = 1/2[A + B + |A - B|]$ is a concrete minimal upper bound of A and B . To see that, consider $y = \sqrt{T - A}x_1 = \sqrt{T - B}x_2 \in \mathcal{R}(\sqrt{T - A}) \cap \mathcal{R}(\sqrt{T - B})$ and decompose H into the orthogonal direct sum $H = E(\mathbb{R}_*) \oplus E(\mathbb{R}_+)$ where E is the spectral measure associated with $A - B$. We easily see that y necessarily belongs to $E(\mathbb{R}_*) \cap E(\mathbb{R}_+) = \{0\}$. Hence, we have $\mathcal{R}(\sqrt{T - A}) \cap \mathcal{R}(\sqrt{T - B}) = \{0\}$ and Theorem 9 tells us that T is a minimal upper bound. It gives an alternate proof of Corollary 5 in [2].

In case of finite dimensional Hilbert spaces, we can give a very simple characterization.

Corollary 11. Let A_1, \dots, A_p be a finite family of self-adjoint operators acting on a finite dimensional Hilbert space H . Then, an upper bound T of A_1, \dots, A_p is a minimal if and only if $\mathcal{N}(T - A_1) + \dots + \mathcal{N}(T - A_p) = H$.

Proof. This characterization follows directly from Theorem 9 and the equality

$$(\mathcal{R}(\sqrt{T - A_1}) \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{R}(\sqrt{T - A_p}))^\perp = \mathcal{N}(T - A_1) + \dots + \mathcal{N}(T - A_p)$$

which is valid in a finite dimensional Hilbert space. \square

Remark 12. Notice that the natural extension of this result " $\mathcal{N}(T - A) + \mathcal{N}(T - B)$ is dense in H " does not characterize minimal upper bounds of A and B in the infinite dimensional case. To see this, it suffices to consider the two positive operators A and B acting on $L^2[0, 1]$ and defined by setting

$$Af(x) = (1 - x)f(x) \text{ and } Bf(x) = f(x) - \int_0^1 f(t)dt.$$

Then the identity operator is a minimal upper bound of A and B but the constant functions are not in the closure of $\mathcal{N}(I - A) + \mathcal{N}(I - B)$.

The sum $A + B$ is clearly the simpler example of upper bound of two positive operators A and B . A natural question is: When $A + B$ is a minimal upper bound? Theorem 9 allows us to give a complete answer.

Corollary 13. *Let A and B be two positive operators acting on H , then $A + B$ is a minimal upper bound of A and B if and only if $\mathcal{R}(\sqrt{A}) \cap \mathcal{R}(\sqrt{B}) = \{0\}$.*

In what follows, we denote by $\mathcal{M}_{A_1, \dots, A_p}$ the weakly closed convex set of all upper bounds of a finite family A_1, \dots, A_p of self-adjoint operators.

Theorem 14. *Let A_1, \dots, A_p be a finite family of self-adjoint operators and $T \in \mathcal{M}_{A_1, \dots, A_p}$. Then T is an extremal point of $\mathcal{M}_{A_1, \dots, A_p}$ if and only if T is a minimal upper bound of A_1, \dots, A_p .*

Proof. Suppose that T is not a minimal upper bound of A_1, \dots, A_p . From Theorem 9, we derive that $\mathcal{R}(\sqrt{T - A_1}) \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{R}(\sqrt{T - A_p}) \neq \{0\}$. Proceeding as in the end of the proof of Theorem 9, we see that there exists a rank one operator $u \otimes u$ such that $0 \neq u \otimes u \leq T - A_i$ for any $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$. Then, the operators $T_1 = T - u \otimes u$ and $T_2 = T + u \otimes u$ both belong to $\mathcal{M}_{A_1, \dots, A_p}$. Moreover, we have $T = 1/2[T_1 + T_2]$ with $T_1 \neq T_2$, and hence T is not an extremal point of $\mathcal{M}_{A_1, \dots, A_p}$.

Conversely, assume that a positive operator T is not in the set $\text{Extr}(\mathcal{M}_{A_1, \dots, A_p})$ of extreme points of $\mathcal{M}_{A, B}$. Then we can write $T = 1/2(T_1 + T_2)$ with T_1 and T_2 in $\mathcal{M}_{A_1, \dots, A_p}$. Setting $R = T - T_1 = T_2 - T$ we see that R is a self-adjoint operator such that

$$|\langle Rx|x \rangle| \leq (\langle (T - A_1)x|x \rangle) \wedge \dots \wedge (\langle (T - A_p)x|x \rangle). \quad (9)$$

for all $x \in H$. Then, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 15. *Let R be a self-adjoint operator acting on a Hilbert space H and S a positive operator such that*

$$|\langle Rx|x \rangle| \leq \langle Sx|x \rangle$$

for any $x \in H$. Then, we can factorize R under the form $R = \sqrt{S}J\sqrt{S}$ where J is a self-adjoint contraction.

Proof. For any positive integer n , we set $S_n = S + 1/nI$. The assumption of Lemma 15 implies that $-I \leq S_n^{-\frac{1}{2}}RS_n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq I$. Thus, there exists a subsequence of positive integers $(\varphi(n))$ such that $S_{\varphi(n)}^{-\frac{1}{2}}RS_{\varphi(n)}^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ weakly converges to a self-adjoint contraction J . The functional calculus associated to a self-adjoint operator ensures that

$$\|\sqrt{S_{\varphi(n)}} - \sqrt{S}\| = \sup\{|\sqrt{t + \frac{1}{\varphi(n)}} - \sqrt{t}|; t \in [0, \|S\|]\} \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{\varphi(n)}}.$$

It follows that the sequence $(S_{\varphi(n)}^{\frac{1}{2}}[S_{\varphi(n)}^{-\frac{1}{2}}RS_{\varphi(n)}^{-\frac{1}{2}}]S_{\varphi(n)}^{\frac{1}{2}})$ weakly converges to $\sqrt{S}J\sqrt{S}$, and hence $R = \sqrt{S}J\sqrt{S}$. \square

We now turn to the end of the proof of Theorem 14. Using (9) and Lemma 15, we obtain that there exist self-adjoint contractions J_1, \dots, J_p such that $R = \sqrt{T - A_1} J_1 \sqrt{T - A_1} = \dots = \sqrt{T - A_p} J_p \sqrt{T - A_p}$. We immediately deduce that the non-null vectorial subspace $\mathcal{R}(R)$ is contained in $\mathcal{R}(\sqrt{T - A_1}) \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{R}(\sqrt{T - A_p})$. Then, Theorem 9 implies that T is not a minimal upper bound of A_1, \dots, A_p .

4 Description of pairs (R, S) of positive operators such that the sum $R + S$ is a minimal upper bound

In this section, we give a complete description of all pairs of positive operators for which the sum is a minimal upper bound.

Theorem 16. *Let R and S be two positive operators in $B(H)$, then the following assertions are equivalent.*

1. *The sum $R + S$ is a minimal upper bound of R and S .*
2. *There exist two orthogonal projections P_1 and P_2 with orthogonal ranges and a positive operator X such that $R = X P_1 X$, $S = X P_2 X$ and $\mathcal{R}(X) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(P_1 + P_2) = \mathcal{R}(P_1) \oplus \mathcal{R}(P_2)$.*
3. *There exist two orthogonal subspaces E_1 and E_2 of H , a positive operator $A \in B(E_1)$, a positive operator $B \in B(E_2)$ and a bounded operator $L \in B(E_2, E_1)$ satisfying $|\langle x | Ly \rangle|^2 \leq \langle Ax | x \rangle \langle By | y \rangle$ for all $(x, y) \in E_1 \times E_2$, such that*

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} A^2 & AL & 0 \\ L^* A & L^* L & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } S = \begin{pmatrix} LL^* & LB & 0 \\ BL^* & B^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

with respect to the orthogonal direct sum $H = E_1 \oplus E_2 \oplus (E_1 + E_2)^\perp$.

Proof. Firstly, we prove the implication (1) \Rightarrow (3). We denote by P the orthogonal projection on $\overline{\mathcal{R}(R + S)}$ and by $Q = I - P$ the orthogonal projection on $\mathcal{N}(R + S)$. Let us introduce the operators

$$\begin{cases} \widetilde{R}_\varepsilon = (R + S + \varepsilon I)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (R + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} I) (R + S + \varepsilon I)^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{2} Q \\ \text{and} \\ \widetilde{S}_\varepsilon = (R + S + \varepsilon I)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (S + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} I) (R + S + \varepsilon I)^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{2} Q, \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

where ε is any positive real number. Observe that $\widetilde{R}_\varepsilon + \widetilde{S}_\varepsilon = I - Q = P$, therefore we see that $\widetilde{R}_\varepsilon$ is a positive contraction. Let us show that $\widetilde{R}_\varepsilon$ (resp. $\widetilde{S}_\varepsilon$) are weakly convergent.

Let $x = (R + S)^{\frac{1}{2}} a$ and $y = (R + S)^{\frac{1}{2}} b$ be in $\mathcal{R}(R + S)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. On the one hand, we have

$$\langle \widetilde{R}_\varepsilon x | y \rangle = \langle (R + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} I) (R + S + \varepsilon I)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (R + S)^{\frac{1}{2}} a | (R + S + \varepsilon I)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (R + S)^{\frac{1}{2}} b \rangle.$$

On the other hand, setting $A = R + S$ and denoting by E^A the spectral measure associated with A , we see that

$$\left\| (A + \varepsilon I)^{-\frac{1}{2}} A^{\frac{1}{2}} a - P a \right\|^2 = \int_{]0, \|A\|]} \frac{\varepsilon^2}{(\sqrt{t} + \sqrt{t + \varepsilon})^2 (t + \varepsilon)} dE_{a,a}^A(t) \rightarrow 0$$

in virtue of the dominated convergence theorem. Therefore, $\langle \tilde{R}_\varepsilon x | y \rangle$ converges for any $x, y \in \mathcal{R}((R + S)^{\frac{1}{2}})$. Now, if $x \in \mathcal{N}(R + S)$, we have $\tilde{R}_\varepsilon x = 0$. Let $\delta > 0$ and $x, y \in \mathcal{R}((R + S)^{\frac{1}{2}}) = \overline{\mathcal{R}(R + S)}$ such that $\|x - x'\| \vee \|y - y'\| \leq \delta$ with $x', y' \in \mathcal{R}((R + S)^{\frac{1}{2}})$, then a straightforward computation leads to

$$|\langle \tilde{R}_{\varepsilon_1} x | y \rangle - \langle \tilde{R}_{\varepsilon_2} x | y \rangle| \leq |\langle (\tilde{R}_{\varepsilon_1} - \tilde{R}_{\varepsilon_2}) x' | y' \rangle| + 2\delta^2 + 2\delta(\|x\| + \delta) + 2\delta(\|y\| + \delta)$$

Since $|\langle (\tilde{R}_{\varepsilon_1} - \tilde{R}_{\varepsilon_2}) x' | y' \rangle| \rightarrow 0$ when $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we see that $(\langle \tilde{R}_\varepsilon x | y \rangle)$ is a Cauchy sequence, hence is convergent. Finally, the sequence $(\langle \tilde{R}_\varepsilon x | y \rangle)$ converge for any $x, y \in H$. Thus, the uniformly bounded operator function (\tilde{R}_ε) (resp. (\tilde{S}_ε)) weakly converges to some positive operator \tilde{R} (resp. \tilde{S}). Taking the limit when ε goes to 0, we easily obtain from (10) the following equalities: $R = \sqrt{R + \tilde{S}} \tilde{R} \sqrt{R + \tilde{S}}$ and $S = \sqrt{R + \tilde{S}} \tilde{S} \sqrt{R + \tilde{S}}$. We also get $\tilde{R} + \tilde{S} = P$.

Let us show that P is a minimal upper bound for \tilde{R} and \tilde{S} . Suppose that there exists a positive operator $J \neq P$ such that $\tilde{R}, \tilde{S} \leq J \leq P$. It leads to $R = \sqrt{R + \tilde{S}} \tilde{R} \sqrt{R + \tilde{S}} \leq \sqrt{R + \tilde{S}} J \sqrt{R + \tilde{S}} \leq R + S$, and similarly $S \leq R + S$. Since $R + S$ is minimal, we have necessarily $R + S = \sqrt{R + \tilde{S}} J \sqrt{R + \tilde{S}}$, which in turn implies $\sqrt{R + \tilde{S}}(P - J)\sqrt{R + \tilde{S}} = 0$. It follows that $(P - J)\sqrt{R + \tilde{S}} = 0$ and finally $P = J$ because the positive operator $P - J$ is null on $\mathcal{N}(R + S)$.

On the one hand, Corollary 13 gives that $\mathcal{R}(\sqrt{\tilde{R}}) \cap \mathcal{R}(\sqrt{\tilde{S}}) = \{0\}$. On the other hand, the inequalities $0 \leq \tilde{R} \leq P$ successively imply $Q\tilde{R}Q = 0$, $\sqrt{\tilde{R}}Q = 0$, and hence $\tilde{R}P = \tilde{R} = \tilde{R}^* = P\tilde{R}$. Let $x \in H$, we then have $\tilde{R}x - \tilde{R}^2x = P\tilde{R}x - \tilde{R}^2x = \tilde{S}\tilde{R}x \in \mathcal{R}(\sqrt{\tilde{R}}) \cap \mathcal{R}(\sqrt{\tilde{S}}) = \{0\}$, thus $\tilde{R} = \tilde{R}^2$. In a similar way we prove that $\tilde{S} = \tilde{S}^2$, hence \tilde{R} and \tilde{S} are two orthogonal projections. Set $E_1 = \mathcal{R}(\tilde{R})$ and $E_2 = \mathcal{R}(\tilde{S})$, we have

$$\tilde{R} = \begin{pmatrix} I_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{S} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

with respect to the orthogonal sum $H = E_1 \oplus E_2 \oplus (E_1 + E_2)^\perp$. The matrix of the positive operator $\sqrt{R + S}$ is necessarily of the form

$$\sqrt{R + S} = \begin{pmatrix} A & L & 0 \\ L^* & B & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

where $A \in B(E_1)$ and $B \in B(E_2)$ are positive operators and $L \in B(E_2, E_1)$ is a bounded operator satisfying $|\langle x | Ly \rangle|^2 \leq \langle Ax | x \rangle \langle By | y \rangle$ for all $(x, y) \in E_1 \times E_2$ because of the positiveness of $\sqrt{R + S}$. The equalities $R = \sqrt{R + \tilde{S}} \tilde{R} \sqrt{R + \tilde{S}}$ and $S = \sqrt{R + \tilde{S}} \tilde{S} \sqrt{R + \tilde{S}}$ give the desired matrix representations of R and S .

Concerning the implication (3) \Rightarrow (2), we have just to set $X = \sqrt{R + \tilde{S}}$, $P_1 = \tilde{R}$ and $P_2 = I - \tilde{R}$ (with the notations used in the proof of (1) \Rightarrow (3)). Notice that the property: $|\langle x | Ly \rangle|^2 \leq \langle Ax | x \rangle \langle By | y \rangle$ for all $(x, y) \in E_1 \times E_2$, ensures that the self adjoint operator X is positive. By construction, the subspaces $\text{Im}(P_1)$ and $\text{Im}(P_2)$ are contained in $\text{Im}(X)$.

Let us now prove the implication (2) \Rightarrow (1). Since $R = XP_1X$ and $S = XP_2X$, we have $R + S = XP_1X + XP_2X = X(P_1 + P_2)X = X^2$. The last equality is due to the inclusion $\mathcal{R}(X) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(P_1 + P_2)$ and the fact that $P_1 + P_2$ is necessarily an orthogonal projection. We thus have $X = \sqrt{R + S}$. We suppose that L is a upper bound of R and S such that $L \leq R + S = X^2$.

Notice that $\|\sqrt{L}x\| \leq \|Xx\|$. According to the well known criterion of Douglas about range inclusion and factorization of operators (see [5] for more informations), we see that there exists a contraction $Y \in B(H)$ such that $\sqrt{L} = YX$ and $\text{Ker}Y = \text{Ker}X$. Let $x = Xx_1 + x_0$ where $x_1 \in H$ and $x_0 \in \text{Ker}X$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle Y^*Yx|x \rangle &= \langle Y^*Y(Xx_1 + x_0)|Xx_1 + x_0 \rangle = \langle YXx_1|YXx_1 \rangle \\ &= \langle Lx_1|x_1 \rangle \geq \langle P_1Xx_1|Xx_1 \rangle = \langle P_1x|x \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

We derive that $Y^*Y \geq P_1$ and in the same manner we can prove that $Y^*Y \geq P_2$. Therefore, for any $x \in \mathcal{R}(P_1)$ we have $\|x\|^2 = \|P_1x\|^2 \leq \|Yx\|^2 \leq \|x\|^2$, hence $Y^*Yx = x$. Similarly, $Y^*Yx = x$ for any $x \in \mathcal{R}(P_2)$. Thus, we have $Y^*Yx = x$ for every $x \in \mathcal{R}(P_1) \oplus \mathcal{R}(P_2) \supseteq \mathcal{R}(X)$. Finally, we can conclude that $L = (\sqrt{L})^*(\sqrt{L}) = (YX)^*(YX) = XY^*YX = X^2 = R + S$. Hence $R + S$ is minimal. \square

The second author wishes to note that the original idea of this paper is due to the first author.

References

- [1] C. D. Aliprantis and O. Burkinshaw, *Positive Operators*, Springer, Dordrecht, 2006.xx+376pp.
- [2] C. Akemann and N. Weaver, *Minimal upper bounds of commuting operators*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 124, 1996, 3469-3476.
- [3] N.I. Akhieser and I.M. Glazman, *Theory of linear Operators in Hilbert-spaces*, Nauka, Moscow, 1966.
- [4] A. Aslanov, *Existence of the Minimum and Maximum of Two Self-Adjoint Operators*, Mathematica Balkanica , New Series; Vol.19, 2005, Fasc3-4, 255-265.
- [5] R.G. Douglas, *On majorarization, factorization and range inclusion of operators in Hilbert space*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 17, 1966, 413-416.
- [6] J. Mićić, Y. Seo, S. E. Takahasi, M. Tominaga, *Inequalities of Furuta and Mond-Pečarić*, Math. Inequal. Appl. 2 (1999) 83-111.
- [7] J. Pečarić and J. Mićić, *Some functions reversing the order of positive operators*, Linear Algebra and its Applications 396 (2005) 175-187 .
- [8] B. Simon, *Trace ideals and their applications*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, UK, 1979.

Institut Camille Jordan, CNRS UMR 5208, Université de Lyon, Université Lyon 1, 43 boulevard du 11 Novembre 1918, 69622 Villeurbanne, France.

E-mail address: cassier@math.univ-lyon1.fr

Département de Mathématiques, Université Ibn Badis, Mostaganem, Algérie.

E-mail address: mohand.Ouldali@univ-mosta.dz