

AN OPERATOR INEQUALITY

P.D. SIAFARIKAS

Department of Mathematics
Section of Applied Mathematics
University of Patra
Patra, Greece

(Received November 10, 1983 and in revised form December 1, 1983)

ABSTRACT. An inequality is proved in abstract separable Hilbert space H where A and B are bounded self-adjoint positive operators defined in H such that $R(A) = R(B)$ and $R(A)$ is closed.

KEY WORDS AND PHRASES. Hilbert space, positive operators, generalized inverse.
1980 MATHEMATICS SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION CODE. 47A05.

1. INTRODUCTION AND PRELIMINARIES.

Let H be an abstract separable Hilbert space and T a linear bounded operator from H into H .

We denote the null space of T by $N(T)$, the range of T by $R(T)$ and assume that $R(T)$ is closed.

We define the generalized inverse (or Moore-Penrose inverse) operator T^+ of T as the unique linear extension of $(T/N(T)^\perp)^{-1}$ to H such that $N(T^+) = R(T)^\perp$.

The linear bounded operator T^+ fulfills the following "Moore-Penrose equations" :

$$\begin{aligned}T T^+ T &= T \\T^+ T T^+ &= T^+ \\(T T^+)^* &= T T^+ \\(T^+ T)^* &= T^+ T\end{aligned}$$

which could also be used as a definition of T^+ .

Penrose used these relations to define the generalized inverse of a matrix in [1].

For a systematic treatment of generalized inverses and their properties in an operator - theoretic setting, we refer to Nashed and Votruba [2]. For an extensive annotated bibliography on the theory and applications of generalized inverses, see [3]. Kaffes in [4] proved the following inequality:

$$[\lambda A + (1-\lambda)B]^+ \leq \lambda A^+ + (1-\lambda)B^+ ,$$

where A, B are positive semi-definite matrices of the same order and $R(A) = R(B)$. In this paper we shall prove that the above inequality holds in an abstract separable Hilbert space H , where A, B are bounded self-adjoint positive operators defined in H such that $R(A) = R(B)$ and $R(A)$ is closed.

2. PROOF OF THE INEQUALITY.

THEOREM 2.1: Let A and B be bounded self-adjoint positive operators from a Hilbert space H into H . Assume that $R(A)$ is closed and $R(A) = R(B)$.

Then for $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ we have

$$[\lambda A + (1-\lambda)B]^+ \leq \lambda A^+ + (1-\lambda)B^+ \tag{2.1}$$

PROOF. The above inequality (2.1) is trivial when $\lambda=0$ or $\lambda=1$. Let $0 < \lambda < 1$ and $A_\lambda = \lambda A + (1-\lambda)B$. Then it is not difficult to prove that $R(A) = R(A_\lambda) = R(B)$.

From theorem 2 of [5] we can deduce that $A^+ = A^{+*}$ if $A=A^*$, and that if Range A is closed so is Range A^+ (when $A=A^*$, $Dom A=H$). From these we can prove that $R(A) = R(A^+)$. To prove (2.1) it suffices to show that

$$(A_\lambda^+ f, f) \leq \lambda (A^+ f, f) + (1-\lambda) (B^+ f, f) \quad \forall f \in H$$

where $(,)$ means scalar multiplication in H .

Let $f \in H$. Then $f = f_1 + f_2$ with $f_1 \in R(A)$ and $f_2 \in N(A)$.

Since
$$R(A) = R(B) = R(A_\lambda)$$

and
$$(Af, f) = (Af_1, f_1), (Bf, f) = (Bf_1, f_1), (A_\lambda f, A_\lambda) = (A_\lambda f_1, f_1),$$

it is enough to prove that:

$$(A_\lambda^+ f, f) \leq \lambda (A^+ f, f) + (1-\lambda) (B^+ f, f) \quad \forall f \in R(A). \tag{2.2}$$

Given that $f \in R(A) = R(B) = R(A_\lambda)$ there are $g_1 \in H, g_2 \in H, g_3 \in H$

such that

$$Ag_1 = f, Ag_2 = f, A_\lambda g_3 = f \tag{2.3}$$

By means of relation (2.3) the above inequality assumes the following form

$$\begin{aligned} \Leftrightarrow (A_\lambda^+ A_\lambda g_3, A_\lambda g_3) &\leq \lambda (A^+ Ag_1, Ag_1) + (1-\lambda) (B^+ Bg_2, Bg_2) \Leftrightarrow \\ \Leftrightarrow (A_\lambda A_\lambda^+ A_\lambda g_3, g_3) &\leq \lambda (AA^+ Ag_1, g_1) + (1-\lambda) (BB^+ Bg_2, g_2) \Leftrightarrow \\ \Leftrightarrow (A_\lambda g_3, g_3) &\leq \lambda (Ag_1, g_1) + (1-\lambda) (Bg_2, g_2) \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

Provided that the operators A, B are positive we have

$$(A(g_1 - g_3), g_1 - g_3) = (Ag_1, g_1) + (Ag_3, g_3) - 2(Ag_3, g_1) \geq 0 \tag{2.5}$$

$$(B(g_2 - g_3), g_2 - g_3) = (Bg_2, g_2) + (Bg_3, g_3) - 2(Bg_3, g_2) \geq 0 \tag{2.6}$$

and
$$(Ag_3, g_1) = (A_\lambda g_3, g_3), (Bg_3, g_2) = A_\lambda g_3, g_3 \tag{2.7}$$

If we multiply (2.5) by λ , (2.6) by $(1-\lambda)$ and add the resulting equations and if we take (2.7) under consideration then the desired inequality (2.4) is obtained.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. I wish to thank the referee for many helpful remarks.

REFERENCES

1. PENROSE, R. A generalized inverse of Matrices, Proc. Camb. Philo. Soc. 51 (1955), 406-413.
2. NASHED, M.Z. and VOTRUBA, G.F., A unified operator theory of generalized inverses, in Generalized Inverses and Applications (M.Z. Nashed, Ed.) pp 1-109, Academic Press, New York, 1976.
3. NASHED, M.Z. (Ed.), Generalized Inverses and Applications, Academic Press, New York, 1976.
4. KAFFES, D., An inequality for matrices, Bull. Soc. Math. Grèce. (to appear).
5. LEE, S. J. and NASHED, M. Z., Generalized inverses for linear manifolds and application to boundary value problems in Banach spaces, Math. Reports Acad. Sci. Canada 4(6) (1982), 347-352.



Hindawi

Submit your manuscripts at
<http://www.hindawi.com>

