

Young's (in)equality for compact operators

by

GABRIEL LAROTONDA (Buenos Aires)

Abstract. If a, b are $n \times n$ matrices, T. Ando proved that Young's inequality is valid for their singular values: if $p > 1$ and $1/p + 1/q = 1$, then

$$\lambda_k(|ab^*|) \leq \lambda_k\left(\frac{1}{p}|a|^p + \frac{1}{q}|b|^q\right) \quad \text{for all } k.$$

Later, this result was extended to the singular values of a pair of compact operators acting on a Hilbert space by J. Erlijman, D. R. Farenick and R. Zeng. In this paper we prove that if a, b are compact operators, then equality holds in Young's inequality if and only if $|a|^p = |b|^q$.

1. Introduction. It all boils down to the following elementary inequality named after W. H. Young: if $p > 1$ and $1/p + 1/q = 1$, then for any $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}^+$,

$$\alpha\beta \leq \frac{1}{p}\alpha^p + \frac{1}{q}\beta^q$$

with equality if and only if $\alpha^p = \beta^q$.

Operator analogues of this elegant fact have been considered, following the fundamental paper by T. Ando [1] for $n \times n$ matrices, and an extension to compact operators by J. Erlijman, D. R. Farenick and R. Zeng [5]. If a, b are compact operators on Hilbert space then for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$(1.1) \quad \lambda_k(|ab^*|) \leq \lambda_k\left(\frac{1}{p}|a|^p + \frac{1}{q}|b|^q\right)$$

where each eigenvalue is counted with multiplicity. This allows one to construct a partial isometry u such that

$$(1.2) \quad u|ab^*|u^* \leq \frac{1}{p}|a|^p + \frac{1}{q}|b|^q$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: Primary 15A45, 47A30; Secondary 15A42, 47A63.

Key words and phrases: compact operator, Young inequality, operator ideal, singular value equality.

Received 26 October 2015; revised 27 April 2016.

Published online 19 May 2016.

for the partial order of operators. This raised the natural question of whether

$$(1.3) \quad \|u|ab^*|u^*\| = \left\| \frac{1}{p}|a|^p + \frac{1}{q}|b|^q \right\| \Rightarrow |a|^p = |b|^q.$$

It is easy to construct examples where this is false, if $\|\cdot\|$ is the operator norm. But O. Hirzallah and F. Kittaneh showed with an elegant inequality [9] that it is true if a, b are Hilbert–Schmidt operators, and the norm is the Hilbert–Schmidt norm. M. Argerami and D. Farenick [3] obtained the same conclusion for the trace norm $\|\cdot\|_1 = \text{Tr}|\cdot|$, assuming $|a|^p, |b|^q$ are nuclear operators.

There have been some attempts to understand the case of equality in (1.2) for compact operators; in 2005, R. Zeng [15] studied the case of operator equality for commuting normal compact injective operators. It was also unclear which class of symmetric norms is suitable to deal with the case of equality in (1.3) (see [3]). In this paper, we prove that the necessary and sufficient condition to have $|a|^p = |b|^q$ is in fact the equality of all singular numbers in (1.1), which enables us to characterize for exactly which norms the assertion (1.3) above is true, and therefore for which operator ideals.

What follows is Theorem 2.11; for the definition of strictly increasing symmetric norm see Definition 2.3:

THEOREM. *Let $a, b \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$. If $p > 1$ and $1/p + 1/q = 1$, then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $|a|^p = |b|^q$.
- (2) $z|ab^*|z^* = \frac{1}{p}|a|^p + \frac{1}{q}|b|^q$ for some contraction $z \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$
- (3) $\|z|ab^*|w\|_\phi = \left\| \frac{1}{p}|a|^p + \frac{1}{q}|b|^q \right\|_\phi < \infty$ for a pair of contractions $z, w \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\|\cdot\|_\phi$ a strictly increasing symmetric norm.
- (4) $\lambda_k(|ab^*|) = \lambda_k\left(\frac{1}{p}|a|^p + \frac{1}{q}|b|^q\right)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Regarding other contexts for the inequality and the case of equality, we now mention briefly some relevant literature. See the paper by R. Zeng [16] for the case of inequality in quaternion matrices; see also the papers by D. Farenick and S. M. Manjegani [6, 11] regarding the case of equality in finite and semi-finite von Neumann algebras. There is also an extension of the inequality to type III von Neumann algebras given by S. M. Manjegani [10]. For reverse Young inequalities see S. M. Manjegani and A. Norouzi [12].

2. Young’s inequality for compact operators. Let \mathcal{H} be a complex Hilbert space, and denote by $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ the bounded linear operators acting in \mathcal{H} . For $y \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, let $|y| = \sqrt{y^*y}$ denote the positive square root; then $y = \nu|y|$ is the polar decomposition of y , where $\nu : \overline{\text{Ran } |y|} \rightarrow \overline{\text{Ran } y}$ is a partial isometry; the projection $\nu\nu^*$ onto the closure of the range of y will be denoted by p_y .

In the following lemma we collect some results that will be used throughout this paper (and will help us fix the notation):

LEMMA 2.1. *Let $a, b, x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$.*

- (1) *If $b = \nu|b|$ then $\nu^*\nu$ is the orthogonal projection onto the closure of the range of $|b|$, $|b^*| = \nu|b|\nu^*$ and $\nu\nu^*$ is the orthogonal projection onto the closure of the range of $|b^*|$.*
- (2) *$|ab^*| = \nu||a||b|\nu^*$ and $\nu^*|ab^*|\nu = ||a||b|$.*
- (3) *If p is a projection, then $x = pxp$ implies $x = px$ and in particular $p_x p = p_x$ (equivalently $p_x \leq p$).*
- (4) *If p is a projection, $pxp = p$ and either $x \geq p$ or $0 \leq x \leq p$, then $xp = p$. In particular if $\text{Ran}(p) = \text{span}(\xi)$ for some $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$,*

$$\langle x\eta, \eta \rangle \geq \langle p\eta, \eta \rangle \quad \text{for any } \eta \in \mathcal{H}$$

and $\langle x\xi, \xi \rangle = \langle \xi, \xi \rangle$, then $x\xi = \xi$. There is a similar assertion for the other case.

Proof. (1) is trivial. To prove (2) write the polar decompositions $a = u|a|$, $b = \nu|b|$. Note that $|ab^*|^2 = \nu|b||a|^2|b|\nu^*$; since $\nu^*\nu|b| = |b|$ we have $(\nu|b||a|^2|b|\nu^*)^n = \nu(|b||a|^2|b|)^n\nu^*$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and an elementary functional calculus argument shows that

$$|ab^*| = (\nu|b||a|^2|b|\nu^*)^{1/2} = \nu(|b||a|^2|b|)^{1/2}\nu^* = \nu||a||b|\nu^*.$$

On the other hand, since $\nu\nu^*\nu = \nu$, we have $\nu\nu^*|ab^*| = |ab^*| = |ab^*|\nu\nu^*$, therefore from $\nu^*|ab^*|^2\nu = ||a||b|^2$ taking square roots and using a similar argument we derive $\nu^*|ab^*|\nu = ||a||b|$.

(3) If $pxp = x$ then $\text{Ran } x \subset \text{Ran } p$, therefore $p_x \leq p$ or equivalently $pp_x = p_x$. Multiplying both sides by x gives $x = px$.

(4) Assume $x \geq p$ (the case $0 \leq x \leq p$ can be treated in a similar fashion, therefore its proof is omitted). Since $x - p \geq 0$, we have, for each $\eta \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\|(x - p)^{1/2}p\eta\|^2 = \langle p(x - p)p\eta, \eta \rangle = 0,$$

thus $(x - p)^{1/2}p = 0$ and multiplying by $(x - p)^{1/2}$ on the left we obtain $(x - p)p = 0$, which shows that $xp = p$. ■

2.1. Singular values. Denote by $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$ the compact operators on \mathcal{H} . Let $\lambda_k(x)$ ($k \in \mathbb{N}_0$) denote the k th eigenvalue of the positive compact operator $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, arranged in decreasing order,

$$\|x\| = \lambda_0 \geq \lambda_1 \geq \dots,$$

where we allow equality because each singular value is counted with multiplicity. Clearly $\lambda_k(f(x)) = f(\lambda_k(x))$ for any non-negative measurable function f defined on $\sigma(x)$.

REMARK 2.2. For $a, b \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and $x \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$, the min-max characterization of singular values [14, Theorem 1.5] and Lemma 2.1(2) easily imply that

- (1) $\lambda_k(axb) \leq \|a\| \|b\| \lambda_k(x)$,
- (2) $\lambda_k(|ab^*|) = \lambda_k(|a| |b|)$.

2.2. Unitarily invariant norms. For a given vector $a = (a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ with $a_i \in \mathbb{R}$, we will denote by a^\downarrow the rearrangement of a in decreasing order, that is, a^\downarrow is a permutation of a such that

$$a_0^\downarrow \geq a_1^\downarrow \geq \dots .$$

Let $\|\cdot\|_\phi$ stand for a unitarily invariant norm in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, and $\phi : \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathbb{N}_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ its associated permutation invariant gauge [14].

DEFINITION 2.3. The norm $\|\cdot\|_\phi$ is *strictly increasing* if, for any pair of sequences $a = (a_i), b = (b_i)$ such that $0 \leq a_i \leq b_i$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the equality $\phi(a) = \phi(b)$ implies that $a_i = b_i$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

See Hiai’s paper [8]; see also property (3) in Simon’s paper [13].

Examples of such norms on $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$ are the Schatten p -norms, $1 \leq p < \infty$, and examples of non-strictly increasing norms are the supremum norm and the Ky-Fan norms. Note that we can always define

$$(2.1) \quad \phi(a) = \sum_{k \geq 0} a_k^\downarrow 2^{-k},$$

which is a strictly increasing norm defined on the whole of $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$.

REMARK 2.4. If $|\cdot|_\phi$ is not equivalent to the supremum norm

$$\|x\| = \sup_{\|\xi\|_H=1} \|x\xi\|_H,$$

then $\mathcal{I}_\phi = \{x \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H}) : \|x\|_\phi < \infty\}$ is a proper bilateral ideal in $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$ according to Calkin’s theory. Assume that a symmetric norm has the Radon–Riesz property

$$\|x_n\|_\phi \rightarrow \|x\|_\phi \text{ and } x_n \rightarrow x \text{ weakly} \Rightarrow \|x - x_n\|_\phi \rightarrow 0$$

(see Arazy’s paper [2] on the equivalence for sequences and compact operators). Simon proved in [13] that in that case the norm is strictly increasing according to our definition. *Can this assertion be reversed?*

2.3. Inequality

REMARK 2.5. For $a, b \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$ we will always denote

$$\alpha_k = \lambda_k(|a|), \quad \beta_k = \lambda_k(|b|), \quad \gamma_k = \lambda_k(|ab^*|), \quad \delta_k = \lambda_k\left(\frac{1}{p}|a|^p + \frac{1}{q}|b|^q\right).$$

Moreover, we will denote by

$$|a| = \sum_k \alpha_k a_k, \quad |b| = \sum_k \beta_k b_k, \quad |ab^*| = \sum_k \gamma_k p_k, \quad \frac{1}{p}|a|^p + \frac{1}{q}|b|^q = \sum_k \delta_k q_k$$

the spectral decompositions of each operator, with a_k, b_k , etc. one-dimensional projections. Note that we allow multiplicity, and if $\gamma_1 = \dots = \gamma_j$ for some finite j , the choice of the first q_j is arbitrary (i.e., it amounts to selecting an orthonormal base of that span).

REMARK 2.6. For $a, b \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$, the following was proved in [5] by Erlijman, Farenick and Zeng: for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\lambda_k(|ab^*|) \leq \lambda_k\left(\frac{1}{p}|a|^p + \frac{1}{q}|b|^q\right),$$

hence there exists a partial isometry u such that $q_k = up_k u^*$ and $u^*u = \sum_k p_k$ is the projection onto the (closure of the) range of $|ab^*|$. Then, for any $a, b \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$,

$$u|ab^*|u^* \leq \frac{1}{p}|a|^p + \frac{1}{q}|b|^q.$$

This extended the original result of Ando [1] stated for positive matrices.

From their result, it can be deduced that the relevant condition to deal with the equality is $\gamma_k = \delta_k$ for all k , to be more precise:

LEMMA 2.7. Let $a, b \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$, $p > 1$, $1/p + 1/q = 1$.

- (1) If $|a|^p = |b|^q$, then $\alpha_k^p = \beta_k^q = \gamma_k = \delta_k$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$.
- (2) If either

$$z|ab^*|z^* = \frac{1}{p}|a|^p + \frac{1}{q}|b|^q$$

for some contraction $z \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, or

$$\|z|ab^*|w\|_\phi = \left\| \frac{1}{p}|a|^p + \frac{1}{q}|b|^q \right\|_\phi$$

for a pair of contractions $z, w \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and a strictly increasing norm, then $\gamma_k = \delta_k$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and

$$u|ab^*|u^* = \frac{1}{p}|a|^p + \frac{1}{q}|b|^q,$$

where u is the partial isometry of Remark 2.6, i.e. $up_k u^* = q_k$ for each k .

Proof. To prove (1), note that clearly $\delta_k = \alpha_k^p = \beta_k^q$. By Lemma 2.1(2), $|ab^*| = \nu|a|^p \nu^*$, and in particular

$$\lambda_k(|ab^*|) \leq \lambda_k(|a|^p) = \lambda_k(|b|^q)$$

by Remark 2.2(1). Now since ν is the partial isometry of $|b|$, also $\nu^*|ab^*|\nu = \nu^*\nu|a|^p\nu^*\nu = |a|^p$, which in turn shows the reverse inequality, and then $\gamma_k = \alpha_k^p = \beta_k^q$ follows.

Regarding (2), note that if equality is attained by a contraction z , then by Remarks 2.6 and 2.2(1),

$$\gamma_k \leq \delta_k = \lambda_k(z|ab^*|z^*) \leq \lambda_k(|ab^*|) = \gamma_k.$$

Likewise, if equality is attained for a strictly increasing norm and a pair of contractions z, w , then since

$$\lambda_k(z|ab^*|w) \leq \lambda_k(|ab^*|) = \gamma_k \leq \delta_k = \lambda_k,$$

we have $\gamma_k = \delta_k$ for every k . ■

2.4. Equality. The following result will be crucial to the proof of our main assertion.

PROPOSITION 2.8. *Let $0 \leq a, b \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$. Let $1 < p < 2$ and $1/p + 1/q = 1$. If*

$$\lambda_k(|ab|) = \lambda_k\left(\frac{1}{p}a^p + \frac{1}{q}b^q\right) \quad \text{for all } k,$$

then $\text{Ran } |ba| \subset \overline{\text{Ran } b}$.

Proof. Let $\varepsilon > 0$, let p_b stand for the projection onto the closure of the range of b , and let $b_\varepsilon = b + \varepsilon(1 - p_b)$. Then $b_\varepsilon^q = b^q + \varepsilon^q(1 - p_b) \leq b^q + \varepsilon^q$ and $b_\varepsilon^2 = b^2 + \varepsilon^2(1 - p_b)$. Therefore

$$|b_\varepsilon a|^2 = ab_\varepsilon^2 a = ab^2 a + \varepsilon^2 a(1 - p_b)a.$$

Let $|ba| = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} \gamma_k e_k \otimes e_k$ with $\gamma_k = \lambda_k(|ba|)$ and let $\{e_k\}_k$ be an orthonormal basis of $\text{Ran } |ba|$. Then as $\gamma_0 = \|ab\| = \|ba\|$, we have $\langle ab^2 a e_0, e_0 \rangle = \|ba\|^2$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon^2 \|(1 - p_b) a e_0\|^2 + \|ba\|^2 &\leq \|b_\varepsilon a\|^2 = \|ab_\varepsilon\|^2 \leq \left\| \frac{1}{p} a^p + \frac{1}{q} b_\varepsilon^q \right\|^2 \\ &= \left\| \frac{1}{p} a^p + \frac{1}{q} b^q + \frac{1}{q} \varepsilon^q (1 - p_b) \right\|^2 \\ &\leq \left\| \frac{1}{p} a^p + \frac{1}{q} b^q + \frac{1}{q} \varepsilon^q \right\|^2 \leq \left(\left\| \frac{1}{p} a^p + \frac{1}{q} b^q \right\| + \frac{1}{q} \varepsilon^q \right)^2 \\ &= \left(\|ab\| + \frac{1}{q} \varepsilon^q \right)^2 = \|ab\|^2 + \frac{2}{q} \|ab\| \varepsilon^q + \frac{1}{q^2} \varepsilon^{2q} \end{aligned}$$

by Remark 2.6 and the hypothesis. Therefore, dividing by ε^2 and letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, since $q > 2$, we conclude that $(1 - p_b) a e_0 = 0$, or equivalently $a e_0 \in \overline{\text{Ran } b}$.

We iterate the argument above for all k such that $\gamma_k = \gamma_0$; let us abuse the notation and assume then that $\gamma_1 < \gamma_0$. Then for all sufficiently small $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_1$,

$$\gamma_1^2 + \varepsilon^2 \|(1 - p_b)ae_1\|^2 < \gamma_0^2.$$

Therefore for all such ε , if $Q = e_0 + e_1$ then $\lambda_1(Q(\varepsilon^2 a(1 - p_b)a + ab^2 a)Q)$ equals

$$\lambda_1(\varepsilon^2 \|(a(1 - p_b)a)^{1/2}e_1\|^2 e_1 + \gamma_1^2 e_1 + \gamma_0^2 e_0) = \gamma_1^2 + \varepsilon^2 \|(1 - p_b)ae_1\|^2.$$

Now for the same reasons as above (and since $\lambda_k(QAQ) \leq \lambda_k(A)$ and $\lambda_k(A + tP) \leq \lambda_k(A + t1) = \lambda_k(A) + t$ for $A \geq 0, t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $P^2 = P = P^*$)

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1(Q(\varepsilon^2 a(1 - p_b)a + ab^2 a)Q) &= \lambda_1|Q|ab_\varepsilon|^2 Q| \leq \lambda_1|ab_\varepsilon|^2 \\ &\leq \lambda_1 \left(\frac{1}{p} a^p + \frac{1}{q} b_\varepsilon^q \right)^2 \\ &\leq \lambda_1 \left(\frac{1}{p} a^p + \frac{1}{q} b^q + \frac{1}{q} \varepsilon^q \right)^2 \\ &= \left[\lambda_1 \left(\frac{1}{p} a^p + \frac{1}{q} b^q \right) + \frac{1}{q} \varepsilon^q \right]^2 \\ &\leq \left(\lambda_1|ab| + \frac{1}{q} \varepsilon^q \right)^2 = \gamma_1^2 + \frac{2}{q} \gamma_1 \varepsilon^q + \frac{1}{q^2} \varepsilon^{2q}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\gamma_1^2 + \varepsilon^2 \|(1 - p_b)ae_1\|^2 \leq \gamma_1^2 + \frac{2}{q} \gamma_1 \varepsilon^q + \frac{1}{q^2} \varepsilon^{2q}$$

and again, dividing by ε and letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we conclude that $ae_1 \in \overline{\text{Ran } b}$. Proceeding recursively, we conclude that $a(\text{Ran } |ba|) \subset \overline{\text{Ran } b}$. Now if $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$, then $a|ba|\xi \in \overline{\text{Ran}(b)}$, therefore $a^2|ba|\xi = a(a|ba|\xi) \in \overline{a\text{Ran}(b)} \subset \overline{\text{Ran}(ab)} = \overline{\text{Ran } |ba|}$, and $a^3|ba|\xi = a(a^2|ba|\xi) \in \overline{a\text{Ran } |ba|} \subset \overline{\text{Ran}(b)}$. Iterating this argument, we arrive at $a^{2n+1}(\text{Ran } |ba|) \subset \overline{\text{Ran}(b)}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Using an approximation of $f = \chi_{\sigma(a)}$ by odd functions, we conclude that $p_a(\text{Ran } |ba|) = f(a)(\text{Ran } |ba|) \subset \overline{\text{Ran}(b)}$ where p_a is the projection onto the closure of the range of a . Therefore $|ba|^2 \xi = ab^2 a \xi = p_a ab^2 a \xi = p_a |ba|^2 \xi \subset \overline{\text{Ran}(b)}$, which gives $\overline{\text{Ran } |ba|} = \overline{\text{Ran}(|ba|^2)} \subset \overline{\text{Ran}(b)}$. ■

The following lemma is well-known; we include a short proof for our particular case (see for instance [4] for the general result):

LEMMA 2.9. *Let $0 \leq x \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$ with $\|\xi\| = 1$. Then*

$$\langle x^r \xi, \xi \rangle \leq \langle x \xi, \xi \rangle^r, \quad 0 < r < 1,$$

with equality iff $x\xi = \langle x\xi, \xi \rangle \xi$. Also

$$\langle x \xi, \xi \rangle^s \leq \langle x^s \xi, \xi \rangle, \quad s > 1,$$

with equality iff $x\xi = \langle x\xi, \xi \rangle \xi$.

Proof. Let $x = \sum x_i p_i$ be a spectral decomposition of x with $\sum_i p_i = 1$. Let $t_i = \|p_i \xi\|^2$; then $\sum_i t_i = 1$. Using Hölder's inequality with $p = 1/r > 1$, we obtain

$$\langle x^r \xi, \xi \rangle = \sum_i x_i^r t_i = \sum_i x_i^r t_i^{1/p} t_i^{1/q} \leq \left(\sum_i x_i t_i \right)^r \left(\sum_i t_i \right)^{1/q} = \langle x \xi, \xi \rangle^r.$$

Assuming equality in Hölder's inequality, it must be $x_i t_i = c t_i$ for all i , therefore $x \xi = \langle x \xi, \xi \rangle \xi$. Taking $s = 1/r$ and replacing x with x^s , the proof of the other case ($s > 1$) is straightforward. ■

It turns out that the relevant hypothesis is neither the operator equality, nor the norm equality, but the singular numbers equality.

THEOREM 2.10. *Assume that $a, b \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$, $p > 1$, $1/p + 1/q = 1$. If*

$$\lambda_k(|ab^*|) = \lambda_k\left(\frac{1}{p}|a|^p + \frac{1}{q}|b|^q\right)$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, then $|a|^p = |b|^q$.

Proof. Since $\lambda_k(|ab^*|) = \lambda_k(|ba^*|)$, exchanging a with b if necessary we can assume that $1 < p \leq 2$. It will be easier to deal first with $a, b \geq 0$. We follow the notation of Remark 2.5.

Since $ba^2b = |ab|^2 = \sum_k \gamma_k^2 p_k$, if $p_0 = \xi \otimes \xi$ with $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\|\xi\| = 1$, then $ba^2b\xi = \gamma_0^2 \xi$. Let $\eta = (1/\gamma_0^2)p_b a^2 b \xi$; then $\eta \in \overline{\text{Ran } b}$ and $b\eta = \xi$. Let p_η be the projection onto $\text{span}(\eta)$. Then it is easy to check that $\|\eta\|^2 b p_\eta b = p_0$. Observe that

$$(2.2) \quad ba^2b \geq \gamma_0^2 p_0 = \gamma_0^2 \|\eta\|^2 b p_\eta b.$$

Now we deal with two cases separately: $p \neq 2$ and $p = 2$.

CASE $p \neq 2$. By Proposition 2.8, we have $p_b |ba| = |ba|$, but $\text{Ran } |ba| = \text{Ran}(ab)$, hence if we set $\bar{a} = p_b a p_b$, then

$$b\bar{a}^2b = b p_b a p_b p_b a p_b b = b a p_b a b = ba^2b \geq \gamma_0^2 \|\eta\|^2 b p_\eta b.$$

Therefore $\bar{a}^2 \geq \gamma_0^2 \|\eta\|^2 p_\eta$ as operators acting on $\mathcal{H}' = \overline{\text{Ran } b}$. Since $1/2 < p/2 < 1$, the operator monotonicity of $t \mapsto t^{p/2}$ implies that in \mathcal{H}' , we have

$$\bar{a}^p \geq \gamma_0^p \|\eta\|^p p_\eta.$$

This also implies

$$(2.3) \quad \frac{\langle \bar{a}^p \eta, \eta \rangle}{\|\eta\|^2} \geq \gamma_0^p \|\eta\|^p.$$

On the other hand, $p_\eta = \|\eta\|^2 p_\eta b^2 p_\eta$, and by Lemma 2.9 with $s = q/2 > 1$,

$$(2.4) \quad \frac{1}{\|\eta\|^q} p_\eta = \left(\frac{p_\eta}{\|\eta\|^2} \right)^{q/2} = (p_\eta b^2 p_\eta)^{q/2} \leq p_\eta b^q p_\eta,$$

equivalently

$$(2.5) \quad \frac{1}{\|\eta\|^q} \langle \eta, \eta \rangle \leq \langle b^q \eta, \eta \rangle.$$

By Young's numerical inequality,

$$(2.6) \quad \gamma_0 = \gamma_0 \|\eta\| \frac{1}{\|\eta\|} \leq \frac{1}{p} \gamma_0^p \|\eta\|^p + \frac{1}{q} \frac{1}{\|\eta\|^q}.$$

Since $1 < p < 2$, the map $t \mapsto t^p$ is operator convex [7, Theorem 2.4], therefore $\bar{a}^p = (p_b a p_b)^p \leq p_b a^p p_b$; combining this with (2.3), (2.5) and (2.6) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_0 &\leq \frac{1}{p} \frac{\langle \bar{a}^p \eta, \eta \rangle}{\|\eta\|^2} + \frac{1}{q} \frac{\langle b^q \eta, \eta \rangle}{\|\eta\|^2} \leq \frac{1}{p} \frac{\langle p_b a^p p_b \eta, \eta \rangle}{\|\eta\|^2} + \frac{1}{q} \frac{\langle b^q \eta, \eta \rangle}{\|\eta\|^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{p} \frac{\langle a^p \eta, \eta \rangle}{\|\eta\|^2} + \frac{1}{q} \frac{\langle b^q \eta, \eta \rangle}{\|\eta\|^2} = \frac{1}{\|\eta\|^2} \left\langle \left(\frac{1}{p} a^p + \frac{1}{q} b^q \right) \eta, \eta \right\rangle \leq \gamma_0 \end{aligned}$$

by the hypothesis on the λ_k .

From this we can derive several conclusions. First, since there is equality in Young's numerical inequality (2.6), we have $\gamma_0 = 1/\|\eta\|^q$. Secondly, since we have equality in (2.4), it follows that $b^2 \eta = (1/\|\eta\|^2) \eta = \gamma_0^{2/q} \eta$ (Lemma 2.9), therefore $\xi = b \eta = \gamma_0^{1/q} \eta$. Third, since $0 \leq \frac{1}{p} a^p + \frac{1}{q} b^q \leq \gamma_0 1$ and now

$$\frac{1}{\|\eta\|^2} \left\langle \left(\frac{1}{p} a^p + \frac{1}{q} b^q \right) \eta, \eta \right\rangle = \frac{1}{\|\xi\|^2} \left\langle \left(\frac{1}{p} a^p + \frac{1}{q} b^q \right) \xi, \xi \right\rangle = \gamma_0$$

we have (Lemma 2.1(4))

$$\left(\frac{1}{p} a^p + \frac{1}{q} b^q \right) \xi = \gamma_0 \xi,$$

and rearranging if necessary the basis of $\ker\left(\left(\frac{1}{p} a^p + \frac{1}{q} b^q\right) - \gamma_0 1\right)$, we conclude $p_0 = p_\eta = p_\xi = q_0$. Note that

$$\gamma_0 \xi = \frac{1}{p} a^p \xi + \frac{1}{q} b^q \xi = \frac{1}{p} a^p \xi + \frac{1}{q} \gamma_0 \xi,$$

which implies that $a^p \xi = \gamma_0 \xi$; with a similar argument and since

$$0 \leq \frac{1}{p} \bar{a}^p + \frac{1}{q} b^q \leq \frac{1}{p} p_b a^p p_b + \frac{1}{q} b^q = p_b \left(\frac{1}{p} p_b a^p p_b + \frac{1}{q} b^q \right) p_b \leq \gamma_0 p_b \leq \gamma_0 1,$$

we deduce that also $\bar{a}^p = \gamma_0 \xi$, therefore $a \xi = \gamma_0^{1/p} \xi$.

We now proceed by induction. Write

$$a = \sum_{\bar{\alpha}_j > \gamma_0^{1/p}} \bar{\alpha}_j \bar{a}_j + \sum_{\alpha_k \leq \gamma_0^{1/p}} \alpha_k a_k,$$

with a_k, \bar{a}_j rank one disjoint projections and $a_k \bar{a}_j = 0$ for all k, j . Then rearranging if necessary we have $\alpha_0 = \gamma_0^{1/p}$, $a_0 = p_0$. Write similarly

$$b = \sum_{\bar{\beta}_j > \gamma_0^{1/q}} \bar{\beta}_j \bar{b}_j + \sum_{\beta_k \leq \gamma_0^{1/q}} \beta_k b_k, \quad \beta_0 = \gamma_0^{1/q}, b_0 = p_0.$$

Let $\bar{a} = (1 - p_0)a(1 - p_0)$ and $\bar{b} = (1 - p_0)b(1 - p_0)$. Then $p_0 \bar{a} = p_0 \bar{b} = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} a &= \bar{a} + \gamma_0^{1/p} p_0, & b &= \bar{b} + \gamma_0^{1/q} p_0, \\ ab &= \bar{a} \bar{b} + \gamma_0 p_0, & |ab| &= |\bar{a} \bar{b}| + \gamma_0 p_0, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{p} \bar{a}^p + \frac{1}{q} \bar{b}^q + \gamma_0 p_0 = \frac{1}{p} a^p + \frac{1}{q} b^q.$$

Therefore

$$\lambda_0 \left(\frac{1}{p} \bar{a}^p + \frac{1}{q} \bar{b}^q \right) = \lambda_1 \left(\frac{1}{p} a^p + \frac{1}{q} b^q \right) = \lambda_1(|ab|) = \lambda_0(|\bar{a} \bar{b}|),$$

and iterating the above construction we arrive at

$$a = \bar{a} + \sum_k \gamma_k^{1/p} p_k, \quad b = \bar{b} + \sum_k \gamma_k^{1/q} p_k$$

with $\bar{a} p_k = \bar{b} p_k = 0$ for each $j, k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then

$$\frac{1}{p} a^p + \frac{1}{q} b^q = \sum_k \lambda_k p_k + \frac{1}{p} \bar{a}^p + \frac{1}{q} \bar{b}^q = |ab| + \frac{1}{p} \bar{a}^p + \frac{1}{q} \bar{b}^q = |ab| + T$$

with $T \geq 0$ compact and $T|ab| = 0$. Now $\lambda_k(|ab|) = \lambda_k(\frac{1}{p} a^p + \frac{1}{q} b^q)$ for all k , which means equal eigenvalues with equal (and finite) multiplicities, a fact that forces $T = 0$, therefore $\bar{a} = \bar{b} = 0$, from which the claim $a^p = b^q$ follows for $a, b \geq 0$, assuming $1 < p < 2$.

CASE $p = 2$. Let us now return to the case we skipped. From (2.2), we know that $p_b a^2 p_b \geq \gamma_0^2 \|\eta\|^2 p_\eta$ on the whole \mathcal{H} , therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_0 &\leq \frac{\gamma_0^2 \|\eta\|^2}{2\|\eta\|^2} + \frac{1}{2\|\eta\|^2} \leq \frac{\langle p_b a^2 p_b \eta, \eta \rangle}{2\|\eta\|^2} + \frac{\langle b^2 \eta, \eta \rangle}{2\|\eta\|^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{\|\eta\|^2} \langle (\frac{1}{2} p_b a^2 p_b + \frac{1}{2} b^2) \eta, \eta \rangle = \frac{1}{\|\eta\|^2} \langle (p_b (\frac{1}{2} a^2 + \frac{1}{2} b^2) p_b) \eta, \eta \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{\|\eta\|^2} \langle (\frac{1}{2} a^2 + \frac{1}{2} b^2) \eta, \eta \rangle \leq \gamma_0 \end{aligned}$$

since $\eta \in \text{Ran}(b)$. Then from the equality in (2.6) we derive that $\lambda_0 = \|\eta\|^{-2}$, and $(\frac{1}{2} a^2 + \frac{1}{2} b^2) \eta = \gamma_0 \eta$ as before. Since $q = 2$, we have lost the strict inequality in (2.4) regarding b . However, since now $\langle p_b a^2 p_b \eta, \eta \rangle \geq \gamma_0^2 \|\eta\|^2$ must be an equality, from Lemma 2.1(4) we conclude that $p_b a^2 \eta = p_b a^2 p_b \eta = \lambda \eta$ for some positive λ , hence $b^2 \eta = (2\gamma_0 - \lambda) \eta$ also. Recalling $1 = \|\xi\|^2 = \|b\eta\|^2 =$

$\langle b^2\eta, \eta \rangle = (2\gamma_0 - \lambda)\|\eta\|^2 = (2\gamma_0 - \lambda)\gamma_0^{-1}$, we obtain $\lambda = \gamma_0$. This tells us that $b\eta = \gamma_0^{1/2}\eta = a\eta$. The rest of the argument follows as in the case of $p < 2$.

Returning to the original statement, if for any compact a, b , we have equality of singular values, since $\lambda_k(|ab^*|) = \lambda_k(|a||b|)$ (Remark 2.2(2)), we obtain $|a|^p = |b|^q$. ■

Let us summarize all the results in one clear-cut statement, the main result of this paper:

THEOREM 2.11. *Let $a, b \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$. If $p > 1$ and $1/p + 1/q = 1$, then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $|a|^p = |b|^q$.
- (2) $z|ab^*|z^* = \frac{1}{p}|a|^p + \frac{1}{q}|b|^q$ for some contraction $z \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$
- (3) $\|z|ab^*|w\|_\phi = \|\frac{1}{p}|a|^p + \frac{1}{q}|b|^q\|_\phi < \infty$ for a pair of contractions $z, w \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\|\cdot\|_\phi$ a strictly increasing symmetric norm.
- (4) $\lambda_k(|ab^*|) = \lambda_k(\frac{1}{p}|a|^p + \frac{1}{q}|b|^q)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Proof. Clearly (1) \Rightarrow (2) with $z = \nu$ (the partial isometry in the polar decomposition of $b = \nu|b|$). If (2) holds, picking a norm as in (2.1), we obtain (2) \Rightarrow (3). By Lemma 2.7, we have (3) \Rightarrow (4), and finally Theorem 2.10 yields (4) \Rightarrow (1). ■

2.4.1. Final remarks: equality of operators. Assume that we have an equality of operators

$$(2.7) \quad z|ab^*|z^* = \frac{1}{p}|a|^p + \frac{1}{q}|b|^q$$

for some contraction $z \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Then from the previous theorem $|a|^p = |b|^q$ and

$$z|b^*|^q z^* = z\nu|b|^q \nu^* z^* = z|ab^*|^* z^* = |b|^q.$$

REMARK 2.12. Let Tr stand for the semifinite trace of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Assume for a moment that $\text{Tr}|b|^q < \infty$, or equivalently $\beta_k = \lambda_k(b) \in \ell_q$. Then

$$\text{Tr}(|b^*|^q(1 - z^*z)) = \text{Tr}|b^*|^q - \text{Tr}(z|b^*|^q) = \text{Tr}|b|^q - \text{Tr}(z|b^*|^q z^*) = 0,$$

which is only possible if $|b^*|^q = |b^*|^q z^* z$, since z is a contraction and the trace is faithful. Then also

$$zz^*|b|^q = zz^*z|b^*|^q z^* = z|b^*|^q z^* = |b|^q,$$

and

$$|b|^q z = z|b^*|^q z^* z = z|b^*|^q$$

or equivalently $|b|z = z|b^*|$, which can be stated as $bz\nu = \nu zb$. The reader can check that these three conditions

- 1) $|b^*|z^*z = |b^*|$,
- 2) $|b|zz^* = |b|$,
- 3) $|b|z = z|b^*|$

are also sufficient to have equality in (2.7).

This last fact, for z a partial isometry (and with a different proof), was observed by Argerami and Farenick [3].

We conjecture that these three conditions are also necessary for (2.7) to hold with a contraction z if b is just compact.

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank Jorge Antezana for pointing me to the nice paper by Argerami and Farenick; Esteban Andruchow for our valuable conversations on this subject; and Martin Argerami for all his help with the manuscript. I would also like to thank the anonymous referee for her/his help in improving the manuscript.

This research was supported by Instituto Argentino de Matemática “Alberto P. Calderón”, Universidad Nacional de General Sarmiento, Universidad de Buenos Aires, CONICET (PIP 2010-0757) and ANPCyT (PICT 2010-2478).

References

- [1] T. Ando, *Matrix Young inequalities*, in: Operator Theory in Function Spaces and Banach Lattices, Oper. Theory Adv. Appl. 75, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1995, 33–38.
- [2] J. Arazy, *More on convergence in unitary matrix spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 83 (1981), 44–48.
- [3] M. Argerami and D. R. Farenick, *Young’s inequality in trace-class operators*, Math. Ann. 325 (2003), 727–744.
- [4] L. G. Brown and H. Kosaki, *Jensen’s inequality in semi-finite von Neumann algebras*, J. Operator Theory 23 (1990), 3–19.
- [5] J. Erlijman, D. R. Farenick and R. Zeng, *Young’s inequality in compact operators*, in: Linear Operators and Matrices, Oper. Theory Adv. Appl. 130, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2002, 171–184.
- [6] D. R. Farenick and S. M. Manjegani, *Young’s inequality in operator algebras*, J. Ramanujan Math. Soc. 20 (2005), 107–124.
- [7] F. Hansen, G. K. Pedersen and G. Kjaergard, *Jensen’s inequality for operators and Löwner’s theorem*, Math. Ann. 258 (1981/82), 229–241.
- [8] F. Hiai, *Equality cases in matrix norm inequalities of Golden–Thompson type*, Linear Multilinear Algebra 36 (1994), 239–249.
- [9] O. Hirzallah and F. Kittaneh, *Matrix Young inequalities for the Hilbert–Schmidt norm*, Linear Algebra Appl. 308 (2000), 77–84.
- [10] S. M. Manjegani, *Spectral dominance and Young’s inequality in type III factors*, J. Inequal. Pure Appl. Math. 7 (2006), art. 82, 8 pp.
- [11] S. M. Manjegani, *Hölder and Young inequalities for the trace of operators*, Positivity 11 (2007), 239–250.
- [12] S. M. Manjegani and A. Norouzi, *Matrix form of the inverse Young inequalities*, Linear Algebra Appl. 486 (2015), 484–493.
- [13] B. Simon, *Convergence in trace ideals*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 83 (1981), 39–43.
- [14] B. Simon, *Trace Ideals and their Applications*, 2nd ed., Math. Surveys Monogr. 120, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2005.
- [15] R. Zeng, *Young’s inequality in compact operators—the case of equality*, J. Inequal. Pure Appl. Math. 6 (2005), art. 110, 10 pp.

- [16] R. Zeng, *The quaternion matrix-valued Young's inequality*, J. Inequal. Pure Appl. Math. 6 (2005), art. 89, 6 pp.

Gabriel Larotonda
Instituto de Ciencias
Universidad Nacional de General Sarmiento
J. M. Gutierrez 1150
(B1613GSX) Los Polvorines
Buenos Aires, Argentina
E-mail: glaroton@ungs.edu.ar

