

## A-NUMERICAL RADIUS OF $A$ -NORMAL OPERATORS IN SEMI-HILBERTIAN SPACES

**M. Faghih-Ahmadi**<sup>1</sup>

**F. Gorjizadeh**

*Department of Mathematics*

*Shiraz University*

*Shiraz, 7146713565*

*Iran*

*e-mails: faghiha@shirazu.ac.ir*

*farzaneanaliz@gmail.com*

**Abstract.** Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a Hilbert space and  $A$  be a positive bounded linear operator on  $\mathcal{H}$ . The semi-inner product  $\langle h, k \rangle_A = \langle Ah, k \rangle$ ,  $h, k \in \mathcal{H}$ , induces a seminorm for a bounded linear operator  $T$ , which is defined by

$$\|T\|_A = \sup\{\|Th\|_A / \|h\|_A : \|h\| \neq 0\}.$$

The main purpose of this paper is to prove that  $\|T\|_A$  equals the  $A$ -numerical radius of  $T$ , when  $T$  is an  $A$ -normal operator. This generalizes the similar result for a normal operator on a Hilbert space.

**Keywords and phrases:**  $A$ -normal operator,  $A$ -adjoint operator,  $A$ -numerical radius.

**2010 Mathematics Subject Classification:** 46C05, 47A05.

### 1. Introduction

Throughout this paper,  $\mathcal{H}$  denotes a complex Hilbert space with the inner product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  and  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$  is the Banach algebra of all bounded linear operators on  $\mathcal{H}$ , and  $A$  always stands for a positive linear operator in  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ .

We are going to consider an additional semi-inner product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_A$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  given by  $\langle h, k \rangle_A = \langle Ah, k \rangle$ , ( $h, k \in \mathcal{H}$ ) which defines a seminorm  $\|\cdot\|_A$  on  $\mathcal{H}$ . This makes  $\mathcal{H}$  into a semi-Hilbertian space. Then we replace the operator norm with

$$\|T\|_A = \sup\{\|Th\|_A / \|h\|_A : \|h\|_A \neq 0\}.$$

The previously defined concepts about operators can be generalized using this seminorm. For some references, the reader can see [1], [2], [7], [5].

---

<sup>1</sup>Corresponding author

Our purpose in this paper, is to study the relationship between the new concept of normality of operators, called *A-normality*, and the numerical radius of them, called the *A-numerical radius*, when we consider  $\|\cdot\|_A$  instead of the initial norm. *A-normal* operators are defined in [6], in which some results related to  $\|\cdot\|_A$  and *A-numerical radius* of them are obtained. A question posed in the mentioned paper, states that if  $\|T\|_A$  equals the *A-numerical radius* of  $T$ , when  $T$  is an *A-normal* operator. In this direction, Section 2 is devoted to collect some facts about  $\|\cdot\|_A$  and the relevant concepts. It is well-known that the numerical radius of a normal operator on a Hilbert space equals its norm [3]. Similar to this fact, the last section is dedicated to proving the same result for operators defined on a semi-Hilbertian space.

## 2. Preliminaries

The positive operator  $A \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$  define a positive semi-definite sesquilinear form  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_A : \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  given by  $\langle h, k \rangle_A = \langle Ah, k \rangle$ . Note that  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_A$  defines a semi-inner product on  $\mathcal{H}$ , and the seminorm induced by it is given by

$$\|h\|_A = \langle h, h \rangle_A^{1/2}.$$

It is easily seen that  $\|\cdot\|_A$  is a norm on  $\mathcal{H}$  if and only if  $A$  is injective.

The above seminorm induces a seminorm on the subspace  $\mathcal{L}^A(\mathcal{H})$  of  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$  consisting of all  $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$  so that for some  $c > 0$  and all  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ ,  $\|Th\|_A \leq c\|h\|_A$ . Indeed, if  $T \in \mathcal{L}^A(\mathcal{H})$ , then

$$\|T\|_A := \sup \left\{ \frac{\|Th\|_A}{\|h\|_A} : h \in \overline{R(A)}, h \neq 0 \right\} < \infty.$$

Operators in  $\mathcal{L}^A(\mathcal{H})$  are called *A-bounded* operators.

Some equivalent statements for  $\|\cdot\|_A$  are summarized in the next two results.

**Proposition 1.** *If  $T \in \mathcal{L}^A(\mathcal{H})$ , then*

$$\begin{aligned} \|T\|_A &= \sup\{\|Th\|_A/\|h\|_A : h \notin \ker A\} \\ &= \sup\{\|Th\|_A : \|h\|_A = 1\} \\ &= \sup\{|\langle Th, k \rangle_A| : h, k \in \mathcal{H}, \|h\|_A \leq 1, \|k\|_A \leq 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

(The last equality is stated in [7].)

**Proof.** Suppose that  $h \notin \ker A$ . Then  $h$  can be represented as  $h = h_1 + h_2$  in which  $h_1 \in \overline{R(A)}$  and  $h_2 \in N(A^{1/2})$ . Note that  $h_1 \neq 0$ , thanks to the fact that  $A^{1/2}h \neq 0$ . Thus,

$$\frac{\|Th\|_A}{\|h\|_A} = \frac{\|A^{1/2}Th_1 + A^{1/2}Th_2\|}{\|A^{1/2}h_1 + A^{1/2}h_2\|}.$$

Since  $\ker A^{1/2}$  is an invariant subspace for  $T$ ,  $Th_2 \in \ker A^{1/2}$ , and so the above equality implies that

$$\frac{\|Th\|_A}{\|h\|_A} = \frac{\|Th_1\|_A}{\|h_1\|_A}.$$

Thus,

$$\sup\{\|Th\|_A/\|h\|_A : h \in \mathcal{H}, A^{1/2}h \neq 0\} = \|T\|_A.$$

The second inequality is obvious, and from which it can be easily deduced that

$$\|T\|_A = \sup\{\|Th\|_A : \|h\|_A \leq 1\}. \tag{1}$$

To prove the last equality, suppose that  $h, k \in \mathcal{H}$  are so that  $\|h\|_A \leq 1$  and  $\|k\|_A \leq 1$ . Then

$$|\langle Th, k \rangle| \leq \|T\|_A,$$

and so

$$\alpha := \sup\{|\langle Th, k \rangle_A| : h, k \in \mathcal{H}, \|h\|_A \leq 1, \|k\|_A \leq 1\} \leq \|T\|_A.$$

Now suppose that  $\|h\| \leq 1$ . For  $\varepsilon > 0$ , let  $k = Th/(\|Th\|_A + \varepsilon)$ . Then

$$|\langle Th, k \rangle_A| = \|Th\|/(\|Th\|_A + \varepsilon) \leq \alpha.$$

Now, letting  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , we observe that  $\|Tx\|_A \leq \alpha$  for each  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  with  $\|h\|_A \leq 1$ . This, coupled with (1), shows that  $\|T\|_A \leq \alpha$ . Hence  $\|T\|_A = \alpha$ . ■

**Corollary 1.** *If  $T \in \mathcal{L}^A(\mathcal{H})$ , then*

$$\|T\|_A = \sup\{|\langle Th, k \rangle_A| : h, k \in \mathcal{H}, \|h\|_A = \|k\|_A = 1\}.$$

**Proof.** Suppose that  $\|h\|_A = 1$ , and  $\|Th\|_A \neq 0$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|Th\|_A &= |\langle Th, T(\frac{h}{\|Th\|_A}) \rangle_A| \\ &\leq \sup\{|\langle Th, k \rangle| : \|k\|_A = 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

So, in light of Proposition 1, the result holds. ■

An operator  $S \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$  is called an  $A$ -adjoint of an operator  $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ , if  $\langle Th, k \rangle_A = \langle h, Sk \rangle_A$ , for every  $h, k \in \mathcal{H}$ , or equivalently,  $AT = S^*A$ . If  $T$  is an  $A$ -adjoint of itself, then  $T$  is called an  $A$ -selfadjoint operator. It is possible that an operator  $T$  does not have an  $A$ -adjoint, and if  $S$  is an  $A$ -adjoint of  $T$  we may find many  $A$ -adjoints; in fact, if  $AV = 0$  for some  $V \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ , then  $S + V$  is an  $A$ -adjoint of  $T$ . The set of all  $A$ -bounded operators which admit an  $A$ -adjoint is denoted by  $\mathcal{L}_A(\mathcal{H})$ . By Douglas' theorem [4],  $\mathcal{L}_A(\mathcal{H})$  consists of all operators  $T$  such that  $R(T^*A) \subseteq R(A)$ . If  $T \in \mathcal{L}_A(\mathcal{H})$ , the reduced solution of the equation  $AX = T^*A$  is a distinguished  $A$ -adjoint operator of  $T$ , which is denoted by  $T^\sharp$ . Note that  $T^\sharp = A^\dagger T^*A$  in which  $A^\dagger$  is the Moore-Penrose inverse of  $A$ . For more details see [1] and [2].

**Definition 1.** An operator  $T \in \mathcal{L}_A(\mathcal{H})$  is an  $A$ -normal operator, if  $T^\sharp T = TT^\sharp$ .

### 3. $A$ -numerical radius

The  $A$ -numerical radius of an operator  $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ , denoted by  $w_A(T)$  is defined as

$$w_A(T) = \sup\{|\langle Th, h \rangle_A| : h \in \mathcal{H}, \|h\|_A = 1\}.$$

It is a generalization of the concept of numerical radius of an operator. Clearly,  $w_A$  defines a seminorm on  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ .

Furthermore, for every  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ ,

$$|\langle Th, h \rangle_A| \leq w_A(T) \cdot \|h\|_A^2.$$

Taking Corollary 1 into consideration, it is obvious that

$$w_A(T) \leq \|T\|_A. \quad (2)$$

From the proof of part (2) of Corollary 3.2 of [6] we can derive the following lemma.

**Lemma 1.** *If  $T \in \mathcal{L}_A(\mathcal{H})$  is an  $A$ -normal operator, then  $\|T^n\|_A = \|T\|_A^n$  for each positive integer  $n$ .*

As it is known [3], for a normal operator  $T$ ,  $w(T) = \|T\|$ , where  $w(T)$  denotes the numerical radius of  $T$ .

In the next theorem, we establish a similar result for  $A$ -normal operators.

**Theorem 1.** *Suppose that  $T \in \mathcal{L}_A(\mathcal{H})$  is an  $A$ -normal operator. Then*

$$\|T\|_A = w_A(T).$$

**Proof.** Take  $h, k \in \mathcal{H}$  so that  $\|h\|_A = \|k\|_A = 1$ .

For an arbitrary operator  $S \in \mathcal{L}_A(\mathcal{H})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |2\langle Sh, k \rangle_A + 2\langle Sk, h \rangle_A| &= |\langle S(h+k), h+k \rangle_A - \langle S(h-k), h-k \rangle_A| \\ &\leq w_A(S)\|h+k\|_A^2 + w_A(S)\|h-k\|_A^2 \\ &= 2w_A(S)(\|h\|_A^2 + \|k\|_A^2) \\ &= 4w_A(S). \end{aligned}$$

If  $\|Sh\|_A \neq 0$ , substitute  $k$  by  $\|Sh\|_A^{-1}Sh$  in the above computations to get

$$\frac{1}{\|Sh\|_A} |\langle Sh, Sh \rangle_A + \langle S^2h, h \rangle_A| \leq 2w_A(S).$$

Consequently,

$$\|Sh\|_A^2 + \langle S^2h, h \rangle_A \leq 2w_A(S)\|Sh\|_A. \quad (3)$$

Choose  $\theta$  so that

$$e^{2i\theta} \langle T^2h, h \rangle_A = |\langle T^2h, h \rangle_A|.$$

Then, applying (3) for  $S = e^{i\theta}T$  implies that

$$\|Th\|_A^2 + \langle e^{2i\theta}T^2h, h \rangle_A \leq 2w_A(T)\|Th\|_A.$$

Therefore,

$$\|Th\|_A^2 + |\langle T^2h, h \rangle_A| \leq 2w_A(T)\|Th\|_A, \tag{4}$$

which implies that

$$\|Th\|_A \leq 2w_A(T).$$

Note that this is true, even if  $\|Th\|_A = 0$ . Consequently,

$$\|T\|_A \leq 2w_A(T). \tag{5}$$

Besides, (4) shows that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq 2w_A(T)\|Th\|_A - \|Th\|_A^2 - |\langle T^2h, h \rangle_A| \\ &\leq w_A(T)^2 - |\langle T^2h, h \rangle_A|, \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$|\langle T^2h, h \rangle_A| \leq w_A(T)^2.$$

Hence

$$w_A(T^2) \leq w_A(T)^2.$$

Now using a mathematical induction, we observe that for every positive integer number  $k$ ,

$$w_A(T^{2^k}) \leq w_A(T)^{2^k}.$$

This coupled with (5) and Lemma (1) shows that

$$\|T\|_A^{2^k} \leq 2w_A(T)^{2^k},$$

and so

$$\|T\|_A \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} 2^{2^{-k}} w_A(T) = w_A(T).$$

Now, taking (2) into account, the equality holds. ■

## References

- [1] ARIAS, M.L., CORACH, G., GONZALEZ, M.C., *Partial isometries in semi-Hilbertian spaces*, Linear Algebra Appl., 428 (2008), 1460-1475.
- [2] ARIAS, M.L., CORACH, G., GONZALEZ, M.C., *Metric properties of projections in semi-Hilbertian spaces*, Integral Equations and Operator Theory, 62 (2008), 11-28.
- [3] BERNAU, S.J., *The spectral theorem for normal operators*, J. London Math. Soc., 40 (1965), 478-486.

- [4] DOUGLAS, R.G., *On majorization, factorization, and range inclusion of operators on Hilbert spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 17 (1996), 413-415.
- [5] FAGHIH-AHMADI, M., *Powers of  $A$ - $m$ -isometric operators and their supercyclicity*, Bull. Malays. Math. Sci. Soc., to appear.
- [6] SADDI, A.,  *$A$ -normal operators in semi-Hilbertian spaces*, The Australian Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications, 9 (1), Art. 5 (2012), 1-12.
- [7] SID AHMED, O.A.M., SADDI, A.,  *$A$ - $m$  isometric operators in semi-Hilbertian spaces*, Linear Algebra Appl., 436 (2012), 3930-3942.

Accepted: 06.05.2015