

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

**SPECTRAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE SUM OF SELF-ADJOINT
OPERATORS**

ARTHUR LARRY LIEBERMAN

SPECTRAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE SUM OF SELF-ADJOINT OPERATORS

ARTHUR LIEBERMAN

Using the techniques of noncommutative integration theory, classical results of Hermann Weyl concerning the positive eigenvalues of the sum of two self-adjoint compact operators are extended to self-adjoint operators which are measurable with respect to a gage space. Let (H, A, m) be a gage space and let K and L be self-adjoint operators which are measurable with respect to (H, A, m) . Let $P_K[\lambda, \infty)$ be the spectral projection of K for the interval $[\lambda, \infty)$ and let $A_K(x) = \sup \{ \lambda \mid m(P_K[\lambda, \infty)) \geq x \}$. Then $A_{K+L}(x+r) \leq A_K(x) + A_L(r)$. If $K \leq L$, then $A_K(x) \leq A_L(x)$. If L is bounded, then $A_{LK}(x) \leq \|L\|^2 A_K(x)$ for $x \leq m(P_K[0, \infty))$. If $q = m(\text{support}(L))$ and $q < \infty$, then $A_K(x+q) \leq A_{K+L}(x)$; if $\mu = A_{|K|}(q)$, then $\|K+L\|_p \geq \|KP_K(-\mu, \mu)\|_p$ for $1 \leq p \leq \infty$.

1. **Notation.** We specifically work in the context of a gage space. [See 5 for definitions and notation.] We will always require that an operator be measurable [5, Definition 2.1]. This is a technical consideration which is necessary to avoid the pathologies which can occur with unbounded operators. Any one of the following conditions implies that a self-adjoint operator T is measurable with respect to the gage space (H, A, m) :

1. $T \in A$.
2. $T\eta A$ and m is a finite gage. ($T\eta A$ means that $UT = TU$ for every unitary operator U in the commutant of A .)
3. $T\eta A$ and $m(\text{support}(T)) < \infty$, where $\text{support}(T)$ is the orthocomplement of the nullspace of T .
4. $T\eta A$ and A is abelian.

If P is a projection operator, P will be identified with the range of P . If T is an operator, $R(T)$ denotes the range of T and $\bar{R}(T)$ denotes the closure of $R(T)$. If T is self-adjoint, note that $\text{support}(T) = \bar{R}(T)$.

(H, A, m) is a gage space. If S and T are self-adjoint operators which are measurable with respect to (H, A, m) , then $S+T(ST)$ will denote the strong sum (product) of S with T ; this is the closure of the ordinary sum (product) and is self-adjoint and measurable [5, Corollary 5.2]. T has spectral decomposition $T = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \lambda dP_T(\lambda)$; the function $P_T(\lambda)$ is chosen to be continuous from the right. If \mathcal{I} is an interval, $P_T(\mathcal{I})$ is the spectral projection of T for the interval \mathcal{I} . The function A_T is defined, for $x > 0$, by $A_T(x) = \sup \{ \lambda \mid m(P_T[\lambda, \infty)) \geq x \}$.

Note that $m(P_T[A_T(x), \infty)) < x$ is possible if $m(P_T(A_T(x) - \varepsilon, A_T(x))) = \infty$ for every $\varepsilon > 0$. $A_T(x)$ is a nonincreasing function of x and is continuous from the left. If $x > m(I)$, where I is the identity operator on H , then $A_T(x) = \sup(\phi) = -\infty$; we will not explicitly mention this pathology in order to avoid excessive technicality and splitting into cases.

The author wishes to thank the referee for finding an error in one of the proofs and for suggestions which make the paper more readable.

2. Statement of the results. Below we state the theorems and corollaries and prove the corollaries. The theorems are proved in the next section. For the remainder of this paper, K and L are self-adjoint operators which are measurable with respect to the gage space (H, A, m) .

THEOREM 1. *Let $q = m(\text{support}(L))$ and assume $q < \infty$. Then $A_K(x + q) \leq A_{K+L}(x)$ for $x > 0$; equivalently, $A_K(x) \leq A_{K+L}(x - q)$ for $x > q$.*

THEOREM 2. *$A_{K+L}(x + r) \leq A_K(x) + A_L(r)$, for $x > 0$, $r > 0$.*

If (H, A, m) is the algebra of all bounded operators on H , m is the usual trace, and K is a compact operator and has (counting multiplicity) at least $j + 1$ positive eigenvalues, then $A_K(j)$ is the j th positive eigenvalue of K and $A_K(j + 1/2)$ is the $(j + 1)$ st positive eigenvalue of K . If in addition L is compact and has at least $k + 1$ positive eigenvalues, then Theorem 2 implies $A_{K+L}(j + k + 1) \leq A_K(j + 1/2) + A_L(k + 1/2) = A_K(j + 1) + A_L(k + 1)$, which is Weyl's result [6, Satz 1]. Similarly, Theorem 1 reduces to [6, Satz 2] if L has finite rank.

By $K \leq L$ is meant $L - K \geq 0$.

COROLLARY 1. *If $K \leq L$, then $A_K(x) \leq A_L(x)$ for $x > 0$.*

Proof of Corollary 1. $K = L + (K - L)$. Note that $K - L \leq 0$. Let $x > 0$ and let ε be an arbitrary positive number with $\varepsilon < x$. Then $A_K(x) \leq A_L(x - \varepsilon) + A_{K-L}(\varepsilon)$ by Theorem 2. Since $A_{K-L}(\varepsilon) \leq 0$ and the function A_L is continuous from the left, $A_K(x) \leq A_L(x)$.

COROLLARY 2. *If $K \leq L$ and f is a nondecreasing real-valued function with domain $(-\infty, \infty)$, then $m(f(K)) \leq m(f(L))$, provided these quantities are both defined.*

Proof of Corollary 2. $m(f(K)) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(\lambda) dm(P_K(\lambda))$ and $m(f(L)) =$

$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(\lambda) dm(P_L(\lambda))$. The conclusion is immediate since by Corollary 1, $m(P_K[\lambda, \infty)) \leq m(P_L[\lambda, \infty))$ and $m(P_L(-\infty, \lambda]) \leq m(P_K(-\infty, \lambda])$ for all real numbers λ . Note that the hypotheses of Corollary 2 do not imply $f(K) \leq f(L)$ [1].

THEOREM 3. $A_{|K+L|}(x+r) \leq A_{|K|}(x) + A_{|L|}(r)$ for $x > 0$ and $r > 0$, where $|K|$ is the absolute value of the operator K .

COROLLARY 3. Let $q = m(\text{support } (L))$ and assume $q < \infty$. Then $A_{|K|}(x+q) \leq A_{|K+L|}(x)$ for $x > 0$; equivalently, $A_{|K|}(x) \leq A_{|K+L|}(x-q)$ for $x > q$.

Proof of Corollary 3. Let $x > 0$, and let ε be an arbitrary positive number with $\varepsilon < x$. Since $K = (K+L) - L$, by Theorem 3, $A_{|K|}(x+q) \leq A_{|K+L|}(x-\varepsilon) + A_{|L|}(q+\varepsilon) = A_{|K+L|}(x-\varepsilon)$ since $A_{|L|}(q+\varepsilon) = 0$ or $-\infty$. Now apply the left continuity of the function $A_{|K+L|}$.

THEOREM 4. Assume L is bounded with norm $\|L\|$. Then $A_{LKL}(x) \leq \|L\|^2 A_K(x)$ for $0 < x \leq m(P_K[0, \infty))$. In particular, if P is a projection in A , then $A_{PKP}(x) \leq A_K(x)$ for $0 < x \leq m(P_K[0, \infty))$.

COROLLARY 4. Assume L is invertible and $aI \leq |L| \leq bI$ for some positive numbers a and b . Then $a^2 A_K(x) \leq A_{LKL}(x) \leq b^2 A_K(x)$ for $0 < x \leq m(P_K[0, \infty))$, where I is the identity operator on H .

Proof of Corollary 4. Clearly $|L| \leq b$ and $|L^{-1}| \leq 1/a$. Apply Theorem 4 to LKL and to $L^{-1}(LKL)L^{-1} = K$.

The p -norm of a self-adjoint measurable operator T is defined [3, Definition 3.1] by $\|T\|_p = (m(|T|^p))^{1/p}$ if $1 \leq p < \infty$ and $\|T\|_\infty = \sup\{\lambda \mid m(P_{|T|}[\lambda, \infty)) > 0\}$. Note that $\|T\|_\infty$ equals the operator norm of T if the gage space is regular, that is, if the gage of every non-zero projection is positive.

THEOREM 5. Let $q = m(\text{support } (L))$ and assume $q < \infty$. Let $\mu = A_{|K|}(q)$. Then $\|K+L\|_p \geq \|KP_K(-\mu, \mu)\|_p$ for $1 \leq p \leq \infty$.

3. Proof of the theorems.

LEMMA 1. Let P and Q be projections in A . Let $Y = \{v \in H \mid Pv = v \text{ and } Qv = 0\}$. Then $Y \in A$ and $Y + \bar{R}(PQ) = P$.

Proof of Lemma 1. Let $v \in Y$ and $w \in R(PQ), w = PQz$. Then

$\langle v, w \rangle = \langle v, PQz \rangle = \langle Pv, Qz \rangle = \langle v, Qz \rangle = \langle Qv, z \rangle = \langle 0, z \rangle = 0$, so that $Y \perp \bar{R}(PQ)$.

Now let $P_y = y$. Let z be the projection of y on the subspace $\bar{R}(PQ)$. Then $y = (y - z) + z$. Clearly $z \in \bar{R}(PQ)$ and consequently, $P(y - z) = y - z$. In addition, $(y - z) \perp \bar{R}(PQ)$. Let w be any vector. Then $\langle Q(y - z), w \rangle = \langle QP(y - z), w \rangle = \langle y - z, PQw \rangle = 0$, so that $Q(y - z) = 0$.

LEMMA 2. *Let P and Q be projections in A . Let $Y = \{v \in H \mid Pv = v \text{ and } Qv = 0\}$. Then $m(Y) \geq m(P) - m(Q)$. In particular, if $Pv = v$ implies $Qv \neq 0$, then $m(Q) \geq m(P)$.*

Proof of Lemma 2. By additivity of the gage and Lemma 1, $m(Y) + m(\bar{R}(PQ)) = m(P)$. To prove the lemma, it suffices to show that $m(\bar{R}(PQ)) \leq m(Q)$; this is well-known for factors but we know of no reference for the general case. For later use, this is proved under the assumption that P is self-adjoint but is not necessarily a projection.

The operator PQ has polar decomposition [2, pp. 323-324] $PQ = M(QP^2Q)^{1/2}$, where M is a partial isometry with initial domain support $(QP^2Q)^{1/2} = \text{support}(QP^2Q) = \bar{R}(QP^2Q)$ and terminal domain support $(PQP)^{1/2} = \text{support}(PQP) = \bar{R}(PQP)$. Consequently, $\bar{R}(PQ) = \bar{R}(PQP)$; also $m(\bar{R}(PQP)) = m(\bar{R}(QPQ))$ since the initial domain and the terminal domain of a partial isometry have the same gage. Then $m(\bar{R}(PQ)) = m(\bar{R}(PQP)) = m(\bar{R}(QPQ)) \leq m(Q)$ since $\bar{R}(QPQ)$ is a subspace of Q .

If H is finite dimensional, Lemma 2 states that the dimension of the solution space of a system of $m(Q)$ homogeneous linear equations in $m(P)$ unknowns is at least $m(P) - m(Q)$.

Proof of Theorem 1. Let $x > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\mu = A_K(x + q)$. Then $m(P_K[\mu - \varepsilon, \infty)) \geq x + q$. Apply Lemma 2 with $P = P_K[\mu - \varepsilon, \infty)$ and $Q = \text{support}(L)$ to obtain $m\{v \in H \mid P_K[\mu - \varepsilon, \infty)v = v \text{ and } Lv = 0\} \geq (x + q) - q = x$. If $P_K[\mu - \varepsilon, \infty)v = v$ and $Lv = 0$, then $\langle (K + L)v, v \rangle \geq (\mu - \varepsilon) \|v\|^2$, so that $P_{K+L}[\mu - \varepsilon, \infty)v \neq 0$. By Lemma 2, $m(P_{K+L}[\mu - \varepsilon, \infty)) \geq m\{v \in H \mid P_K[\mu - \varepsilon, \infty)v = v \text{ and } Lv = 0\} \geq x$. Since ε is an arbitrary positive number, $A_{K+L}(x) \geq \mu = A_K(x + q)$.

Proof of Theorem 2. Let $x > 0$ and $r > 0$, and assume $A_{K+L}(x + r) > A_K(x) + A_L(r)$. Let $4\delta = A_{K+L}(x + r) - A_K(x) - A_L(r)$. Let $P = P_{K+L}[A_{K+L}(x + r) - \delta, \infty)$; then $m(P) \geq x + r$. Let Q be projection on the subspace of H spanned by $P_K[A_K(x) + \delta, \infty)$ and $P_L[A_L(r) + \delta, \infty)$; then $m(Q) < x + r$.

Let $Pv = v$ with $\|v\| = 1$. Then $\langle (K + L)v, v \rangle \geq A_{K+L}(x + r) - \delta = A_K(x) + A_L(r) + 4\delta - \delta > (A_K(x) + \delta) + (A_L(r) + \delta)$, so that either

$\langle Kv, v \rangle > A_K(x) + \delta$ or $\langle Lv, v \rangle > A_L(r) + \delta$. Therefore $Qv \neq 0$. By Lemma 2, $m(Q) \geq m(P)$, which is impossible since $m(P) \geq x + r$ and $m(Q) < x + r$.

Proof of Theorem 3. Let $\lambda > 0$ and $\psi > 0$. Apply Lemma 2 with $P = P_{K+L}[\lambda + \psi, \infty)$ and $Q =$ projection on the subspace of H spanned by $P_K[\lambda, \infty)$ and $P_L[\psi, \infty)$ to obtain $m(P_{K+L}[\lambda + \psi, \infty)) \leq m(Q) \leq m(P_K[\lambda, \infty)) + m(P_L[\psi, \infty))$. Similarly, $m(P_{-(K+L)}[\lambda + \psi, \infty)) \leq m(P_{-K}[\lambda, \infty)) + m(P_{-L}[\psi, \infty))$. Adding these inequalities yields $m(P_{|K+L|}[\lambda + \psi, \infty)) \leq m(P_{|K|}[\lambda, \infty)) + m(P_{|L|}[\psi, \infty))$.

Let δ be a small positive number. Then $m(P_{|K+L|}[A_{|K|}(\lambda) + \delta + A_{|L|}(\psi) + \delta, \infty)) \leq m(P_{|K|}[A_{|K|}(\lambda) + \delta, \infty)) + m(P_{|L|}[A_{|L|}(\psi) + \delta, \infty)) < \lambda + \psi$, so that $A_{|K+L|}(\lambda + \psi) < A_{|K|}(\lambda) + A_{|L|}(\psi) + 2\delta$.

Proof of Theorem 4. Without loss of generality assume $\|L\| = 1$. We will show that $m(P_{LKL}[\lambda, \infty)) \leq m(P_K[\lambda, \infty))$ for $\lambda > 0$. Let $\lambda > 0$ and let $P = P_{LKL}[\lambda, \infty)$. Let $v \in H$, $\|v\| = 1$, and $Pv = v$. Then $\langle LKLv, v \rangle \geq \lambda$, so that $\langle KLv, Lv \rangle \geq \lambda$. Since $\|Lv\| \leq 1$, $P_K[\lambda, \infty)Lv \neq 0$ and $LP_K[\lambda, \infty)Lv \neq 0$. Let Q be projection on $\bar{R}(LP_K[\lambda, \infty)L)$; then $Qv \neq 0$. By Lemma 2, $m(P) \leq m(Q)$. But $m(Q) \leq m(\bar{R}(LP_K[\lambda, \infty)))$ because of set inclusion, and $m(\bar{R}(LP_K[\lambda, \infty))) \leq m(P_K[\lambda, \infty))$; this is proved in the last paragraph of the proof of Lemma 2.

Proof of Theorem 5. If $p = \infty$, $\|K + L\|_\infty = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0+} A_{|K+L|}(\varepsilon) \geq \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0+} A_{|K|}(q + \varepsilon)$ by Corollary 3. If $m(P_{|K|}[\mu, \infty)) > q$, then $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0+} A_{|K|}(q + \varepsilon) = \mu \geq \|KP_K(-\mu, \mu)\|_\infty$. If $m(P_{|K|}[\mu, \infty)) = q$, then $A_{|K|}(q + \varepsilon) = A_{|KP_K(-\mu, \mu)|}(\varepsilon)$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and the result is immediate. If $m(P_{|K|}[\mu, \infty)) < q$, then $m(P_{|K|}(\mu - \varepsilon, \mu)) = \infty$ for every $\varepsilon > 0$, so that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0+} A_{|K|}(q + \varepsilon) = \mu = \|KP_K(-\mu, \mu)\|_\infty$.

Now let $1 \leq p < \infty$. Since the theorem is trivial for $\mu = 0$, assume $\mu > 0$. If $m(P_{|K+L|}[\lambda, \infty)) = \infty$ for some $\lambda > 0$, then $\|K + L\|_p = \infty$ and the theorem holds trivially. Therefore, assume $m(P_{|K+L|}[\lambda, \infty)) < \infty$ for all $\lambda > 0$. Fix λ , $0 < \lambda < \mu$. Let $\gamma = m(P_{|K+L|}[\lambda, \infty))$ and let $\varepsilon > 0$. Note that if $\lambda = A_{|K+L|}(\gamma + \varepsilon)$, then $m(P_{|K+L|}(\lambda - \varepsilon_1, \lambda)) = \infty$ for every $\varepsilon_1 > 0$. Therefore, we can assume $\lambda > A_{|K+L|}(\gamma + \varepsilon)$. By Corollary 3, $A_{|K+L|}(\gamma + \varepsilon) \geq A_{|K|}(\gamma + q + \varepsilon)$. Therefore, $m(P_{|K|}[\lambda, \infty)) \leq \gamma + q + \varepsilon$. Since ε is arbitrary, $m(P_{|K+L|}[\lambda, \infty)) \geq m(P_{|K|}[\lambda, \infty)) - q \geq m(P_{|K|}[\lambda, \mu))$ for $\lambda < \mu$. Now $\|K + L\|_p^p = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\lambda|^p dm(P_{K+L}(\lambda)) = \int_0^{\infty} \lambda^p dm(P_{|K+L|}(\lambda))$ and

$$\|KP_K(-\mu, \mu)\|_p^p = \int_{-\mu < \lambda < \mu} |\lambda|^p dm(P_K(\lambda)) = \int_{0 \leq \lambda < \mu} \lambda^p dm(P_{|K|}(\lambda)).$$

The conclusion follows immediately.

REFERENCES

1. J. Benda and S. Sherman, *Monotone and convex operator functions*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **79** (1955), 58-71.
2. J. Dixmier, *Les Algèbres D'opérateurs dans L'espace Hilbertien*, 2nd edition, Paris, Gauthier-Villars, 1969.
3. R. A. Kunze, *L_p Fourier transforms on locally compact unimodular groups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **89** (1958), 519-540.
4. J. von Neumann, *Collected Works*, Volume III, New York, MacMillan, 1961.
5. I. E. Segal, *A noncommutative extension of abstract integration*, Ann. of Math., **57** (1953), 401-457.
6. H. Weyl, *Das asymptotische Verteilungsgesetz der Eigenwerte linearer partieller Differentialgleichungen*, Math. Ann., **71** (1912), 441-479.

Received February 12, 1973.

CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

EDITORS

RICHARD ARENS (Managing Editor)
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

J. DUGUNDJI
Department of Mathematics
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California 90007

R. A. BEAUMONT
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98105

D. GILBARG AND J. MILGRAM
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

E. F. BECKENBACH

B. H. NEUMANN

F. WOLF

K. YOSHIDA

SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
OSAKA UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
* * *
AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY
NAVAL WEAPONS CENTER

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

Vol. 53, No. 1

March, 1974

Martin Bartelt, <i>Strongly unique best approximates to a function on a set, and a finite subset thereof</i>	1
S. J. Bernau, <i>Theorems of Korovkin type for L_p-spaces</i>	11
S. J. Bernau and Howard E. Lacey, <i>The range of a contractive projection on an L_p-space</i>	21
Marilyn Breen, <i>Decomposition theorems for 3-convex subsets of the plane</i>	43
Ronald Elroy Bruck, Jr., <i>A common fixed point theorem for a commuting family of nonexpansive mappings</i>	59
Aiden A. Bruen and J. C. Fisher, <i>Blocking sets and complete k-arcs</i>	73
R. Creighton Buck, <i>Approximation properties of vector valued functions</i>	85
Mary Rodriguez Embry and Marvin Rosenblum, <i>Spectra, tensor products, and linear operator equations</i>	95
Edward William Formanek, <i>Maximal quotient rings of group rings</i>	109
Barry J. Gardner, <i>Some aspects of T-nilpotence</i>	117
Juan A. Gatica and William A. Kirk, <i>A fixed point theorem for k-set-contractions defined in a cone</i>	131
Kenneth R. Goodearl, <i>Localization and splitting in hereditary noetherian prime rings</i>	137
James Victor Herod, <i>Generators for evolution systems with quasi continuous trajectories</i>	153
C. V. Hinkle, <i>The extended centralizer of an S-set</i>	163
I. Martin (Irving) Isaacs, <i>Lifting Brauer characters of p-solvable groups</i>	171
Bruce R. Johnson, <i>Generalized Lerch zeta function</i>	189
Erwin Kleinfeld, <i>A generalization of $(-1, 1)$ rings</i>	195
Horst Leptin, <i>On symmetry of some Banach algebras</i>	203
Paul Weldon Lewis, <i>Strongly bounded operators</i>	207
Arthur Larry Lieberman, <i>Spectral distribution of the sum of self-adjoint operators</i>	211
I. J. Maddox and Michael A. L. Willey, <i>Continuous operators on paranormed spaces and matrix transformations</i>	217
James Dolan Reid, <i>On rings on groups</i>	229
Richard Miles Schori and James Edward West, <i>Hyperspaces of graphs are Hilbert cubes</i>	239
William H. Specht, <i>A factorization theorem for p-constrained groups</i>	253
Robert L Thele, <i>Iterative techniques for approximation of fixed points of certain nonlinear mappings in Banach spaces</i>	259
Tim Eden Traynor, <i>An elementary proof of the lifting theorem</i>	267
Charles Irvin Vinsonhaler and William Jennings Wickless, <i>Completely decomposable groups which admit only nilpotent multiplications</i>	273
Raymond O'Neil Wells, Jr, <i>Comparison of de Rham and Dolbeault cohomology for proper surjective mappings</i>	281
David Lee Wright, <i>The non-minimality of induced central representations</i>	301
Bertram Yood, <i>Commutativity properties in Banach $*$-algebras</i>	307