

FROM NORM INEQUALITIES TO SPECTRAL GRAPH THEORY

PINTU BHUNIA AND SATYAJIT SAHOO

ABSTRACT. We develop a new refinement of the Kato's inequality and using this refinement we obtain several upper bounds for the numerical radius of a bounded linear operator as well as the product of operators, which improve the well known existing bounds. Further, we obtain a necessary and sufficient condition for the positivity of 2×2 certain block matrices and using this condition we deduce an upper bound for the numerical radius involving a contraction operator. Furthermore, we study the Schatten p -norm inequalities for the sum of two $n \times n$ complex matrices via singular values and from the inequalities we obtain the p -numerical radius and the classical numerical radius bounds. We show that for every $p > 0$, the p -numerical radius $w_p(\cdot) : \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies $w_p(T) \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \left(\| |T|^{2(1-t)} + |T^*|^{2(1-t)} \| + \| |T|^{2t} + |T^*|^{2t} \| \right)_{p/2}}$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$. Considering $p \rightarrow \infty$, we get a nice refinement of the well known classical numerical radius bound $w(T) \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \|T^*T + TT^*\|}$.

As an application of the Schatten p -norm inequalities we develop a bound for the energy of graph. We show that $\mathcal{E}(G) \geq \frac{2m}{\sqrt{\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{ \sum_{j, v_i \sim v_j} d_j \}}}$, where $\mathcal{E}(G)$ is the energy of a simple graph G with m edges and n vertices v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n such that degree of v_i is d_i for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction and motivation	1
2. A refinement of the Kato's inequality and numerical radius bounds	5
3. A Refinement of the numerical radius bounds via contraction operators	11
4. Schatten p -norm and p -numerical radius bounds via singular values	12
5. An application to estimate the energy of a graph	15
References	17

1. INTRODUCTION AND MOTIVATION

Suppose $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ denotes the \mathbb{C}^* -algebra of all bounded linear operators on a complex Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . If \mathcal{H} is finite-dimensional with dimension n , then $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is identified with $\mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$, the set of all $n \times n$ complex matrices. For $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, T^* denotes the Hilbert adjoint of T and $|T|$ denotes the positive operator $(T^*T)^{1/2}$. Let $Re(T) = \frac{1}{2}(T + T^*)$ and $Im(T) =$

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 47A30, 47A12, 47A05, 05C50.

Key words and phrases. Numerical radius, p -numerical radius, Schatten p -norm, Operator norm, Energy of graph.

The first author would like to thank SERB, Govt. of India for the financial support in the form of National Post Doctoral Fellowship (N-PDF, File No. PDF/2022/000325) under the mentorship of Prof. Apoorva Khare. The second author is thankful to NISER Bhubaneswar for providing the necessary facilities to carry out this work and also expresses his gratitude to Prof. Anil Kumar Karn.

$\frac{1}{2i}(T - T^*)$ be the real and the imaginary part of T , respectively. Let $\|T\|$ and $w(T)$ denote the operator norm and the numerical radius of T , respectively. Recall that $\|T\| = \sup\{\|Tx\| : x \in \mathcal{H}, \|x\| = 1\}$ and $w(T) = \sup\{|\langle Tx, x \rangle| : x \in \mathcal{H}, \|x\| = 1\}$. It is easy to verify that $w(T) = \max\{\|Re(\lambda T)\| : \lambda \in \mathbb{C}, |\lambda| = 1\}$, see [8]. The numerical radius $w(\cdot) : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defines a norm and it satisfies

$$\frac{1}{2}\|T\| \leq w(T) \leq \|T\| \quad \text{for every } T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}). \quad (1.1)$$

The numerical range and the associated numerical radius have important contribution to study operators and their various analytic and geometric properties. However, the exact value calculation of the numerical radius of an arbitrary operator is still a hard problem. So many mathematicians have been tried to develop different bounds which improve the classical bounds in (1.1), see the books [13, 42]. One well known improved upper bound is

$$w(T) \leq \frac{1}{2}\| |T| + |T^*| \|, \quad (1.2)$$

given by Kittaneh [34]. Another improvement is shown by Bhunia and Paul [15], namely,

$$w(T) \leq \sqrt{\|\alpha|T|^2 + (1 - \alpha)|T^*|^2\|}, \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in [0, 1]. \quad (1.3)$$

This bound improves the bound $w(T) \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}\| |T|^2 + |T^*|^2 \|}$, proved by Kittaneh [33]. For more recent development bounds for the numerical radius, the reader can see the articles [9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 29, 31, 32, 38, 41].

One of the most basic useful inequalities to study numerical radius bounds is the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, i.e., $|\langle x, y \rangle| \leq \|x\|\|y\|$, for all $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$. An extension of this inequality is the Buzano's inequality [17], namely,

$$|\langle x, e \rangle \langle e, y \rangle| \leq \frac{\|e\|^2}{2} (\|x\|\|y\| + |\langle x, y \rangle|), \quad \text{for any } x, y, e \in \mathcal{H}. \quad (1.4)$$

Closely related to the Buzano's inequality (1.4), Dragomir [20, Corollary 1] proved that for every $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$,

$$|\langle Tx, Ty \rangle| \leq \frac{\|T\|^2}{2} (|\langle x, y \rangle| + \|x\|\|y\|). \quad (1.5)$$

The Buzano's inequality and its siblings have been interestingly used in the literature to present certain applications of operator inequalities, one can see in [17, 20, 21, 39]. A refinement of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality is given in [31, Theorem 2.6], namely,

$$|\langle x, y \rangle| \leq \left(\|x\| - \frac{\inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \|x - \lambda y\|^2}{2\|x\|} \right) \|y\|, \quad \text{for } x, y \in \mathcal{H} \text{ with } x \neq 0. \quad (1.6)$$

A generalization of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality is the Kato's inequality [30], namely,

$$|\langle Tx, y \rangle| \leq \| |T|^t x \| \| |T^*|^{1-t} y \|, \quad T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}), \text{ for all } x, y \in \mathcal{H} \text{ and for all } t \in [0, 1]. \quad (1.7)$$

This is also very useful to study numerical radius bounds of bounded linear operators.

In Section 2, we obtain an improvement of the Kato's inequality (1.7). In particular, we prove that

Theorem 1.1. (See Lemma 2.2)

$$|\langle Tx, y \rangle| \leq \begin{cases} \left(\| |T|^t x \| - \frac{\inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \| |T|^t x - \lambda |T|^{1-t} U^* y \|^2}{2 \| |T|^t x \|^2} \right) \| |T^*|^{1-t} y \| & \text{when } \|Tx\| \|T^*y\| \neq 0 \\ \| |T|^t x \| \| |T^*|^{1-t} y \| & \text{when } \|Tx\| \|T^*y\| = 0, \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, 1]. \end{cases}$$

Using the above improvement we develop various refinements of the existing numerical radius bounds. We show that

Theorem 1.2. (See Theorem 2.6)

$$w(T) \leq \frac{1}{2} \| |T|^{2t} + |T^*|^{2(1-t)} \| - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\| |T^*|^{1-t} x_n \|}{2 \| |T|^t x_n \|} \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \| (|T|^t - \lambda |T|^{1-t} U^*) x_n \|^2,$$

for all $t \in [0, 1]$ and $w(T) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\langle T x_n, x_n \rangle|$.

This is a non-trivial refinement of $w(T) \leq \frac{1}{2} \| |T|^{2t} + |T^*|^{2(1-t)} \|$, for all $t \in [0, 1]$, proved by El-Haddad and Kittaneh [22, Theorem 1]. Among other bounds we obtain that

Theorem 1.3. (See Theorem 2.12)

$$w(T) \leq \frac{\|T\|^{1-t}}{2} \left(\| |T|^t + |T^*|^t \| - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\| |T^*|^{\frac{t}{2}} x_n \|}{2 \| |T|^{\frac{t}{2}} x_n \|} \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \| (|T|^{\frac{t}{2}} - \lambda |T|^{\frac{t}{2}} U^*) x_n \|^2 \right),$$

for all $t \in [0, 1]$.

This is a non-trivial refinement of $w(T) \leq \frac{\|T\|^{1-t}}{2} \| |T|^t + |T^*|^t \|$, for all $t \in [0, 1]$, recently proved by Bhunia [6, Corollary 2.13]. Further, we develop an upper bound for the numerical radius of the product of operators. In particular, we prove that

Theorem 1.4. (See Theorem 2.15) If $X \geq 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} w(AXB) &\leq \frac{\|X\|}{2} \left(\| |A^*|^2 + |B|^2 \| - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|A^* x_n\|}{2 \|B x_n\|} \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \| (B - \lambda A^*) x_n \|^2 \right) \\ &\leq \frac{\|X\|}{2} \| |A^*|^2 + |B|^2 \|. \end{aligned}$$

In Section 3, we obtain a necessary and sufficient condition for the positivity of 2×2 block matrix $\begin{bmatrix} A & C^* \\ C & B \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H})$. In particular, we show that

Theorem 1.5. (See Theorem 3.2) Suppose $A, B, C \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ with $A \geq 0$ and $B \geq 0$.

Then $\begin{bmatrix} A & C^* \\ C & B \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H})$ is positive if and only if there is a contraction K such that

$$|\langle Cx, y \rangle| \leq \sqrt{\langle A^{\frac{1}{2}} |K| A^{\frac{1}{2}} x, x \rangle \langle B^{\frac{1}{2}} |K^*| B^{\frac{1}{2}} y, y \rangle} \text{ for all } x, y \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Applying this condition, in Theorem 3.5, we obtain an upper bound for the numerical radius, which improves recently developed bound [38, Theorem 2.5].

In Section 4, we study the Schatten p -norm and p -numerical radius bounds for $n \times n$ complex matrices. For a matrix $T \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$, the p -numerical radius of T is defined as

$$w_p(T) = \max\{\|Re(\lambda T)\|_p : \lambda \in \mathbb{C}, |\lambda| = 1\}, \quad p > 0$$

where $\|\cdot\|_p$ is the Schatten p -norm. Recall that $\|T\|_p = \left(\sum_{j=1}^n s_j^p(T)\right)^{1/p} = (\text{trace } |T|^p)^{1/p}$, where $s_1(T) \geq s_2(T) \geq \dots \geq s_n(T)$ are the singular values of T , i.e., the eigenvalues of $|T|$. For $p = \infty$, $\|T\|_p = \|T\| = s_1(T)$ and so $w_p(T) = w(T)$ is the classical numerical radius of T . For $p \geq 1$, the Schatten p -norm defines a norm on $\mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$. For $1 \leq p \leq q \leq \infty$, $\|T\| \leq \|T\|_q \leq \|T\|_p \leq \|T\|_1$. The Schatten p -norm is very useful to study matrix theory and compact operators also. Over the years many researchers have been studied various results on it, see [1, 2, 3, 7, 19] and the references therein. Here, we develop the Schatten p -norm inequalities for the sum of two $n \times n$ complex matrices via singular values. In particular, we show that

Theorem 1.6. (See Theorem 4.2) *Let $T, S \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$ and e, f, g, h are non-negative continuous functions on $[0, \infty)$ such that $f(t)g(t) = t$ and $e(t)h(t) = t$ for all $t \geq 0$. Then*

$$s_j(T + S) \leq \|g^2(|T^*|) + h^2(|S^*|)\|^{1/2} s_j^{1/2} (f^2(|T|) + e^2(|S|)) \quad \text{for every } j = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Furthermore,

$$\|T + S\|_p \leq \|g^2(|T^*|) + h^2(|S^*|)\|^{1/2} \|f^2(|T|) + e^2(|S|)\|_{p/2}^{1/2} \quad \text{for every } p > 0. \quad (1.8)$$

Among other Schatten p -norm inequalities, from the bound (1.8), we deduce the following p -numerical radius bound for matrices.

Theorem 1.7. (See Corollary 4.7)

$$w_p(T) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left\| |T|^{2(1-t)} + |T^*|^{2(1-t)} \right\|^{1/2} \left\| |T|^{2t} + |T^*|^{2t} \right\|_{p/2}^{1/2},$$

for every $p > 0$ and for all $t \in [0, 1]$. Considering $p \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$w^2(T) \leq \frac{1}{4} \left\| |T|^{2(1-t)} + |T^*|^{2(1-t)} \right\| \left\| |T|^{2t} + |T^*|^{2t} \right\|. \quad (1.9)$$

The bound (1.9) refines the well known bound $w^2(T) \leq \frac{1}{2} \|T^*T + TT^*\|$, given by Kittaneh [33].

Finally, in Section 5, as an application of the Schatten p -norm inequalities we develop a lower bound for the energy of a graph which is introduced by Gutman [24] in connection to the total π -electron energy in Chemical Science. In particular, we prove that

Theorem 1.8. (See Theorem 5.1)

$$\mathcal{E}(G) \geq \frac{2m}{\sqrt{\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left\{ \sum_{j, v_i \sim v_j} d_j \right\}}},$$

where m is the number of edges of a simple graph G and d_i is the degree of the vertex v_i , for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

This bound improves $\mathcal{E}(G) \geq 2\sqrt{m}$ (see [18]) for a certain class of graphs. We provide computational examples to illustrate the bounds.

2. A REFINEMENT OF THE KATO'S INEQUALITY AND NUMERICAL RADIUS BOUNDS

In this section, we obtain a refinement of the Kato's inequality (1.7) and using the refinement we develop upper bounds for the numerical radius of bounded linear operators, which improve the existing bounds. To prove the results first we need the following lemma which follows from the identity $\|x\|^2\|y\|^2 - |\langle x, y \rangle|^2 = \|y\|^2\|x - \lambda y\|^2 - |\langle y, x - \lambda y \rangle|^2$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$.

Lemma 2.1. [31] *If $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$, then $\|x\|^2\|y\|^2 - |\langle x, y \rangle|^2 = \|y\|^2 \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \|x - \lambda y\|^2$.*

Here we mention that a simple proof of the inequality (1.6) can be derived from Lemma 2.1, since $\|y\|^2 \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \|x - \lambda y\|^2 = \|x\|^2\|y\|^2 - |\langle x, y \rangle|^2 \leq 2\|x\|\|y\|(\|x\|\|y\| - |\langle x, y \rangle|)$. We now obtain a refinement of the Kato's inequality (1.7), which also generalizes the refinement of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality (1.6).

Lemma 2.2. *Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and $T = U|T|$ be the polar decomposition of T . Then for all $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$, we have*

$$|\langle Tx, y \rangle| \leq \begin{cases} \left(\| |T|^t x \| - \frac{\inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \| |T|^t x - \lambda |T|^{1-t} U^* y \|^2}{2 \| |T|^t x \|^2} \right) \| |T^*|^{1-t} y \| & \text{when } \|Tx\| \|T^*y\| \neq 0 \\ \| |T|^t x \| \| |T^*|^{1-t} y \| & \text{when } \|Tx\| \|T^*y\| = 0, \end{cases}$$

for all $t \in [0, 1]$. In particular, for $t = \frac{1}{2}$, we have

$$|\langle Tx, y \rangle| \leq \begin{cases} \left(\| |T|^{1/2} x \| - \frac{\inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \| |T|^{1/2} (x - \lambda U^* y) \|^2}{2 \| |T|^{1/2} x \|^2} \right) \| |T^*|^{1/2} y \| & \text{when } \|Tx\| \|T^*y\| \neq 0 \\ \| |T|^{1/2} x \| \| |T^*|^{1/2} y \| & \text{when } \|Tx\| \|T^*y\| = 0. \end{cases}$$

Proof. If $\|Tx\| \|T^*y\| = 0$ then the result follows from (1.7), so we only prove the case when $\|Tx\| \|T^*y\| \neq 0$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle |T|^{2t} x, x \rangle^{1/2} \langle |T^*|^{2(1-t)} y, y \rangle^{1/2} - |\langle Tx, y \rangle| \\ &= \frac{\langle |T|^{2t} x, x \rangle \langle |T^*|^{2(1-t)} y, y \rangle - |\langle Tx, y \rangle|^2}{\langle |T|^{2t} x, x \rangle^{1/2} \langle |T^*|^{2(1-t)} y, y \rangle^{1/2} + |\langle Tx, y \rangle|} \\ &\geq \frac{\| |T|^t x \|^2 \| |T^*|^{1-t} y \|^2 - |\langle |T|^t x, |T|^{1-t} U^* y \rangle|^2}{2 \langle |T|^{2t} x, x \rangle^{1/2} \langle |T^*|^{2(1-t)} y, y \rangle^{1/2}} \quad (\text{by using (1.7)}) \\ &= \frac{\| |T|^t x \|^2 \| |T|^{1-t} U^* y \|^2 - |\langle |T|^t x, |T|^{1-t} U^* y \rangle|^2}{2 \langle |T|^{2t} x, x \rangle^{1/2} \langle |T^*|^{2(1-t)} y, y \rangle^{1/2}} \\ &= \frac{\| |T^*|^{1-t} y \|^2 \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \| |T|^t x - \lambda |T|^{1-t} U^* y \|^2}{2 \| |T|^t x \| \| |T^*|^{1-t} y \|} \quad (\text{by Lemma 2.1}). \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$|\langle Tx, y \rangle| \leq \langle |T|^{2t} x, x \rangle^{1/2} \langle |T^*|^{2(1-t)} y, y \rangle^{1/2} - \frac{\| |T^*|^{1-t} y \|^2 \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \| |T|^t x - \lambda |T|^{1-t} U^* y \|^2}{2 \| |T|^t x \| \| |T^*|^{1-t} y \|},$$

as desired. \square

From Lemma 2.2, we obtain the following inequality for positive operators.

Proposition 2.3. *If $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is positive then for all $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$, we have*

$$|\langle Tx, y \rangle| \leq \begin{cases} \left(\|T^t x\| - \frac{\inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \|T^t x - \lambda T^{1-t} y\|^2}{2 \|T^t x\|} \right) \|T^{1-t} y\| & \text{when } \|Tx\| \|Ty\| \neq 0 \\ \|T^t x\| \|T^{1-t} y\| & \text{when } \|Tx\| \|Ty\| = 0, \end{cases}$$

for all $t \in [0, 1]$. In particular, for $t = \frac{1}{2}$, we have

$$|\langle Tx, y \rangle| \leq \begin{cases} \left(\|T^{1/2} x\| - \frac{\inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \|T^{1/2}(x - \lambda y)\|^2}{2 \|T^{1/2} x\|} \right) \|T^{1/2} y\| & \text{when } \|Tx\| \|Ty\| \neq 0 \\ \|T^{1/2} x\| \|T^{1/2} y\| & \text{when } \|Tx\| \|Ty\| = 0. \end{cases}$$

Here, we consider an example to show that Lemma 2.2 is a proper refinement of (1.7).

Example 2.4. Take $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^n$, $T = I$, $x = (1, 0, 0, \dots, 0)$ and $y = (\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, 0, \dots, 0)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle Tx, y \rangle| &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} < \frac{3}{4} = \left(\| |T|^t x \| - \frac{\inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \| |T|^t x - \lambda |T|^{1-t} U^* y \|^2}{2 \| |T|^t x \|} \right) \| |T^*|^{1-t} y \| \\ &< 1 = \| |T|^t x \| \| |T^*|^{1-t} y \|. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 2.2, we now obtain a necessary and sufficient condition for which the Kato's inequality (1.7) becomes equality. Note that when $\|Tx\| \|T^* y\| = 0$ then $|\langle Tx, y \rangle| = \| |T|^t x \| \| |T^*|^{1-t} y \| = 0$ for every $t \in [0, 1]$.

Proposition 2.5. *Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and let $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$ be such that $\|Tx\| \|T^* y\| \neq 0$. Then*

$$|\langle Tx, y \rangle| = \| |T|^t x \| \| |T^*|^{1-t} y \| \quad \text{for every } t \in [0, 1]$$

if and only if

$$\inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \| |T|^t x - \lambda |T|^{1-t} U^* y \| = 0 \quad (T = U|T| \text{ is the polar decomposition of } T).$$

Proof. The necessary part follows from Lemma 2.2 and so we only prove the sufficient part. Suppose $\inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \| |T|^t x - \lambda |T|^{1-t} U^* y \| = 0$. Therefore, this implies $|\langle |T|^t x, |T|^{1-t} U^* y \rangle| = \| |T|^t x \| \| |T|^{1-t} U^* y \|$, i.e., $|\langle Tx, y \rangle| = \| |T|^t x \| \| |T^*|^{1-t} y \|$. \square

Again applying Lemma 2.2, we develop an upper bound for the numerical radius of bounded linear operators which refines the existing bound (1.2).

Theorem 2.6. *Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, $T \neq 0$ and $T = U|T|$ be the polar decomposition. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} w(T) &\leq \frac{1}{2} \| |T|^{2t} + |T^*|^{2(1-t)} \| - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\| |T^*|^{1-t} x_n \|}{2 \| |T|^t x_n \|} \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \| (|T|^t - \lambda |T|^{1-t} U^*) x_n \|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \| |T|^{2t} + |T^*|^{2(1-t)} \|, \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, 1] \end{aligned}$$

where the sequence $\{x_n\} \subset \mathcal{H}$, $\|x_n\| = 1$ such that $w(T) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\langle T x_n, x_n \rangle|$. For $t = \frac{1}{2}$,

$$\begin{aligned} w(T) &\leq \frac{1}{2} \| |T| + |T^*| \| - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\| |T^*|^{1/2} x_n \|}{2 \| |T|^{1/2} x_n \|} \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \| |T|^{1/2} (I - \lambda U^*) x_n \|^2 \quad (2.1) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \| |T| + |T^*| \|. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Put $x = x_n$ and $y = x_n$ in Lemma 2.2 and taking $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}$, we get the desired bounds. \square

Clearly, Theorem 2.6 refines the existing bound $w(T) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left\| |T|^{2t} + |T^*|^{2(1-t)} \right\|$, for all $t \in [0, 1]$, which is proved by El-Haddad and Kittaneh [22, Theorem 1]. We show in Example 2.14 that this refinement is proper. Next, we obtain an inner product inequality for the product of operators.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $A, X, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ with X is positive. Then*

$$|\langle AXBx, y \rangle| \leq \frac{\|X\|}{2} \left(2\|Bx\| \|A^*y\| - \frac{\inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \|Bx - \lambda A^*y\|^2}{2\|Bx\|} \|A^*y\| \right),$$

for all $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$ with $Bx \neq 0$.

Proof. For any $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, we can write (1.5) as

$$|\langle |T|^2 x, y \rangle| \leq \frac{\||T|\|^2}{2} (|\langle x, y \rangle| + \|x\| \|y\|) = \frac{\||T|\|^2}{2} (|\langle x, y \rangle| + \|x\| \|y\|).$$

Substitute $|T|^2$ by X , we get

$$|\langle Xx, y \rangle| \leq \frac{\|X\|}{2} (|\langle x, y \rangle| + \|x\| \|y\|) \quad (2.2)$$

(see also [39, Remark 3.1]). Now we replace x and y by Bx and A^*y respectively, we get

$$|\langle AXBx, y \rangle| \leq \frac{\|X\|}{2} (|\langle Bx, A^*y \rangle| + \|Bx\| \|A^*y\|).$$

Therefore, using (1.6), we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle AXBx, y \rangle| &\leq \frac{\|X\|}{2} \left[\left(\|Bx\| - \frac{\inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \|Bx - \lambda A^*y\|^2}{2\|Bx\|} \right) \|A^*y\| + \|Bx\| \|A^*y\| \right] \\ &= \frac{\|X\|}{2} \left(2\|Bx\| \|A^*y\| - \frac{\inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \|Bx - \lambda A^*y\|^2}{2\|Bx\|} \|A^*y\| \right). \end{aligned}$$

\square

If we consider $A = U|T|^{\frac{1-t}{2}}$ (where $T = U|T|$ is the polar decomposition), $B = |T|^{\frac{t}{2}}$ and $X = |T|^{\frac{1}{2}}$ in Lemma 2.7, we obtain

Proposition 2.8. *Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and $T = U|T|$ be the polar decomposition of T . Then*

$$|\langle Tx, y \rangle| \leq \frac{\|T\|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2} \left(2\sqrt{\langle |T|^t x, x \rangle \langle |T^*|^{1-t} y, y \rangle} - \frac{\inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \||T|^{\frac{t}{2}} x - \lambda |T|^{\frac{1-t}{2}} U^* y\|^2}{2\||T|^{\frac{t}{2}} x\|} \||T^*|^{\frac{1-t}{2}} y\| \right),$$

for all $t \in [0, 1]$ and for any $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$ with $Tx \neq 0$.

Again, by setting $A = U|T|^{\frac{t}{2}}$, $B = |T|^{\frac{1-t}{2}}$ and $X = |T|^{1-t}$ in Lemma 2.7, we get

Proposition 2.9. *Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and $T = U|T|$ be the polar decomposition. Then*

$$|\langle Tx, y \rangle| \leq \frac{\|T\|^{1-t}}{2} \left(2\sqrt{\langle |T|^t x, x \rangle \langle |T^*|^t y, y \rangle} - \frac{\inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \||T|^{\frac{t}{2}} x - \lambda |T|^{\frac{1-t}{2}} U^* y\|^2}{2\||T|^{\frac{t}{2}} x\|} \||T^*|^{\frac{t}{2}} y\| \right),$$

for all $t \in [0, 1]$ and for any $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$ with $Tx \neq 0$.

Consider $x = x_n$ and $y = x_n$ in Proposition 2.9 and taking $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}$, we get the following stronger upper bound for the numerical radius than that in (1.1).

Theorem 2.10. *Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, $T \neq 0$ and $T = U|T|$ be the polar decomposition. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} w(T) &\leq \|T\| - \|T\|^{1-t} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\| |T^*|^{\frac{t}{2}} x_n \|}{4 \| |T|^{\frac{t}{2}} x_n \|} \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \left\| (|T|^{\frac{t}{2}} - \lambda |T|^{\frac{t}{2}} U^*) x_n \right\|^2, \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, 1] \\ &\leq \|T\|, \end{aligned}$$

where the sequence $\{x_n\} \subset \mathcal{H}$, $\|x_n\| = 1$ such that $w(T) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\langle T x_n, x_n \rangle|$.

Again, from Proposition 2.8 we obtain

Theorem 2.11. *Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, $T \neq 0$ and $T = U|T|$ be the polar decomposition. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} w(T) &\leq \frac{\|T\|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2} \left(\| |T|^t + |T^*|^{1-t} \| - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\| |T^*|^{\frac{1-t}{2}} x_n \|}{2 \| |T|^{\frac{t}{2}} x_n \|} \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \left\| (|T|^{\frac{t}{2}} - \lambda |T|^{\frac{1-t}{2}} U^*) x_n \right\|^2 \right) \\ &\leq \frac{\|T\|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2} \| |T|^t + |T^*|^{1-t} \|, \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, 1], \end{aligned}$$

where the sequence $\{x_n\} \subset \mathcal{H}$, $\|x_n\| = 1$ such that $w(T) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\langle T x_n, x_n \rangle|$.

Proof. From Proposition 2.8, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle T x, x \rangle| &\leq \frac{\|T\|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2} \left(\langle |T|^t x, x \rangle + \langle |T^*|^{1-t} x, x \rangle - \frac{\inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \| |T|^{\frac{t}{2}} x - \lambda |T|^{\frac{1-t}{2}} U^* x \|^2}{2 \| |T|^{\frac{t}{2}} x \|} \| |T^*|^{\frac{1-t}{2}} x \| \right) \\ &\leq \frac{\|T\|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2} \left(\| |T|^t + |T^*|^{1-t} \| - \frac{\inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \| |T|^{\frac{t}{2}} x - \lambda |T|^{\frac{1-t}{2}} U^* x \|^2}{2 \| |T|^{\frac{t}{2}} x \|} \| |T^*|^{\frac{1-t}{2}} x \| \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $T x \neq 0$. This gives the desired bounds. \square

Similarly, from Proposition 2.9, we obtain

Theorem 2.12. *Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, $T \neq 0$ and $T = U|T|$ be the polar decomposition. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} w(T) &\leq \frac{\|T\|^{1-t}}{2} \left(\| |T|^t + |T^*|^t \| - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\| |T^*|^{\frac{t}{2}} x_n \|}{2 \| |T|^{\frac{t}{2}} x_n \|} \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \left\| (|T|^{\frac{t}{2}} - \lambda |T|^{\frac{t}{2}} U^*) x_n \right\|^2 \right) \\ &\leq \frac{\|T\|^{1-t}}{2} \| |T|^t + |T^*|^t \|, \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, 1], \end{aligned}$$

where the sequence $\{x_n\} \subset \mathcal{H}$, $\|x_n\| = 1$ such that $w(T) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\langle T x_n, x_n \rangle|$.

Remark 2.13. Recently, Bhunia [6, Corollary 2.13] proved that

$$w(T) \leq \frac{\|T\|^t}{2} \| |T|^{2\alpha(1-t)} + |T^*|^{2(1-\alpha)(1-t)} \|, \quad 0 \leq \alpha, t \leq 1. \quad (2.3)$$

In particular, for $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$,

$$w(T) \leq \frac{\|T\|^t}{2} \| |T|^{1-t} + |T^*|^{1-t} \|, \quad 0 \leq t \leq 1 \quad (2.4)$$

and also for $t = \frac{1}{2}$,

$$w(T) \leq \frac{\|T\|^{1/2}}{2} \left\| |T|^\alpha + |T^*|^{1-\alpha} \right\|, \quad 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1. \quad (2.5)$$

Again if we take $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ in (2.5), then $w(T) \leq \frac{1}{2} \|T\|^{1/2} \left\| |T|^{1/2} + |T^*|^{1/2} \right\|$, which is also proved by Kittaneh et al. [32]. Here we would like to remark that Theorem 2.11 refines the bound (2.5) and Theorem 2.12 refines the bound (2.4). To show proper refinement we consider the following example.

Example 2.14. Take $T = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$. Then $U = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ such that $T = U|T|$ is the polar decomposition. Here, $\|T\| = 2$, $w(T) = \frac{\sqrt{5}}{2} = |\langle Tx_0, x_0 \rangle|$, where $x_0 = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{10}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{5}} \right) \in \mathbb{C}^3$. Also, simple calculation shows that $\inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \left\| (|T|^{\frac{t}{2}} - \lambda |T|^{\frac{t}{2}} U^*) x_0 \right\|^2 = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left| 1 - \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{5}} \right|^2 + 2^t \left| \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{5}} - \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{2}} \right|^2 \right\} > 0$, $\left\| |T^*|^{\frac{t}{2}} x_0 \right\| = \sqrt{\frac{1}{10} + \frac{2^t}{2}} > 0$ and $\left\| |T|^{\frac{t}{2}} x_0 \right\| = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{2^{1+t}}{5}} > 0$. In particular, for $t = 0.01$, we see that

$$\|T\|^{1-t} \frac{\left\| |T^*|^{\frac{t}{2}} x_0 \right\|}{4 \left\| |T|^{\frac{t}{2}} x_0 \right\|} \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \left\| (|T|^{\frac{t}{2}} - \lambda |T|^{\frac{t}{2}} U^*) x_0 \right\|^2 \approx 0.06089$$

and so $\|T\| - \|T\|^{1-t} \frac{\left\| |T^*|^{\frac{t}{2}} x_0 \right\|}{4 \left\| |T|^{\frac{t}{2}} x_0 \right\|} \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \left\| (|T|^{\frac{t}{2}} - \lambda |T|^{\frac{t}{2}} U^*) x_0 \right\|^2 \approx 1.9391 < 2 = \|T\|$ and so the refinement in Theorem 2.10 is a proper. Similarly, using the same example we can show that the refinements in Theorem 2.6, Theorem 2.11 and Theorem 2.12 are also proper.

Next, by using Lemma 2.7, we obtain the following numerical radius bound for the product of operators.

Theorem 2.15. *Let $A, B, X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ with $B \neq 0$ and X is positive. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} w(AXB) &\leq \frac{\|X\|}{2} \left(\left\| |A^*|^2 + |B|^2 \right\| - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|A^* x_n\|}{2 \|B x_n\|} \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \|(B - \lambda A^*) x_n\|^2 \right) \\ &\leq \frac{\|X\|}{2} \left\| |A^*|^2 + |B|^2 \right\|, \end{aligned}$$

where the sequence $\{x_n\} \subset \mathcal{H}$, $\|x_n\| = 1$ such that $w(AXB) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\langle AXBx_n, x_n \rangle|$. For $X = I$,

$$\begin{aligned} w(AB) &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left\| |A^*|^2 + |B|^2 \right\| - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|A^* x_n\|}{4 \|B x_n\|} \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \|(B - \lambda A^*) x_n\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left\| |A^*|^2 + |B|^2 \right\|. \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

Proof. From Lemma 2.7, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle AXBx, x \rangle| &\leq \frac{\|X\|}{2} \left(2\|Bx\|\|A^*x\| - \frac{\inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \|Bx - \lambda A^*x\|^2}{2\|Bx\|} \|A^*x\| \right) \\ &\leq \frac{\|X\|}{2} \left(\langle (|A^*|^2 + |B|^2)x, x \rangle - \frac{\inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \|Bx - \lambda A^*x\|^2}{2\|Bx\|} \|A^*x\| \right) \\ &\leq \frac{\|X\|}{2} \left(\| |A^*|^2 + |B|^2 \| - \frac{\inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \|Bx - \lambda A^*x\|^2}{2\|Bx\|} \|A^*x\| \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $x \in \mathcal{H}$ with $\|x\| = 1$ and $Bx \neq 0$. This gives the desired bounds. \square

Remark 2.16. (i) Let $A, X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ with $A \neq 0$ and X is positive. Put $B = A$ in Theorem 2.15, we get $w(AXA) \leq \frac{\|X\|}{2} \| |A^*|^2 + |A|^2 \|$.

(ii) The inequality (2.6) is a non-trivial improvement of $w(AB) \leq \frac{1}{2} \| |A^*|^2 + |B|^2 \|$, which follows from [33, Remark 1, (17)]. This also follows from [40, Proposition 2.8] by setting $f(t) = g(t) = t^{\frac{1}{2}}, r = 1, p = q = 2, X = I$.

(iii) By setting $\alpha = 1, r = 1, p = q = 2$ in [40, Theorem 3.1] we have that $w(AXB) \leq \frac{\|X\|}{2} \| |A|^2 + |B|^2 \|$, for $A, B, X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ such that A, B are positive. In particular, $w(AB) \leq \frac{1}{2} \| |A|^2 + |B|^2 \|$. Note that the bounds in Theorem 2.15 are better (more generalize) than these above bounds.

Suppose $S = U|S|$ is the polar decomposition. Letting $A = U|S|^{\frac{1}{2}}, X = |S|^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $B = T$ in Theorem 2.15, we obtain

Corollary 2.17. Let $T, S \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}), T \neq 0, S = U|S|$ be the polar decomposition. Then

$$w(ST) \leq \frac{\|S\|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2} \left(\| |S^*| + |T|^2 \| - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\| |S^*|^{\frac{1}{2}} x_n \|}{2\|Tx_n\|} \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \|(T - \lambda |S^*|^{\frac{1}{2}} U^*)x_n\|^2 \right),$$

where the sequence $\{x_n\} \subset \mathcal{H}, \|x_n\| = 1$ such that $w(ST) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\langle STx_n, x_n \rangle|$.

We now provide an example to illustrate the numerical radius bounds in Theorem 2.15.

Example 2.18. Take $A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and $X = B = I$. We have $\|A\| = 2$ and

$w(A) = \frac{\sqrt{5}}{2} = |\langle Ax_0, x_0 \rangle|$, where $x_0 = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{10}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{5}} \right) \in \mathbb{C}^3$. Also, $\inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \|(B - \lambda A^*)x_0\|^2 = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \left\{ \frac{1}{10} + \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} - \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{10}} \right|^2 + \left| \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{5}} - \lambda\sqrt{2} \right|^2 \right\} \approx 0.405$, $\|A^*x_0\| = \sqrt{\frac{21}{10}}$ and $\|Bx_0\| = 1$. Therefore, $\frac{\|A^*x_0\|}{2\|Bx_0\|} \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \|(B - \lambda A^*)x_0\|^2 \approx 0.2934$ and so

$$\frac{\|X\|}{2} \left(\| |A^*|^2 + |B|^2 \| - \frac{\|A^*x_0\|}{2\|Bx_0\|} \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \|(B - \lambda A^*)x_0\|^2 \right) \approx 2.3532 < 2.5 = \frac{\|X\|}{2} \| |A^*|^2 + |B|^2 \|.$$

Thus, Theorem 2.15 is a proper refinement of $w(AXB) \leq \frac{\|X\|}{2} \| |A^*|^2 + |B|^2 \|$.

3. A REFINEMENT OF THE NUMERICAL RADIUS BOUNDS VIA CONTRACTION OPERATORS

In this section, we study the numerical radius bounds for a single operator as well as product operators involving contraction operators. We begin this section with the following known lemma.

Lemma 3.1. [38, Lemma 1.1] *Let $A, B, C \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, where A and B are positive and let $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

(i) $\begin{bmatrix} A & C^* \\ C & B \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H})$ is positive.

(ii) $|\langle Cx, y \rangle| \leq \sqrt{\langle Ax, x \rangle \langle By, y \rangle}$.

(iii) There is a contraction K (i.e., $\|K\| \leq 1$) such that $C = B^{1/2}KA^{1/2}$.

Using Lemma 3.1, we now prove another equivalent statement of the positivity of the block matrix $\begin{bmatrix} A & C^* \\ C & B \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H})$.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $A, B, C \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, where A and B are positive and let $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$.*

Then $\begin{bmatrix} A & C^ \\ C & B \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H})$ is positive if and only if there is a contraction K such that*

$$|\langle Cx, y \rangle| \leq \sqrt{\langle A^{\frac{1}{2}}|K|A^{\frac{1}{2}}x, x \rangle \langle B^{\frac{1}{2}}|K^*|B^{\frac{1}{2}}y, y \rangle}.$$

Proof. Suppose $\begin{bmatrix} A & C^* \\ C & B \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H})$ is positive. Then from Lemma 3.1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle Cx, y \rangle|^2 &= |\langle B^{1/2}KA^{1/2}x, y \rangle|^2 = |\langle KA^{1/2}x, B^{1/2}y \rangle|^2 \\ &\leq \langle |K|A^{1/2}x, A^{1/2}x \rangle \langle |K^*|B^{1/2}y, B^{1/2}y \rangle \\ &= \langle A^{1/2}|K|A^{1/2}x, x \rangle \langle B^{1/2}|K^*|B^{1/2}y, y \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Conversely, let $|\langle Cx, y \rangle| \leq \sqrt{\langle A^{\frac{1}{2}}|K|A^{\frac{1}{2}}x, x \rangle \langle B^{\frac{1}{2}}|K^*|B^{\frac{1}{2}}y, y \rangle}$. Since $|K| \leq I$ and $|K^*| \leq$

I , we have $\sqrt{\langle A^{\frac{1}{2}}|K|A^{\frac{1}{2}}x, x \rangle \langle B^{\frac{1}{2}}|K^*|B^{\frac{1}{2}}y, y \rangle} \leq \sqrt{\langle Ax, x \rangle \langle By, y \rangle}$. Thus, Lemma 3.1

implies $\begin{bmatrix} A & C^* \\ C & B \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H})$ is positive. □

Next, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 3.3. [35] *Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and f, g are non-negative continuous functions on $[0, \infty)$ such that $f(t)g(t) = t$ for all $t \geq 0$. Then $|\langle Tx, y \rangle| \leq \sqrt{\langle f^2(|T|)x, x \rangle \langle g^2(|T^*|)y, y \rangle}$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$.*

By applying Theorem 3.2 and Lemma 3.3, we obtain the following Kato's type inequality, which is an improved version of [38, Corollary 2.1].

Proposition 3.4. *Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. If f, g are non-negative continuous functions on $[0, \infty)$ satisfying $f(t)g(t) = t$, $t > 0$, then there is a contraction operator K such that*

$$|\langle Tx, y \rangle| \leq \sqrt{\langle f(|T|)|K|f(|T|)x, x \rangle \langle g(|T^*|)|K^*|g(|T^*|)y, y \rangle}, \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Proof. From Lemma 3.3, we get $|\langle Tx, y \rangle|^2 \leq \langle f^2(|T|)x, x \rangle \langle g^2(|T^*|)y, y \rangle$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$ and so from Lemma 3.1, we get $\begin{bmatrix} f^2(|T|) & T^* \\ T & g^2(|T^*|) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H})$ is positive. Therefore, Theorem 3.2 implies the desired result. \square

Applying Proposition 3.4, we now obtain an upper bound for the numerical radius.

Theorem 3.5. *Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. If f, g are non-negative continuous functions on $[0, \infty)$ satisfying $f(t)g(t) = t$ ($t \geq 0$), then there is a contraction operator K such that*

$$w(T) \leq \frac{1}{2} \|f(|T|)|K|f(|T|) + g(|T^*|)|K^*|g(|T^*|)\| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|f^2(|T|) + g^2(|T^*|)\|.$$

In particular, for $f(t) = g(t) = \sqrt{t}$,

$$w(T) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left\| |T|^{\frac{1}{2}}|K||T|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |T^*|^{\frac{1}{2}}|K^*||T^*|^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \leq \frac{1}{2} \| |T| + |T^*| \| . \quad (3.1)$$

Proof. From Proposition 3.4, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle Tx, x \rangle| &\leq \langle f(|T|)|K|f(|T|)x, x \rangle^{1/2} \langle g(|T^*|)|K^*|g(|T^*|)x, x \rangle^{1/2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \langle (f(|T|)|K|f(|T|) + g(|T^*|)|K^*|g(|T^*|))x, x \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum over $\|x\| = 1$, we get the desired first bound. \square

Remark 3.6. For any contraction operator K , we see that $|K| \leq |K|^{1/2} \leq I$ and $|K^*| \leq |K^*|^{1/2} \leq I$. Therefore, Theorem 3.5 implies the existing bound [38, Theorem 2.5], namely, $w(T) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left\| f(|T|)|K|^{1/2}f(|T|) + g(|T^*|)|K^*|^{1/2}g(|T^*|) \right\|$ and also implies [22, Theorem 1], namely, $w(T) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left\| |T|^{2t} + |T^*|^{2(1-t)} \right\|$, for all $t \in [0, 1]$.

Again, by applying Theorem 3.2 and using the positivity of $\begin{bmatrix} |B|^2 & B^*A \\ A^*B & |A|^2 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H})$, we can also obtain the following numerical radius bound for the product two operators, which improves the bound in [38, Remark 2.4] as well as [33, (17)].

Corollary 3.7. *If $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, then there is a contraction operator K such that*

$$w(A^*B) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left\| |A||K^*||A| + |B||K||B| \right\| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|A^*A + B^*B\|.$$

The following example illustrates that the inequalities in Corollary 3.7 are proper. Consider $A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and $B = I$. Then there exists a contraction $K = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ such that $A^*B = |A|K|B|$, and we see that

$$w(A^*B) = \frac{\sqrt{5}}{2} < \frac{1}{2} \left\| |A||K^*||A| + |B||K||B| \right\| = 2 < \frac{5}{2} = \frac{1}{2} \|A^*A + B^*B\|.$$

4. SCHATTEN p -NORM AND p -NUMERICAL RADIUS BOUNDS VIA SINGULAR VALUES

In this section, we develop the Schatten p -norm inequalities for the sum of two $n \times n$ complex matrices and from which we deduce the p -numerical radius bounds. To get the results first we need the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. [5, Corollary III.1.2] *Let $T \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$. Then*

$$s_j(T) = \max_{\dim M=j} \left\{ \min_{x \in M, \|x\|=1} \|Tx\| \right\}.$$

Theorem 4.2. *Let $T, S \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$ and e, f, g, h are non-negative continuous functions on $[0, \infty)$ such that $f(t)g(t) = t$ and $e(t)h(t) = t$ for all $t \geq 0$. Then*

$$s_j(T + S) \leq \|g^2(|T^*|) + h^2(|S^*|)\|^{1/2} s_j^{1/2}(f^2(|T|) + e^2(|S|)) \quad \text{for every } j = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Furthermore,

$$\|T + S\|_p \leq \|g^2(|T^*|) + h^2(|S^*|)\|^{1/2} \|f^2(|T|) + e^2(|S|)\|_{p/2}^{1/2} \quad \text{for every } p > 0. \quad (4.1)$$

Proof. From Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.3, we get that $\begin{pmatrix} f^2(|T|) & T^* \\ T & g^2(|T^*|) \end{pmatrix} \geq 0$ and $\begin{pmatrix} e^2(|S|) & S^* \\ S & h^2(|S^*|) \end{pmatrix} \geq 0$. Therefore, $\begin{pmatrix} f^2(|T|) + e^2(|S|) & T^* + S^* \\ T + S & g^2(|T^*|) + h^2(|S^*|) \end{pmatrix} \geq 0$ and so again from Lemma 3.1, we get

$$|\langle (T + S)x, y \rangle|^2 \leq \langle (f^2(|T|) + e^2(|S|))x, x \rangle \langle (g^2(|T^*|) + h^2(|S^*|))y, y \rangle, \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Taking the supremum over $\|y\| = 1$, we get

$$\|(T + S)x\|^2 \leq \|g^2(|T^*|) + h^2(|S^*|)\| \langle (f^2(|T|) + e^2(|S|))x, x \rangle, \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathcal{H}.$$

This implies

$$\max_{\dim M=j} \min_{x \in M, \|x\|=1} \|(T+S)x\|^2 \leq \|g^2(|T^*|) + h^2(|S^*|)\| \max_{\dim M=j} \min_{x \in M, \|x\|=1} \langle (f^2(|T|) + e^2(|S|))x, x \rangle,$$

for every $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Therefore, using Lemma 4.1, we get

$$s_j(T + S) \leq \|g^2(|T^*|) + h^2(|S^*|)\|^{1/2} s_j^{1/2}(f^2(|T|) + e^2(|S|)) \quad \text{for every } j = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Now we have

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^n s_j^p(T + S) \right)^{1/p} \leq \|g^2(|T^*|) + h^2(|S^*|)\|^{1/2} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n s_j^{p/2}(f^2(|T|) + e^2(|S|)) \right)^{1/p}.$$

This gives (4.1). □

From the inequality (4.1), we deduce that

Corollary 4.3. *Let $T, S \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$. Then*

$$\|T + S\|_p \leq \| |T^*|^{2t} + |S^*|^{2t} \|^{1/2} \| |T|^{2(1-t)} + |S|^{2(1-t)} \|_{p/2}^{1/2} \quad (4.2)$$

and

$$\|T + S\|_p \leq \| |T^*|^{2t} + |S^*|^{2(1-t)} \|^{1/2} \| |T|^{2(1-t)} + |S|^{2t} \|_{p/2}^{1/2}, \quad (4.3)$$

for every $p > 0$ and for all $t \in [0, 1]$.

Considering $p \rightarrow \infty$ in Corollary 4.3, we get

Corollary 4.4. *Let $T, S \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$. Then*

$$\|T + S\| \leq \left\| |T^*|^{2t} + |S^*|^{2t} \right\|^{1/2} \left\| |T|^{2(1-t)} + |S|^{2(1-t)} \right\|^{1/2} \quad (4.4)$$

and

$$\|T + S\| \leq \left\| |T^*|^{2t} + |S^*|^{2(1-t)} \right\|^{1/2} \left\| |T|^{2(1-t)} + |S|^{2t} \right\|^{1/2}, \quad (4.5)$$

for all $t \in [0, 1]$.

Remark 4.5. Let $T, S \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$. In particular, for $t = 1/2$, we get

$$\|T + S\| \leq \left\| |T^*| + |S^*| \right\|^{1/2} \left\| |T| + |S| \right\|^{1/2}. \quad (4.6)$$

Moreover, if T and S are normal, then

$$\|T + S\| \leq \left\| |T| + |S| \right\|. \quad (4.7)$$

Using Theorem 4.2, we now obtain the p -numerical radius bound.

Theorem 4.6. *Let $T \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$ and let e, f, g, h are non-negative continuous functions on $[0, \infty)$ such that $f(t)g(t) = t$ and $e(t)h(t) = t$ for all $t \geq 0$. Then*

$$w_p(T) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left\| g^2(|T^*|) + h^2(|T|) \right\|^{1/2} \left\| f^2(|T|) + e^2(|T^*|) \right\|_{p/2}^{1/2}, \quad \text{for every } p > 0.$$

Proof. Replacing T by $e^{i\theta}T$ and S by $e^{-i\theta}S^*$ ($\theta \in \mathbb{R}$) in Theorem 4.2, we get

$$\|Re(e^{i\theta}T)\|_p \leq \frac{1}{2} \left\| g^2(|T^*|) + h^2(|T|) \right\|^{1/2} \left\| f^2(|T|) + e^2(|T^*|) \right\|_{p/2}^{1/2}, \quad \text{for every } p > 0.$$

Considering the supremum over $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, we get the desired inequality. \square

From Theorem 4.6, we deduce that

Corollary 4.7. *Let $T \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$, then*

$$w_p(T) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left\| |T|^{2(1-t)} + |T^*|^{2(1-t)} \right\|^{1/2} \left\| |T|^{2t} + |T^*|^{2t} \right\|_{p/2}^{1/2},$$

for every $p > 0$ and for all $t \in [0, 1]$. Considering $p \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$w^2(T) \leq \frac{1}{4} \left\| |T|^{2(1-t)} + |T^*|^{2(1-t)} \right\| \left\| |T|^{2t} + |T^*|^{2t} \right\|, \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, 1]. \quad (4.8)$$

Remark 4.8. For $T \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{4} \left\| |T|^{2(1-t)} + |T^*|^{2(1-t)} \right\| \left\| |T|^{2t} + |T^*|^{2t} \right\| &= \left\| \frac{|T|^{2(1-t)} + |T^*|^{2(1-t)}}{2} \right\| \left\| \frac{|T|^{2t} + |T^*|^{2t}}{2} \right\| \\ &\leq \left\| \frac{|T|^2 + |T^*|^2}{2} \right\|^{1-t} \left\| \frac{|T|^2 + |T^*|^2}{2} \right\|^t \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left\| |T|^2 + |T^*|^2 \right\| \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, 1]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the bound (4.8) refines the well known bound $w^2(T) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left\| |T|^2 + |T^*|^2 \right\|$, given in [33]. Also, we remark that the bound (1.2) follows from (4.8) by setting $t = 1/2$.

From Theorem 4.6, we also deduce that

Corollary 4.9. *Let $T \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$, then*

$$w_p(T) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left\| |T|^{2t} + |T^*|^{2(1-t)} \right\|^{1/2} \left\| |T|^{2t} + |T^*|^{2(1-t)} \right\|_{p/2}^{1/2},$$

for every $p > 0$ and for all $t \in [0, 1]$.

Considering $p \rightarrow \infty$, we get $w(T) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left\| |T|^{2t} + |T^*|^{2(1-t)} \right\|$, for all $t \in [0, 1]$, which is also proved in [22, Theorem 1]. Now from Corollary 4.7 (for $t = 1/2$), we get

Corollary 4.10. *Let $T \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$, then*

$$w_p(T) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left\| |T| + |T^*| \right\|^{1/2} \left\| |T| + |T^*| \right\|_{p/2}^{1/2}, \quad \text{for every } p > 0.$$

Taking $p \rightarrow \infty$, we get the existing bound (1.2). Considering $T = S$ in (4.2), we get

Corollary 4.11. *Let $T \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$, then*

$$\|T\|_p \leq \|T\|^t \|T\|_{p(1-t)}^{1-t}, \quad \text{for every } p > 0 \text{ and for all } t \in (0, 1). \quad (4.9)$$

In particular, for $t = 1/2$,

$$\|T\|_p \leq \sqrt{\|T\| \|T\|_{p/2}}, \quad \text{for every } p > 0. \quad (4.10)$$

5. AN APPLICATION TO ESTIMATE THE ENERGY OF A GRAPH

As an application of the Schatten p -norm inequalities obtained above, we develop a lower bound for the energy of a simple graph, which was introduced by Gutman [24] in connection to the total π -electron energy. For details on the general theory of the total π -electron energy, as well as its chemical applications, the reader can see [25, 26]. Let G be a simple (undirected) graph with n vertices v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n and m edges e_1, e_2, \dots, e_m . Let d_i denote the degree of the vertex v_i for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. The adjacency matrix associated with the graph G , denoted as $Adj(G)$, is defined as $Adj(G) = (a_{ij})_{n \times n}$, where $a_{ij} = 1$ if $v_i \sim v_j$ (i.e., v_i is adjacent to v_j) and $a_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. Clearly, $Adj(G)$ is a self-adjoint matrix with entries 0, 1 and the main diagonal entries are zero. Let $\lambda_1(G) \geq \lambda_2(G) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(G)$ be the eigenvalues of $Adj(G)$. It is well known that $\lambda_1(G) > 0$ and so $\|Adj(G)\| = \lambda_1(G)$. In 2019, Bhunia et al. [16, Theorem 2.2] proved that

$$\|Adj(G)\| \leq \sqrt{\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left\{ \sum_{j, v_i \sim v_j} d_j \right\}}. \quad (5.1)$$

The energy of the graph G , denoted as $\mathcal{E}(G)$, is defined as $\mathcal{E}(G) = \sum_{i=1}^n |\lambda_i(G)|$. The search of lower and upper bounds for $\mathcal{E}(G)$ is a wide subfield of the spectral graph theory. In 1971, McClelland [36] provided an upper bound that $\mathcal{E}(G) \leq \sqrt{2mn}$. After that various bounds have been studied, we refer to see [28, 37] and the references therein. Recently, Bhunia [7] showed that $\mathcal{E}(G) \leq \sqrt{2m(\text{rank } Adj(G))}$. Clearly, $\sqrt{2m(\text{rank } Adj(G))} < \sqrt{2mn}$ for every singular graph G . A lower bound is provided in [18] that $\mathcal{E}(G) \geq 2\sqrt{m}$. We now develop a new lower bound of $\mathcal{E}(G)$ in terms of the degree of the vertices and the number of edges.

Theorem 5.1. *Let G be a simple graph with m edges and n vertices v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n such that degree of v_i is d_i for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Then*

$$\mathcal{E}(G) \geq \frac{2m}{\sqrt{\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left\{ \sum_{j, v_i \sim v_j} d_j \right\}}}.$$

Proof. From (4.10), we obtain that $\|Adj(G)\|_p^2 \leq \|Adj(G)\| \|Adj(G)\|_{p/2}$, for every $p > 0$. In particular, for $p = 2$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} 2m = \sum_{i=1}^n d_i = \text{trace } |Adj(G)|^2 &= \|Adj(G)\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \|Adj(G)\| \|Adj(G)\|_1 \\ &= \|Adj(G)\| \sum_{i=1}^n |\lambda_i(G)| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n |\lambda_i(G)| \sqrt{\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left\{ \sum_{j, v_i \sim v_j} d_j \right\}} \quad (\text{by (5.1)}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\mathcal{E}(G) = \sum_{i=1}^n |\lambda_i(G)| \geq \frac{2m}{\sqrt{\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left\{ \sum_{j, v_i \sim v_j} d_j \right\}}}$, as desired. \square

Remark 5.2. Clearly, Theorem 5.1 gives better bound than the bound $\mathcal{E}(G) \geq 2\sqrt{m}$ if

$$m > \sqrt{\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left\{ \sum_{j, v_i \sim v_j} d_j \right\}}.$$

We consider two graphs G_1 and G_2 and their adjacency matrices (known as Huckel matrices [27]) associated with the molecular structure of the carbon skeleton of 1,2-divinylcyclobutadiene and 1,4-divinylbenzene, respectively.





FIGURE 1. Graph G_1 and $Adj(G_1)$

From Theorem 5.1 we get $\mathcal{E}(G_1) \geq \frac{16}{\sqrt{7}}$ and $\mathcal{E}(G_2) \geq \frac{20}{\sqrt{6}}$, whereas the existing bound $\mathcal{E}(G) \geq 2\sqrt{m}$ gives $\mathcal{E}(G_1) \geq 2\sqrt{8}$ and $\mathcal{E}(G_2) \geq 2\sqrt{10}$.

FIGURE 2. Graph G_2 and $Adj(G_2)$

Data availability statements Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

Competing Interests The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Al-Natoor, O. Hirzallah and F. Kittaneh, Singular value and norm inequalities for products and sums of matrices, *Period. Math. Hungar* 88 (2024), no. 1, 204–217
- [2] A. Al-Natoor and F. Kittaneh, Further unitarily invariant norm inequalities for positive semidefinite matrices, *Positivity* 26 (2022), Paper No. 8, 11 pp.
- [3] A. Benmakhlof, O. Hirzallah and F. Kittaneh, On the p -numerical radius of Hilbert space operators, *Linear Multilinear Algebra*, 69 (2021), no. 15, 2813–2829.
- [4] R. Bhatia, *Positive definite matrices*, Princeton University Press, 2007.
- [5] R. Bhatia, *Matrix Analysis*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer, New York (1997).
- [6] P. Bhunia, Improved bounds for the numerical radius via polar decomposition of operators, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 683 (2024) 31–45.
- [7] P. Bhunia, Norm inequalities for Hilbert space operators with applications, (2024). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2404.01982>
- [8] P. Bhunia, A. Sen and K. Paul, Generalized Cartesian decomposition and numerical radius inequalities, *Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo (2)* 73 (2024), no. 3, 887–897.
- [9] P. Bhunia, Sharper bounds for the numerical radius of $n \times n$ operator matrices, *Arch. Math. (Basel)* (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00013-024-02017-6>
- [10] P. Bhunia, F. Kittaneh, K. Paul and A. Sen, Anderson’s theorem and A -spectral radius bounds for semi-Hilbertian space operators, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 657 (2023), 147–162.
- [11] P. Bhunia, Numerical radius and spectral radius inequalities with an estimation for roots of a polynomial, *Indian J. Pure Appl. Math.* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13226-023-00523-x>
- [12] P. Bhunia, S. Jana, M. S. Moslehian and K. Paul, Improved inequalities for the numerical radius via Cartesian decomposition, *Funct. Anal. Its Appl.* 57 (2023), 18–28.
- [13] P. Bhunia, S. S. Dragomir, M. S. Moslehian and K. Paul, *Lectures on numerical radius inequalities*, Infosys Sci. Found. Ser. Math. Sci., Springer, Cham, 2022.

- [14] P. Bhunia and K. Paul, New upper bounds for the numerical radius of Hilbert space operators, *Bull. Sci. Math.* 167 (2021), Paper No. 102959, 11 pp.
- [15] P. Bhunia and K. Paul, Proper improvement of well-known numerical radius inequalities and their applications, *Results Math.* 76 (2021), no. 4, Paper No. 177, 12 pp.
- [16] P. Bhunia, S. Bag and K. Paul, Bounds for eigenvalues of the adjacency matrix of a graph, *J. Interdiscip. Math.* 22 (2019), no. 4, 415–431.
- [17] M. L. Buzano, Generalizzazione della diseguaglianza di Cauchy-Schwarz (Italian) *Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. e Politec. Torino.* 31 (1971/73), 405–409.
- [18] G. Caporossi, D. Cvetkovic, I. Gutman and P. Hansen, Variable neighborhood search for extremal graphs. 2. Finding graphs with extremal energy, *J. Chem. Inf. Comput. Sci.* 39 (1999) 984–996.
- [19] C. Conde and M. S. Moslehian, Norm inequalities related to p -Schatten class, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 498 (2016) 441–449.
- [20] S. S. Dragomir, A Buzano type inequality for two Hermitian forms and applications, *Linear Multilinear Algebra* 65 (2017), no. 3, 514–525.
- [21] S. S. Dragomir, Buzano’s inequality holds for any projection, *Bull. Aust. Math. Soc.*, 93 (2016), 504–510.
- [22] M. El-Haddad and F. Kittaneh, Numerical radius inequalities for Hilbert space operators. II, *Stud. Math.* 182 (2007), no. 2, 133–140.
- [23] T. Furuta, *Invitation to Linear Operators*, Taylor and Francis, London, 2001.
- [24] I. Gutman, The energy of a graph, *Ber. Math.-Statist. Sect. Forschungszentrum Graz* 103 (1978) 1–22.
- [25] I. Gutman, Bounds for total π -electron energy of conjugated hydrocarbons, *Z. Phys. Chem. (Leipzig)* 226 (1985) 59–64.
- [26] I. Gutman and O.E. Polansky, *Mathematical Concepts in Organic Chemistry*, Springer, Berlin, 1986.
- [27] D. Janežič, A. Miličević, S. Nikolić and N. Trinajstić, *Graph-theoretical matrices in chemistry*, CRC Press, Taylor & Francis Group, 2015.
- [28] A. Jahanbani, Upper Bounds for the Energy of Graphs, *MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem.* 79 (2018) 275–286.
- [29] M. R. Jena, N. Das and S. Sahoo, Refinements of some numerical radius inequalities for Hilbert space operators, *Filomat* 37 (2023), no. 10, 3043–3051.
- [30] T. Kato, Notes on some inequalities for linear operators, *Math. Ann.* 125 (1952), 208–212.
- [31] F. Kittaneh and A. Zamani, A refinement of A -Buzano inequality and applications to A -numerical radius inequalities, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 697 (2024), 32–48.
- [32] F. Kittaneh, H. R. Moradi and M. Sababheh, Sharper bounds for the numerical radius, *Linear Multilinear Algebra* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1080/03081087.2023.2177248>
- [33] F. Kittaneh, Numerical radius inequalities for Hilbert space operators, *Studia Math.* 168 (2005), no. 1, 73–80.
- [34] F. Kittaneh, Numerical radius inequality and an estimate for the numerical radius of the Frobenius companion matrix, *Studia Math.* 158 (2003), no. 1, 11–17.
- [35] F. Kittaneh, Notes on some inequalities for Hilbert space operators, *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.*, 24 (1988), 283–293.
- [36] B. J. McClelland, Properties of the latent roots of a matrix: The estimation of π electron energies, *J. Chem. Phys.* 54 (1971) 640–643.
- [37] J. Rada and A. Tineo, Upper and lower bounds for the energy of bipartite graphs, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 289 (2004) 446–455.
- [38] M. Sababheh, H. R. Moradi and S. Sahoo, Inner product inequalities with applications, *Linear Multilinear Algebra*, (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1080/03081087.2024.2312444>
- [39] M. Sababheh, H. R. Moradi and Z. Heydarbeygi, Buzano, Kreĭn and Cauchy-Schwarz inequalities, *Oper. Matrices.* 16 (2022), no. 1, 239–250.
- [40] M. Sattari, M. S. Moslehian and T. Yamazaki, Some generalized numerical radius inequalities for Hilbert space operators, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 470 (2015), 216–227.

- [41] S. Sahoo and N. C. Rout, New upper bounds for the numerical radius of operators on Hilbert space, *Adv. Oper. Theory* 7 (2022), no. 4, Paper No. 50, 20 pp.
- [42] P.Y. Wu and H.-L. Gau, Numerical Ranges of Hilbert Space Operators. *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its Applications*, vol. 179 (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2021), xviii+483 pp.

(BHUNIA) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE, BENGALURU 560012, KARNATAKA, INDIA

Email address: `pintubhunia5206@gmail.com`; `pintubhunia@iisc.ac.in`

(SAHOO) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH, BHUBANESWAR, INDIA

Email address: `ssahoomath@gmail.com`; `ssahoo@niser.ac.in`