

NAYAK'S THEOREM FOR COMPACT OPERATORS

B V RAJARAMA BHAT AND NEERU BALA

ABSTRACT. Let A be an $m \times m$ complex matrix and let $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_m$ be the eigenvalues of A arranged such that $|\lambda_1| \geq |\lambda_2| \geq \dots \geq |\lambda_m|$ and for $n \geq 1$, let $s_1^{(n)} \geq s_2^{(n)} \geq \dots \geq s_m^{(n)}$ be the singular values of A^n . Then a famous theorem of Yamamoto (1967) states that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (s_j^{(n)})^{\frac{1}{n}} = |\lambda_j|, \quad \forall 1 \leq j \leq m.$$

Recently S. Nayak strengthened this result very significantly by showing that the sequence of matrices $|A^n|^{\frac{1}{n}}$ itself converges to a positive matrix B whose eigenvalues are $|\lambda_1|, |\lambda_2|, \dots, |\lambda_m|$. Here this theorem has been extended to arbitrary compact operators on infinite dimensional complex separable Hilbert spaces. The proof makes use of Nayak's theorem, Stone-Weirstrass theorem, Borel-Caratheodory theorem and some technical results of Anselone and Palmer on collectively compact operators. Simple examples show that the result does not hold for general bounded operators.

1. INTRODUCTION

The main aim of this paper is to study convergence of a sequence of positive bounded linear operators of the form $(|T^n|^{1/n})$, where T is a compact operator on a separable Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . Sequences of this form are of essential importance in spectral theory as seen from the classical spectral radius formula.

For $m \geq 1$, any complex matrix $A = [a_{ij}]_{1 \leq i, j \leq m}$ is considered as an operator on the finite dimensional Hilbert space \mathbb{C}^m in the usual way. By spectral radius formula we know that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|A^n\|^{\frac{1}{n}}$ exists and equals to the spectral radius of A . A well-known result of Yamamoto goes much further. Let $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_m$ be the eigenvalues of A . We assume that $|\lambda_1| \geq |\lambda_2| \geq \dots \geq |\lambda_m|$. For $n \geq 1$, let $s_1^{(n)} \geq s_2^{(n)} \geq \dots \geq s_m^{(n)}$ be the singular values of A^n . Then the main theorem of Yamamoto [14] states that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (s_j^{(n)})^{\frac{1}{n}} = |\lambda_j|, \quad \forall 1 \leq j \leq m.$$

The spectral radius formula is the special case with $j = 1$. In [13], S. Nayak proved a spatial version of Yamamoto's theorem. In fact, he showed that the sequence of matrices $(|A^n|)^{\frac{1}{n}}$ converges to a positive matrix B , whose eigenvalues are $|\lambda_1|, |\lambda_2|, \dots, |\lambda_m|$. From this Yamamoto's result follows as a simple corollary.

Yamamoto tried to extend his results to compact operators on infinite dimensional separable Hilbert spaces and obtained some partial results in [15]. A satisfactory extension was got by Davis [7]. Presently we extend Nayak's result to compact operators and show that for any compact operator A , $(|A^n|)^{\frac{1}{n}}$ converges in norm to a positive operator B , whose spectrum

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 47A10, 47B06, 47B07.

Key words and phrases. Compact operator, singular value, spectrum, norm convergence.

is $\{|\lambda| : \lambda \in \sigma(A)\}$. The proof is considerably different from that of [13, Theorem 3.8], for technical reasons.

Section 2 contains some introductory material and some basic tools which we are going to need. One specific concept we will use is the notion of collectively compact operators.

Section 3 contains the main result generalizing Nayak's theorem to compact operators. We also provide some examples to show that the result does not hold for general bounded operators even if relax the convergence to strong or weak operator topology.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Let $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be the space of all bounded operators on a complex separable Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . For any bounded operator T , $\text{ran}(T)$ and $\text{ker}(T)$ will denote the range and the kernel of T , respectively. For any vector space \mathcal{M} , $\dim(\mathcal{M})$ will denote the dimension of \mathcal{M} .

To begin with we recall a case of Holder-McCarthy inequality.

Proposition 2.1. [12, Theorem 1.4, Page 5] *Let $S \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be a positive operator. Then*

$$\langle S^r x, x \rangle \leq \langle Sx, x \rangle^r$$

for all $0 < r < 1$ and every unit vector $x \in \mathcal{H}$.

As a special case of the above result, we get that

$$(1) \quad \langle |T^n|^{1/n} x, x \rangle \leq \langle |T^n| x, x \rangle^{1/n}$$

for every $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and unit vector $x \in \mathcal{H}$. This inequality plays a crucial role in the study of limits of $(|T^n|^{1/n})$.

One of the key ingredient of our proof is the notion of collectively compact sets of operators. This has been extensively studied in the literature: See [2, 3] for more details. We say, a set $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is *collectively compact* if and only if the set $\{Kx : K \in \mathcal{K}, \|x\| \leq 1\}$ has compact closure. Originally the notion of collectively compact set of operators was introduced to study approximate solution of integral equations in [4]. Various properties of such sets are studied in [1, 5]. We simply recall the results we are going to need.

Proposition 2.2. [2, Proposition 2.1] *Let $T, T_n \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the following are equivalent.*

- (1) (T_n) converges to T in SOT and (T_n) is collectively compact.
- (2) (T_n) converges to T in SOT and $(T_n - T)$ is collectively compact, and T is compact.

Proposition 2.3. [2, Proposition 2.2] *Let $T, T_n \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If (T_n) converges to T in norm topology and each $T_n - T$ is compact then $(T_n - T)$ is collectively compact.*

In the following we are quoting only a relevant part of [2, Theorem 3.4].

Proposition 2.4. [2, Theorem 3.4] *Let $T, T_n \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If (T_n) converges to T in strong operator topology, $(T_n - T)$ is collectively compact and each T_n is self-adjoint then (T_n) converges to T in norm.*

The following statement can be found in [1], just prior to Theorem 2.1.

Proposition 2.5. [1] *Assume $\{K_{m,n} : n \geq\}$ is collectively compact for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\{K_{m,n}\}$ converges in norm to some bounded operator K_n , uniformly in n , as m tends to ∞ . Then $\{K_n : n \geq 1\}$ is collectively compact.*

We also need the following classical result from complex analysis.

Theorem 2.6. [11, Theorem 3.1, Page 338] (*Borel-Caratheodory theorem*). *Let g be an analytic function on a disk of radius R centered at zero in the complex plane. Suppose $0 < r < R$. Then*

$$\sup_{|z| \leq r} |g(z)| \leq \frac{2r}{R-r} \sup_{|z| \leq R} \operatorname{Re} g(z) + \frac{R+r}{R-r} |g(0)|.$$

It is very important for our analysis to keep track of the multiplicities of eigenvalues of a compact operator A . If λ is a non-zero eigenvalue of A , then we consider the ‘algebraic multiplicity’ of A , which is the dimension of $E_\lambda(A)$, the root-space spanned by generalized eigenvectors with eigenvalue λ :

$$E_\lambda(A) := \operatorname{span}\{x : (A - \lambda)^r x = 0, \text{ for some } r \geq 1\}.$$

We know that this space is finite dimensional. Throughout the article, eigenvalues of compact operators would always be considered with this multiplicity. The theorem of Davis [7] is an ingredient for our proof, and it uses this multiplicity. For self-adjoint compact operators algebraic multiplicity is same as the geometric multiplicity (dimension of the corresponding eigenspace).

Note that, if λ is an isolated point of $\sigma(A)$, then we can define the Riesz projection of A corresponding to the isolated point $\{\lambda\}$ as

$$P_\lambda := \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\Gamma (\delta - A)^{-1} d\delta,$$

where Γ is a closed contour around $\{\lambda\}$ separating $\{\lambda\}$ from $\sigma(A) \setminus \{\lambda\}$. Then $\dim(\operatorname{ran} P_\lambda)$ is equal to the algebraic multiplicity of λ (see Page 26, [9] for more details.)

We enumerate the non-zero eigenvalues of a compact operator A as, $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots$, with $|\lambda_1| \geq |\lambda_2| \geq \dots$, where each non-zero eigenvalue is repeated with its algebraic multiplicity. If this collection is finite, say has size M , then by convention we take $\lambda_i = 0$ for $i > M$. We will call any such sequence as an *eigen-sequence* of A . For a compact operator A , the multiplicity of 0 is defined as the dimension of $\{x : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A^n x = 0\}$. It is to be noted that the multiplicity of 0 may not be accounted for in the sequence $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots)$, even if 0 is an eigenvalue. For this reason calling (λ_i) enumerated as above as eigen-sequence of A is slight abuse of notation.

3. MAIN RESULTS

Following Nayak [13] for any bounded operator T on \mathcal{H} and non-negative scalar r , define the following set:

$$V(T, r) = \{x \in \mathcal{H} : \limsup \langle |T^n| x, x \rangle^{1/n} \leq r\}.$$

We have this definition for arbitrary bounded operators, but we would be using it mostly for compact operators. Our first result yields that the set $V(T, r)$ is a subspace for every $r \geq 0$ and also gives a relation between the eigenspace of T and $V(T, r)$.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Then we have the following.*

- (1) $V(T, r)$ is a subspace of \mathcal{H} for $r \geq 0$.
- (2) If λ is an eigenvalue of T , then $\ker(T - \lambda I) \subseteq V(T, r)$ for every $r \geq |\lambda|$.
- (3) For a self adjoint operator T , if λ is an isolated point of $\sigma(T)$ with $|\lambda| = r$, then $\text{ran}P_\lambda \subseteq V(T, r + \epsilon)$ for any $\epsilon > 0$, where P_λ is the Riesz projection of T corresponding to the isolated point λ .

Proof. Let $r \geq 0$.

- (1) Suppose $x, y \in V(T, r)$ and $\alpha \neq 0$ is a scalar. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup \langle |T^n| \alpha x, \alpha x \rangle^{1/n} &= \limsup |\alpha|^{2/n} \langle |T^n| x, x \rangle^{1/n} \\ &\leq \lim |\alpha|^{2/n} \limsup \langle |T^n| x, x \rangle^{1/n} \\ &\leq r. \end{aligned}$$

We also have,

$$\begin{aligned} &\limsup \langle |T^n| (x + y), x + y \rangle^{1/n} \\ &\leq \limsup (\langle |T^n| x, x \rangle + \langle |T^n| x, y \rangle + \langle |T^n| y, x \rangle + \langle |T^n| y, y \rangle)^{1/n} \\ &\leq \limsup (\langle |T^n| x, x \rangle + 2\langle |T^n| x, x \rangle^{1/2} \langle |T^n| y, y \rangle^{1/2} + \langle |T^n| y, y \rangle)^{1/n} \\ &= \limsup (\langle |T^n| x, x \rangle^{1/2} + \langle |T^n| y, y \rangle^{1/2})^{2/n} \\ &\leq \max \{ \limsup \langle |T^n| x, x \rangle^{1/n}, \limsup \langle |T^n| y, y \rangle^{1/n} \} \\ &\leq r. \end{aligned}$$

The second last inequality follows from [13, Lemma 2.2]. Hence $V(T, r)$ is a subspace of \mathcal{H} .

- (2) Let $x \in \ker(T - \lambda I)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle |T^n| x, x \rangle^{1/n} &\leq \| |T^n| x \|^{1/n} \| x \|^{1/n} \\ &= \| T^n x \|^{1/n} \| x \|^{1/n} \\ &= |\lambda| \| x \|^{2/n}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\limsup \langle |T^n| x, x \rangle^{1/n} \leq |\lambda| \leq r$ for every $r \geq |\lambda|$.

- (3) This follows directly from [8, Page 582, 25]. □

For a positive operator $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, the renowned spectral theorem ensures that there exists a projection valued measure E supported on $[0, \|T\|]$ such that

$$T = \int_0^{\|T\|} \lambda dE.$$

Now, we observe a relationship between the subspaces $V(T, r)$ and the spectral projections of T .

Proposition 3.2. *Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be a positive operator. For $r \geq 0$, suppose λ_r is the largest spectral value of T less than or equal to r . Then*

$$(2) \quad V(T, r) = V(T, \lambda_r) = \text{ran}(E[0, \lambda_r]),$$

where E is the spectral measure corresponding to the operator T .

Proof. By spectral theorem for positive operators, we know that

$$T = \int_0^{\|T\|} \lambda dE \text{ and } T^n = \int_0^{\|T\|} \lambda^n dE, \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Let $x \in \mathcal{H}$ be a non-zero vector. We claim that $\limsup \langle T^n x, x \rangle^{1/n} = \delta$ if and only if δ is the smallest value in $[0, \|T\|]$ satisfying $\langle E(\delta, \|T\|]x, x \rangle = 0$.

Let δ be the smallest value in $[0, \|T\|]$ satisfying $\langle E(\delta, \|T\|]x, x \rangle = 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle T^n x, x \rangle &= \int_0^\delta \lambda^n d\langle E x, x \rangle \\ &\leq \delta^n \int_0^\delta d\langle E x, x \rangle \\ &\leq \delta^n \|x\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, $\limsup \langle T^n x, x \rangle^{1/n} \leq \delta$.

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. Then $\langle E(\delta - \epsilon, \delta]x, x \rangle \neq 0$, otherwise δ is not the smallest value in $[0, \|T\|]$ satisfying $\langle E(\delta, \|T\|]x, x \rangle = 0$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \langle T^n x, x \rangle &= \int_0^\delta \lambda^n d\langle E x, x \rangle \\ &\geq \int_{\delta - \epsilon}^\delta \lambda^n d\langle E x, x \rangle \\ &\geq (\delta - \epsilon)^n \langle E(\delta - \epsilon, \delta]x, x \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle E(\delta - \epsilon, \delta]x, x \rangle^{1/n} = 1$, we have $\limsup \langle T^n x, x \rangle^{1/n} \geq \delta - \epsilon$. Thus

$$\limsup \langle T^n x, x \rangle^{1/n} \geq \delta,$$

and consequently $\limsup \langle T^n x, x \rangle^{1/n} = \delta$. If $\limsup \langle T^n x, x \rangle^{1/n} = \delta$, then arguing on similar lines as above, we get that $\langle E(\delta, \|T\|]x, x \rangle = 0$.

Let $r \geq 0$ and λ_r be the largest spectral value of T less than or equal to r . By definition of $V(T, r)$, we have $V(T, \lambda_r) \subseteq V(T, r)$. To get the reverse inequality, suppose $x \in V(T, r)$. By the previous claim, we know that $\limsup \langle T^n x, x \rangle^{1/n} = \tilde{\lambda}$, where $\tilde{\lambda}$ is the smallest spectral value of T satisfying $\langle E(\tilde{\lambda}, \|T\|]x, x \rangle = 0$. Since $x \in V(T, r)$, we have $\tilde{\lambda} \leq r$. Also, $\tilde{\lambda} \leq \lambda_r$. Thus $x \in V(T, \tilde{\lambda}) \subseteq V(T, \lambda_r)$. Hence $V(T, r) = V(T, \lambda_r)$.

We know that $x \in V(T, \lambda_r)$ if and only if $\langle E(\lambda_r, \|T\|]x, x \rangle = 0$. Since $E(\lambda_r, \|T\|]$ is an orthogonal projection, we have $\langle E(\lambda_r, \|T\|]x, x \rangle = 0$ if and only if $x \in \text{ran}(E[0, \lambda_r])$. Hence $V(T, \lambda_r) = \text{ran}(E[0, \lambda_r])$. \square

In above results, for a given $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ we have studied the spaces $V(T, r)$ for $r \geq 0$. Now, we go the reverse way and show that these spaces can be used to identify the operator.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $T_1, T_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be two positive operators. If $V(T_1, r) = V(T_2, r)$ for every $r \geq 0$, then $T_1 = T_2$.*

Proof. Let E_1 and E_2 be spectral measures of T_1, T_2 respectively. We assume that $V(T_1, r) = V(T_2, r)$ for every $r \geq 0$. By Proposition 3.2, we have

$$\text{ran}(E_1[0, a_1]) = \text{ran}(E_2[0, a_2]),$$

where a_1 and a_2 are largest spectral values of T_1 and T_2 less than equal to r , respectively. We have to show that $a_1 = a_2$. On the contrary, assume that $a_1 < a_2$. If $a_1 < \tilde{r} < a_2$, then $V(T_2, \tilde{r}) = V(T_2, \tilde{a}_2)$, where $\tilde{a}_2 < a_2$ is a spectral value of T_2 . We have

$$\text{ran}(E_2[0, a_2]) = \text{ran}(E_1[0, a_1]) = V(T_1, r) = V(T_1, \tilde{r}) = V(T_2, \tilde{r}) = \text{ran}(E_2[0, \tilde{a}_2]),$$

which is a contradiction. Thus $a_1 = a_2$ and consequently $\text{ran}(E_1[0, a_1]) = \text{ran}(E_2[0, a_1])$. Hence $E_1[0, r] = E_1[0, a_1] = E_2[0, a_1] = E_2[0, a_2] = E_2[0, r]$ for every $r \geq 0$. This implies $T_1 = T_2$. \square

In the following, we focus our attention on a compact operator A on a separable Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . We want to show the norm convergence of the sequence $\{|A^n|^{\frac{1}{n}} : n \geq 1\}$. It is often convenient to assume that $\|A\| < 1$. This is possible in view of the following observation.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be any operator and let $c > 0$ be a scalar. Then the sequence $(|A^n|^{1/n})$ is norm convergent if and only if $(|cA|^n|^{1/n})$ is norm convergent. Moreover, in such a case,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |(cA)^n|^{1/n} = |c| \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |A^n|^{1/n}.$$

Proof. This is clear, as $|(cA)^n|^{1/n} = |c||A^n|^{1/n}$, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. \square

Consider

$$\zeta_A : \text{set of all norm limit points of } (|A^n|^{1/n}).$$

Our first task is to show that ζ_A is non-empty and consists of positive compact operators. This is accomplished by making use of the notion of collective compactness. Subsequently, we will show that all limit points of $\{|A^n|^{1/n} : n \geq 1\}$ are equal, that is, ζ_A is singleton and the whole sequence converges to this limit point.

Theorem 3.5. *Let $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be a compact operator with $\|A\| < 1$. Then the set $\{|A^n|^{1/n} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is collectively compact.*

Proof. Let $\{e_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be an orthonormal basis for the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . Then A admits an infinite matrix representation (a_{ij}) with respect to the basis. Define

$$\tilde{A}_m = (a_{ij})_{i,j=1}^m \text{ and } A_m = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{A}_m & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

As in the proof of Theorem 2 of [15], we have (A_m) converges to A in the norm topology. Then it follows that (A_m^n) converges in norm topology to A^n for every n . We claim that this convergence takes place uniformly in n .

Since $\|A\| < 1$, we have $\|A_m\| < 1$. Using analytic functional calculus, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_m^n - A^n\| &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \left\| \int_{\mathbb{T}} \lambda^n [(\lambda - A_m)^{-1} - (\lambda - A)^{-1}] d\lambda \right\| \\ &\leq \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{T}} |\lambda|^n \|(\lambda - A_m)^{-1} - (\lambda - A)^{-1}\| \\ &= \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{T}} \|(\lambda - A_m)^{-1}\| \|A_m - A\| \|(\lambda - A)^{-1}\|, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbb{T} is the unit circle centered at the origin with radius 1. We observe that $\|A_m\| \leq \|A\|$ and consequently,

$$\|(\lambda - A_m)^{-1}\| = \|(1 - \lambda^{-1} A_m)^{-1}\| \leq \frac{1}{1 - \|A_m\|} \leq \frac{1}{1 - \|A\|},$$

for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$. Now, we have

$$\|A_m^n - A^n\| \leq \frac{1}{(1 - \|A\|)^2} \|A_m - A\| \text{ for every } n \in \mathbb{N},$$

which implies that (A_m^n) converges to A^n in norm topology, uniformly in n , as m tends to ∞ . This proves our claim.

Now for $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_m^{*n} A_m^n - A^{*n} A^n\| &\leq \|A_m^{*n} A_m^n - A^{*n} A_m^n\| + \|A^{*n} A_m^n - A^{*n} A^n\| \\ &\leq \|A_m^{*n} - A^{*n}\| + \|A_m^n - A^n\| \\ &\leq 2\|A_m^n - A^n\|. \end{aligned}$$

From the inequality above, we conclude that $\|A_m^{*n} A_m^n - A^{*n} A^n\|$ converges to 0 uniformly in n . Consider any analytic polynomial p . Using analytic functional calculus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|p(A_m^{*n} A_m^n) - p(A^{*n} A^n)\| &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \left\| \int_{\mathbb{T}} p(\lambda) [(\lambda - A_m^{*n} A_m^n)^{-1} - (\lambda - A^{*n} A^n)^{-1}] d\lambda \right\| \\ &\leq \|p\|_{\infty, \mathbb{D}} \|(\lambda - A_m^{*n} A_m^n)^{-1}\| \|A_m^{*n} A_m^n - A^{*n} A^n\| \|(\lambda - A^{*n} A^n)^{-1}\| \\ &\leq \frac{\|p\|_{\infty, \mathbb{D}}}{(1 - \|A\|)^2} \|A_m^{*n} A_m^n - A^{*n} A^n\|, \end{aligned}$$

where $\|p\|_{\infty, \mathbb{D}} := \sup\{|p(z)| : |z| < 1\}$. In the above computations, the last inequality follows from the fact that $\|A^{*n} A^n\| \leq \|A\|^{2n} \leq \|A\|$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and using the following inequality.

$$\|(\lambda - A^{*n} A^n)^{-1}\| = \|(1 - \lambda^{-1} A^{*n} A^n)^{-1}\| \leq \frac{1}{1 - \|A^{*n} A^n\|} \leq \frac{1}{1 - \|A\|}, \text{ for } \lambda \in \mathbb{T}.$$

A similar calculation implies that $\|(\lambda - A_m^{*n} A_m^n)^{-1}\| \leq \frac{1}{1 - \|A\|}$, for $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$. Hence,

$$(3) \quad \|p(A_m^{*n} A_m^n) - p(A^{*n} A^n)\| \leq \frac{\|p\|_{\infty, \mathbb{D}}}{(1 - \|A\|)^2} \|A_m^{*n} A_m^n - A^{*n} A^n\|.$$

Now, we claim that $\|(A_m^{*n} A_m^n)^{1/2n} - (A^{*n} A^n)^{1/2n}\|$ converges to 0 uniformly in n . To prove this, fix $0 < \epsilon < 1$. We define $f_n(z) = |z|^{1/2n}$ for $z \in 2\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, where $2\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ is the closed unit disc of radius 2, around the origin. Clearly, it is a continuous function on a compact Hausdorff space. Then the Stone-Weierstrass approximation theorem implies that there exists a trigonometric polynomial, p_n such that $\|f_n - p_n\|_{\infty, 2\overline{\mathbb{D}}} := \sup\{|(f_n - p_n)(z)| : |z| < 2\} < \frac{\epsilon}{4}$. Note that p_n is a trigonometric polynomial in z , means that it is of the form, $a_n(z) + b_n(\bar{z})$, where a_n, b_n are usual polynomials. Define $p_n^{(j)}$ for $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$ by

$$p_n^{(1)}(z) = p_n(z); p_n^{(2)}(z) = p_n(\bar{z}); p_n^{(3)}(z) = \overline{p_n(z)}; p_n^{(4)}(z) = \overline{p_n(\bar{z})}.$$

Observe that for $z \in 2\overline{\mathbb{D}}$,

$$f_n(z) = f_n(\bar{z}) = \overline{f_n(z)} = \overline{f_n(\bar{z})}.$$

It follows that $\|f_n - p_n\|_{\infty, 2\overline{\mathbb{D}}} = \|f_n - p_n^{(j)}\|_{\infty, 2\overline{\mathbb{D}}}$ for $1 \leq j \leq 4$. Consequently, taking $q_n = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{j=1}^4 p_n^{(j)}$,

$$\|f_n - q_n\|_{\infty, 2\overline{\mathbb{D}}} = \|f_n - p_n\|_{\infty, 2\overline{\mathbb{D}}} < \frac{\epsilon}{4}.$$

It is clear that $\|f_n\|_{\infty, 2\overline{\mathbb{D}}} = 2$. Hence

$$\|q_n\|_{\infty, 2\overline{\mathbb{D}}} < 2 + \frac{\epsilon}{4}.$$

From the definition of q_n , it is clear that it is of the form $q_n(z) = g_n(z) + \overline{g_n(\bar{z})}$, where g_n is a polynomial with real coefficients. Then by Borel-Caratheodory Theorem (see Theorem 2.6) for $r = 1$ and $R = 2$,

$$\sup_{|z| \leq 1} |g_n(z)| \leq 2 \sup_{|z| \leq 2} q_n(z) + 3|g_n(0)|.$$

Observe that $q_n(0) = g_n(0) + \overline{g_n(0)} = 2g_n(0)$. Hence $|g_n(0)| = \frac{1}{2}|q_n(0)| \leq \frac{1}{2}\|q_n\|_{\infty, 2\overline{\mathbb{D}}} < 1 + \frac{\epsilon}{8}$. Consequently, we have $\|g_n\|_{\infty, \mathbb{D}} < 2(2 + \frac{\epsilon}{4}) + 3(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{8}) < 8$.

Note that $A_m^{*n} A_m^n$ and $A^{*n} A^n$ are self-adjoint operators for $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. By continuous functional calculus for self-adjoint operators, we have $q_n(A_m^{*n} A_m^n) = 2g_n(A_m^{*n} A_m^n)$ and $q_n(A^{*n} A^n) = 2g_n(A^{*n} A^n)$. Then by equation (3),

$$\begin{aligned} \|(A_m^{*n} A_m^n)^{1/2n} - (A^{*n} A^n)^{1/2n}\| &= \|f_n(A_m^{*n} A_m^n) - f_n(A^{*n} A^n)\| \\ &\leq \|f_n(A_m^{*n} A_m^n) - q_n(A_m^{*n} A_m^n)\| + 2\|g_n(A_m^{*n} A_m^n) - g_n(A^{*n} A^n)\| \\ &\quad + \|q_n(A^{*n} A^n) - f_n(A^{*n} A^n)\| \\ &\leq 2\|f_n - q_n\|_{\infty, \mathbb{D}} + 2 \frac{\|g_n\|_{\infty, \mathbb{D}}}{(1 - \|A\|)^2} \|A_m^{*n} A_m^n - A^{*n} A^n\| \\ &\leq 2 \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{4} + \frac{16}{(1 - \|A\|)^2} \|A_m^{*n} A_m^n - A^{*n} A^n\|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\|(A_m^{*n} A_m^n)^{1/2n} - (A^{*n} A^n)^{1/2n}\|$ converges to 0 uniformly in n . In other words, $\{|A_m^n|^{\frac{1}{n}}\}$ converges to $|A^n|^{\frac{1}{n}}$, uniformly in n as m tends to ∞ .

By Nayak's theorem for matrices [13], we know that $(|A_m^n|^{1/n})$ converges to some positive finite rank operator B_m . Consequently, Proposition 2.3 gives that $\{|A_m^n|^{1/n} - B_m : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is collectively compact for each m . Then Proposition 2.2 implies that $\{|A_m^n|^{1/n} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is

collectively compact for each m and hence Proposition 2.5 implies that $\{|A^n|^{1/n} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is collectively compact. \square

Lemma 3.6. *Let $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be a compact operator with $\|A\| < 1$. Then the set ζ_A of norm limit points of $(|A^n|^{1/n})$ is non-empty and consists of positive compact operators.*

Proof. Let $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be a compact operator. Then $\||A^n|^{1/n}\| \leq \|A\|$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By [10, Theorem 5.1.3, Page 306] $(|A^n|^{1/n})$ has a WOT convergent subsequence, say $(|A^{n_k}|^{1/n_k})$ converging to B in WOT.

We claim that $(|A^{n_k}|^{1/n_k})$ converges to B in norm. Since $|A^{n_k}|^{1/n_k}$ converges to B in WOT, we have $|A|^{1/2}(|A^{n_k}|^{1/n_k})$ converges to $|A|^{1/2}B$ in SOT and $|A|(|A^{n_k}|^{1/n_k})$ converges to $|A|B$ in norm by [6, Page 81]. By taking adjoint, we get that $(|A^{n_k}|^{1/n_k})|A|$ converges to $B|A|$ in norm.

Let $x \in \ker(|A|)$. Then $|A^{n_k}|^{1/n_k}x = 0$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and consequently $\langle Bx, x \rangle = 0$. Since B is a positive operator, we have $Bx = 0$. As a result, we get that $\ker(|A|) \subseteq \ker(B)$.

Let $y \in \mathcal{H}$, and $y = y_1 + y_2$, where $y_1 \in \ker(|A|)$ and $y_2 \in \overline{\text{ran}}(|A|)$. For $\epsilon > 0$, there exist $z_2 \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $\|y_2 - |A|z_2\| < \frac{\epsilon}{3}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \||A^{n_k}|^{1/n_k}y - By\| &= \||A^{n_k}|^{1/n_k}(y_1 + y_2) - B(y_1 + y_2)\| \\ &= \||A^{n_k}|^{1/n_k}y_2 - By_2\| \\ &\leq \||A^{n_k}|^{1/n_k}y_2 - |A^{n_k}|^{1/n_k}|A|z_2\| + \||A^{n_k}|^{1/n_k}|A|z_2 - B|A|z_2\| \\ &\quad + \|B|A|z_2 - By_2\| \\ &= \frac{2\epsilon}{3} + \||A^{n_k}|^{1/n_k}|A|z_2 - B|A|z_2\|. \end{aligned}$$

We know that $(|A^{n_k}|^{1/n_k}|A|)$ converges to $B|A|$ in norm, thus by above calculation, we get $|A^{n_k}|^{1/n_k}$ converges to B in SOT.

By Theorem 3.5, we know that $\{|A^{n_k}|^{1/n_k}\}$ is collectively compact and Proposition 2.2 (2), implies that $\{|A^{n_k}|^{1/n_k} - B\}$ is collectively compact and B is compact. Now, Proposition 2.4 gives that $\{|A^{n_k}|^{1/n_k}\}$ converges to B in the norm topology. \square

Lemma 3.7. *Let $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be a compact operator with $\|A\| < 1$. Then for $B \in \zeta_A$,*

$$V(A, r) \subseteq V(B, r) \text{ for } r \geq 0.$$

Proof. As B is a limit point of $(|A^n|^{1/n})$, there exists a subsequence, say $(|A^{n_k}|^{1/n_k})$ converging to B . Suppose $0 \neq x \in V(A, r)$ for $r \geq 0$ and $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$\langle B^p x, x \rangle = \lim_k \langle |A^{n_k}|^{p/n_k} x, x \rangle.$$

If we choose $n_k > p$, then by Proposition 2.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle B^p x, x \rangle &\leq \lim_k \langle |A^{n_k}| x, x \rangle^{p/n_k} \frac{\|x\|^2}{\|x\|^{2p/n_k}} \\ &\leq \limsup_n \langle |A^n| x, x \rangle^{p/n} \|x\|^2 \\ &\leq r^p \|x\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\limsup \langle B^p x, x \rangle^{1/p} \leq r$. Hence $x \in V(B, r)$. \square

In the following we see that the spectrum of operators in ζ_A is determined by the spectrum of A .

Lemma 3.8. *Let $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be a compact operator with $\|A\| < 1$, and let $B \in \zeta_A$. Then*

$$\sigma(B) = \{|\lambda| : \lambda \in \sigma(A)\}.$$

For $\lambda \neq 0$, $\dim \ker(B - |\lambda|I)$ is equal to the sum of the algebraic multiplicity of $\eta \in \sigma(A)$ for which $|\eta| = |\lambda|$.

Proof. There is a subsequence $(|A^{n_i}|^{1/n_i})$ converging to B . Let $(s_i^{(n)})$ and (δ_i) be eigensequences of $|A^n|^{1/n}$ and B , respectively. Observe that as these are positive operators eigen-sequences are uniquely determined. By [9, (b), Page 123], we know that

$$\left| s_i^{(n_i)} - \delta_i \right| \leq \| |A^{n_i}|^{1/n_i} - B \|, \text{ for } i \in \mathbb{N}.$$

This implies $s_i^{(n_i)}$ converges to δ_i as $l \rightarrow \infty$ for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$. By [7], we know that

$$s_i^{(n)} \rightarrow |\lambda_i| \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$. As a result, we get $\delta_i = |\lambda_i|$ for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Since B, A are compact operators, 0 is in their spectrum anyway. Hence $\sigma(B) = \{|\lambda| : \lambda \in \sigma(A)\}$.

Note that the multiplicity of any δ_i is same as the sum of the algebraic multiplicities of λ_j for which $|\lambda_j| = \delta_i$. As a result $\dim \ker(B - \delta_i I)$ is equal to sum of the algebraic multiplicity of $\lambda_j \in \sigma(A)$ for which $|\lambda_j| = \delta_i$. This proves the second part. \square

A simple consequence of Lemma 3.8 is that the only limit point of $(|A^n|^{1/n})$ is singleton zero for a compact quasinilpotent operator, for example Volterra operator.

Lemma 3.9. *Let $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be a compact operator with $\sigma(A) = \{0\}$. Then $\zeta_A = \{0\}$. Moreover, $\limsup \langle |A^n| x, x \rangle^{1/n} = 0$ for every $x \in \mathcal{H}$.*

Proof. The first part is clear from the previous result. The second part follows from the following computations. For non-zero $x \in \mathcal{H}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup \langle |A^n| x, x \rangle^{1/n} &\leq \limsup \| |A^n| x \|^{1/n} \|x\|^{1/n} \\ &= \limsup \| A^n x \|^{1/n} \|x\|^{1/n} \\ &\leq \limsup \| A^n \|^{1/n} \|x\|^{2/n} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality holds because spectral radius of A is zero. \square

Finally we are in a position to state and prove our main theorem.

Theorem 3.10. *Let $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be a compact operator. Then the sequence $(|A^n|^{1/n})$ converges in norm to a positive compact operator B , where for $r \geq 0$,*

$$\ker(B - rI) = \{x \in \mathcal{H} : \limsup \langle |A^n|x, x \rangle^{1/n} = r\} \cup \{0\}.$$

Further, $(|A^n|)^{\frac{1}{n}}$ converges to 0 if and only if A is quasi-nilpotent, that is, $\sigma(A) = \{0\}$.

Proof. Making use of Lemma 3.4, in the following we assume $\|A\| \leq 1$.

First we will show that if $B \in \zeta_A$, then

$$V(A, r) = V(B, r) \text{ for } r \geq 0.$$

By Proposition 3.3, this will show that ζ_A is singleton. By Lemma 3.7, we already know that $V(A, r) \subseteq V(B, r)$ for every $r \geq 0$. Let (λ_i) be an eigen-sequence of A . Note that for non-zero $x \in \mathcal{H}$, we have

$$\langle |A^n|x, x \rangle^{1/n} \leq \| |A^n|x \|^{1/n} \|x\|^{1/n} \leq \| |A^n| \|^{1/n} \|x\|^{2/n} = s_1(A^n)^{1/n} \|x\|^{2/n}.$$

By [7], we get that $\limsup \langle |A^n|x, x \rangle^{1/n} \leq |\lambda_1|$ for non-zero vector $x \in \mathcal{H}$. As a result, $V(B, |\lambda_1|) = \mathcal{H} = V(A, |\lambda_1|)$, where the first equality follows from Proposition 3.2. Suppose $|\lambda_1| = |\lambda_2| = \dots = |\lambda_{i_1}|$ and $|\lambda_{i_1+1}| < |\lambda_{i_1}|$. Then $V(B, |\lambda_j|) = V(B, |\lambda_1|) = \mathcal{H} = V(A, |\lambda_1|) = V(A, |\lambda_j|)$ for $1 \leq j \leq i_1$.

Now, assume that $|\lambda_{i_1+1}| = |\lambda_{i_1+2}| = \dots = |\lambda_{i_2}|$. We claim that $V(B, |\lambda_{i_2}|) = V(A, |\lambda_{i_2}|)$. Consider a real number r such that $|\lambda_{i_1+1}| < r < |\lambda_{i_1}|$. Let P_r be the Riesz projection corresponding to the operator A defined by

$$P_r = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_r} (\mu - A)^{-1} d\mu,$$

where integration is taken over the circle centered at the origin with radius r . By [8, Page 582,25], we have

$$\limsup \langle |A^n|x, x \rangle^{1/n} \leq \limsup \| |A^n|x \|^{1/n} < r \text{ for } x \in \text{ran}P_r.$$

Hence $\text{ran}P_r \subseteq V(A, r)$ and consequently $\dim V(A, r)^\perp \leq \dim \ker P_r = i_1$. Note that as B is a positive compact operator, $\mathcal{H} = \ker B \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1, \lambda_i \neq 0}^\infty \ker(B - |\lambda_i|I)$ and by Proposition 3.2, we have

$$\dim(V(B, r)^\perp) = \dim(V(B, |\lambda_{i_2}|)^\perp) = \dim \ker(B - |\lambda_1|I) = i_1 \geq \dim(V(A, r)^\perp).$$

By Lemma 3.7, we know that $V(A, r) \subseteq V(B, r)$ and consequently

$$\dim(V(B, r)^\perp) \leq \dim(V(A, r)^\perp).$$

This implies that $\dim(V(B, r)^\perp) = \dim(V(A, r)^\perp)$. Now from $V(A, r) \subseteq V(B, r)$, we get $V(B, r) = V(A, r)$. Since $|\lambda_k| = |\lambda_{i_2}|$ for $i_1 + 1 \leq k \leq i_2$, we have $V(B, r) = V(B, |\lambda_k|) = V(B, |\lambda_{i_2}|) = V(A, r) \supseteq V(A, |\lambda_{i_2}|) = V(A, |\lambda_k|)$ for $i_1 + 1 \leq k \leq i_2$. Let $x \in V(B, |\lambda_{i_2}|)$. Then $x \in V(B, r)$ for every $|\lambda_{i_1+1}| < r < |\lambda_{i_1}|$, as a result $x \in V(A, r)$. Taking limit r going to $|\lambda_{i_2}|$, we get that $x \in V(A, |\lambda_{i_2}|)$ and this proves our claim that $V(B, |\lambda_{i_2}|) = V(A, |\lambda_{i_2}|)$.

Continuing the same procedure, we get that $V(A, |\lambda|) = V(B, |\lambda|)$ for every non-zero λ . Also, observe that $\ker(B - |\lambda|I) = \{x \in \mathcal{H} : \limsup \langle |A^n|x, x \rangle^{1/n} = |\lambda|\} \cup \{0\}$.

We claim that, if $\lambda = 0$, then $V(B, 0) = \ker B = \{x \in \mathcal{H} : \limsup \langle |A^n|x, x \rangle^{1/n} = 0\} = V(A, 0)$. If $\limsup \langle |A^n|x, x \rangle^{1/n} = 0$, then $\liminf \langle |A^n|x, x \rangle^{1/n} = 0$ and as a result the following limit exists and

$$\lim \langle |A^n|x, x \rangle^{1/n} = 0.$$

By Proposition 2.1, $\langle Bx, x \rangle = \lim \langle |A^{n_k}|^{1/n_k}x, x \rangle = 0$. Hence $x \in \ker(B)$. On the other hand, if $y \in \ker(B)$ and $\limsup \langle |A^n|y, y \rangle^{1/n} = |\lambda| \neq 0$, then we know that $x \in \ker(B - |\lambda|I)$, which is a contradiction.

Suppose $B_1, B_2 \in \zeta_A$. Then

$$V(B_1, r) = V(A, r) = V(B_2, r), \quad r \geq 0.$$

Proposition 3.3 implies that $B_1 = B_2$. Thus $(|A^n|^{1/n})$ has a unique norm limit point, say B . We know that any WOT limit point of this sequence is also a norm limit point. From the sequential WOT compactness of the unit ball of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, it follows that $(|A^n|^{1/n})$ converges to B . By Lemma 3.8 and the spectral theorem for positive compact operators, we have

$$B = \sum_{\delta=|\lambda|, \text{ for some } \lambda \in \sigma(A)} \delta E_\delta,$$

where E_δ is orthogonal projection onto $\ker(B - \delta I) = \{x \in \mathcal{H} : \limsup \langle |A^n|x, x \rangle^{1/n} = \delta\} \cup \{0\}$. \square

If we drop the condition that the operator is compact then the above result does not hold. The following example illustrates this.

Example 3.11. Let L be the left shift operator on $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$ defined by

$$L(x_1, x_2, \dots) = (x_2, x_3, \dots) \text{ for } (x_1, x_2, \dots) \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N}).$$

Then $L^{*n}L^n = P_n$, where P_n is the orthogonal projection on the space $\overline{\text{span}}\{e_i : i > n\}$, where $\{e_m : m \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is the standard orthonormal basis for $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$. Consequently $(|L^n|^{1/n}) = (P_n)$ converges to zero in SOT but not in the norm topology.

Example 3.12. Consider an operator T on $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$ defined on the standard basis $(e_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$ by

$$Te_i = \begin{cases} \frac{e_2}{2} & \text{if } i = 1; \\ \frac{e_{2^n+1}}{2^{2^n-1}} & \text{if } i = 2^n; \\ 2e_{i+1} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that T is a weighted shift with weights less than or equal to 2 and hence T is a bounded linear operator. To have more clarity about the operator T , we give an expended form of the

operator T and its adjoint:

$$T(x_1, x_2, \dots) = \left(0, \frac{x_1}{2}, \frac{x_2}{2}, 2x_3, \frac{x_4}{2^3}, 2x_5, 2x_6, 2x_7, \frac{x_8}{2^7}, 2x_9, \dots\right),$$

$$T^*(x_1, x_2, \dots) = \left(\frac{x_2}{2}, \frac{x_3}{2}, 2x_4, \frac{x_5}{2^3}, 2x_6, 2x_7, 2x_8, \frac{x_9}{2^7}, 2x_{10}, \dots\right).$$

Observe that $(T^*)^n T^n$ is diagonal for every n . Then by simple computations, it follows that

$$|T|e_1 = \frac{e_1}{2}, |T^2|^{1/2}e_1 = \frac{e_1}{2}, |T^3|^{1/3}e_1 = \frac{e_1}{2^{1/3}}, |T^4|^{1/4}e_1 = \frac{e_1}{2},$$

and for $n \geq 2$,

$$|T^{2^n-1}|^{\frac{1}{2^n-1}}e_1 = \frac{e_1}{2^{\frac{1}{2^n-1}}}, |T^{2^n}|^{\frac{1}{2^n}}e_1 = \frac{e_1}{2}.$$

As a result

$$\langle |T^{2^n-1}|^{\frac{1}{2^n-1}}e_1, e_1 \rangle = \frac{1}{2^{\frac{1}{2^n-1}}} \rightarrow 1,$$

$$\langle |T^{2^n}|^{\frac{1}{2^n}}e_1, e_1 \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}.$$

In other words the sequence $(\langle |T^m|^{1/m}e_1, e_1 \rangle)$ has two subsequences converging to two different points, and hence the sequence is not convergent. Consequently, $(|T^m|^{1/m})$ is not convergent in WOT.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Bhat gratefully acknowledges funding from SERB (India) through J C Bose Fellowship No. JBR/2021/000024.

REFERENCES

- [1] Anselone, P. M. *Collectively compact approximations of integral operators with discontinuous kernels*. J. Math. Anal. Appl. **22 (3)** (1968), 582-590.
- [2] Anselone, P. and Palmer, T. *Spectral analysis of collectively compact, strongly convergent operator sequences*. Pacific J. Math. **25(3)** (1968), 423-431.
- [3] Anselone, P. and Palmer, T. *Collectively compact sets of linear operators*. Pacific J. Math. **25(3)** (1968), 417-422.
- [4] Anselone, P. M. and Moore, R. H. *Approximate solutions of integral and operator equations*. J. Math. Anal. Appl. **9(2)** (1964), 268-277.
- [5] Atkinson, K. E. *The numerical solution of the eigenvalue problem for compact integral operators*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **129(3)** (1967), 458-465.
- [6] Conway, J. B. *A course in operator theory*. Grad. Stud. Math., 21 Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2000. xvi+372 pp.
- [7] Davis, C. *On a theorem of Yamamoto*. Numerische Mathematik, **14(3)** (1970), 297-298.
- [8] Dunford, N. and Schwartz, J.T. *Linear operators, part 1: general theory* **Vol. 10**, John Wiley & Sons (1988).
- [9] Gohberg, I. and Goldberg, S. *Basic operator theory*. Birkhäuser, (2013).
- [10] Kadison, R. V. and Ringrose, J. R. *Fundamentals of the Theory of Operator Algebras*. **Vol. 1** Academic Press, New York (1983).
- [11] Lang, S. *Complex analysis*. **Vol. 103** Springer Science & Business Media, (2013).

- [12] Pečarić, J., Furuta, T., Mičić, T., Seo, T. *Mond-Pečarić method in operator inequalities*. Element, Zagreb (2005)
- [13] Nayak, S. *A stronger form of Yamamoto's theorem on singular values*. Linear Algebra Appl. **679** (2023), 231-245.
- [14] Yamamoto, T. *On the extreme values of the roots of matrices*, J. Math. Soc. Japan. **19** (2), (1967), 173-178.
- [15] Yamamoto, T. *On the eigenvalues of compact operators in a Hilbert space*. Numerische Mathematik, **11** (1968), 211-219.

INDIAN STATISTICAL INSTITUTE, BANGALORE

Email address: bvrajaramabhat@gmail.com

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY (INDIAN SCHOOL OF MINES), DHANBAD

Email address: neerusingh41@gmail.com