

ACCRETIVE PARTIAL TRANSPOSE MATRICES AND THEIR CONNECTIONS TO MATRIX MEANS

EMAN ALDABBAS AND MOHAMMAD SABABHEH

ABSTRACT. Accretive partial transpose (APT) matrices have been recently defined, as a natural extension of positive partial transpose (PPT) matrices.

In this paper, we discuss further properties of APT matrices in a way that extends some of those properties known for PPT matrices.

Among many results, we show that if A, B, X are $n \times n$ complex matrices such that A, B are sectorial with sector angle α for some $\alpha \in [0, \pi/2)$, and if $f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is a certain operator monotone function such that $\begin{bmatrix} \cos^2(\alpha)f(A) & X \\ X^* & \cos^2(\alpha)f(B) \end{bmatrix}$ is APT, Then $\begin{bmatrix} f(A)\nabla_t f(B) & X \\ X^* & f(A\nabla_t B) \end{bmatrix}$ is APT for any $0 \leq t \leq 1$, where ∇_t is the weighted arithmetic mean.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the sequel, upper case letters will be used to denote square matrices of appropriate sizes. The zero matrix will be denoted by O , while the identity matrix by I . The algebra of all $n \times n$ matrices is denoted by \mathcal{M}_n . Thus, if $A, B, C, D \in \mathcal{M}_n$, then the 2×2 block form $\begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix}$ is an element of \mathcal{M}_{2n} .

Block matrices have acquired a considerable attention in the literature, as they can be used to better understand certain notions and to simplify some proofs. We refer the reader to [23, 26, 33, 34, 46, 49, 50] where applications of block matrices can be seen.

An important subclass of \mathcal{M}_n is the cone of positive matrices. Recall that $A \in \mathcal{M}_n$ is said to be positive semi-definite, and written as $A \geq O$, if $\langle Ax, x \rangle \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$. If, for all nonzero $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$, we have $\langle Ax, x \rangle > 0$, then A is said to be positive definite, written as $A > O$.

Given $A \in \mathcal{M}_n$, the numerical range $W(A)$ of A is defined as the image of the unit sphere of \mathbb{C}^n under the quadratic form $x \mapsto \langle Ax, x \rangle$. That is,

$$W(A) = \{ \langle Ax, x \rangle : x \in \mathbb{C}^n, \|x\| = 1 \}.$$

The numerical range has been an important notion in matrix analysis, with numerous applications and considerable interest in the literature. Studies of the numerical range cover all possible related notions, such as its shape in the complex plane [6, 15, 30], geometric properties such as compactness and convexity [5, 16, 41], inclusion of eigenvalues [55], and inclusion of the origin [21].

The concern of whether $W(A)$ includes the origin or not has received the attention of researchers due to the following interesting property [28].

Key words and phrases. Accretive matrix, PPT matrix, APT matrix, positive matrix, geometric mean.

Proposition 1.1. *Let $A \in \mathcal{M}_n$ be such that $0 \notin W(A)$. Then there exists $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$W(e^{i\theta}A) \subseteq \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \Re z > 0\},$$

where $\Re z = \frac{z+z^*}{2}$ is the real part of z .

Due to this property, an accretive matrix was defined as a matrix with numerical range in $\Gamma := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \Re z \geq 0\}$. For simplicity, we will write $A \in \Gamma_n$ to mean that $A \in \mathcal{M}_n$ is accretive.

Letting $\Re(A) = \frac{A+A^*}{2}$ and $\Im(A) = \frac{A-A^*}{2i}$ be the real and imaginary parts of A , respectively, we have

$$A \in \Gamma_n \Leftrightarrow \Re(A) \geq O.$$

If $\Re(A) > O$, we write $A \in \Gamma_n^+$, to mean that A is strictly accretive. We remark that in the literature, accretive matrices were defined as those matrices A with $\Re(A) \geq O$, sometimes and as those with $\Re(A) > O$. This is just a conventional matter.

Remark 1.2. *If $A \in \Gamma_n$, we may define $A_k = A + \frac{1}{k}I$ as a sequence of matrices such that $A_k \in \Gamma_n^+$, and $A_k \rightarrow A$. Thus, elements of Γ_n are limits, in the norm topology, of elements from Γ_n^+ . This remark becomes handy when we need to deal with the inverse of an accretive matrix. Elements of Γ_n^+ are invertible, while some elements of Γ_n are not.*

Related to accretive matrices, the notion of sectorial matrices is used as an alternative terminology. If we define, for $\alpha \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2})$,

$$S_\alpha = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \Re(z) \geq 0 \text{ and } |\Im(z)| \leq \tan(\alpha)\Re(z)\},$$

then it can be seen that S_α is a sector in the right half plane, with half angle α . It can be easily shown that

$$A \in \Gamma_n \Leftrightarrow W(A) \in S_\alpha \text{ for some } \alpha \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2}).$$

For $\alpha \in [0, \pi/2)$, we use the notation $\Pi_{n,\alpha}$ to denote all matrices in \mathcal{M}_n with numerical range in S_α . Thus, it is evident that

$$\Gamma_n = \bigcup_{\alpha \in [0, \pi/2)} \Pi_{n,\alpha}.$$

The class of accretive matrices has recently gained a great attention. We refer the reader to [29, 4, 7, 8, 9, 17, 18, 20, 37, 45, 48, 51, 56, 40, 53] as a list of such references.

For the 2×2 block matrix $M = \begin{bmatrix} A & X \\ X^* & B \end{bmatrix}$, its partial transpose is defined by $M^\tau = \begin{bmatrix} A & X^* \\ X & B \end{bmatrix}$. It is well known that if $M \geq O$, then $M^\tau \geq O$ need not be true [22, p. 221]. We say that M is positive partial transpose (PPT for short) if $M \geq O$ and $M^\tau \geq O$. The class of PPT matrices has been a renowned topic with significance in mathematical physics. We refer the reader to [1, 2, 23, 36, 38, 47] for some recent progress on PPT matrices, and to [25, 42] for significance of this class in physics.

Motivated by the recent treatment of accretive matrices, accretive partial transpose (APT) matrices have been defined recently in [31] to extend the concept of PPT matrices.

The 2×2 block matrix $M = \begin{bmatrix} A & X \\ Y^* & B \end{bmatrix}$ is called accretive partial transpose if M and M^τ are accretive. Clearly, the class of APT matrices includes that of PPT matrices.

One can see that if M is accretive, then so is $\begin{bmatrix} B & Y^* \\ X & A \end{bmatrix}$, by conjugating with $\begin{bmatrix} O & I \\ I & O \end{bmatrix}$.

We refer the reader to [26, 27, 31, 39, 54] for properties and inequalities related to APT matrices.

Given $A \in \mathcal{M}_n$, if all eigenvalues of A are real, we use the notation $\lambda_j(A)$ to denote the j -th eigenvalue. The singular values of $A \in \mathcal{M}_n$ are the eigenvalues of $|A| = (A^*A)^{1/2}$, and $s_j(A)$ will denote the j -th singular value of A . A unitarily invariant norm $\|\cdot\|_u$ on \mathcal{M}_n is a matrix norm that satisfies the additional property $\|UAV\|_u = \|A\|_u$ for all $A, U, V \in \mathcal{M}_n$ such that U and V are unitaries. In the sequel, when we write $\|\cdot\|_u$, we mean an arbitrary unitarily invariant norm on \mathcal{M}_n , normalized so that $\|\text{diag}(1, 0, \dots, 0)\| = 1$. Of particular interest, the spectral norm (or the usual operator norm) is denoted by $\|\cdot\|$.

The main purpose of this paper is to prove new properties of APT matrices, in a way that extends some known facts about PPT ones. However, to state and prove our results, we will need some results and notions from the literature, as discussed in the next section.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we discuss briefly some needed notions and facts that are known to researchers in this field. A familiar reader with the topic can proceed to the main results section immediately. The organization of the stated results in this section will be as follows. We begin with some results about positivity of the block form M , then some results about accretive matrices will be presented. After that results on PPT and APT matrices will be stated.

Lemma 2.1. ([10, Theorem 1.3.3]) *Let $A, B, X \in \mathcal{M}_n$ be such that $A, B > O$. Then $M = \begin{bmatrix} A & X \\ X^* & B \end{bmatrix} \geq O$, if and only if $A \geq XB^{-1}X^*$.*

As an interesting contribution, we prove the accretive version of Lemma 2.1 in Theorem 3.1 below.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $A, B, X \in \mathcal{M}_n$ be such that $M = \begin{bmatrix} A & X \\ X^* & B \end{bmatrix} \geq O$.*

(i) [13] *For any unitarily invariant norm $\|\cdot\|_u$ on \mathcal{M}_n ,*

$$\|M\|_u \leq \|A + B\|_u.$$

(ii) [13] *If X is Hermitian, then there exist two unitary matrices $U, V \in \mathcal{M}_n$ such that*

$$M = \frac{1}{2} \left(U(A + B)U^* + V(A + B)V^* \right).$$

(iii) [52] *For $j = 1, \dots, n$,*

$$2s_j(X) \leq s_j(M).$$

The notion of matrix means is indeed essential in studying positivity of block matrices. We recall that the weighted geometric mean of the positive definite matrices A and B is defined by the equation

$$(2.1) \quad A\sharp_t B = A^{1/2} \left(A^{-1/2} B A^{-1/2} \right)^t A^{1/2}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq 1.$$

When $t = \frac{1}{2}$, we simply write $A\sharp B$. The weighted geometric mean is a special case of matrix means. Recall that a matrix mean on the set of all positive definite matrices is a binary operation σ defined by

$$(2.2) \quad A\sigma B = A^{1/2} f(A^{-1/2} B A^{-1/2}) A^{1/2},$$

where $f \in \mathbf{m} := \{f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty) : f \text{ is an operator monotone function with } f(1) = 1\}$. By an operator monotone function $f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$, we mean a function that satisfies $f(A) \leq f(B)$ whenever $0 < A \leq B$. The geometric mean above corresponds to the function $f(x) = x^t, 0 \leq t \leq 1$. Another important mean is the weighted arithmetic mean defined for $A, B \geq O$ as $A\nabla_t B = (1-t)A + tB, 0 \leq t \leq 1$. For background on matrix means, we refer the reader to [32]. Although the above definition for matrix means is stated for positive definite matrices, it is still valid for positive semi-definite matrices via a limit approach. The geometric mean enjoys the following properties [43].

Lemma 2.3. *Let $A, B, C, D \geq O$, and let $t \in [0, 1]$. Then*

- (i) $A\sharp_t B \geq O$.
- (ii) $A\sharp_{1-t} B = B\sharp_t A$.
- (iii) $A\sharp_t B \leq C\sharp_t D$, if $A \leq C$ and $B \leq D$.

The notion of matrix means was extended to accretive matrices in [7], where the definition in (2.2) applies to strictly accretive matrices.

For a non-zero matrix mean σ , the adjoint σ^* is defined by [32]

$$A\sigma^* B = \left(A^{-1} \sigma B^{-1} \right)^{-1}.$$

One can easily verify that for any strictly accretive matrices A and B , and for any invertible matrix X , we have [7, Theorem 5.4]

$$X^*(A\sigma B)X = (X^*AX)\sigma(X^*BX),$$

and for any $A, B \geq O$ and for any matrix X , we have [32]

$$(2.3) \quad X^*(A\sigma B)X \leq (X^*AX)\sigma(X^*BX).$$

For the next result, we clarify one point. When $f \in \mathbf{m}$, it is defined on $(0, \infty)$. However, it is known that such f has an analytic continuation to $\mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$, see [11, Theorem V.4.7]. See also [7, Proposition 1.2] for further details. When $A \in \Gamma_n^+$, we know that the spectrum of A avoids $(-\infty, 0]$, which makes $f(A)$, for such A , well defined.

Moreover, by appealing to a limit argument as in Remark 1.2, we can see how to pass from Γ_n^+ to Γ_n for most results. In what follows, $\Pi_{n,\alpha}^+ = \Gamma_n^+ \cap \Pi_{n,\alpha}$.

Lemma 2.4. [7, Proposition 7.1, Proposition 7.2] *Let $A \in \Pi_{n,\alpha}^+$ for some $\alpha \in [0, \pi/2)$ and let $f \in \mathfrak{m}$. Then*

$$\cos^2(\alpha)\Re(f(A)) \leq f(\Re(A)) \leq \Re(f(A)).$$

Moreover [18, 35],

$$\Re(A^{-1}) \leq (\Re(A))^{-1} \leq \sec^2 \alpha \Re(A^{-1}).$$

Lemma 2.5. [7] *Let $A, B \in \Pi_{n,\alpha}^+$ for some $\alpha \in [0, \pi/2)$ and let σ be any matrix mean. Then*

$$\Re(A)\sigma\Re(B) \leq \Re(A\sigma B) \leq \sec^2(\alpha)(\Re(A)\sigma\Re(B)).$$

So, if $A, B \in \Gamma_n^+$, then so does $A\sigma B$.

In addition to the above lemmas, we have the following results about PPT matrices. The first result is usually referred to as Hiroshima's inequality [24, 38].

Lemma 2.6. *Let $A, B, X \in \mathcal{M}_n$ be such that $M = \begin{bmatrix} A & X \\ X^* & B \end{bmatrix}$ is PPT. Then $\|X\|_u \leq \|A + B\|_u$.*

Lemma 2.7. [23, Theorem 2.1] *Let $A, B, X \in \mathcal{M}_n$ be such that $A, B \geq O$. Then $M = \begin{bmatrix} A & X \\ X^* & B \end{bmatrix}$ is PPT if and only if $\begin{bmatrix} A\sharp_t B & X \\ X^* & A\sharp_{1-t} B \end{bmatrix}$ is PPT for all $t \in [0, 1]$.*

The APT version of Lemma 2.7 is stated in Theorem 3.4 below.

Lemma 2.8. [47, Theorem 2.1, Corollary 2.1] *Let $A, B, X \in \mathcal{M}_n$ be such that $M = \begin{bmatrix} A & X \\ X^* & B \end{bmatrix}$ is PPT, and let $X = U|X|$ be the polar decomposition of X . Then for any $0 \leq t \leq 1$,*

$$|X| \leq \left(A\sharp_t(U^*BU) \right) \sharp \left(A\sharp_{1-t}(U^*BU) \right),$$

and

$$|X^*| \leq \left((UAU^*)\sharp_t B \right) \sharp \left((UAU^*)\sharp_{1-t} B \right).$$

Furthermore,

$$|X| \leq \left(A\sharp_t B \right) \sharp \left(U^*(A\sharp_{1-t} B)U \right),$$

and

$$|X^*| \leq \left(U(A\sharp_t B)U^* \right) \sharp \left(A\sharp_{1-t} B \right).$$

Lemma 2.9. [47, Corollary 2.2] *Let $M = \begin{bmatrix} A & X \\ X^* & B \end{bmatrix}$ be PPT with $A, B, X \in \mathcal{M}_n$. Then for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and $0 \leq t \leq 1$,*

$$\lambda_j(2|X| - A\sharp_t B) \leq \lambda_j(A\sharp_{1-t} B).$$

We refer the reader to Corollary 3.8, Corollary 3.9 and Corollary 3.11 for the APT versions of Lemma 2.8 and Lemma 2.9.

Lemma 2.10. [23, Theorem 2.3] Let $M = \begin{bmatrix} A & X \\ X^* & B \end{bmatrix}$ be PPT with $A, B, X \in \mathcal{M}_n$, and let σ be a matrix mean. Then $\begin{bmatrix} A\sigma^*B & X \\ X^* & B\sigma A \end{bmatrix}$ is PPT.

Lemma 2.11. [23, Theorem 2.8] Let $f : [0, \infty] \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be an operator concave function and let $\begin{bmatrix} f(A) & X \\ X^* & f(B) \end{bmatrix}$ be PPT. Then $\begin{bmatrix} f(A)\nabla_t f(B) & X \\ X^* & f(A\nabla_t B) \end{bmatrix}$ is PPT for any $0 \leq t \leq 1$.

The APT versions of Lemma 2.10 and Lemma 2.11 are stated in Theorem 3.13 and Theorem 3.15 below.

Finally, we state some results for APT matrices.

Lemma 2.12. Let $M = \begin{bmatrix} A & X \\ Y^* & B \end{bmatrix}$ be APT with $A, B \in \Gamma_n^+$, $X, Y \in \mathcal{M}_n$.

(i) [56, Theorem 3.5] If $M \in \Pi_{2n, \alpha}$ for some $\alpha \in [0, \pi/2)$, then $\|M\|_u \leq \sec(\alpha)\|A+B\|_u$.

(ii) [39] The block matrix $\begin{bmatrix} A\sharp B & X \\ Y^* & A\sharp B \end{bmatrix}$ is also APT.

3. MAIN RESULTS

In this section, we present our results, where we extend some of the known properties and inequalities in the PPT case to the APT case.

We point out that upon letting $\alpha = 0$, all stated results for APT matrices below reduce to known scenarios for PPT matrices.

Before proceeding, we state and prove the following version of Lemma 2.1 for accretive blocks. The motivation of this result is the observation that $A \geq XB^{-1}X^*$ is equivalent to $A - XB^{-1}X^* \geq O$. We point out that the first assertion of this theorem was shown in [18].

Theorem 3.1. Let $A, B \in \Gamma_n^+$, $X \in \mathcal{M}_n$. If $M = \begin{bmatrix} A & X \\ X^* & B \end{bmatrix} \in \Gamma_n$, then $A - XB^{-1}X^* \in \Gamma_n$. On the other hand, if $B \in \Pi_{n, \alpha}$ for some $\alpha \in [0, \pi/2)$, is such that $A - XB^{-1}X^* \in \Gamma_n$, then $\begin{bmatrix} A & \cos \alpha X \\ \cos \alpha X^* & B \end{bmatrix} \in \Gamma_n$.

Proof. If $M \in \Gamma_n$, then $\Re(M) \geq O$. Since $\Re(M) = \begin{bmatrix} \Re(A) & X \\ X^* & \Re(B) \end{bmatrix}$, Lemma 2.1 implies that $\Re(A) \geq X(\Re(B))^{-1}X^*$. But it is well known that when $B \in \Gamma_n^+$, then $(\Re(B))^{-1} \geq \Re(B^{-1})$; see Lemma 2.4. Consequently, $\Re(A) \geq X(\Re(B))^{-1}X^* \geq X\Re(B^{-1})X^* = \Re(XB^{-1}X^*)$, which ensures that $\Re(A - XB^{-1}X^*) \geq O$. This is equivalent to saying that $A - XB^{-1}X^* \in \Gamma_n$.

On the other hand, assume that $A - XB^{-1}X^* \in \Gamma_n$. This means that $\Re(A - XB^{-1}X^*) \geq O$, or $\Re(A) - X\Re(B^{-1})X^* \geq O$. But we know that $\Re(B^{-1}) \geq \cos^2 \alpha (\Re(B))^{-1}$ from Lemma

2.4. Therefore, we have $\Re(A) - \cos^2 \alpha X (\Re(B))^{-1} X^* \geq O$, which is equivalent to saying that $\begin{bmatrix} \Re(A) & \cos \alpha X \\ \cos \alpha X^* & \Re(B) \end{bmatrix} \geq O$. This last statement ensures that $\begin{bmatrix} A & \cos \alpha X \\ \cos \alpha X^* & B \end{bmatrix} \in \Gamma_n$. \square

Notice that since $A - (A^{-1})^{-1} \geq O$ for any invertible $A \in M_n$, then by Theorem 3.1, we have the following

Corollary 3.2. *Let $A \in \Gamma_n^+$. Then $\begin{bmatrix} A & \cos(\alpha)I \\ \cos(\alpha)I & A^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \in \Gamma_n$.*

Remark 3.3. *If $A \in M_n$ is positive definite ($\alpha = 0$), then $\begin{bmatrix} A & I \\ I & A^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \geq O$, which is a well-known fact [10, page15]. On the other hand, since $\Re(A) \leq (\Re(A^{-1}))^{-1}$ for any strictly accretive $A \in M_n$, the block matrix $\begin{bmatrix} A & I \\ I & A^{-1} \end{bmatrix}$ is never accretive for any strictly accretive non-Hermitian matrix A .*

The following theorem extends part (ii) of Lemma 2.12.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $A, B \in \Gamma_n^+$, $X, Y \in \mathcal{M}_n$. Then $M = \begin{bmatrix} A & X \\ Y^* & B \end{bmatrix}$ is APT if and only if $\begin{bmatrix} A \#_t B & X \\ Y^* & A \#_{1-t} B \end{bmatrix}$ is APT for all $t \in [0, 1]$.*

Proof. Assume first that $M = \begin{bmatrix} A & X \\ Y^* & B \end{bmatrix}$ is APT, and set $Z = \frac{X+Y}{2}$. Since M is APT, then $\begin{bmatrix} A & X \\ Y^* & B \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} A & Y^* \\ X & B \end{bmatrix} \in \Gamma_{2n}$. Conjugating these two accretive matrices with $\begin{bmatrix} O & I \\ I & O \end{bmatrix}$ implies that $\begin{bmatrix} B & Y^* \\ X & A \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} B & X \\ Y^* & A \end{bmatrix} \in \Gamma_{2n}$.

Now,

$$\begin{bmatrix} A & X \\ Y^* & B \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} B & X \\ Y^* & A \end{bmatrix} \in \Gamma_{2n} \Rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \Re(A) & Z \\ Z^* & \Re(B) \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \Re(B) & Z \\ Z^* & \Re(A) \end{bmatrix} \geq O.$$

Applying Lemma 2.1, we obtain

$$(3.1) \quad Z \Re(B)^{-1} Z^* \leq \Re(A) \quad \text{and} \quad Z \Re(A)^{-1} Z^* \leq \Re(B).$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{bmatrix} A & Y^* \\ X & B \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} B & Y^* \\ X & A \end{bmatrix} \in \Gamma_{2n} \Rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \Re(A) & Z^* \\ Z & \Re(B) \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \Re(B) & Z^* \\ Z & \Re(A) \end{bmatrix} \geq O.$$

Lemma 2.1 again implies

$$(3.2) \quad Z^* \Re(B)^{-1} Z \leq \Re(A) \quad \text{and} \quad Z^* \Re(A)^{-1} Z \leq \Re(B).$$

But for any $t \in [0, 1]$, Lemma 2.5 implies

$$\Re(A\sharp_{1-t}B) \geq \Re(A)\sharp_{1-t}\Re(B).$$

Since both $\Re(A), \Re(B) > O$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} Z\left(\Re(A\sharp_{1-t}B)\right)^{-1}Z^* &\leq Z\left(\Re(A)\sharp_{1-t}\Re(B)\right)^{-1}Z^* \\ &= Z\left(\Re(A)^{-1}\sharp_{1-t}\Re(B)^{-1}\right)Z^* \\ &= Z\left(\Re(B)^{-1}\sharp_t\Re(A)^{-1}\right)Z^* \\ &\leq \left(Z\Re(B)^{-1}Z^*\sharp_t Z\Re(A)^{-1}Z^*\right) \quad (\text{by (2.3)}) \\ &\leq \Re(A)\sharp_t\Re(B) \quad (\text{by (3.1) and Lemma 2.3}) \\ &\leq \Re(A\sharp_tB) \quad (\text{by Lemma 2.5}). \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 2.1, this is equivalent to $\begin{bmatrix} \Re(A\sharp_tB) & Z \\ Z^* & \Re(A\sharp_{1-t}B) \end{bmatrix} \geq O$.

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} Z^*\left(\Re(A\sharp_{1-t}B)\right)^{-1}Z &\leq Z^*\left(\Re(A)\sharp_{1-t}\Re(B)\right)^{-1}Z \\ &= Z^*\left(\Re(A)^{-1}\sharp_{1-t}\Re(B)^{-1}\right)Z \\ &= Z^*\left(\Re(B)^{-1}\sharp_t\Re(A)^{-1}\right)Z \\ &\leq \left(Z^*\Re(B)^{-1}Z\sharp_t Z^*\Re(A)^{-1}Z\right) \\ &\leq \Re(A)\sharp_t\Re(B) \quad \text{by (3.2)} \\ &\leq \Re(A\sharp_tB), \end{aligned}$$

which is equivalent to saying $\begin{bmatrix} \Re(A\sharp_tB) & Z^* \\ Z & \Re(A\sharp_{1-t}B) \end{bmatrix} \geq O$. Thus, we have shown that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Re(A\sharp_tB) & Z \\ Z^* & \Re(A\sharp_{1-t}B) \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \Re(A\sharp_tB) & Z^* \\ Z & \Re(A\sharp_{1-t}B) \end{bmatrix} \geq O,$$

which means that $\begin{bmatrix} A\sharp_tB & X \\ Y^* & A\sharp_{1-t}B \end{bmatrix}$ and $\begin{bmatrix} A\sharp_tB & Y^* \\ X & A\sharp_{1-t}B \end{bmatrix}$ are accretive, and hence $\begin{bmatrix} A\sharp_tB & X \\ Y^* & A\sharp_{1-t}B \end{bmatrix}$ is APT for any $t \in [0, 1]$. This completes the sufficiency part of the theorem.

For the necessity part, assume that $\begin{bmatrix} A\sharp_tB & X \\ Y^* & A\sharp_{1-t}B \end{bmatrix}$ is APT for all $t \in [0, 1]$. Then by letting $t = 0$, we reach the desired conclusion because $A\sharp_0B = A$ and $A\sharp_1B = B$. \square

Notice that if $M = \begin{bmatrix} A & X \\ X^* & B \end{bmatrix}$ is accretive, then $\Re(M) = \begin{bmatrix} \Re(A) & X \\ X^* & \Re(B) \end{bmatrix} \geq O$. Hence, by part (iii) of Lemma 2.2,

$$2s_j(X) \leq s_j(\Re(M)).$$

Since, $\lambda_j(\Re(A)) \leq s_j(A)$ for any matrix A , one may apply Lemma 2.12 to obtain the following extension of part (iii) of Lemma 2.2 and of Lemma 2.6.

Proposition 3.5. *Let $A, B, X \in \mathcal{M}_n$ be such that $M = \begin{bmatrix} A & X \\ X^* & B \end{bmatrix} \in \Gamma_{2n}$. Then*

$$2s_j(X) \leq s_j(M), \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Moreover, if M is APT and $M \in \Pi_{2n, \alpha}$ for some $\alpha \in [0, \pi/2)$, then

$$(3.3) \quad 2\|X\|_u \leq \sec(\alpha)\|A + B\|_u$$

Remark 3.6. *It is worth mentioning here that part (iii) of Lemma 2.2 is equivalent to the following well-known fact*

$$s_j(A - B) \leq s_j(A \oplus B), \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

when $A, B \geq O$. Here the direct sum $A \oplus B$ denotes the block diagonal matrix $\begin{bmatrix} A & O \\ O & B \end{bmatrix}$.

This is no longer true in the accretive case. To see this let

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 2 + 2i & -1 + 2i \\ 3 + 2i & 1 + i \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 + 2i & -2 - i \\ -2 - i & 5 + i \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then it can be seen that both $A, B \in \Gamma_n^+$, and

$$s(A - B) = \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}(5\sqrt{97} + 61)}, \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}(61 - 5\sqrt{97})} \right\} \approx \{7.42443, 2.42443\},$$

and

$$s(A \oplus B) = \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}(3\sqrt{165} + 41)}, \sqrt{7(\sqrt{3} + 2)}, \sqrt{7(2 - \sqrt{3})}, \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}(41 - 3\sqrt{165})} \right\} \\ \approx \{6.30618, 5.1112, 1.36954, 1.11002\}.$$

That is, in this example, $s_1(A - B) > s_1(A \oplus B)$.

Applying Proposition 3.5, together with Theorem 3.4, implies the following.

Corollary 3.7. *Let $A, B \in \Gamma_n^+$, $X \in \mathcal{M}_n$ be such that $M = \begin{bmatrix} A & X \\ X^* & B \end{bmatrix}$ is APT with $M \in \Pi_{2n, \alpha}$ for some $\alpha \in [0, \pi/2)$. Then, for any $t \in [0, 1]$,*

$$(3.4) \quad \|X\|_u \leq \frac{\sec(\alpha)}{2} \|A\sharp_t B + A\sharp_{1-t} B\|_u.$$

Corollary 3.8. *Let $A, B \in \Gamma_n^+$, $X, Y \in \mathcal{M}_n$ be such that $M = \begin{bmatrix} A & X \\ Y^* & B \end{bmatrix}$ is APT. Then*

$$\left| \frac{X+Y}{2} \right| \leq \Re(A \#_t (V^* B V)) \# \Re(A \#_{1-t} (V^* B V)),$$

and

$$\left| \frac{X^* + Y^*}{2} \right| \leq \Re((V A V^*) \#_t B) \# \Re((V A V^*) \#_{1-t} B),$$

where V is the unitary matrix in the polar decomposition $\frac{X+Y}{2} = V \left| \frac{X+Y}{2} \right|$.

Proof. Since M is APT, then $\Re(M) = \begin{bmatrix} \Re(A) & \frac{X+Y}{2} \\ \frac{X^*+Y^*}{2} & \Re(B) \end{bmatrix}$ is PPT. Hence, by Lemma 2.8,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{X+Y}{2} \right| &\leq \left(\Re(A) \#_t (V^* \Re(B) V) \right) \# \left(\Re(A) \#_{1-t} (V^* \Re(B) V) \right) \\ &= \left(\Re(A) \#_t \Re(V^* B V) \right) \# \left(\Re(A) \#_{1-t} \Re(V^* B V) \right) \\ &\leq \Re(A \#_t (V^* B V)) \# \Re(A \#_{1-t} (V^* B V)), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Lemma 2.5 and part (iii) of Lemma 2.3 to obtain the last inequality. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{X^* + Y^*}{2} \right| &\leq \left((V \Re(A) V^*) \#_t \Re(B) \right) \# \left((V \Re(A) V^*) \#_{1-t} \Re(B) \right) \\ &= \left(\Re(V A V^*) \#_t \Re(B) \right) \# \left(\Re(V A V^*) \#_{1-t} \Re(B) \right) \\ &\leq \Re((V A V^*) \#_t B) \# \Re((V A V^*) \#_{1-t} B), \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

Corollary 3.9. *Let $A, B \in \Gamma_n^+$, $X, Y \in \mathcal{M}_n$ be such that $M = \begin{bmatrix} A & X \\ Y^* & B \end{bmatrix}$ is APT. Then*

$$\left| \frac{X+Y}{2} \right| \leq \frac{\Re(A \#_t B + V^* (A \#_{1-t} B) V)}{2},$$

and

$$\left| \frac{X^* + Y^*}{2} \right| \leq \frac{\Re(V (A \#_t B) V^* + (A \#_{1-t} B))}{2},$$

where V is the unitary matrix in the polar decomposition $\frac{X+Y}{2} = V \left| \frac{X+Y}{2} \right|$.

Proof. Since M is APT, then $\Re(M) = \begin{bmatrix} \Re(A) & \frac{X+Y}{2} \\ \frac{X^*+Y^*}{2} & \Re(B) \end{bmatrix}$ is PPT. Hence, by Lemma 2.8,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{X+Y}{2} \right| &\leq \left(\Re(A) \#_t \Re(B) \right) \# \left(V^* (\Re(A) \#_{1-t} \Re(B)) V \right) \\ &\leq \Re(A \#_t B) \# \left(V^* \Re(A \#_{1-t} B) V \right) \\ &= \Re(A \#_t B) \# \Re \left(V^* (A \#_{1-t} B) V \right) \\ &\leq \frac{\Re(A \#_t B) + \Re \left(V^* (A \#_{1-t} B) V \right)}{2} \\ &= \frac{\Re \left((A \#_t B) + V^* (A \#_{1-t} B) V \right)}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Lemma 2.5, part (iii) of Lemma 2.3 and the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality to obtain the last two inequalities. In a similar fashion,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{X^*+Y^*}{2} \right| &\leq \left(V (\Re(A) \#_t \Re(B)) V^* \right) \# \left(\Re(A) \#_{1-t} \Re(B) \right) \\ &\leq \left(V \Re(A \#_t B) V^* \right) \# \Re(A \#_{1-t} B) \\ &= \Re \left(V (A \#_t B) V^* \right) \# \Re(A \#_{1-t} B) \\ &\leq \frac{\Re \left(V (A \#_t B) V^* \right) + \Re(A \#_{1-t} B)}{2} \\ &= \frac{\Re \left(V (A \#_t B) V^* + (A \#_{1-t} B) \right)}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

completing the proof. □

By applying the same argument used in the proof of Corollary 3.9 and Weyl's monotonicity principle, we obtain the following result.

Corollary 3.10. *Let $A, B \in \Gamma_n^+$, $X, Y \in \mathcal{M}_n$ be such that $M = \begin{bmatrix} A & X \\ Y^* & B \end{bmatrix}$ is APT. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} s_j \left(\frac{X+Y}{2} \right) &\leq s_j \left((\Re(A) \#_t \Re(B)) \# (V^* (\Re(A) \#_{1-t} \Re(B)) V) \right) \\ &\leq s_j \left(\Re(A \#_t B) \# (V^* (\Re(A \#_{1-t} B) V)) \right) \\ &\leq s_j \left(\frac{\Re(A \#_t B) + \Re(A \#_{1-t} B) V}{2} \right) \\ &\leq s_j \left(\frac{A \#_t B + V^* (A \#_{1-t} B) V}{2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Extending Lemma 2.9 to the APT case, we have the following.

Corollary 3.11. *Let $A, B \in \Gamma_n^+, X \in \mathcal{M}_n$ be such that $M = \begin{bmatrix} A & X \\ X^* & B \end{bmatrix}$ is APT. Then, for any $t \in [0, 1]$,*

$$\lambda_j\left(2|X| - \Re(A\sharp_t B)\right) \leq \lambda_j\left(\Re(A\sharp_{1-t} B)\right) \leq s_j(A\sharp_{1-t} B), j = 1, \dots, n.$$

Proof. By Corollary 3.9, we have

$$2|X| \leq \Re(A\sharp_t B) + V^* \Re(A\sharp_{1-t} B) V,$$

so that

$$2|X| - \Re(A\sharp_t B) \leq V^* \Re(A\sharp_{1-t} B) V.$$

Thus, by Weyl's monotonicity principle,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_j\left(2|X| - \Re(A\sharp_t B)\right) &\leq \lambda_j\left(V^* \Re(A\sharp_{1-t} B) V\right) \\ &= \lambda_j\left(\Re(A\sharp_{1-t} B)\right) \\ &\leq s_j(A\sharp_{1-t} B). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

An interesting version of Corollary 3.7 is stated next.

Corollary 3.12. *Let $A, B \in \Gamma_n^+, X \in \mathcal{M}_n$ be such that $M = \begin{bmatrix} A & X \\ X^* & B \end{bmatrix}$ is APT. Then, for any $t \in [0, 1]$,*

$$\|X\|_u \leq \frac{1}{2} \|(A\sharp_t B) + V^* (A\sharp_{1-t} B) V\|_u,$$

where V is the unitary matrix in the polar decomposition $X = V|X|$.

Proof. Notice that, by Corollary 3.9,

$$\begin{aligned} 2s_j\left(\frac{X+Y}{2}\right) &= 2\lambda_j\left(\left|\frac{X+Y}{2}\right|\right) \\ &\leq 2\lambda_j\left(\Re(A\sharp_t B) \sharp \Re(V^* (A\sharp_{1-t} B) V)\right) \\ &\leq \lambda_j\left(\Re\left((A\sharp_t B) + V^* (A\sharp_{1-t} B) V\right)\right) \\ &\leq s_j\left(A\sharp_t B + V^* (A\sharp_{1-t} B) V\right). \end{aligned}$$

Letting $Y = X$ completes the proof. □

Now we have the following extension of Lemma 2.10 to the APT case.

Theorem 3.13. *Let $A, B \in \Gamma_n^+, X \in \mathcal{M}_n$ be such that $M = \begin{bmatrix} A & X \\ X^* & B \end{bmatrix}$ is APT. Then*

$\begin{bmatrix} A\sigma^* B & X \\ X^* & B\sigma A \end{bmatrix}$ *is APT, for any matrix mean σ .*

Proof. Since $M = \begin{bmatrix} A & X \\ X^* & B \end{bmatrix}$ is APT, it follows that $\begin{bmatrix} \Re(A) & X \\ X^* & \Re(B) \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \Re(A) & X^* \\ X & \Re(B) \end{bmatrix} \geq O$. Applying Lemma 2.1 on these two block forms implies that

$$(3.5) \quad X\Re(B)^{-1}X^* \leq \Re(A), X\Re(A)^{-1}X^* \leq \Re(B).$$

$\begin{bmatrix} A\sigma^*B & X \\ X^* & B\sigma A \end{bmatrix}$ is accretive if $\begin{bmatrix} \Re(A\sigma^*B) & X \\ X^* & \Re(B\sigma A) \end{bmatrix} \geq O$. But

$$\begin{aligned} X\left(\Re(B\sigma A)\right)^{-1}X^* &\leq X\left(\Re(B)\sigma\Re(A)\right)^{-1}X^* \quad (\text{by Lemma 2.5}) \\ &= X\left(\Re(B)^{-1}\sigma^*\Re(A)^{-1}\right)X^* \\ &\leq \left(X\Re(B)^{-1}X^*\right)\sigma^*\left(X\Re(A)^{-1}X^*\right) \quad (\text{by (2.3)}) \\ &\leq \Re(A)\sigma^*\Re(B) \quad (\text{by (3.5)}) \\ &\leq \Re(A\sigma^*B) \quad (\text{by Lemma 2.5}). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.1 then implies that $\begin{bmatrix} \Re(A\sigma^*B) & X \\ X^* & \Re(B\sigma A) \end{bmatrix} \geq O$, and hence $\begin{bmatrix} A\sigma^*B & X \\ X^* & B\sigma A \end{bmatrix}$ is accretive. Similarly, one can show that $\begin{bmatrix} A\sigma^*B & X^* \\ X & B\sigma A \end{bmatrix}$ is accretive, which means that $\begin{bmatrix} A\sigma^*B & X \\ X^* & B\sigma A \end{bmatrix}$ is APT.. □

The following lemma is needed to complete the proof of the next main result, which discusses a sufficient condition that $\begin{bmatrix} f(A)\nabla_t f(B) & X \\ X^* & f(A\nabla_t B) \end{bmatrix}$ is APT.

Lemma 3.14. *Let $A, B, X \in \mathcal{M}_n$ be such that $A, B \in \Pi_{n,\alpha}^+$ for some $\alpha \in [0, \pi/2)$, and let $f \in \mathfrak{m}$ be such that $\begin{bmatrix} \cos^2(\alpha)f(A) & X \\ X^* & \cos^2(\alpha)f(B) \end{bmatrix}$ is APT. Then $\begin{bmatrix} f(\Re(A)) & X \\ X^* & f(\Re(B)) \end{bmatrix}$ is PPT.*

Proof. Since the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} \cos^2(\alpha)f(A) & X \\ X^* & \cos^2(\alpha)f(B) \end{bmatrix}$ is APT, it follows that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \cos^2(\alpha)\Re(f(A)) & X \\ X^* & \cos^2(\alpha)\Re(f(B)) \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \cos^2(\alpha)\Re(f(A)) & X^* \\ X & \cos^2(\alpha)\Re(f(B)) \end{bmatrix} \geq O.$$

Applying Lemma 2.1 on these two block forms implies that

$$(3.6) \quad X(\cos^2(\alpha)\Re(f(B)))^{-1}X^* \leq \cos^2(\alpha)\Re(f(A))$$

and

$$(3.7) \quad X^*(\cos^2(\alpha)\Re(f(B)))^{-1}X \leq \cos^2(\alpha)\Re(f(A))$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} X\left(f(\Re(B))\right)^{-1}X^* &\leq X\left(\cos^2(\alpha)\Re(f(B))\right)^{-1}X^* \quad (\text{by Lemma 2.4}) \\ &\leq \cos^2(\alpha)\Re(f(A)) \quad (\text{by (3.6)}) \\ &\leq f(\Re(A)) \quad (\text{by Lemma 2.4}). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} X^*\left(f(\Re(B))\right)^{-1}X &\leq X^*\left(\cos^2(\alpha)\Re(f(B))\right)^{-1}X \quad (\text{by Theorem 2.4}) \\ &\leq \cos^2(\alpha)\Re(f(A)) \quad (\text{by (3.7)}) \\ &\leq f(\Re(A)) \quad (\text{by Lemma 2.4}). \end{aligned}$$

That is, $\begin{bmatrix} f(\Re(A)) & X \\ X^* & f(\Re(B)) \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} f(\Re(A)) & X^* \\ X & f(\Re(B)) \end{bmatrix} \geq O$. This implies the desired conclusion. \square

Theorem 3.15. *Let $A, B, X \in \mathcal{M}_n$ be such that $A, B \in \Pi_{n,\alpha}^+$ for some $\alpha \in [0, \pi/2)$, and let $f \in \mathbf{m}$ be such that $\begin{bmatrix} \cos^2(\alpha)f(A) & X \\ X^* & \cos^2(\alpha)f(B) \end{bmatrix}$ is APT. Then $\begin{bmatrix} f(A)\nabla_t f(B) & X \\ X^* & f(A\nabla_t B) \end{bmatrix}$ is APT for any $0 \leq t \leq 1$.*

Proof. Since the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} \cos^2(\alpha)f(A) & X \\ X^* & \cos^2(\alpha)f(B) \end{bmatrix}$ is APT, Lemma 3.14 implies that the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} f(\Re(A)) & X \\ X^* & f(\Re(B)) \end{bmatrix}$ is PPT. Consequently, by Lemma 2.11, the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} f(\Re(A))\nabla_t f(\Re(B)) & X \\ X^* & f(\Re(A\nabla_t B)) \end{bmatrix}$ is PPT for any $t \in [0, 1]$, which implies

$$(3.8) \quad X\left(f(\Re(A)\nabla_t \Re(B))\right)^{-1}X^* \leq f(\Re(A))\nabla_t f(\Re(B)).$$

Now, $\begin{bmatrix} f(A)\nabla_t f(B) & X \\ X^* & f(A\nabla_t B) \end{bmatrix}$ is APT if $\begin{bmatrix} \Re(f(A)\nabla_t f(B)) & X \\ X^* & \Re(f(A\nabla_t B)) \end{bmatrix}$ is PPT. But,

$$\begin{aligned} X\left(\Re(f(A\nabla_t B))\right)^{-1}X^* &\leq X\left(f(\Re(A\nabla_t B))\right)^{-1}X^* \quad (\text{by Lemma 2.4}) \\ &= X\left(f\left(\Re(A)\nabla_t \Re(B)\right)\right)^{-1}X^* \\ &\leq f(\Re(A))\nabla_t f(\Re(B)) \quad (\text{by (3.8)}) \\ &\leq \Re(f(A))\nabla_t \Re(f(B)) \quad (\text{by Lemma 2.4}) \\ &= \Re(f(A)\nabla_t f(B)). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, one can show that

$$X^*\left(\Re(f(A\nabla_t B))\right)^{-1}X \leq \Re(f(A)\nabla_t f(B)),$$

which completes the proof. \square

Let $A, B, X \in \mathcal{M}_n$. If $A, B > O$, and $\|X\| \leq \|A\sharp B\|$, we say that Schwarz inequality holds for the triple (A, B, X) , in order.

In [3], Ando established certain conditions on the matrices $A, B, X \in \mathcal{M}_n$ under which the positivity of the block matrix $M = \begin{bmatrix} A & X \\ X^* & B \end{bmatrix}$ ensures that Schwarz inequality holds for (A, B, X) , as follows.

Lemma 3.16. [3, Theorem 3.6] *Let $A, B, X \in \mathcal{M}_n$ be such that $A, B > O$ and that $M = \begin{bmatrix} A & X \\ X^* & B \end{bmatrix} \geq O$. Then Schwarz inequality holds for (A, B, X) if any of the following conditions holds:*

1. $AX = XA$.
2. $X^*A^{-1}X = XA^{-1}X^*$.
3. $\exists k > 0 : B = kA$.

In Theorem 3.17 we extend Theorem 3.16 to the accretive case.

Theorem 3.17. *Let $A, B, X \in \mathcal{M}_n$ be such that A is normal. Assume further that $M = \begin{bmatrix} A & X \\ X^* & B \end{bmatrix}$ is accretive, with $A, B \in \Gamma_n^+$. Then $\|X\| \leq \|A\sharp B\|$ if one of the following conditions holds:*

1. $AX = XA$.
2. $X^*A^{-1}X = XA^{-1}X^*$.
3. $\exists k > 0 : B = kA$.

Proof. Assume first that $AX = XA$. Then, as a consequence of Fuglede-Putnam Theorem [19, 44], we infer that $A^*X = XA^*$. Adding these two relations for A and X implies $\Re(A)X = X\Re(A)$. Now, since M is accretive, then $\Re(M) = \begin{bmatrix} \Re(A) & X \\ X^* & \Re(B) \end{bmatrix} \geq O$.

Consequently, by Lemma 3.16, then Lemma 2.5,

$$\|X\| \leq \|\Re(A)\sharp\Re(B)\| \leq \|\Re(A\sharp B)\| \leq \|A\sharp B\|.$$

Similarly, if $X^*A^{-1}X = XA^{-1}X^*$, then $X^*(\Re(A))^{-1}X = X(\Re(A))^{-1}X^*$.

Now, since M is accretive, then $\Re(M) = \begin{bmatrix} \Re(A) & X \\ X^* & \Re(B) \end{bmatrix} \geq O$. Proceeding as before proves the desired conclusion when $X^*A^{-1}X = XA^{-1}X^*$.

Finally, if $B = kA$ for some $k > 0$, then $\Re(B) = k\Re(A)$, and the same argument as above completes the proof. \square

The following two lemmas are needed for our last result.

Lemma 3.18. [14, Theorem 3.1] *Let $A, B, X \in \mathcal{M}_n$ be such that $AX = XA$ and $M = \begin{bmatrix} A & X \\ X^* & B \end{bmatrix} \geq O$. Then*

$$s_j(X) \leq s_j\left(A^{1/2} B^{1/2}\right) \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Lemma 3.19. [12] *Let $A, B \in M_n$ be positive semi-definite. Then*

$$s_j\left(A^{1/2} B^{1/2}\right) \leq s_j\left(\frac{A+B}{2}\right) \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Theorem 3.20. *Let $A, B, X \in \mathcal{M}_n$ be such that $M = \begin{bmatrix} A & X \\ X^* & B \end{bmatrix} \in \Gamma_n$ and $AX = XA$.*

Then

$$\|X\|_u \leq \frac{1}{2}\|A+B\|_u.$$

Proof. Since M is accretive, then $\Re(M) = \begin{bmatrix} \Re(A) & X \\ X^* & \Re(B) \end{bmatrix} \geq O$, and since $AX = XA$, then $\Re(A)X = X\Re(A)$. Consequently, by Lemma 3.18, then Lemma 3.19, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} s_j(X) &\leq s_j\left((\Re(A))^{1/2} (\Re(B))^{1/2}\right) \\ &\leq s_j\left(\Re\left(\frac{A+B}{2}\right)\right) \\ &\leq s_j\left(\frac{A+B}{2}\right) \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \dots, n. \end{aligned}$$

Equivalently, $\|X\|_u \leq \frac{1}{2}\|A+B\|_u$. □

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Alakhrass. A note on positive partial transpose blocks. *AIMS Math.*, 8(10):23747–23755, 2023.
- [2] M. Alakhrass. Singular value inequalities related to PPT blocks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10461*, 2023.
- [3] T. Ando. Geometric mean and norm Schwarz inequality. *Ann. Funct. Anal.*, 7(1):1–8, 2016.
- [4] Y. Arlinskii. On sectorial block operator matrices. *Журнал математической физики, анализа, геометрии*, 9(4):533–571, 2002.
- [5] C. Ballantine. Numerical range of a matrix: some effective criteria. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 19(2):117–188, 1978.
- [6] N. Bebiano, R. Lemos, and G. Soares. On the numerical range of kac-sylvester matrices. *Electron. J. of Linear Algebra*, 39:242–259, 2023.
- [7] Y. Bedrani, F. Kittaneh, and M. Sababheh. From positive to accretive matrices. *Positivity*, 25(4):1601–1629, 2021.
- [8] Y. Bedrani, F. Kittaneh, and M. Sababheh. Numerical radii of accretive matrices. *Linear Multilinear Algebra*, 69(5):957–970, 2021.
- [9] Y. Bedrani, F. Kittaneh, and M. Sababheh. On the weighted geometric mean of accretive matrices. *Ann. Funct. Anal.*, 12:1–16, 2021.
- [10] R. Bhatia. *Positive definite matrices*. Princeton university press, 2009.
- [11] R. Bhatia. *Matrix analysis*, volume 169. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [12] R. Bhatia and F. Kittaneh. On the singular values of a product of operators. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 11(2):272–277, 1990.
- [13] J.C. Bourin, E.Y. Lee, and M. Lin. Positive matrices partitioned into a small number of hermitian blocks. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 438(5):2591–2598, 2013.
- [14] A. Burqan and F. Kittaneh. Singular value and norm inequalities associated with 2 x 2 positive semidefinite block matrices. *Electron. J. Linear Algebra*, 32:116–124, 2017.

- [15] M.T. Chien, L. Yeh, Y.T. Yeh, and F.Z. Lin. On geometric properties of the numerical range. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 274(1-3):389–410, 1998.
- [16] C. Davis. The Toeplitz-Hausdorff theorem explained. *Can. Math. Bull.*, 14(2):245–246, 1971.
- [17] S. Drury. Principal powers of matrices with positive definite real part. *Linear Multilinear Algebra*, 63(2):296–301, 2015.
- [18] S. Drury and M. Lin. Singular value inequalities for matrices with numerical ranges in a sector. *Oper. Matrices*, (4):1143–1148, 2014.
- [19] B. Fuglede. A commutativity theorem for normal operators. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, 36(1):35–40, 1950.
- [20] S. Furuichi, H. R. Moradi, and M. Sababbeh. Further properties of accretive matrices. *Ann. Fenn. Math.*, 49(1):387–404, 2024.
- [21] H. L. Gau and P. Y. Wu. Numerical ranges of nilpotent operators. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 429(4):716–726, 2008.
- [22] M. B. Ghaemi, N. Gharakhanlu, T. M. Rassias, and R. Saadati. *Advances in matrix inequalities*. Springer, 2021.
- [23] I. Gumus, H. R. Moradi, and M. Sababbeh. On positive and positive partial transpose matrices. *Electron. J. Linear Algebra*, 38:792–802, 2022.
- [24] T. Hiroshima. Majorization criterion for distillability of a bipartite quantum state. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 91(5):057902, 2003.
- [25] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki. On the necessary and sufficient conditions for separability of mixed quantum states. *Phys. Lett. A*, 223(1), 1996.
- [26] H. Huang. Refining some inequalities on 2×2 block accretive matrices. *Oper. Matrices*, 16(1), 2022.
- [27] Z. Huang. Singular value inequalities on 2×2 block accretive partial transpose matrices. *ScienceAsia*, 49(6):827–829, 2023.
- [28] C. R. Johnson. *Matrices whose Hermitian part is positive definite*. PhD thesis, California Institute of Technology, 1972.
- [29] Tosio Kato. Fractional powers of dissipative operators. *JMSJ*, 13(3):246–274, 1961.
- [30] D. S. Keeler, L. Rodman, and I. M. Spitkovsky. The numerical range of 3×3 matrices. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 252(1-3):115–139, 1997.
- [31] L. Kuai. An extension of the fiedler-markham determinant inequality. *Linear Multilinear Algebra*, 66(3):547–553, 2018.
- [32] F. Kubo and T. Ando. Means of positive linear operators. *Math. Ann.*, 246:205–224, 1980.
- [33] E.Y. Lee. The off-diagonal block of a PPT matrix. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 486:449–453, 2015.
- [34] Y. Li, X. Lin, and L. Feng. Partial determinant inequalities for positive semidefinite block matrices. *J. Math. Inequal.*, 15(4):1435–1445, 2021.
- [35] M. Lin. Extension of a result of Haynsworth and Hartfiel. *Arch. Math.*, 104:93–100, 2015.
- [36] M. Lin. Inequalities related to 2×2 block PPT matrices. *Oper. Matrices*, 9(4):917–924, 2015.
- [37] M. Lin. Some inequalities for sector matrices. *Oper. Matrices*, (4):915–921, 2016.
- [38] M. Lin and H. Wolkowicz. Hiroshima’s theorem and matrix norm inequalities. *Acta Sci. Math.*, 81:45–53, 2015.
- [39] J. Liu, J.J. Mei, and D. Zhang. Inequalities related to the geometric mean of accretive matrices. *Oper. Matrices*, 15(2):581–587, 2021.
- [40] Leila Nasiri and Shigeru Furuichi. New inequalities for sector matrices applying Garg–Aujla inequalities. *Advances in Operator Theory*, 7(2):16, 2022.
- [41] W. Parker. Characteristic roots and field of values of a matrix. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 57(2):103–108, 1951.
- [42] A. Peres. Separability criterion for density matrices. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 77(8):1413, 1996.
- [43] W. Pusz and S. Woronowicz. Functional calculus for sesquilinear forms and the purification map. *Rep. Math. Phys.*, 8(2):159–170, 1975.

- [44] C. Putnam. On normal operators in Hilbert space. *Am. J. Math.*, 73(2):357–362, 1951.
- [45] M. Raïssouli, M. Sal Moslehian, and S. Furuichi. Relative entropy and Tsallis entropy of two accretive operators. *C. R. Math.*, 355(6):687–693, 2017.
- [46] M. Sababheh, C. Conde, and H.R. Moradi. On the matrix Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. *Oper. Matrices*, 17(2), 2023.
- [47] M. Sababheh, I. Gumus, and H. R. Moradi. Further properties of PPT and (α, β) -normal matrices. *Oper. Matrices*, 18(1):257–271, 2024.
- [48] M. Sababheh, I. Gümüş, and H. R. Moradi. Operator inequalities via accretive transforms. *Hacet. J. Math. Stat.*, 53(1):40–52, 2024.
- [49] M. Sababheh and H.R. Moradi. New orders among Hilbert space operators. *Math. Inequal. Appl.*, 26(2), 2023.
- [50] B. Southworth and S. Olivier. A note on 2×2 block-diagonal preconditioning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.00711*, 2020.
- [51] F. Tan and A. Xie. An extension of the AM–GM–HM inequality. *Bull. Iran. Math. Soc.*, 46:245–251, 2020.
- [52] Y. Tao. More results on singular value inequalities of matrices. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 416(2-3):724–729, 2006.
- [53] Chaojun Yang. Some singular value inequalities for sector matrices involving operator concave functions. *J. Math.*, 2022(1):4535343, 2022.
- [54] J. Yang. Inequalities on 2×2 block accretive matrices. *Oper. Matrices*, 16:323–328, 2022.
- [55] P. Zachlin and M. Hochstenbach. On the numerical range of a matrix: By Rudolf Kippenhahn (1951 in Bomberg). *Linear Multilinear Algebra*, 56(1-2):185–225, 2008.
- [56] F. Zhang. A matrix decomposition and its applications. *Linear Multilinear Algebra*, 63(10):2033–2042, 2015.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF JORDAN, AMMAN 11942, JORDAN

Email address: e_aldabbas@ju.edu.jo; aldabbas@ualberta.ca

DEPARTMENT OF BASIC SCIENCES, PRINCESS SUMAYA UNIVERSITY FOR TECHNOLOGY, AMMAN 11941, JORDAN

Email address: sababheh@psut.edu.jo; sababheh@yahoo.com