

ON REVERSES OF THE GOLDEN-THOMPSON TYPE INEQUALITIES

MOHAMMAD BAGHER GHAEMI, VENUS KALEIBARY AND SHIGERU FURUICHI

ABSTRACT. In this paper we present some reverses of the Golden-Thompson type inequalities: Let H and K be Hermitian matrices such that $e^s e^H \preceq_{ols} e^K \preceq_{ols} e^t e^H$ for some scalars $s \leq t$, and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. Then for all $p > 0$ and $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$

$$\lambda_k(e^{(1-\alpha)H+\alpha K}) \leq (\max\{S(e^{sp}), S(e^{tp})\})^{\frac{1}{p}} \lambda_k(e^{pH} \sharp_{\alpha} e^{pK})^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

where $A \sharp_{\alpha} B = A^{\frac{1}{2}} (A^{-\frac{1}{2}} B^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{-\frac{1}{2}})^{\alpha} A^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is α -geometric mean, $S(t)$ is the so called Specht's ratio and \preceq_{ols} is the so called Olson order. The same inequalities are also provided with other constants. The obtained inequalities improve some known results.

1. INTRODUCTION

In what follows, capital letters A, B, H and K stand for $n \times n$ matrices or bounded linear operators on an n -dimensional complex Hilbert space $(\mathcal{H}, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$. For a pair A, B of Hermitian matrices, we say $A \leq B$ if $B - A \geq 0$. Let A and B be two positive definite matrices. For each $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, the weighted geometric mean $A \sharp_{\alpha} B$ of A and B in the sense of Kubo-Ando [10] is defined by

$$A \sharp_{\alpha} B = A^{\frac{1}{2}} (A^{-\frac{1}{2}} B^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{-\frac{1}{2}})^{\alpha} A^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Also for positive definite matrices A and B , the weak log-majorization $A \prec_{wlog} B$ means that

$$\prod_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(A) \leq \prod_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(B), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

where $\lambda_1(A) \geq \lambda_2(A) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(A)$ are the eigenvalues of A listed in decreasing order. If equality holds when $k = n$, we have the log-majorization $A \prec_{log} B$. It is known that the weak log-majorization $A \prec_{wlog} B$ implies $\|A\|_u \leq \|B\|_u$ for any unitarily invariant norm $\|\cdot\|_u$, i.e. $\|UAV\|_u = \|A\|_u$ for all A and all unitaries U, V . See [2] for theory of majorization.

In [15], Specht obtained an inequality for the arithmetic and geometric means of positive numbers: Let $x_1 \geq \dots \geq x_n > 0$ and set $t = x_1/x_n$. Then

$$\frac{x_1 + \dots + x_n}{n} \leq S(t)(x_1 \dots x_n)^{\frac{1}{n}},$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 15A42; Secondary 15A60, 47A63.

Key words and phrases. Ando-Hiai inequality, Golden-Thompson inequality, Eigenvalue inequality, Geometric mean, Olson order, Specht ratio, Generalized Kantorovich constant, Unitarily invariant norm.

where

$$S(t) = \frac{(t-1)t^{1/(t-1)}}{e \log t} \quad (t \neq 1) \quad \text{and} \quad S(1) = 1 \quad (1.1)$$

is called the Specht ratio at t . Note that $\lim_{p \rightarrow 0} S(t^p)^{\frac{1}{p}} = 1$, $S(t^{-1}) = S(t) > 1$ for $t \neq 1, t > 0$ [6]. Specht's inequality is a ratio type reverse inequality of the classical arithmetic-geometric mean inequality. Using this nice ratio we can state our main result in Section 2.

The Golden-Thompson trace inequality, which is of importance in statistical mechanics and in the theory of random matrices, states that $\text{Tre}^{H+K} \leq \text{Tre}^H \text{e}^K$ for arbitrary Hermitian matrices H and K . This inequality has been complemented in several ways [1, 9]. Ando and Hiai in [1] proved that for every unitarily invariant norm $\|\cdot\|_u$ and $p > 0$

$$\|(e^{pH} \sharp_{\alpha} e^{pK})^{\frac{1}{p}}\|_u \leq \|e^{(1-\alpha)H + \alpha K}\|_u. \quad (1.2)$$

Seo in [13] found some upper bounds on $\|e^{(1-\alpha)H + \alpha K}\|_u$ in terms of scalar multiples of $\|(e^{pH} \sharp_{\alpha} e^{pK})^{\frac{1}{p}}\|_u$, which show reverse of the Golden-Thompson type inequality (1.2). In this paper we establish another reverses of this inequality, which improve and refine Seo's results. In fact the general sandwich condition $sA \leq B \leq tA$ for positive definite matrices, is the key for our statements. Also, the so called Olson order \preceq_{ols} is used. For positive operators, $A \preceq_{ols} B$ if and only if $A^r \leq B^r$ for every $r \geq 1$ [12]. Our results are parallel to eigenvalue inequalities obtained in [3] and [8].

2. REVERSE INEQUALITIES VIA SPECHT RATIO

To study the Golden-Thompson inequality, Ando-Hiai in [1] developed the following log-majorization:

$$A^r \sharp_{\alpha} B^r \prec_{\log} (A \sharp_{\alpha} B)^r, \quad r \geq 1,$$

or equivalently

$$(A^p \sharp_{\alpha} B^p)^{\frac{1}{p}} \prec_{\log} (A^q \sharp_{\alpha} B^q)^{\frac{1}{q}}, \quad 0 < q \leq p.$$

There are some literatures [14] on the converse of these inequalities in terms of unitarily invariant norm $\|\cdot\|_u$. By the following lemmas, we obtain a new reverse of these inequalities in terms of eigenvalue inequalities.

Lemma 2.1. *Let A and B be positive definite matrices such that $sA \leq B \leq tA$ for some scalars $0 < s \leq t$, and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. Then*

$$A^r \sharp_{\alpha} B^r \leq (\max\{S(s), S(t)\})^r (A \sharp_{\alpha} B)^r, \quad 0 < r \leq 1, \quad (2.1)$$

where $S(t)$ is the Specht's ratio defined as (4.3).

Proof. Let f be an operator monotone function on $[0, \infty)$. Then according to the proof of Theorem 1 in [7], we have

$$f(A) \sharp_{\alpha} f(B) \leq f(M(A \sharp_{\alpha} B)),$$

where $M = \max\{S(s), S(t)\}$. Putting $f(t) = t^r$ for $0 < r \leq 1$, we reach inequality (2.1). \square

Lemma 2.2. *Let A and B be positive definite matrices such that $sA \preceq_{ols} B \preceq_{ols} tA$ for some scalars $0 < s \leq t$, and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. Then*

$$\lambda_k(A \sharp_{\alpha} B)^r \leq \max\{S(s^r), S(t^r)\} \lambda_k(A^r \sharp_{\alpha} B^r), \quad r \geq 1, \quad (2.2)$$

and hence,

$$\lambda_k(A^q \sharp_{\alpha} B^q)^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq (\max\{S(s^p), S(t^p)\})^{\frac{1}{p}} \lambda_k(A^p \sharp_{\alpha} B^p)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad 0 < q \leq p, \quad (2.3)$$

where $S(t)$ is the Specht's ratio defined as (4.3) and $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

Proof. First note that the condition $sA \preceq_{ols} B \preceq_{ols} tA$, is equivalent to the condition $s^{\nu} A^{\nu} \leq B^{\nu} \leq t^{\nu} A^{\nu}$ for every $\nu \geq 1$. In particular, we have $sA \leq B \leq tA$ for $\nu = 1$. Also, for $r \geq 1$ we have $0 < \frac{1}{r} \leq 1$ and by (2.1)

$$A^{\frac{1}{r}} \sharp_{\alpha} B^{\frac{1}{r}} \leq (\max\{S(s), S(t)\})^{\frac{1}{r}} (A \sharp_{\alpha} B)^{\frac{1}{r}}. \quad (2.4)$$

On the other hand, from the condition $s^{\nu} A^{\nu} \leq B^{\nu} \leq t^{\nu} A^{\nu}$ for every $\nu \geq 1$ and letting $\nu = r$, we have

$$s^r A^r \leq B^r \leq t^r A^r.$$

Now if we let $X = A^r$, $Y = B^r$, $w = s^r$ and $z = t^r$, then

$$wX \leq Y \leq zX. \quad (2.5)$$

Using (2.4) under the condition (2.5), we have

$$X^{\frac{1}{r}} \sharp_{\alpha} Y^{\frac{1}{r}} \leq (\max\{S(w), S(z)\})^{\frac{1}{r}} (X \sharp_{\alpha} Y)^{\frac{1}{r}},$$

and this is the same as

$$A \sharp_{\alpha} B \leq (\max\{S(s^r), S(t^r)\})^{\frac{1}{r}} (A^r \sharp_{\alpha} B^r)^{\frac{1}{r}}.$$

Hence

$$\lambda_k(A \sharp_{\alpha} B) \leq (\max\{S(s^r), S(t^r)\})^{\frac{1}{r}} \lambda_k(A^r \sharp_{\alpha} B^r)^{\frac{1}{r}}.$$

By taking r -th power on both sides and using the Spectral Mapping Theorem, we get the desired inequality (2.2). Note that from the minimax characterization of eigenvalues of a Hermitian matrix [2] it follows immediately that $A \leq B$ implies $\lambda_k(A) \leq \lambda_k(B)$ for each k . Similarly since $p/q \geq 1$, from inequality (2.2)

$$\lambda_k(A \sharp_{\alpha} B)^{\frac{p}{q}} \leq \max\{S(s^{\frac{p}{q}}), S(t^{\frac{p}{q}})\} \lambda_k(A^{\frac{p}{q}} \sharp_{\alpha} B^{\frac{p}{q}}). \quad (2.6)$$

Replacing A and B by A^q and B^q in (2.6), and using the sandwich condition $s^q A^q \leq B^q \leq t^q A^q$, we have

$$\lambda_k(A^q \sharp_{\alpha} B^q)^{\frac{p}{q}} \leq \max\{S(s^p), S(t^p)\} \lambda_k(A^p \sharp_{\alpha} B^p).$$

This completes the proof. \square

Note that eigenvalue inequalities immediately imply log-majorization and unitarily invariant norm inequalities.

Corollary 2.3. *Let A and B be positive definite matrices such that $mI \leq A, B \leq MI$ for some scalars $0 < m \leq M$ with $h = M/m$, and let $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. Then*

$$A^r \sharp_{\alpha} B^r \leq S(h)^r (A \sharp_{\alpha} B)^r, \quad 0 < r \leq 1, \quad (2.7)$$

and hence

$$\lambda_k(A \sharp_{\alpha} B)^r \leq S(h^r) \lambda_k(A^r \sharp_{\alpha} B^r), \quad r \geq 1, \quad (2.8)$$

$$\lambda_k(A^q \sharp_{\alpha} B^q)^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq S(h^p)^{\frac{1}{p}} \lambda_k(A^p \sharp_{\alpha} B^p)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad 0 < q \leq p. \quad (2.9)$$

where $S(t)$ is the Specht's ratio defined as (4.3) and $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

Proof. Since $mI \leq A, B \leq MI$ implies $\frac{m}{M}A \leq B \leq \frac{M}{m}A$, the inequality (2.7) is obtained by letting $s = m/M$, $t = M/m$ in Lemma 2.1. Also from $mI \leq A, B \leq MI$, we have $m^{\nu}I \leq A^{\nu}, B^{\nu} \leq M^{\nu}I$ for every $\nu \geq 1$, and so

$$\left(\frac{m}{M}\right)^{\nu} A^{\nu} \leq B^{\nu} \leq \left(\frac{M}{m}\right)^{\nu} A^{\nu}. \quad (2.10)$$

Using Lemma 2.2 under the condition (2.10), we reach inequalities (2.8) and (2.9). Note that $S(h) = S(\frac{1}{h})$. \square

Remark 2.4. We remark that the matrix inequality (2.7) is more stronger than corresponding norm inequality obtained by Seo in [13, Corollary 3.2]. Also inequality (2.9) is presented in [13, Lemma 3.1].

In the sequel we show a reverse of the Golden-Thompson type inequality (1.2), which is our main result.

Theorem 2.5. *Let H and K be Hermitian matrices such that $e^s e^H \preceq_{ols} e^K \preceq_{ols} e^t e^H$ for some scalars $s \leq t$, and let $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. Then for all $p > 0$,*

$$\lambda_k(e^{(1-\alpha)H+\alpha K}) \leq (\max\{S(e^{sp}), S(e^{tp})\})^{\frac{1}{p}} \lambda_k(e^{pH} \sharp_{\alpha} e^{pK})^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

where $S(t)$ is the so called Specht's ratio defined as (4.3) and $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

Proof. Replacing A and B by e^H and e^K in the inequality (2.3) of Lemma 2.2, we can write

$$\lambda_k(e^{qH} \sharp_{\alpha} e^{qK})^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq (\max\{S(e^{sp}), S(e^{tp})\})^{\frac{1}{p}} \lambda_k(e^{pH} \sharp_{\alpha} e^{pK})^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad 0 < q \leq p.$$

By [9, Lemma 3.3], we have

$$e^{(1-\alpha)H+\alpha K} = \lim_{q \rightarrow 0} (e^{qH} \sharp_{\alpha} e^{qK})^{\frac{1}{q}},$$

and hence it follows that for each $p > 0$,

$$\lambda_k(e^{(1-\alpha)H+\alpha K}) \leq (\max\{S(e^{sp}), S(e^{tp})\})^{\frac{1}{p}} \lambda_k(e^{pH} \sharp_{\alpha} e^{pK})^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

\square

Corollary 2.6. *Let H and K be Hermitian matrices such that $e^s e^H \preceq_{ols} e^K \preceq_{ols} e^t e^H$ for some scalars $s \leq t$, and let $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. Then for every unitarily invariant norm $\|\cdot\|_u$ and all $p > 0$,*

$$\|e^{(1-\alpha)H+\alpha K}\|_u \leq (\max\{S(e^{sp}), S(e^{tp})\})^{\frac{1}{p}} \|(e^{pH} \sharp_{\alpha} e^{pK})^{\frac{1}{p}}\|_u, \quad (2.11)$$

and the right-hand side of (2.11) converges to the left-hand side as $p \downarrow 0$. In particular,

$$\|e^{H+K}\|_u \leq \max\{S(e^{2s}), S(e^{2t})\} \|(e^{2H} \sharp e^{2K})\|_u.$$

Corollary 2.7. [13, Theorem 3.3-Theorem 3.4] *Let H and K be Hermitian matrices such that $mI \leq H, K \leq MI$ for some scalars $m \leq M$, and let $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. Then for all $p > 0$,*

$$\lambda_k(e^{(1-\alpha)H+\alpha K}) \leq S(e^{(M-m)p})^{\frac{1}{p}} \lambda_k(e^{pH} \sharp_{\alpha} e^{pK})^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

So, for every unitarily invariant norm $\|\cdot\|_u$

$$\|e^{(1-\alpha)H+\alpha K}\|_u \leq S(e^{(M-m)p})^{\frac{1}{p}} \|(e^{pH} \sharp_{\alpha} e^{pK})\|_u,$$

and the right-hand side of these inequalities converges to the left-hand side as $p \downarrow 0$.

Proof. From $mI \leq H, K \leq MI$, we have $e^{\nu m} \leq e^{\nu H}, e^{\nu K} \leq e^{\nu M}$ for every $\nu \geq 1$ and so we can derive $e^{m-M}e^H \preceq_{ols} e^K \preceq_{ols} e^{M-m}e^H$. Now the assertion is obtained by applying Theorem 2.5 and the fact that for every $t > 0$, $S(t) = S(\frac{1}{t})$. \square

3. REVERSE INEQUALITIES VIA KANTOROVICH CONSTANT

A well-known matrix version of the Kantorovich inequality [11] asserts that if A and U are two matrices such that $0 < mI \leq A \leq MI$ and $UU^* = I$, then

$$UA^{-1}U^* \leq \frac{(m+M)^2}{4mM}(UAU^*)^{-1}. \quad (3.1)$$

Let $w > 0$. The generalized Kantorovich constant $K(w, \alpha)$ is defined by

$$K(w, \alpha) := \frac{w^\alpha - w}{(\alpha - 1)(w - 1)} \left(\frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} \frac{w^\alpha - 1}{w^\alpha - w} \right)^\alpha, \quad (3.2)$$

for any real number $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ [6]. In fact, $K(\frac{M}{m}, -1) = K(\frac{M}{m}, 2)$ is the constant occurring in (3.1).

Now as a result of following statement, we have another reverse Golden-Thompson type inequality which refines corresponding inequality in [13].

Proposition 3.1. [8, Theorem 3] *Let H and K be Hermitian matrices such that $e^s e^H \preceq_{ols} e^K \preceq_{ols} e^t e^H$ for some scalars $s \leq t$, and let $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. Then*

$$\lambda_k(e^{(1-\alpha)H+\alpha K}) \leq K(e^{p(t-s)}, \alpha)^{-\frac{1}{p}} \lambda_k(e^{pH} \sharp_{\alpha} e^{pK})^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad p > 0, \quad (3.3)$$

where $K(w, \alpha)$ is the generalized Kantorovich constant defined as (3.2).

Theorem 3.2. *Let H and K be Hermitian matrices such that $mI \leq K, H \leq MI$ for some scalars $m \leq M$ and let $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. Then for every $p > 0$*

$$\lambda_k(e^{(1-\alpha)H+\alpha K}) \leq K(e^{2p(M-m)}, \alpha)^{-\frac{1}{p}} \lambda_k(e^{pH} \sharp_{\alpha} e^{pK})^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

and the right-hand side of this inequality converges to the left-hand side as $p \downarrow 0$. In particular,

$$\lambda_k(e^{H+K}) \leq \frac{e^{2M} + e^{2m}}{2e^M e^m} \lambda_k(e^{2H} \sharp e^{2K}), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Proof. Since $mI \leq K, H \leq MI$ implies $e^{m-M}e^H \preceq_{ols} e^K \preceq_{ols} e^{M-m}e^H$, desired inequalities are obtained by letting $s = m - M$ and $t = M - m$ in Proposition 3.1.

For the convergence, we know that $\frac{2w^{\frac{1}{4}}}{w^{\frac{1}{2}} + 1} \leq K(w, \alpha) \leq 1$, for every $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. So, for every $p > 0$

$$1 \leq K(w^p, \alpha)^{-\frac{1}{p}} \leq \left(\frac{2w^{\frac{p}{4}}}{w^{\frac{p}{2}} + 1}\right)^{-\frac{1}{p}}.$$

A simple calculation shows that

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 0} -\frac{1}{p} \ln\left(\frac{2w^{\frac{p}{4}}}{w^{\frac{p}{2}} + 1}\right) = \lim_{p \rightarrow 0} \frac{\ln(w)(w^{\frac{p}{2}} - 1)}{4w^{\frac{p}{2}} + 1} = 0,$$

and hence $\lim_{p \rightarrow 0} \left(\frac{2w^{\frac{p}{4}}}{w^{\frac{p}{2}} + 1}\right)^{-\frac{1}{p}} = 1$. Now by using the sandwich condition and letting $w = e^{2(M-m)}$, we have $\lim_{p \rightarrow 0} K(e^{2p(M-m)}, \alpha)^{-\frac{1}{p}} = 1$. \square

Remark 3.3. Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.2, Seo in [13, Theorem 4.2] proved that

$$\|e^{(1-\alpha)H+\alpha K}\|_u \leq K(e^{(M-m)}, p)^{-\frac{\alpha}{p}} K(e^{2p(M-m)}, \alpha)^{-\frac{1}{p}} \|(e^{pH} \sharp_{\alpha} e^{pK})^{\frac{1}{p}}\|_u, \quad 0 < p \leq 1,$$

and

$$\|e^{(1-\alpha)H+\alpha K}\|_u \leq K(e^{2p(M-m)}, \alpha)^{-\frac{1}{p}} \|(e^{pH} \sharp_{\alpha} e^{pK})^{\frac{1}{p}}\|_u, \quad p \geq 1.$$

But the inequality (3.3) shows that the sharper constant for all $p > 0$ is $K(e^{2p(M-m)}, \alpha)^{-\frac{1}{p}}$. Since for $0 < p \leq 1$, $K(e^{(M-m)}, p)^{-\frac{\alpha}{p}} \geq 1$ and hence

$$K(e^{2p(M-m)}, \alpha)^{-\frac{1}{p}} \leq K(e^{(M-m)}, p)^{-\frac{\alpha}{p}} K(e^{2p(M-m)}, \alpha)^{-\frac{1}{p}}.$$

4. SOME RELATED RESULTS

It has been shown [7] that if $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is operator monotone function and $0 < mI \leq A \leq B \leq MI \leq I$ with $h = \frac{M}{m}$, then for all $\alpha \in [0, 1]$

$$f(A) \sharp_{\alpha} f(B) \leq \exp\left(\alpha(1-\alpha)\left(1 - \frac{1}{h}\right)^2\right) f(A \sharp_{\alpha} B), \quad (4.1)$$

This new ratio has been introduced by Furuichi and Minculete in [4], which is different from Specht ratio and Kantorovich constant. By applying (4.4) for $f(t) = t^r$, $0 < r \leq 1$ we have the following results similar to Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2.

Lemma 4.1. *Let A and B be positive definite matrices such that $0 < mI \leq A \leq B \leq MI \leq I$ with $h = M/m$, and let $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. Then*

$$A^r \sharp_{\alpha} B^r \leq \exp\left(r\alpha(1-\alpha)\left(1 - \frac{1}{h}\right)^2\right) (A \sharp_{\alpha} B)^r, \quad 0 < r \leq 1,$$

Lemma 4.2. *Let A and B be positive definite matrices such that $0 < mI \preceq_{ols} A \preceq_{ols} B \preceq_{ols} MI \preceq_{ols} I$ with $h = M/m$, and let $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. Then for all $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$,*

$$\lambda_k(A \sharp_{\alpha} B)^r \leq \exp\left(\alpha(1-\alpha)\left(1 - \frac{1}{h^r}\right)^2\right) \lambda_k(A^r \sharp_{\alpha} B^r), \quad r \geq 1,$$

$$\lambda_k(A^q \sharp_{\alpha} B^q)^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq \exp\left(\frac{1}{p}\alpha(1-\alpha)\left(1 - \frac{1}{h^p}\right)^2\right) \lambda_k(A^p \sharp_{\alpha} B^p)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad 0 < q \leq p. \quad (4.2)$$

Theorem 4.3. *Let H and K be Hermitian matrices such that $e^m I \preceq_{ols} e^H \preceq_{ols} e^K \preceq_{ols} e^M I \preceq_{ols} I$ for some scalars $m \leq M$, and let $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. Then for all $p > 0$ and $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$*

$$\lambda_k(e^{(1-\alpha)H+\alpha K}) \leq \exp\left(\frac{1}{p}\alpha(1-\alpha)\left(1 - \frac{1}{e^{p(M-m)}}\right)^2\right) \lambda_k(e^{pH} \sharp_{\alpha} e^{pK})^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

and so, for every unitarily invariant norm $\|\cdot\|_u$

$$\|e^{(1-\alpha)H+\alpha K}\|_u \leq \exp\left(\frac{1}{p}\alpha(1-\alpha)\left(1 - \frac{1}{e^{p(M-m)}}\right)^2\right) \|(e^{pH} \sharp_{\alpha} e^{pK})^{\frac{1}{p}}\|_u.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 2.5, by replacing A and B with e^H and e^K , and $h = e^{M-m}$ in the inequality (4.2). \square

Remark 4.4. Under the different conditions, the different coefficients are not comparable. But it is known that if we have a certain statement under the sandwich condition $0 < sA \leq B \leq tA$, then the same statement is also true under the condition $0 < mI \leq A, B \leq MI$ and $0 < mI \leq A \leq B \leq MI \leq I$. Hence, we can compare the following special cases:

- (1) Comparison of the constants in Theorem 4.3 and in Theorem 3.2:
Let $e^m I \preceq_{ols} e^H \preceq_{ols} e^K \preceq_{ols} e^M I \preceq_{ols} I$. Operator monotony of $\log(t)$ leads to $mI \leq H \leq K \leq MI \leq I$, and so $mI \leq H, K \leq MI$. Now by applying Theorem 3.2 we have

$$\lambda_k(e^{(1-\alpha)H+\alpha K}) \leq K(e^{2p(M-m)}, \alpha)^{-\frac{1}{p}} \lambda_k(e^{pH} \sharp_{\alpha} e^{pK})^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad p > 0.$$

Also, by Theorem 4.3

$$\lambda_k(e^{(1-\alpha)H+\alpha K}) \leq \exp\left(\frac{1}{p}\alpha(1-\alpha)\left(1 - \frac{1}{e^{p(M-m)}}\right)^2\right) \lambda_k(e^{pH} \sharp_{\alpha} e^{pK})^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad p > 0.$$

Letting $h = e^{M-m} \geq 1$, the following numerical examples show that there is no ordering between these inequalities.

- (i) Take $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$, $p = \frac{1}{2}$ and $h = 2$, then we have

$$K(h^{2p}, \alpha)^{-\frac{1}{p}} - \exp\left(\frac{1}{p}\alpha(1-\alpha)\left(1 - \frac{1}{h^p}\right)^2\right) \simeq -0.0134963.$$

- (ii) Take $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$, $p = \frac{1}{2}$ and $h = 8$, then we have

$$K(h^{2p}, \alpha)^{-\frac{1}{p}} - \exp\left(\frac{1}{p}\alpha(1-\alpha)\left(1 - \frac{1}{h^p}\right)^2\right) \simeq 0.0631159.$$

- (2) Comparison of the constants in Lemma 4.1 and in Lemma 2.1:
Let $0 < mI \leq A \leq B \leq MI \leq I$. Then the following sandwich condition is obtained

$$m \leq \frac{m}{M} \leq 1 \leq A^{-\frac{1}{2}}BA^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{M}{m} \leq \frac{1}{m}.$$

Now by letting $s = 1$ and $t = \frac{M}{m} = h$ in Lemma 2.1, we get

$$A^r \sharp_{\alpha} B^r \leq S(h)^r (A \sharp_{\alpha} B)^r, \quad 0 < r \leq 1. \quad (4.3)$$

Also, by Lemma 4.1

$$A^r \sharp_{\alpha} B^r \leq \exp\left(r\alpha(1-\alpha)\left(1-\frac{1}{h}\right)^2\right)(A \sharp_{\alpha} B)^r, \quad 0 < r \leq 1. \quad (4.4)$$

It is shown in [4, Remark 2.4] that there is no ordering between coefficients of (4.3) and (4.4). Therefore, we may conclude evaluation of Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 2.1 are different.

REFERENCES

1. T. Ando and F. Hiai, Log-majorization and complementary Golden-Thompson type inequalities, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 197/198 (1994) 113–131.
2. R. Bhatia, *Matrix Analysis*, Grad. Texts in Math., vol. 169, Springer-Verlag, 1997.
3. J.-C. Bourin and Y. Seo, Reverse inequality to Golden-Thompson type inequalities: comparison of e^{A+B} and $e^A e^B$, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 426 (2007), 312–316.
4. S. Furuichi and N. Minculete, Alternative reverse inequalities for Youngs inequality, *J. Math. Inequal.* 5 (2011) 595–600.
5. T. Furuta, Operator inequalities associated with Holder-McCarthy and Kantorovich inequalities, *J. Inequal. Appl.* 2 (1998) 137–148.
6. T. Furuta, J. Mićić, J.E. Pečarić and Y. Seo, Mond-Pečarić method in operator inequalities, *Monographs in Inequalities 1*, Element, Zagreb, 2005.
7. M.B. Ghaemi and V. Kaleibary, Some inequalities involving operator monotone functions and operator means, *Math. Inequal. Appl.* 19 (2016) 757–764.
8. M.B. Ghaemi and V. Kaleibary, Eigenvalue inequalities related to the Ando-Hiai inequality, *Math. Inequal. Appl.* 20 (2017) 217–223.
9. F. Hiai and D. Petz, The Golden-Thompson trace inequality is complemented, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 181 (1993) 153–185.
10. F. Kubo and T. Ando, Means of positive linear operators, *Math. Ann.* 246 (1980) 205–224.
11. B. Mond and J.E. Pečarić, A matrix version of the Ky Fan generalization of the Kantorovich inequality, *Linear and Multilinear Algebra.* 36 (1994) 217–221.
12. M.P. Olson, The selfadjoint operators of a von Neumann algebra from a conditionally complete lattice, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 28 (1971) 537–544.
13. Y. Seo, Reverses of the Golden-Thompson type inequalities due to Ando-Hiai-Petz, *Banach J. Math. Anal.* 2 (2008) 140–149.
14. Y. Seo, On a reverse of Ando-Hiai inequality, *Banach J. Math. Anal.* 4 (2010) 87–91.
15. W. Specht, Zur Theorie der elementaren Mittel, *Math. Z.* 74 (1960) 91–98.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, IRAN UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, NARMAK, TEHRAN 16846-13114, IRAN.

E-mail address: mghaemi@iust.ac.ir

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, IRAN UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, NARMAK, TEHRAN 16846-13114, IRAN.

E-mail address: v.kaleibary@gmail.com

DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION SCIENCE, COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES AND SCIENCES, NIIHON UNIVERSITY, 3-25-40, SAKURAJYOUSUI, SETAGAYA-KU, TOKYO, 156-8550, JAPAN.

E-mail address: furuichi@chs.nihon-u.ac.jp