

Perturbation estimation for the parallel sum of Hermitian positive semi-definite matrices

Wei Luo^a, Chuanning Song^a, Qingxiang Xu^{a,1,*}

^aDepartment of Mathematics, Shanghai Normal University, Shanghai 200234, PR China

Abstract

Let $\mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ be the set of all $n \times n$ complex matrices. For any Hermitian positive semi-definite matrices A and B in $\mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$, their new common upper bound less than $A + B - A : B$ is constructed, where $(A + B)^\dagger$ denotes the Moore-Penrose inverse of $A + B$, and $A : B = A(A + B)^\dagger B$ is the parallel sum of A and B . A factorization formula for $(A + X) : (B + Y) - A : B - X : Y$ is derived, where $X, Y \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ are any Hermitian positive semi-definite perturbations of A and B , respectively. Based on the derived factorization formula and the constructed common upper bound of X and Y , some new and sharp norm upper bounds of $(A + X) : (B + Y) - A : B$ are provided. Numerical examples are also provided to illustrate the sharpness of the obtained norm upper bounds.

Keywords: Moore-Penrose inverse; parallel sum; perturbation estimation; norm upper bound

2000 MSC: 15A09, 15A60, 46L05, 47A55

1. Introduction and preliminaries

Throughout this paper, $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ is the set of all $m \times n$ complex matrices. For any $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$, let $\mathcal{R}(A)$, A^* and $\|A\|$ denote the range, the conjugate transpose and the 2-norm of A , respectively. Let $B, C \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ be Hermitian. The notation $B \geq C$ is used to indicate that $B - C$ is positive semi-definite.

Recall that the Moore-Penrose inverse of $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ is the unique element $A^\dagger \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$ which satisfies

$$AA^\dagger A = A, A^\dagger AA^\dagger = A^\dagger, (AA^\dagger)^* = AA^\dagger \text{ and } (A^\dagger A)^* = A^\dagger A.$$

It is known (see e.g. [22]) that $\mathcal{R}(A^\dagger) = \mathcal{R}(A^*)$, $(A^*)^\dagger = (A^\dagger)^*$ and $(AA^*)^\dagger = (A^*)^\dagger A^\dagger$. So if A is Hermitian, then $(A^\dagger)^* = A^\dagger$ and $AA^\dagger = A^\dagger A$.

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: luoweipig1@163.com (Wei Luo), songning@shnu.edu.cn (Chuanning Song), qxxu@shnu.edu.cn, qingxiang_xu@126.com (Qingxiang Xu)

¹Supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (11671261).

One application of the Moore-Penrose inverse is the study of the parallel sum introduced by Anderson and Duffin in [2] for Hermitian positive semi-definite matrices. Let $A, B \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ be Hermitian positive semi-definite. The parallel sum of A and B is defined by

$$A : B = A(A + B)^\dagger B, \quad (1.1)$$

which is so named because of its origin in and application to the electrical network theory that

$$(r_1^{-1} + r_2^{-1})^{-1} = r_1(r_1 + r_2)^{-1}r_2$$

is the resistance arising from resistors r_1 and r_2 in parallel. It is proved in [2, Lemmas 2 and 4] that $A : B \geq 0$ and a norm upper bound of $A : B$ is given in [2, Theorem 25] as

$$\|A : B\| \leq \frac{\|A\| \cdot \|B\|}{\|A\| + \|B\|}. \quad (1.2)$$

The perturbation estimation for the parallel sum is also considered in [2]. More precisely, let $A, B, X, Y \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ be all Hermitian positive semi-definite and let E be the error induced by the perturbation of $A : B$ as

$$E = (A + X) : (B + Y) - A : B. \quad (1.3)$$

It can be deduced from [2, Corollary 21] that $E \geq 0$ and a norm upper bound of E is established in [2, Theorem 31] as

$$\|E\| \leq \lambda_{A,B} \|X + Y\|, \quad (1.4)$$

where

$$\lambda_{A,B} = 2\|(A + B)^\dagger A\|^2 + 2\|(A + B)^\dagger B\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}. \quad (1.5)$$

Ever since the publication of [2], the parallel sum has been studied in the more general settings of non-square matrices under certain conditions of range inclusions [17], of positive operators A and B on a Hilbert space such that the range of $A + B$ is closed [5] and furthermore, without any assumptions on the range of $A + B$ [14, 19]. As the generalizations of the parallel sum, shorted operators and the weakly parallel sum are also studied in [1, 6, 12, 16, 18] and [7, 13], respectively. For many different equivalent definitions and the properties of the parallel sum, see a recent review paper [9] and the references therein.

Although much progress has been made in the study of the parallel sum and its various generalizations, very little has been done on the improvement of norm upper bound (1.4), which is the concern of this paper. Let $X, Y \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ be Hermitian positive semi-definite. Checking the proof of [2, Theorem 31] carefully, we find that the norm $\|X + Y\|$ appearing in (1.4) can in fact be replaced by any $\|Z\|$, where Z is any common upper bound of X and Y . The less is Z , the sharper is the resulting upper bound (1.4). This leads us to

investigate small common upper bounds of X and Y . One choice less than $X + Y$ is the matrix $C_{X,Y}$ defined by


$$C_{X,Y} = X + Y - X : Y, \quad (1.6)$$

which is a common upper bound of X and Y since by (2.1), $C_{X,Y} - X = Y - X : Y = Y(X + Y)^\dagger Y \geq 0$ and $C_{X,Y} - Y \geq 0$ in a similar way. It is of independent interest to find out a common upper bound of X and Y , which is even less than $C_{X,Y}$. By using certain C^* -algebraic technique, we have managed to figure out such a common upper bound $X \vee Y$; see Theorem 2.4 for the details.

Another way to improve the upper bound (1.4) is the reduction of the coefficient $\lambda_{A,B}$ given by (1.5), where $A, B, X, Y \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ are all Hermitian positive semi-definite. Let T and H be defined by

$$T = (A + B) : (X + Y), \quad H = (A + X) : (B + Y) - A : B - X : Y. \quad (1.7)$$

Along the line of checking $\langle Hx, x \rangle \geq 0$ for any $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$, it is proved in [2, Lemmas 18 and 20] that the matrix H defined by (1.7) is also Hermitian positive semi-definite. An interpretation of such a result with electronic circuits is as follows:



The key point of this paper is, a factorization formula for H can be derived as (3.1), which leads obviously to the positivity of H since by Lemma 2.3, the matrix T defined by (1.7) is positive.

The parallel sum and its generalizations have proved to be useful operations in a wide variety of fields, such as electrical networks [2, 3, 16], statistics [18, 20], control theory [4, 15], geodetic adjustments [25], image denoising problems [11], signal recovery [8], numerical calculations [10] and so on. In view of the observational error or measuring error, it is meaningful to study the perturbation estimation of the parallel sum.

Formula (3.1) plays a crucial role in our study of the perturbation estimation for the parallel sum. It is firstly applied to study the one-sided perturbation (3.7), and is then applied to deal with the special case of the two-sided perturbation (3.11), where a norm upper bound (3.12), as well as its simplified version (3.13), is obtained. The general two-sided perturbation (1.3) is concerned in Theorem 3.5, where two norm upper bounds with parameters are derived, and one of which turns out to be the infimum of a function $f(t)$ defined on $(0, +\infty)$ as (3.20). As shown by Example 4.1, this infimum is easy to handle since the parameter t can be chosen by using certain Matlab commands directly. The

sharpness of the newly obtained upper bounds are illustrated by Remark 3.2 and two numerical examples in Section 4.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, a new kind of common upper bound of two Hermitian positive semi-definite matrices is constructed. In Section 3, the perturbation estimation for the parallel sum of Hermitian positive semi-definite matrices is carried out. In Section 4, two numerical examples are provided.

2. A new kind of common upper bound of two Hermitian positive semi-definite matrices

The purpose of this section is to construct a new kind of common upper bound of two Hermitian positive semi-definite matrices. We begin with two auxiliary lemmas, whose proofs are direct.

Lemma 2.1. *For any $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$, it holds that $\mathcal{R}(AA^*) = \mathcal{R}(A)$. If in addition $m = n$ and $A \geq 0$, then $\mathcal{R}(A^{\frac{1}{2}}) = \mathcal{R}(A)$, $A^\dagger \geq 0$ and $(A^\dagger)^{\frac{1}{2}} = (A^{\frac{1}{2}})^\dagger$.*

Lemma 2.2. *Let $A, B \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ be such that $0 \leq A \leq B$. Then $\mathcal{R}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(B)$ and $\|A\| \leq \|B\|$.*

Some basic properties of the parallel sum of Hermitian positive semi-definite matrices are derived in [2], part of which are as follows:

Lemma 2.3. (cf. [2, Lemmas 1–4] and Lemma 2.2) *Let $A, B \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ be Hermitian positive semi-definite. Then $A : B \geq 0$, $\mathcal{R}(A : B) = \mathcal{R}(A) \cap \mathcal{R}(B)$, and*

$$A : B = B : A = A - A(A + B)^\dagger A = B - B(A + B)^\dagger B. \quad (2.1)$$

Now, we state the main result of this section as follows:

Theorem 2.4. *Let $X, Y \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ be both Hermitian positive semi-definite. Then $X + Y - 4(X : Y) \geq 0$, and a common upper bound of X and Y can be given by*

$$X \vee Y = \frac{X + Y}{2} + (X + Y)^{\frac{1}{2}} W^{\frac{1}{2}} (X + Y)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (2.2)$$

where

$$W = \left[(X + Y)^\dagger \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\frac{X + Y}{4} - X : Y \right] \left[(X + Y)^\dagger \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (2.3)$$

Furthermore, $X \vee Y \leq C_{X,Y}$ and $X \vee Y = C_{X,Y}$ if and only if $X : Y = 0$, where $C_{X,Y}$ is defined by (1.6).

Proof. (1) We prove that the matrix $X \vee Y$ defined by (2.2) is a common upper bound of X and Y . Let $P = (X + Y)(X + Y)^\dagger$. Then P is an orthogonal projection and by Lemma 2.1, we have

$$P = (X + Y)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[(X + Y)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right]^\dagger = (X + Y)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[(X + Y)^\dagger \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} = \left[(X + Y)^\dagger \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} (X + Y)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

which is the unit of the C^* -subalgebra \mathfrak{B} of $\mathcal{L}(H)$ defined by

$$\mathfrak{B} = P\mathcal{L}(H)P = \left[(X+Y)^\dagger\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{L}(H)\left[(X+Y)^\dagger\right]^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where $H = \mathbb{C}^n$ is a Hilbert space endowed with the usual inner product and $\mathcal{L}(H) \cong \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ is the set of all (bounded) linear operators on H . Let $X_1, Y_1 \in \mathfrak{B}$ be Hermitian positive semi-definite defined by

$$X_1 = \left[(X+Y)^\dagger\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}X\left[(X+Y)^\dagger\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{ and } Y_1 = \left[(X+Y)^\dagger\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}Y\left[(X+Y)^\dagger\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (2.4)$$

Then clearly, $X_1 + Y_1 = P$ and hence

$$X_1Y_1 = X_1(P - X_1) = X_1 - X_1^2 = (P - X_1)X_1 = Y_1X_1.$$

Let $C^*(P, X_1)$ be the unital commutative C^* -subalgebra of \mathfrak{B} generated by P and X_1 , and $Sp(X_1)$ be the spectrum of X_1 . Then by [21, Section 1.1], we know that $C^*(P, X_1)$ is isomorphic to $C(Sp(X_1))$ via Gelfand transform \wedge such that

$$\widehat{X_1}(t) = t, \widehat{Y_1}(t) = 1 - t \text{ and } \widehat{P}(t) = 1, \text{ for any } t \in Sp(X_1) \subseteq [0, +\infty).$$

Now, we let $X_1 \vee Y_1 \in C^*(P, X_1)$ be such that

$$\widehat{X_1 \vee Y_1}(t) = \max \left\{ \widehat{X_1}(t), \widehat{Y_1}(t) \right\} = \frac{1}{2} + \sqrt{\left(t - \frac{1}{2}\right)^2} = \frac{1}{2} + \sqrt{t^2 - t + \frac{1}{4}}. \quad (2.5)$$

Then, clearly $X_1 \vee Y_1$ is the least common upper bound of X_1 and Y_1 in $C^*(P, X_1)$. The expression of $\widehat{X_1 \vee Y_1}(t)$ given by (2.5) indicates that

$$X_1 \vee Y_1 = \frac{P}{2} + W_1^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (2.6)$$

where

$$W_1 = X_1^2 - X_1 + \frac{P}{4} = \left(X_1 - \frac{P}{2}\right)^* \left(X_1 - \frac{P}{2}\right) \geq 0. \quad (2.7)$$

In view of (2.7), (2.4), (2.1) and (2.3), we have

$$W_1 = \left[(X+Y)^\dagger\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[X(X+Y)^\dagger X - X + \frac{X+Y}{4} \right] \left[(X+Y)^\dagger\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} = W. \quad (2.8)$$

The expression of W_1 above, together with (2.7), indicates that

$$\frac{X+Y}{4} - X : Y = (X+Y)^{\frac{1}{2}} W_1 (X+Y)^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq 0.$$

Put

$$Z = (X+Y)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot (X_1 \vee Y_1) \cdot (X+Y)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (2.9)$$

Then since $X_1 \vee Y_1 \geq X_1$, we know from (2.4) that

$$Z \geq (X+Y)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot X_1 \cdot (X+Y)^{\frac{1}{2}} = X.$$

Similarly, it holds that $Z \geq Y$. Moreover, from (2.9), (2.6), (2.8) and (2.2) we know that $Z = X \vee Y$. This completes the proof that $X \vee Y$ is a common upper bound of X and Y .

(2) We prove that $X \vee Y \leq C_{X,Y}$ and $X \vee Y = C_{X,Y}$ if and only if $X : Y = 0$. Indeed, by (1.6), (2.2), (2.1), (2.4), (2.8) and (2.7) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
C_{X,Y} - X \vee Y &= \frac{X+Y}{2} - X : Y - (X+Y)^{\frac{1}{2}} W^{\frac{1}{2}} (X+Y)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= (X+Y)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\frac{P}{2} - \left[(X+Y)^{\dagger} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} (X : Y) \left[(X+Y)^{\dagger} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} - W^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] (X+Y)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= (X+Y)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\frac{P}{2} - X_1 + X_1^2 - W_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] (X+Y)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= (X+Y)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\frac{P}{4} + W_1 - W_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] (X+Y)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= (X+Y)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(W_1^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{P}{2} \right)^2 (X+Y)^{\frac{1}{2}} = TT^* \geq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where $T = (X+Y)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(W_1^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{P}{2} \right)$. Note that $\left[(X+Y)^{\dagger} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} T = W_1^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{P}{2}$, so the discussion above indicates that

$$\begin{aligned}
C_{X,Y} = X \vee Y &\iff T = 0 \iff W_1^{\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{P}{2} \iff W_1 = \frac{P}{4} \\
&\iff X_1^2 - X_1 = 0 \text{ by (2.7)} \\
&\iff \left[(X+Y)^{\dagger} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[X(X+Y)^{\dagger} X - X \right] \left[(X+Y)^{\dagger} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} = 0 \text{ by (2.4)} \\
&\iff X : Y = 0 \text{ by (2.1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of all the assertions. \square

Before ending this section, we make a few remarks on the common upper bound (2.2). Let $X, Y \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ be both Hermitian positive semi-definite. If Z is any common upper bound of X and Y , then from Lemma 2.2 we have $\|Z\| \geq \max\{\|X\|, \|Y\|\}$. It is interesting to find out a common upper bound which gets the equation above. The matrix $X \vee Y$ defined by (2.2) is such a common upper bound in the following two cases:

Case 1: X and Y are commutative. Indeed, if $XY = YX$, then $X, Y, (X+Y)^{\frac{1}{2}}, (X+Y)^{\dagger}$ and $\left((X+Y)^{\dagger} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ are commutative each other. It follows from (2.3) that

$$(X+Y)^{\frac{1}{2}} W^{\frac{1}{2}} (X+Y)^{\frac{1}{2}} = [(X+Y)W(X+Y)]^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
(X+Y)W(X+Y) &= (X+Y) \left[\frac{X+Y}{4} - X(X+Y)^\dagger Y \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{4}(X+Y)^2 - X(X+Y)(X+Y)^\dagger Y \\
&= \frac{1}{4}(X+Y)^2 - XY \\
&= \frac{1}{4}(X-Y)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Accordingly, from (2.2) we have $X \vee Y = \frac{1}{2}[X+Y+|X-Y|]$, which means clearly that

$$\|X \vee Y\| = \max\{\|X\|, \|Y\|\} \quad (2.10)$$

by functional calculus in the commutative C^* -algebra generated by X and Y .

Case 2: One of X and Y is larger than another. We might as well assume that $X \leq Y$. Following the notations as in the proof of Theorem 2.4, we have $X_1 \leq Y_1$ and thus by (2.9) we conclude that

$$X \vee Y = (X+Y)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot (X_1 \vee Y_1) \cdot (X+Y)^{\frac{1}{2}} = (X+Y)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot Y_1 \cdot (X+Y)^{\frac{1}{2}} = Y,$$

which leads to (2.10) obviously.

Example 2.1. Let $0 < a < \frac{1}{2}$, $X = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ and $Y = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$. Then $YX \neq XY$, whereas $0 \leq X \leq Y$.

Next, we consider the special case where the underlying matrices are orthogonal projections. Assume that $P, Q \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ are two orthogonal projections. Let P_0 be the orthogonal projection from \mathbb{C}^n onto $\mathcal{R}(P) \cap \mathcal{R}(Q)$. We prove that

$$P \vee Q = P + Q - P_0. \quad (2.11)$$

Indeed, by [2, Theorem 8] we have $P : Q = \frac{1}{2}P_0$, which means that $P_0, P + Q, (P+Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}, (P+Q)^\dagger$ and $((P+Q)^\dagger)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ are commutative each other. It follows that

$$(P+Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}W^{\frac{1}{2}}(P+Q)^{\frac{1}{2}} = [(P+Q)W(P+Q)]^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (2.12)$$

where

$$(P+Q)W(P+Q) = (P+Q) \left[\frac{P+Q}{4} - \frac{1}{2}P_0 \right] = \frac{(P+Q-2P_0)^2}{4}.$$

Note that $P+Q-2P_0 = (P-P_0) + (Q-P_0) \geq 0$, so the equation above indicates that $[(P+Q)W(P+Q)]^{\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{P+Q-2P_0}{2}$. This, together with (2.2) and (2.12), yields (2.11).

Based on (2.11), we prove that

$$\|P \vee Q\| = \max\{\|P\|, \|Q\|\} \iff PQ = QP.$$

In fact, if $PQ = QP$, then $P \vee Q$ given by (2.11) is an orthogonal projection and thus (2.10) is satisfied, with X and Y therein be replaced by P and Q , respectively.

On the other hand, if $PQ \neq QP$, then the orthogonal projection $P - P_0$ is non-zero and from (2.11) we have

$$\|P \vee Q\| \geq \|(P - P_0) \cdot P \vee Q \cdot (P - P_0)\| = \|(P - P_0) + (P - P_0)Q(P - P_0)\|. \quad (2.13)$$

Similarly, $Q - P_0 \neq 0$ and

$$\|P \vee Q\| \geq \|(Q - P_0) + (Q - P_0)P(Q - P_0)\|. \quad (2.14)$$

Suppose on the contrary that $\|P \vee Q\| = 1$, then it can be deduced from (2.13) and (2.14) that

$$(P - P_0)Q(P - P_0) = 0 \text{ and } (Q - P_0)P(Q - P_0) = 0;$$

or equivalently, $Q(P - P_0) = 0$ and $P(Q - P_0) = 0$, that is, $QP = P_0$ and $PQ = P_0$, which is in contradiction to the assumption that $PQ \neq QP$.

3. Perturbation estimation for the parallel sum

In this section, we study the perturbation estimation for the parallel sum of Hermitian positive semi-definite matrices.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that $A, B, X, Y \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ are all Hermitian positive semi-definite. Let T and H be defined by (1.7). Then*

$$H = [(A + B)^\dagger B - (X + Y)^\dagger Y]^* \cdot T \cdot [(A + B)^\dagger B - (X + Y)^\dagger Y]. \quad (3.1)$$

Proof. For simplicity, we put $S = A + B + X + Y$. Then

$$H = (A + X)S^\dagger(B + Y) - A(A + B)^\dagger B - X(X + Y)^\dagger Y = I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4, \quad (3.2)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= AS^\dagger B - A(A + B)^\dagger B, I_2 = AS^\dagger Y, \\ I_3 &= XS^\dagger Y - X(X + Y)^\dagger Y, I_4 = XS^\dagger B. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$A + B \leq S, \mathcal{R}((A + B)^\dagger) = \mathcal{R}((A + B)^*) = \mathcal{R}(A + B)$$

and $\mathcal{R}(S^\dagger S) = \mathcal{R}(SS^\dagger) = \mathcal{R}(S)$, so by Lemma 2.2 we have $S^\dagger S(A + B)^\dagger = (A + B)^\dagger$. Similarly, it holds that $A(A + B)^\dagger(A + B) = A$, $(A + B)(A + B)^\dagger B = B$ and

$$(A + B)(A + B)^\dagger T = T,$$

since $\mathcal{R}(T) = \mathcal{R}(A + B) \cap \mathcal{R}(X + Y)$ by Lemma 2.3. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &= A[S^\dagger - (A + B)^\dagger]B = -AS^\dagger[S - (A + B)](A + B)^\dagger B \\
&= -A(A + B)^\dagger(A + B) \cdot S^\dagger(X + Y)(A + B)^\dagger B \\
&= -A(A + B)^\dagger T(A + B)^\dagger B \\
&= -[(A + B) - B](A + B)^\dagger T(A + B)^\dagger B \\
&= -T(A + B)^\dagger B + B(A + B)^\dagger T(A + B)^\dagger B.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &= A(A + B)^\dagger(A + B) \cdot S^\dagger \cdot (X + Y)(X + Y)^\dagger Y \\
&= A(A + B)^\dagger T(X + Y)^\dagger Y \\
&= T(X + Y)^\dagger Y - B(A + B)^\dagger T(X + Y)^\dagger Y,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

$$I_3 = -T(X + Y)^\dagger Y + Y(X + Y)^\dagger T(X + Y)^\dagger Y, \tag{3.5}$$

$$I_4 = T(A + B)^\dagger B - Y(X + Y)^\dagger T(A + B)^\dagger B. \tag{3.6}$$

Eq. (3.1) then follows from (3.2)–(3.6). \square

Now we use Eq. (3.1) to study the perturbation estimation for the parallel sum. First, we consider the one-sided perturbation as follows:

Corollary 3.2. *Suppose that $A, B, X \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ are all Hermitian positive semi-definite. Let*

$$G = (A + X) : B - A : B. \tag{3.7}$$

Then

$$\|G\| \leq \frac{\|(A + B)^\dagger B\|^2 \cdot \|A + B\| \cdot \|X\|}{\|A + B\| + \|X\|}. \tag{3.8}$$

Proof. If we put $Y = 0$ in (1.7), then a formula for G can be derived immediately from (3.1) as

$$G = [(A + B)^\dagger B]^* \cdot [(A + B) : X] \cdot [(A + B)^\dagger B], \tag{3.9}$$

which leads obviously to the inequality (3.8) by using norm estimation (1.2). \square

A direct application of the preceding corollary is as follows:

Corollary 3.3. [2, Theorem 28] *Suppose that $A, B, X \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ are all Hermitian positive semi-definite. Let G be defined by (3.7). Then*

$$\|G\| \leq \|(A + B)^\dagger B\|^2 \cdot \|X\|. \tag{3.10}$$

Next, we consider the special case of the two-sided perturbation as follows:

Theorem 3.4. Suppose that $A, B, Z \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ are all Hermitian positive semi-definite. Let $\alpha > 0, \beta > 0$ and

$$F_{\alpha, \beta} = (A + \alpha Z) : (B + \beta Z) - A : B. \quad (3.11)$$

Then

$$\|F_{\alpha, \beta}\| \leq \frac{1}{\alpha + \beta} \left[\frac{\|(A + B)^\dagger(\beta A - \alpha B)\|^2 \cdot \|A + B\|}{\|A + B\| + (\alpha + \beta)\|Z\|} + \alpha\beta \right] \|Z\| \quad (3.12)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{\alpha + \beta} \left[\|(A + B)^\dagger(\beta A - \alpha B)\|^2 + \alpha\beta \right] \|Z\|. \quad (3.13)$$

Proof. For simplicity, we put

$$T_{\alpha, \beta} = (A + B) : ((\alpha + \beta)Z) \text{ and } S_{\alpha, \beta} = (A + B)^\dagger B - ((\alpha + \beta)Z)^\dagger (\beta Z). \quad (3.14)$$

Since $\mathcal{R}(T_{\alpha, \beta}) = \mathcal{R}(A + B) \cap \mathcal{R}(Z)$ by Lemma 2.3, we have

$$Z^\dagger Z T_{\alpha, \beta} = T_{\alpha, \beta} = (A + B)^\dagger (A + B) T_{\alpha, \beta}.$$

The equations above, together with (3.14), yield

$$S_{\alpha, \beta}^* T_{\alpha, \beta} = \frac{\alpha B - \beta A}{\alpha + \beta} (A + B)^\dagger T_{\alpha, \beta}, T_{\alpha, \beta} S_{\alpha, \beta} = T_{\alpha, \beta} (A + B)^\dagger \frac{\alpha B - \beta A}{\alpha + \beta}. \quad (3.15)$$

Note that $(\alpha Z) : (\beta Z) = \frac{\alpha\beta}{\alpha + \beta} Z$, so by (3.11), (1.7), (3.1), (3.14), (3.15) and (1.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_{\alpha, \beta}\| &= \|S_{\alpha, \beta}^* T_{\alpha, \beta} S_{\alpha, \beta} + (\alpha Z) : (\beta Z)\| \\ &= \left\| \frac{\beta A - \alpha B}{\alpha + \beta} \cdot (A + B)^\dagger \cdot T_{\alpha, \beta} \cdot (A + B)^\dagger \cdot \frac{\beta A - \alpha B}{\alpha + \beta} + \frac{\alpha\beta}{\alpha + \beta} Z \right\| \\ &\leq \frac{\|T_{\alpha, \beta}\| \cdot \|(A + B)^\dagger(\beta A - \alpha B)\|^2}{(\alpha + \beta)^2} + \frac{\alpha\beta}{\alpha + \beta} \|Z\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\alpha + \beta} \left[\frac{\|(A + B)^\dagger(\beta A - \alpha B)\|^2 \cdot \|A + B\|}{\|A + B\| + (\alpha + \beta)\|Z\|} + \alpha\beta \right] \|Z\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\alpha + \beta} \left[\|(A + B)^\dagger(\beta A - \alpha B)\|^2 + \alpha\beta \right] \|Z\|. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.1. Let $X, Y \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ be any Hermitian positive semi-definite matrices and let α, β be any positive numbers. As the numbers of the resistors in electronic circuits can be viewed as positive scalar matrices, it is meaningful to find out a Hermitian positive semi-definite matrix Z such that $\alpha Z \geq X$ and $\beta Z \geq Y$.

One solution to the problem above is $Z_{\alpha, \beta}$, which can be derived directly by (2.2) and (2.3) as

$$Z_{\alpha, \beta} = \frac{X}{\alpha} \vee \frac{Y}{\beta} = \frac{\beta X + \alpha Y}{2\alpha\beta} + \left(\frac{\beta X + \alpha Y}{\alpha\beta} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} W_{\alpha, \beta}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{\beta X + \alpha Y}{\alpha\beta} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (3.16)$$

where

$$W_{\alpha,\beta} = \left[\left(\frac{\beta X + \alpha Y}{\alpha\beta} \right)^\dagger \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\frac{\beta X + \alpha Y}{4\alpha\beta} - X(\beta X + \alpha Y)^\dagger Y \right] \left[\left(\frac{\beta X + \alpha Y}{\alpha\beta} \right)^\dagger \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Now, we consider the general case of the two-sided perturbation of the parallel sum as follows:

Theorem 3.5. *Suppose that $A, B, X, Y \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ are all Hermitian positive semi-definite. Let E be defined by (1.3). Then*

$$\|E\| \leq \inf_{\alpha > 0, \beta > 0} \left[\frac{\|(A+B)^\dagger(\beta A - \alpha B)\|^2 \cdot \|A+B\|}{(\alpha + \beta)\|A+B\| + (\alpha + \beta)^2 \|Z_{\alpha,\beta}\|} + \frac{\alpha\beta}{\alpha + \beta} \right] \|Z_{\alpha,\beta}\| \quad (3.17)$$

$$\leq \inf_{\alpha > 0, \beta > 0} \frac{1}{\alpha + \beta} \left[\|(A+B)^\dagger(\beta A - \alpha B)\|^2 + \alpha\beta \right] \|Z_{\alpha,\beta}\| \quad (3.18)$$

$$= \inf_{t > 0} f(t), \quad (3.19)$$

where $Z_{\alpha,\beta}$ is given by (3.16) such that $Z_{\alpha,\beta} = \frac{1}{\alpha} (X \vee \frac{Y}{t})$ for $t = \frac{\beta}{\alpha}$, and

$$f(t) = \frac{1}{1+t} \left[\|(A+B)^\dagger(tA - B)\|^2 + t \right] \cdot \left\| X \vee \frac{Y}{t} \right\|. \quad (3.20)$$

Proof. Let $Z_{\alpha,\beta}$ be given by (3.16) for any $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta > 0$. Then $\alpha Z_{\alpha,\beta} \geq X$ and $\beta Z_{\alpha,\beta} \geq Y$, which means by (3.1) that $E \leq F_{\alpha,\beta}$ and thus $\|E\| \leq \|F_{\alpha,\beta}\|$, where $F_{\alpha,\beta}$ is defined by (3.11) with Z therein be replaced by $Z_{\alpha,\beta}$. The desired norm upper bounds follows immediately from Theorem 3.4. \square

Putting $\alpha = \beta = 1$ in (3.18), we get a corollary as follows:

Corollary 3.6. *Suppose that $A, B, X, Y \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ are all Hermitian positive semi-definite. Let E be defined by (1.3). Then*

$$\|E\| \leq \mu_{A,B} \|X \vee Y\|, \quad (3.21)$$

where $X \vee Y$ is given by (2.2) and $\mu_{A,B}$ is defined by

$$\mu_{A,B} = \frac{1}{2} \left[\|(A+B)^\dagger(A-B)\|^2 + 1 \right]. \quad (3.22)$$

Remark 3.2. Suppose that $A, B, X, Y \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ are all Hermitian positive semi-definite. Let $\lambda_{A,B}$ and $\mu_{A,B}$ be defined by (1.5) and (3.22), respectively. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{A,B} &= \frac{1}{2} \|(A+B)^\dagger A - (A+B)^\dagger B\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left[\|(A+B)^\dagger A\| + \|(A+B)^\dagger B\| \right]^2 + \frac{1}{2} \\ &\leq \|(A+B)^\dagger A\|^2 + \|(A+B)^\dagger B\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \\ &\leq \lambda_{A,B}. \end{aligned}$$

The inequalities of $\mu_{A,B} \leq \lambda_{A,B}$ and $\|X \vee Y\| \leq \|X + Y\|$ indicate that upper bound (3.21) is sharper than the original norm upper bound (1.4).

Remark 3.3. One special case of the two-sided perturbation (3.11) is $A = B$. Note that

$$(A + X) : (A + X) - A : A = \frac{1}{2}(A + X) - \frac{1}{2}A = \frac{1}{2}X,$$

so in this case norm upper bound (3.21) is accurate.

Remark 3.4. Given any natural number n and any $k_i > 0$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, let $A = k_1 I_n, B = k_2 I_n, X = k_3 I_n$ and $Y = k_4 I_n$, where I_n is the identity matrix in $\mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$. Let E be defined by (1.3). Then (3.17) becomes an equation if we put $\alpha = k_3$ and $\beta = k_4$ therein.

4. Numerical examples

In this section, we provide two numerical examples as follows.

Example 4.1. For any $t \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2})$, let $A(t), B(t) \in \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2}$ be defined by

$$A(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(t) & \frac{1}{4} \sin(t) \\ \frac{1}{4} \sin(t) & \cos(t) \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } B(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(t) & -\frac{1}{4} \sin(t) \\ -\frac{1}{4} \sin(t) & \cos(t) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Put $A = A(\frac{\pi}{6}), X = A(\frac{5\pi}{32}) - A(\frac{\pi}{6}), B = B(\frac{\pi}{6})$ and $Y = B(\frac{3\pi}{32}) - B(\frac{\pi}{6})$. Then A, B, X and Y are all positive definite. Let E and f be defined by (1.3) and (3.20), respectively. Then

$$E = A\left(\frac{5\pi}{32}\right) : B\left(\frac{3\pi}{32}\right) - A\left(\frac{\pi}{6}\right) : B\left(\frac{\pi}{6}\right) \text{ and } \|E\| = 0.0453,$$

and from the graph of f drawn by using Matlab command “fplot” or by using Matlab command “fmincon” alternatively, we know that f gets its infimum around the point $t = 6.2197$; that is, $\inf\{t > 0 | f(t)\} \approx f(6.2197) = 0.0511$. Thus, a comparison of the errors can be provided as in Table 1, which shows that for this example, norm upper bound (3.19) is much better than the other two.

Table 1: Comparison of the errors associated to norm upper bounds (1.4), (3.19) and (3.21)

	Upper bound (1.4)	Upper bound (3.19)	Upper bound (3.21)
Numerical value	0.2752	0.0511	0.0732
Relative error	507.5%	12.8%	61.6%

Example 4.2. For any $t \in (-\infty, +\infty)$, let $P(t) \in \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2}$ be the orthogonal projection defined by

$$P(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos^2(t) & -\sin(t) \cos(t) \\ -\sin(t) \cos(t) & \sin^2(t) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Put

$$A = P\left(\frac{\pi}{8}\right), B = P\left(\frac{\pi}{6}\right), X = P\left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right), Y = P\left(\frac{\pi}{3}\right),$$

and let E, f be defined by (1.3) and (3.20), respectively. Then $\|E\| = 0.4650$ and $\inf\{t > 0 | f(t)\} = f(1) = 0.5000$. A comparison of the errors is also provided in Table 2, which shows that for this example, norm upper bounds (3.19) and (3.21) are the same.

Table 2: Comparison of the errors associated to norm upper bounds (1.4), (3.19) and (3.21)

	Upper bound (1.4)	Upper bound (3.19)	Upper bound (3.21)
Numerical value	3	0.5	0.5
Relative error	545.2%	7.5%	7.5%

5. Concluding remarks

As shown in Theorem 2.4 that for any two Hermitian positive semi-definite matrices $X, Y \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$, a common upper bound of X and Y can be constructed based on certain C^* -algebraic technique. This common upper bound is proved to be strictly less than $X + Y - X : Y$ whenever $X : Y$ is non-zero. Furthermore, if X and Y are two positive operators acting on a general Hilbert C^* -module [24, Section 2], then Theorem 2.4 still works in the case that $X + Y$ is Moore-Penrose invertible; or equivalently, $X + Y$ has a closed range [23, Theorem 2.2].

As mentioned early, the positivity of the matrix H defined by (1.7) can be derived directly from the factorization formula (3.1) for H . This newly obtained factorization formula can also be extended to the infinite-dimensional case. More precisely, if A, B, X and Y are positive operators such that $A + B + X + Y, A + B$ and $X + Y$ are all Moore-Penrose invertible, then the factorization formula (3.1) for H is also valid.

As illustrated by Remark 3.2 and two numerical examples in Section 4, the newly obtained upper bounds (3.19) and (3.21) are sharper than the original one established in [2, Theorem 31]. It is not hard to prove that norm upper bound (1.2) is also true for positive operators A and B if $A + B$ is Moore-Penrose invertible. Thus in the general setting of Hilbert C^* -modules, a generalized version of Theorem 3.5 can also be obtained provided that the associated operators are all Moore-Penrose invertible.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank the referee for helpful suggestions.

References

- [1] W.N. Anderson, Jr., Shorted operators, SIAM J. Appl. Math. 20 (1971), 520–525.

- [2] W.N. Anderson, Jr. and R.J. Duffin, Series and parallel addition of matrices, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 26 (1969), 576–594.
- [3] W.N. Anderson Jr., T.D. Morley, and G.E. Trapp, Ladder networks, fixed points, and the geometric mean, *Circuits Systems Signal Process.* 3 (1983), 259–268.
- [4] W.N. Anderson Jr., T.D. Morley, and G.E. Trapp, Infinite networks and quadratic optimal control, *Circuits Systems Signal Process.* 9 (1990), 229–238.
- [5] W.N. Anderson, Jr. and M. Schreiber, The infimum of two projections, *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)* 33 (1972), 165–168.
- [6] W.N. Anderson, Jr. and G. E. Trapp, Shorted operators II, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* 28 (1975), 60–71.
- [7] J. Antezana, G. Corach, and D. Stojanoff, Bilateral shorted operators and parallel sums, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 2006 (414), 570–588.
- [8] S.R. Becker and P.L. Combettes, An algorithm for splitting parallel sums of linearly composed monotone operators, with applications to signal recovery, *J. Nonlinear Convex Anal* 15 (2014), 137–159.
- [9] P. Berkics, On parallel sum of matrices, *Linear Multilinear Algebra.* 65 (2017), 2114–2123.
- [10] A.F. Berliet, Geometric approach to the parallel sum of vectors and application to the vector ε -algorithm, *Numer. Algorithms.* 65 (2014), 783–807.
- [11] R.I. Bot and C. Hendrich, A Douglas-Rachford type primal-dual method for solving inclusions with mixtures of composite and parallel-sum type monotone operators, *SIAM J. Optim.* 23 (2013), 2541–2565.
- [12] C.A. Butler and T.D. Morley, A note on the shorted operator, *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.* 9 (1988), 147–155.
- [13] M.S. Djikić, Extensions of the Fill-Fishkind formula and the infimum-parallel sum relation, *Linear Multilinear Algebra.* 64 (2015), 2335–2349.
- [14] P.A. Fillmore and J.P. Williams, On operator ranges, *Adv. Math.* 7 (1971), 254–281.
- [15] W.L. Green and E. Kamen, Stabilization of linear systems over a commutative normed algebra with applications to spatially distributed parameter dependent systems, *SIAM J. Control Optim.* 23 (1985), 1–18.
- [16] S.K. Mitra, Shorted operators and the identification problem, *IEEE Trans. Circ. Syst.* 29 (1982), 581–583.

- [17] S.K. Mitra and P.L. Odell, On parallel summability of matrices, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 74 (1986), 239–255.
- [18] S.K. Mitra and S. Puntanen, The shorted operator statistically interpreted, *Calcutta Statist. Assoc. Bull.* 40 (1990/91), 97–102.
- [19] T.D. Morley, An alternative approach to the parallel sum, *Adv. Appl. Math.* 10 (1989), 358–369.
- [20] D.V. Ouellette, Schur complements and statistics, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 36 (1981), 187–295.
- [21] G.K. Pedersen, *C^* -algebras and their automorphism groups*, London Math. Soc. Monographs 14, Academic Press, 1979.
- [22] G. Wang, Y. Wei, and S. Qiao, *Generalized inverses: theory and computations*, Science Press, Beijing, 2004.
- [23] Q. Xu and L. Sheng, Positive semi-definite matrices of adjointable operators on Hilbert C^* -modules, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 428 (2008), 992–1000.
- [24] Q. Xu, Y. Wei, and Y. Gu, Sharp norm-estimations for Moore-Penrose inverses of stable perturbations of Hilbert C^* -module operators, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 47 (2010), 4735–4758.
- [25] D. Zhong and W. Welsch, The parallel sum of matrices and its application in geodetic adjustments, *J. Geod.* 71 (1997), 171–175.