Log-majorization related to Rényi divergences
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Abstract

For $\alpha, z > 0$ with $\alpha \neq 1$, motivated by comparison between different kinds of Rényi divergences in quantum information, we consider log-majorization between the matrix functions

$$P_\alpha(A, B) := B^{1/2}(B^{-1/2}AB^{-1/2})^\alpha B^{1/2},$$
$$Q_{\alpha, z}(A, B) := (B^{1-\alpha/2z}A^{\alpha/z}B^{1-\alpha/2z})^z$$

of two positive (semi)definite matrices $A, B$. We precisely determine the parameter $\alpha, z$ for which $P_\alpha(A, B) \prec_{\log} Q_{\alpha, z}(A, B)$ and $Q_{\alpha, z}(A, B) \prec_{\log} P_\alpha(A, B)$ holds, respectively.
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1 Introduction

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we write $\mathbb{M}_n$ for the $n \times n$ complex matrices and $\mathbb{M}_n^+$ for the positive semidefinite $n \times n$ matrices. We write $B > 0$ if $B \in \mathbb{M}_n$ is positive definite.

Recall that for $X, Y \in \mathbb{M}_n^+$, the log-majorization $X \prec_{\log} Y$ means that

$$\prod_{i=1}^k \lambda_i(X) \leq \prod_{i=1}^k \lambda_i(Y), \quad k = 1, \ldots, n$$

with equality for $k = n$ (i.e., $\det X = \det Y$), where $\lambda_1(X) \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_n(X)$ are the eigenvalues of $X$ in decreasing order counting multiplicities. As is well-known, $X \prec_{\log} Y$ implies the weak majorization $X \prec_w Y$, i.e., $\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i(X) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i(Y)$ for $k = 1, \ldots, n$. The latter is equivalent to that $\|X\| \leq \|Y\|$ holds for every unitarily invariant norm $\| \cdot \|$. See, e.g., [1, 7, 12, 18] for generalities on majorization theory for matrices.
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Let $\alpha, z > 0$ with $\alpha \neq 1$, and let $A, B \in \mathbb{M}_n^+$ with $B > 0$. In the present paper we are concerned with the following two-variable matrix functions

\[ P_\alpha(A, B) := B^{1/2}(B^{-1/2}AB^{-1/2})^\alpha B^{1/2}, \]
\[ Q_{\alpha, z}(A, B) := (B^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} A^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}} B^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}})^z. \]

Two special versions of $Q_{\alpha, z}$ are

\[ Q_{\alpha}(A, B) := Q_{\alpha, 1}(A, B) = B^{1-\alpha} A^{\alpha} B^{1-\alpha}, \]
\[ \tilde{Q}_{\alpha}(A, B) := Q_{\alpha, \alpha}(A, B) = (B^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} A^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}} B^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}})^\alpha. \]

Our motivation to consider these functions comes from different types of Rényi divergences that have recently been developed in quantum information. The conventional (or standard) $\alpha$-Rényi divergence (due to Petz [21]) is

\[ D_\alpha(A\|B) := \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \frac{\text{Tr} Q_\alpha(A, B)}{\text{Tr} A}, \]

the sandwiched $\alpha$-Rényi divergence [20, 24] is

\[ \tilde{D}_\alpha(A\|B) := \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \frac{\text{Tr} \tilde{Q}_\alpha(A, B)}{\text{Tr} A}, \]

and the so-called $\alpha$-$z$-Rényi divergence [5] is

\[ D_{\alpha, z}(A\|B) := \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \frac{\text{Tr} Q_{\alpha, z}(A, B)}{\text{Tr} A}. \]

In addition to $D_\alpha$ and $\tilde{D}_\alpha$ we define the maximal $\alpha$-Rényi divergence

\[ \hat{D}_\alpha(A\|B) := \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \frac{\text{Tr} P_\alpha(A, B)}{\text{Tr} A}. \]

(For the term “maximal” here, see Remark [8.4]) See [13] and references therein for more background information on quantum divergences.

We note that $P_\alpha(A, B)$ is a special case of operator perspective defined associated with a function $f$ on $(0, \infty)$ by

\[ P_f(A, B) := B^{1/2} f(B^{-1/2}AB^{-1/2}) B^{1/2}, \quad A, B \in \mathbb{M}_n^+, \ A, B > 0, \]

which was studied by Effros and Hansen [10] and others, with applications to quantum information. Furthermore, note that when $f$ is a non-negative operator monotone function on $(0, \infty)$ with $f(1) = 1$, $P_f(A, B)$ is nothing but the operator mean $B \sigma_f A$ associated with $f$ in the Kubo-Ando sense [17]. In particular, when $0 < \alpha < 1$, $P_\alpha(A, B) = B \#_\alpha A$, the weighted geometric mean (first introduced by Pusz and Woronowicz [22] in the case $\alpha = 1/2$).
The inequality $\tilde{D}_\alpha(A\|B) \leq D_\alpha(A\|B)$ is well-known as a consequence of Araki’s log-majorization \cite{4} (see also \cite{2}); indeed, $Q_{\alpha,z}(A,B)$ is monotone decreasing in $z > 0$ in the log-majorization order. However, the comparison between $\tilde{D}_\alpha$ and $D_{\alpha,z}$ (in particular, $D_\alpha$) has not fully been investigated so far, which motivate us to consider the log-majorization between $P_\alpha$ and $Q_{\alpha,z}$. In this paper we present the following theorem which was announced without proofs in \cite{13} Remark 4.6:

**Theorem 1.1.** Let $A, B \in \mathbb{M}_n^+$ with $B > 0$.

1. For $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $z > 0$, $P_\alpha(A,B) \prec_{\log} Q_{\alpha,z}(A,B)$.
2. For $\alpha > 1$ and $0 < z \leq \min\{\alpha/2, \alpha - 1\}$, $P_\alpha(A,B) \prec_{\log} Q_{\alpha,z}(A,B)$.
3. For $\alpha > 1$ and $z \geq \max\{\alpha/2, \alpha - 1\}$, $Q_{\alpha,z}(A,B) \prec_{\log} P_\alpha(A,B)$.

In particular, $P_\alpha(A,B) \prec_{\log} Q_{\alpha}(A,B)$ if $0 < \alpha < 1$ or $\alpha \geq 2$, and $Q_\alpha(A,B) \prec_{\log} P_\alpha(A,B)$ if $1 < \alpha \leq 2$.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sections 2 and 3 we prove Theorem 1.1. In Section 4 we give an example showing that Theorem 1.1 is best possible with regard to the assumptions on the parameters $\alpha, z$, so that Theorem 1.1 is completed into Theorem 4.1. In Section 5 we present the necessary and sufficient conditions on $\alpha, r, z$ for which $P_{\alpha,r}(A,B) \prec_{\log} Q_{\alpha,z}(A,B)$ and $Q_{\alpha,z}(A,B) \prec_{\log} P_{\alpha,r}(A,B)$ hold, respectively, where $P_{\alpha,r}(A,B) := P_\alpha(A^{1/r}, B^{1/r})^r$. Moreover, we give a log-majorization for $P_\alpha$ for $\alpha \geq 2$, supplementing Ando-Hiai’s log-majorization \cite{2} for $P_\alpha$ for $0 < \alpha < 1$ and its complementary version recently obtained by Kian and Seo \cite{16} for $P_\alpha$ for $1 < \alpha \leq 2$. (Note that the negative power $\beta \in [-1,0)$ case in \cite{16} can be rephrased into the case of $P_\alpha$ for $\alpha = 1 - \beta \in [1,2]$, see Section 5.) Applying our log-majorization results, in Sections 6 and 7 we give norm inequalities for unitarily invariant norms and logarithmic trace inequalities. The norm inequalities here improve those given in \cite{16} and the logarithmic trace inequalities here supplement those given in \cite{2}. Finally in Section 8 we completely determine the parameters $\alpha, z$ for which $\tilde{D}_\alpha(A\|B) \leq D_{\alpha,z}(A\|B)$ and $D_{\alpha,z}(A\|B) \leq \tilde{D}_\alpha(A\|B)$ hold, respectively.

### 2 Log-majorization (Part 1)

First, note that Araki’s log-majorization \cite{4} (see also \cite{2}) implies that for every $\alpha > 0$,

$$Q_{\alpha,z'}(A,B) \prec_{\log} Q_{\alpha,z}(A,B) \quad \text{if } 0 < z \leq z'.$$

The next proposition is an easy part of log-majorization results between $P_\alpha$ and $Q_{\alpha,z}$.

**Proposition 2.1.** Let $A, B \in \mathbb{M}_n^+$ with $B > 0$. 


(1) Assume that $0 < \alpha < 1$. Then for every $z > 0$,
\[ P_\alpha(A, B) \prec_{\log} Q_{\alpha, z}(A, B). \]

(2) Assume that $1 < \alpha \leq 2$ and $0 < z \leq \alpha - 1$. Then
\[ P_\alpha(A, B) \prec_{\log} Q_{\alpha, z}(A, B). \]

(3) Assume that $\alpha > 1$ and $z \geq \max\{\alpha/2, \alpha - 1\}$. Then
\[ Q_{\alpha, z}(A, B) \prec_{\log} P_\alpha(A, B). \]

Proof. (1) Although this is an immediate consequence of well-known Araki’s and Ando-Hiai’s log-majorization (see [4, 2]), we give a proof for the convenience of the reader. By continuity we may assume that $A > 0$ as well as $B > 0$. From the Lie-Trotter formula, letting $z' \to \infty$ in (2.1) gives
\[ \exp(\alpha \log A + (1 - \alpha) \log B) \prec_{\log} Q_{\alpha, z}(A, B), \quad z > 0. \] (2.2)
On the other hand, when $0 < \alpha < 1$, the log-majorization in [2] says that
\[ P_\alpha(A, B) = B\#_\alpha A \prec_{\log} (B^p\#_\alpha A^p)^{1/p}, \quad 0 < p < 1. \]
Letting $p \downarrow 0$ and using [15, Lemma 3.3] we have
\[ P_\alpha(A, B) \prec_{\log} \exp(\alpha \log A + (1 - \alpha) \log B). \] (2.3)
Combining (2.2) and (2.3) implies the asserted log-majorization.

(2) By continuity we may assume that $A > 0$ as well as $B > 0$. The proof below is an easy application of the standard anti-symmetric tensor power technique (see, e.g., [2]). To show that $P_\alpha(A, B) \prec_{\log} Q_{\alpha, z}(A, B)$, it suffices to prove that
\[ \|P_\alpha(A, B)\|_\infty \leq \|Q_{\alpha, z}(A, B)\|_\infty, \]
where $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ denotes the operator norm. Due to the positive homogeneity in $A, B$ of both $P_\alpha$ and $Q_{\alpha, z}$ (i.e., $P_\alpha(\lambda A, \lambda B) = \lambda P_\alpha(A, B)$ for $\lambda > 0$ and similarly for $Q_{\alpha, z}$), it also suffices to prove that
\[ Q_{\alpha, z}(A, B) \leq I \implies P_\alpha(A, B) \leq I. \] (2.4)
Here recall the identity
\[ (B^{-1/2}AB^{-1/2})^\alpha = B^{-1/2}A^{1/2}(A^{1/2}B^{-1/2}A^{1/2})^{\alpha - 1}A^{1/2}B^{-1/2}, \] (2.5)
as seen from the well-known equality
\[ Xf(X^*X) = f(XX^*)X \] (2.6)
for every $X \in \mathbb{M}_n$ and every continuous function $f$ on an interval containing the eigenvalues of $X^*X$ (the proof is easy by approximating $f$ by polynomials). Therefore,

$$P_\alpha(A, B) = A^{1/2}(A^{1/2}B^{-1}A^{1/2})^{\alpha-1}A^{1/2}, \tag{2.7}$$

so that for (2.4) it suffices to prove that

$$B^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}A^\frac{\alpha}{\alpha}B^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \leq I \implies A^{1/2}(A^{1/2}B^{-1}A^{1/2})^{\alpha-1}A^{1/2} \leq I,$$

or equivalently,

$$A^\frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \leq B^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}} \implies (A^{1/2}B^{-1}A^{1/2})^{\alpha-1} \leq A^{-1}. \tag{2.8}$$

Now, assume that $1 < \alpha \leq 2$ and $0 < z \leq \alpha - 1$, and that $A^\frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \leq B^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}}$. Since $0 < z/(\alpha - 1) \leq 1$,

$$B^{-1} = (B^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}})^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}} \leq (A^\frac{\alpha}{\alpha})^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}} = A^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}},$$

and hence

$$A^{1/2}B^{-1}A^{1/2} \leq A^{1/2}A^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}}A^{1/2} = A^{-\frac{1}{\alpha-1}}.$$

Since $0 < \alpha - 1 \leq 1$, we have

$$(A^{1/2}B^{-1}A^{1/2})^{\alpha-1} \leq (A^{-\frac{1}{\alpha-1}})^{\alpha-1} = A^{-1},$$

proving (2.8).

(3) As in the proof of (2) we may assume that both $A, B$ are positive definite, and prove the implication opposite to (2.4). In the present case, similarly to the above, it suffices to prove that

$$(B^{-1/2}AB^{-1/2})^{\alpha} \leq B^{-1} \implies A^\frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \leq B^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}},$$

or letting $C := B^{-1/2}AB^{-1/2} > 0$, we may prove that

$$C^\alpha \leq B^{-1} \implies (B^{1/2}CB^{1/2})^\frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \leq B^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}}. \tag{2.9}$$

Now, assume that $\alpha > 1$ and $z \geq \max\{\alpha/2, \alpha - 1\}$. Note by (2.1) that if once $Q_{\alpha, z}(A, B) < \log P_\alpha(A, B)$ holds for $z = z_0$ with some $z_0 > 0$, then the same does for all $z \geq z_0$. Hence we may further assume that $z \leq \alpha$. If $C^\alpha \leq B^{-1}$, then $B \leq C^{-\alpha}$ so that $C^{1/2}BC^{1/2} \leq C^{1-\alpha}$. Since $0 \leq \frac{\alpha}{z} - 1 \leq 1$, we have

$$(C^{1/2}BC^{1/2})^\frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \leq (C^{1-\alpha})^\frac{\alpha}{\alpha} = C^{(1-\alpha)(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha}-1)}.$$

Since by (2.5),

$$(B^{1/2}CB^{1/2})^\frac{\alpha}{\alpha} = B^{1/2}C^{1/2}(C^{1/2}BC^{1/2})^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha}}C^{1/2}B^{1/2},$$

and hence

$$B^{1/2}C^{1/2}(C^{1/2}BC^{1/2})^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha}} \leq B^{1/2}C^{1/2}C^{1-\alpha}C^{1/2}B^{1/2} \leq B^{1/2}C^{1-\alpha}B^{1/2},$$

or equivalently

$$(B^{1/2}CB^{1/2})^\frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \leq C^{1-\alpha}B^{1/2}.$$
we have
\[
(B^{1/2}CB^{1/2})^{\alpha} \leq B^{1/2}C^{1+(1-\alpha)(\frac{\alpha}{z}-1)}B^{1/2} = B^{1/2}(C^\alpha)^{-\frac{\alpha-1}{z}}B^{1/2}.
\]
Since the assumption on \(\alpha, z\) implies that \(0 \leq 1 - \frac{\alpha-1}{z} < 1\), we have
\[
(B^{1/2}CB^{1/2})^{\alpha} \leq B^{1/2}(B^{-1})^{1-\frac{\alpha-1}{z}}B^{1/2} = B^{\frac{\alpha-1}{z}},
\]
proving (2.9).

It should be noted that the above proofs of (2.8) and (2.9) are more or less similar to that of [23, Theorem 3] for the Furuta inequality with negative powers.

**Remark 2.2.** When \(\alpha = 2\), since \(P_2(A, B) = AB^{-1}A\) is unitarily equivalent to \(B^{-1/2}A^2B^{-1/2}\), \(P_2(A, B) \prec_{\log} Q_{2,z}(A, B)\) is equivalent to
\[
B^{-1/2}A^2B^{-1/2} \prec_{\log} (B^{-\frac{1}{2}}A^\frac{3}{2}B^{-\frac{1}{2}})^z.
\]
Assume that \(AB \neq BA\). Then from Araki’s log-majorization [4] and [11, Theorem 2.1] we see that the above log-majorization holds true if and only if \(0 < z \leq 1\). Similarly, \(Q_{2,z}(A, B) \prec_{\log} P_2(A, B)\) holds if and only if \(z \geq 1\). These are of course consistent with (2) and (3) of Proposition 2.1.

In particular, when \(A\) is a projection, we have:

**Proposition 2.3.** Let \(\alpha > 1\) and \(z > 0\). Assume that \(E, B \in M_n^+\) are such that \(E\) is a projection, \(B > 0\) and \(EB \neq BE\). Then:

(a) \(P_\alpha(E, B) \prec_{\log} Q_{\alpha,z}(E, B)\) if and only if \(z \leq \alpha - 1\).

(b) \(Q_{\alpha,z}(E, B) \prec_{\log} P_\alpha(E, B)\) if and only if \(z \geq \alpha - 1\).

**Proof.** We write
\[
P_\alpha(E, B) = B^{1/2}(B^{-1/2}EB^{-1/2})^\alpha B^{1/2} = B^{1/2}B^{-1/2}E(EB^{-1}E)^{\alpha-1}EB^{-1/2}B^{1/2} = (EB^{-1}E)^{\alpha-1}.
\]
On the other hand, \(Q_{\alpha,z}(E, B) = (B^{\frac{1}{2z}}EB^{\frac{1}{2z}})^z\) is unitarily equivalent to \((EB^{\frac{1}{2z}}E)^z\).
Hence \(P_\alpha(E, B) \prec_{\log} Q_{\alpha,z}(E, B)\) is equivalent to
\[
(EB^{-1}E)^{\alpha-1} \prec_{\log} (EB^{\frac{1}{2z}}E)^z.
\]
From [11, Theorem 2.1] we see that this holds if and only if \(\alpha - 1 \geq z\). Similarly, \(Q_{\alpha,z}(E, B) \prec_{\log} P_\alpha(E, B)\) holds if and only if \(z \geq \alpha - 1\).  

6
3 Log-majorization (Part 2)

Our final goal is to completely determine the regions of \( \{(\alpha, z) : \alpha, z > 0\} \) for which \( P_\alpha \prec_{\log} Q_{\alpha,z} \) holds, or \( Q_{\alpha,z} \prec_{\log} P_\alpha \) holds, or neither holds true, respectively. The next step to the goal is to find a region in \( \alpha \geq 2 \) where \( P_\alpha \prec_{\log} Q_{\alpha,z} \) holds true. Since \( P_2 \prec_{\log} Q_{2,z} \) holds if and only if \( 0 < z \leq 1 \) (see Remark 2.2), it would be reasonable to conjecture that there is a region in \( \alpha \geq 2 \) touching \( \{(2, z) : 0 < z \leq 1\} \) where \( P_\alpha \prec_{\log} Q_{\alpha,z} \) holds.

We show the next log-majorization result by elaborating the anti-symmetric tensor power technique. The proof reveals essentially similar features to those of [2, Theorem 4.1] and [3, Theorem 2.1].

**Proposition 3.1.** Assume that \( \alpha \geq 2 \) and \( 0 < z \leq \alpha/2 \). Then for every \( A, B \in M_n^+ \) with \( B > 0 \),

\[
P_\alpha(A, B) \prec_{\log} Q_{\alpha,z}(A, B).
\]

**Proof.** By continuity we may assume that both \( A, B \) are positive definite. Assume that \( \alpha \geq 2 \) and \( 0 < z \leq \alpha/2 \). Due to the anti-symmetric tensor power technique and the positive homogeneity in \( A, B \) of \( P_\alpha \) and \( Q_{\alpha,z} \), it suffices to prove that

\[
A^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \leq B^{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}} \quad \implies \quad P_\alpha(A, B) \leq I.
\]

So assume that \( A^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \leq B^{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}} \). We divide the proof into two cases. First, assume that \( 2m \leq \alpha \leq 2m + 1 \) for some \( m \in \mathbb{N} \), so write \( \alpha = 2m + \lambda \) with \( 0 \leq \lambda \leq 1 \). Note that

\[
P_\alpha(A, B) = B^{1/2}(B^{-1/2}AB^{-1/2})^m(B^{-1/2}AB^{-1/2})^\lambda(B^{-1/2}AB^{-1/2})^mB^{1/2} = (AB^{-1})^m(B_{\#_\lambda} A)(B^{-1} A)^m.
\]

Since \( 0 < z/\alpha \leq 1/2 \), we have \( A \leq B^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}} \) and hence

\[
B_{\#_\lambda} A \leq B_{\#_\lambda} B^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}} = B^{1-\lambda}B^{\frac{(\alpha-1)\lambda}{\alpha}} = B^{\frac{\alpha-\lambda}{\alpha}}.
\]

Therefore,

\[
P_\alpha(A, B) \leq (AB^{-1})^{m-1} AB^{-\frac{\alpha+\lambda}{\alpha}} A(B^{-1} A)^{m-1}.
\]

Since

\[
\frac{(\alpha + \lambda)z}{\alpha(\alpha - 1)} \leq \frac{\alpha + \lambda}{2(\alpha - 1)} \leq 1
\]

thanks to \( \alpha = 2m + \lambda \geq 2 + \lambda \), we have

\[
B^{-\frac{\alpha+\lambda}{\alpha}} = (B^{-\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}})^{-\frac{(\alpha+\lambda)z}{\alpha(\alpha-1)}} \leq (A^{\frac{\alpha}{2}})^{-\frac{(\alpha+\lambda)z}{\alpha(\alpha-1)}} = A^{-\frac{\alpha-\lambda}{\alpha-1}},
\]

so that

\[
P_\alpha(A, B) \leq (AB^{-1})^{m-1} A^{\frac{\alpha-\lambda}{\alpha-1}} (B^{-1} A)^{m-1}.
\]
Finally, since \( \frac{(\alpha - 2 - \lambda)z}{\alpha(\alpha - 1)} \leq \frac{\alpha - 2 - \lambda}{2(\alpha - 1)} \leq 1 \), we have
\[
A^\frac{\alpha - 2 - \lambda}{\alpha - 1} = (A^\frac{\alpha}{\alpha + 1})^\frac{(\alpha - 2 - \lambda)z}{\alpha(\alpha - 1)} \leq (B^\frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha + 1})^\frac{(\alpha - 2 - \lambda)z}{\alpha(\alpha - 1)} = B^\frac{\alpha - 2 - \lambda}{\alpha},
\]
so that
\[
P_\alpha(A, B) \leq (AB^{-1})^{m-2}AB^{-\frac{\alpha + 2 + \lambda}{\alpha}}A(B^{-1}A)^{m-2}.
\]
The above argument can be repeated to see that for \( k = 0, 1, \ldots, m - 1 \),
\[
P_\alpha(A, B) \leq (AB^{-1})^{m-1-k}AB^{-\frac{\alpha + 2m-2k}{\alpha}}A(B^{-1}A)^{m-1-k},
\]
and hence
\[
P_\alpha(A, B) \leq AB^{-\frac{\alpha + 2m-2+\lambda}{\alpha}}A = AB^{-\frac{2(\alpha - 1)}{\alpha}}A.
\]
Finally, since \( 2z/\alpha \leq 1 \), we have
\[
B^{-\frac{2(\alpha - 1)}{\alpha}} \leq (B^\frac{\alpha}{\alpha + 1})^{-\frac{2z}{\alpha}} \leq (A^\frac{\alpha}{\alpha + 1})^{-\frac{2z}{\alpha}} = A^{-2},
\]
so that \( P_\alpha(A, B) \leq I \).

Secondly, assume that \( 2m + 1 < \alpha < 2m + 2 \) for some \( m \in \mathbb{N} \), so write \( \alpha = 2m + 2 - \lambda \) with \( 0 < \lambda < 1 \). Note that
\[
P_\alpha(A, B) = B^{1/2}(B^{-1/2}AB^{-1/2})^{m+1}(B^{-1/2}AB^{-1/2})^{-\lambda}(B^{-1/2}AB^{-1/2})^{m+1}B^{1/2}
= (AB^{-1})^m AB^{-1/2}(B^{-1/2}AB^{-1/2})^{-\lambda}B^{-1/2}A(B^{-1}A)^m
= (AB^{-1})^m A(B \#_\lambda A)^{-1}(B^{-1}A)^m.
\]
Since \( 0 \leq z/(\alpha - 1) \leq 1 \), we have \( B \geq A^\frac{\alpha}{\alpha + 1} \) so that
\[
(B \#_\lambda A)^{-1} \leq (A^\frac{\alpha}{\alpha + 1} \#_\lambda A)^{-1} = (A^{\frac{\alpha(1-\lambda)}{\alpha - 1}} \lambda)^{-1} = A^{-\frac{\alpha - \lambda}{\alpha - 1}}.
\]
Therefore,
\[
P_\alpha(A, B) \leq (AB^{-1})^m A^{\frac{\alpha - 2 + \lambda}{\alpha - 1}}(B^{-1}A)^m.
\]
Since
\[
\frac{(\alpha - 2 + \lambda)z}{\alpha(\alpha - 1)} \leq \frac{\alpha - 2 + \lambda}{2(\alpha - 1)} \leq 1,
\]
we have
\[
A^{\frac{\alpha - 2 + \lambda}{\alpha - 1}} = (A^\frac{\alpha}{\alpha + 1})^\frac{(\alpha - 2 + \lambda)z}{\alpha(\alpha - 1)} \leq (B^\frac{\alpha}{\alpha + 1})^\frac{(\alpha - 2 + \lambda)z}{\alpha(\alpha - 1)} = B^{\frac{\alpha - 2 + \lambda}{\alpha}},
\]
so that
\[
P_\alpha(A, B) \leq (AB^{-1})^{m-1}AB^{-\frac{\alpha + 2 - \lambda}{\alpha}}A(B^{-1}A)^{m-1}.
\]
Since
\[
\frac{(\alpha + 2 - \lambda)z}{\alpha(\alpha - 1)} \leq \frac{\alpha + 2 - \lambda}{2(\alpha - 1)} \leq 1,
\]
we have
\[ B^{-\frac{\alpha+2-\lambda}{\alpha}} = (B^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}})^{(\frac{\alpha+2-\lambda}{\alpha} \cdot \frac{1}{\alpha})} \leq (A^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha}})^{\frac{(\alpha+2-\lambda)}{\alpha}} = A^{-\frac{\alpha+2-\lambda}{\alpha-1}}, \]
so that
\[ P_\alpha(A, B) \leq (AB^{-1})^{m-1} A^{\frac{\alpha+2-\lambda}{\alpha-1}} (B^{-1} A)^{m-1}. \]
Repeating the above argument we have
\[ P_\alpha(A, B) \leq (AB^{-1})^{m-1} A^{\frac{\alpha+2-\lambda}{\alpha-1}} (B^{-1} A)^{m-1}. \]

Now, Theorem 1.1 stated in the Introduction is proved from the log-majorization results between \( P_\alpha \) and \( Q_{\alpha,z} \) obtained so far in Propositions 2.1 and 3.1.

We note that some discussions involving \( P_\alpha, Q_\alpha = Q_{\alpha,1} \) and \( \tilde{Q}_\alpha = Q_{\alpha,a} \) were recently given in \( \square \) Sect. 5.  

### 4 Main theorem

In this section we prove that Theorem 1.1 is best possible with regard to the assumptions on the parameters \( \alpha, z \).

Assume that \( \alpha > 1 \). For each \( x, y > 0 \) and \( \theta \in \mathbb{R} \) define \( 2 \times 2 \) positive definite matrices
\[
A_\theta := \begin{bmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & x \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \cos \theta & \sin \theta \\ -\sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{bmatrix}, \quad B := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & y \end{bmatrix}. \tag{4.1}
\]
We write
\[
B^{-1/2} A_\theta B^{-1/2} = \left[ 1 + (x - 1) \frac{\sin^2 \theta}{2} \right] + (1 - x) y^{-1/2} \frac{\sin^2 \theta}{2} xy^{-1} + (1 - x) (1 - x) y^{-1} \frac{\sin^2 \theta}{2}
\]
\[ = G + \theta H + \theta^2 K + o(\theta^2), \]
where
\[
G := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & xy^{-1} \end{bmatrix}, \quad H := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & (1 - x) y^{-1/2} \\ (1 - x) y^{-1/2} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad K := \begin{bmatrix} x - 1 & 0 \\ 0 & (1 - x) y^{-1} \end{bmatrix},
\]
and \( o(\theta^2) \) denotes a small value such that \( o(\theta^2) / \theta^2 \to 0 \) as \( \theta \to 0 \). We apply the Taylor formula with Fréchet derivatives (see e.g., III. Theorem 2.3.1]) to obtain
\[
(B^{-1/2} A_\theta B^{-1/2})^\alpha = G^\alpha + D(x^\alpha) (G)(\theta H + \theta^2 K + \frac{1}{2} D^2(x^\alpha)(G)(\theta H, \theta H) + o(\theta^2),
\]
where the second and the third terms in the right-hand side are the first and the second Fréchet derivatives of $X \mapsto X^\alpha$ ($X \in \mathbb{M}_+^\times$, $X > 0$) at $G$, respectively. By Daleckii and Krein’s derivative formula (see [7, Theorem V.3.3], [11, Theorem 2.3.1]) we have

$$D(x^\alpha)(G)(\theta H + \theta^2 K)$$

$$= \left[ \frac{(x^\alpha)'(1, 1)}{(x^\alpha)'(1, xy^{-1})} \frac{(x^\alpha)'(1, xy^{-1})}{(x^\alpha)'(xy^{-1}, xy^{-1})} \right] \circ (\theta H + \theta^2 K)$$

$$= \left[ \frac{\alpha}{1-x} \frac{1-(xy-1)^\alpha}{\alpha(xy-1)^{\alpha-1}} \right] \circ (\theta H + \theta^2 K)$$

$$= \theta \left[ \frac{x^\alpha y^\alpha}{x-y} \frac{1}{(1-x)y^{\alpha}} \right] \frac{(x^\alpha)'(1, xy^{-1})}{(x^\alpha)'(1, xy^{-1})} \circ (\theta H + \theta^2 K)$$

$$= \theta \left[ \frac{x^\alpha y^\alpha}{x-y} \frac{1}{(1-x)y^{\alpha}} \right] \frac{(x^\alpha)'(1, xy^{-1})}{(x^\alpha)'(1, xy^{-1})} \circ (\theta H + \theta^2 K)$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{\theta^2}{2} D^2(x^\alpha)(G)(\theta H, \theta H) = \theta^2 \left[ \frac{(x-1)^2(\alpha y - \alpha x + x^\alpha y^{\alpha-1})}{(x-y)^2} \frac{(x-y)^2}{(x-1)^2(\alpha y - \alpha x + x^\alpha y^{\alpha-1})} \right]$$

(In the above computation we have assumed that $x \neq y$.) Therefore, it follows that

$$(B^{-1/2}A_{\theta}B^{-1/2}) = \left[ \begin{array}{cc} 1 + s_\alpha^{(1)} \theta^2 & s_\alpha^{(3)} \theta \\ s_\alpha^{(2)} & x^\alpha y^{\alpha-1} + s_\alpha^{(2)} \theta^2 \end{array} \right] + o(\theta^2),$$

where

$$s_\alpha^{(1)} := \alpha (x-1) + \frac{(x-1)^2(\alpha y - \alpha x + x^\alpha y^{\alpha-1})}{(x-y)^2},$$

$$s_\alpha^{(2)} := \alpha x^{\alpha-1}(1-x)y^{\alpha-1} + \frac{(x-1)^2(\alpha y - \alpha x + x^\alpha y^{\alpha-1})}{(x-y)^2}.$$

(The form of $s_\alpha^{(3)}$ is not written down here since it is unnecessary in the computation below.) We hence arrive at

$$\text{Tr} P_\alpha(A_{\theta}, B) = 1 + x^\alpha y^{\alpha-1} + (s_\alpha^{(1)} + s_\alpha^{(2)} \theta) \theta^2 + o(\theta^2).$$

\(4.2\)
Next, we write

\[
B^{\frac{1}{z} - \theta} A^{\frac{\alpha}{z}} B^{\frac{1}{z} - \theta} = \begin{bmatrix}
1 + (x^{\alpha} - 1) \sin^2 \theta & (1 - x^{\alpha}) y^{\frac{1-\alpha}{z}} \frac{\sin 2\theta}{2} \\
(1 - x^{\alpha}) y^{\frac{1-\alpha}{z}} \sin 2\theta & x^{\alpha} y^{\frac{1-\alpha}{z}} + (1 - x^{\alpha}) y^{\frac{2-\alpha}{z}} \sin^2 \theta
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
= \begin{bmatrix}
1 + (x^{\alpha} - 1)\theta^2 & (1 - x^{\alpha}) y^{\frac{1-\alpha}{z}} \theta \\
(1 - x^{\alpha}) y^{\frac{1-\alpha}{z}} \theta & x^{\alpha} y^{\frac{1-\alpha}{z}} + (1 - x^{\alpha}) y^{\frac{2-\alpha}{z}} \theta^2
\end{bmatrix} + o(\theta^2).
\]

Since

\[
\det\left(tI - B^{\frac{1}{z} - \theta} A^{\frac{\alpha}{z}} B^{\frac{1}{z} - \theta}\right) = t^2 - \left\{1 + x^{\alpha} y^{\frac{1-\alpha}{z}} + (x^{\alpha} - 1)(1 - y^{\frac{1-\alpha}{z}})\theta^2\right\} t + x^{\alpha} y^{\frac{1-\alpha}{z}} + o(\theta^2),
\]

the eigenvalues of \(B^{\frac{1}{z} - \theta} A^{\frac{\alpha}{z}} B^{\frac{1}{z} - \theta}\) are

\[
t_{\pm \alpha,z,\theta} = \frac{1}{2}\left[1 + x^{\alpha} y^{\frac{1-\alpha}{z}} + (x^{\alpha} - 1)(1 - y^{\frac{1-\alpha}{z}})\theta^2 \right. \\
\pm \sqrt{(1 - x^{\alpha} y^{\frac{1-\alpha}{z}})^2 + 2(x^{\alpha} - 1)(1 - y^{\frac{1-\alpha}{z}})(1 + x^{\alpha} y^{\frac{1-\alpha}{z}})\theta^2} + o(\theta^2).
\]

Assuming that \(1 - x^{\alpha} y^{\frac{1-\alpha}{z}} > 0\) (this is the case when we let \(y \to \infty\) for any fixed \(x > 0\)), we have

\[
t_{\pm \alpha,z,\theta} = \frac{1}{2}\left[1 + x^{\alpha} y^{\frac{1-\alpha}{z}} + (x^{\alpha} - 1)(1 - y^{\frac{1-\alpha}{z}})\theta^2 \\
\right. \\
\pm \left\{1 - x^{\alpha} y^{\frac{1-\alpha}{z}} + \frac{(x^{\alpha} - 1)(1 - y^{\frac{1-\alpha}{z}})(1 + x^{\alpha} y^{\frac{1-\alpha}{z}})\theta^2}{1 - x^{\alpha} y^{\frac{1-\alpha}{z}}}\right\} + o(\theta^2),
\]

so that

\[
t_{\alpha,z,\theta}^+ = 1 + \frac{(x^{\alpha} - 1)(1 - y^{\frac{1-\alpha}{z}})}{1 - x^{\alpha} y^{\frac{1-\alpha}{z}}} \theta^2 + o(\theta^2),
\]

\[
t_{\alpha,z,\theta}^- = x^{\alpha} y^{\frac{1-\alpha}{z}} \left\{1 - \frac{(x^{\alpha} - 1)(1 - y^{\frac{1-\alpha}{z}})}{1 - x^{\alpha} y^{\frac{1-\alpha}{z}}} \theta^2\right\} + o(\theta^2).
\]

Therefore, we have

\[
\text{Tr} Q_{\alpha,z}(A_{\theta}, B) = (t_{\alpha,z,\theta}^+)^z + (t_{\alpha,z,\theta}^-)^z
\]

\[
= 1 + z \left\{1 - x^{\alpha} y^{\frac{1-\alpha}{z}} + z \frac{(x^{\alpha} - 1)(1 - y^{\frac{1-\alpha}{z}})(1 - x^{\alpha} y^{1-\alpha})}{1 - x^{\alpha} y^{\frac{1-\alpha}{z}}} \theta^2 + o(\theta^2)\right\}.
\]
Now, suppose that $Q_{\alpha,z}(A_{\theta}, B) \prec_{\log} P_{\alpha}(A_{\theta}, B)$ holds for all $\theta \neq 0$. Then we must have $\text{Tr} Q_{\alpha,z}(A_{\theta}, B) \leq \text{Tr} P_{\alpha}(A_{\theta}, B)$. (Since $\det Q_{\alpha,z}(A_{\theta}, B) = \det P_{\alpha}(A_{\theta}, B)$, $Q_{\alpha,z}(A_{\theta}, B) \prec_{\log} P_{\alpha}(A_{\theta}, B)$ is indeed equivalent to $\text{Tr} Q_{\alpha,z}(A_{\theta}, B) \leq \text{Tr} P_{\alpha}(A_{\theta}, B)$ in the $2 \times 2$ case here.) So by (4.2) and (4.3) it follows that

$$z \left( x^\frac{\alpha}{2} - 1 \right) \left( 1 - y^\frac{1-\alpha}{2} \right) \frac{1 - x^\alpha y^{1-\alpha}}{1 - x^\frac{\alpha}{2} y^\frac{1-\alpha}{2}} \leq s_{\alpha}^{(1)} + s_{\alpha}^{(2)} y.$$

For any $x > 0$, let $y \to \infty$; then the above left-hand side converges to $z(x^\frac{\alpha}{2} - 1)$, while $s_{\alpha}^{(1)} \to \alpha(x - 1)$ and $s_{\alpha}^{(2)} \to (x - 1)^2$ thanks to $\alpha > 1$. Hence we must have for every $x > 0$,

$$z(x^\frac{\alpha}{2} - 1) \leq \alpha(x - 1) + (x - 1)^2.$$

Letting $x \searrow 0$ gives $-z \leq -\alpha + 1$, i.e., $z \geq \alpha - 1$. Moreover, for any $x > 1$,

$$z \frac{x^\frac{\alpha}{2} - 1}{x - 1} \leq x + \alpha - 1,$$

which holds true only when $\alpha/z \leq 2$, i.e., $z \geq \alpha/2$. On the other hand, suppose that $P_{\alpha}(A_{\theta}, B) \prec_{\log} Q_{\alpha,z}(A_{\theta}, B)$ holds for all $\theta \neq 0$. Then, similarly to the above case, $z \leq \alpha - 1$ and $z \leq \alpha/2$ must follow.

Thus, combining the above discussions with Theorem 3.1 proves our main theorem as follows:

**Theorem 4.1.** Let $\alpha, z > 0$ with $\alpha \neq 1$.

(a) The following conditions are equivalent:

(i) $P_{\alpha}(A, B) \prec_{\log} Q_{\alpha,z}(A, B)$ for every $A, B \in \mathbb{M}_n^+$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, with $B > 0$;
(ii) $\text{Tr} P_{\alpha}(A, B) \leq \text{Tr} Q_{\alpha,z}(A, B)$ for every $A, B \in \mathbb{M}_n^+$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, with $B > 0$;
(iii) $P_{\alpha}(A, B) \prec_{\log} Q_{\alpha,z}(A, B)$ for every $A, B \in \mathbb{M}_2^+$ with $A, B > 0$;
(iv) either $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $z > 0$ is arbitrary, or $\alpha > 1$ and $0 < z \leq \min\{\alpha/2, \alpha - 1\}$.

(b) The following conditions are equivalent:

(i) $Q_{\alpha,z}(A, B) \prec_{\log} P_{\alpha}(A, B)$ for every $A, B \in \mathbb{M}_n^+$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, with $B > 0$;
(ii) $\text{Tr} Q_{\alpha,z}(A, B) \leq \text{Tr} P_{\alpha}(A, B)$ for every $A, B \in \mathbb{M}_n^+$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, with $B > 0$;
(iii) $Q_{\alpha,z}(A, B) \prec_{\log} P_{\alpha}(A, B)$ for every $A, B \in \mathbb{M}_2^+$ with $A, B > 0$;
(iv) $\alpha > 1$ and $z \geq \max\{\alpha/2, \alpha - 1\}$.

The theorem says that neither $P_{\alpha}(A, B) \prec_{\log} Q_{\alpha,z}(A, B)$ nor $Q_{\alpha,z}(A, B) \prec_{\log} P_{\alpha}(A, B)$ holds in general in the regions of $1 < \alpha < 2$ and $\alpha - 1 < z < \alpha/2$ and of $\alpha > 2$ and $\alpha/2 < z < \alpha - 1$.  
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5 Further extension

For $A, B \in \mathbb{M}_n^+$ with $B > 0$, taking the expression $Q_{\alpha, z}(A, B) = Q_{\alpha}(A^{1/z}, B^{1/z})^z$ into account, we may define the two-parameter extension of $P_{\alpha}$ as

$$P_{\alpha, r}(A, B) := P_{\alpha}(A^{1/r}, B^{1/r})^r = \{B^{1/2r}(B^{-1/2r}A^{1/r}B^{-1/2r})^\alpha B^{1/2r}\}^r, \quad \alpha, r > 0.$$  

The log-majorization in [2] says that when $0 < \alpha < 1$,

$$P_{\alpha, r}(A, B) \prec \log P_{\alpha, r'}(A, B) \quad \text{if} \quad 0 < r \leq r'.$$  

(5.1)

For every $A, B > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$, note by (2.7) that $P_{\alpha}(A, B) = A^{1/2}(A^{-1/2}BA^{-1/2})^\beta A^{1/2}$ where $\beta := 1 - \alpha$ (the right-hand side is often denoted by $A_{\#\beta}B$ when $\beta \not\in [0, 1]$ instead of $A_{\#\beta}B$ for $\beta \in [0, 1]$). Thus, the log-majorization recently obtained in [16, Theorem 3.1] is rephrased as follows: When $1 < \alpha \leq 2$, for every $A, B \in \mathbb{M}_n^+$ with $B > 0$,

$$P_{\alpha, r}(A, B) \prec \log P_{\alpha, r'}(A, B) \quad \text{if} \quad 0 < r' \leq r.$$  

(5.2)

In particular, when $\alpha = 2$, this reduces to Araki’s log-majorization (see Remark 2.2).

For each $\alpha, r, z > 0$ with $\alpha \neq 1$, since it is easy to see that $P_{\alpha, r}(A, B) \prec \log Q_{\alpha, z}(A, B)$ (resp., $Q_{\alpha, z}(A, B) \prec \log P_{\alpha, r}(A, B)$) for every $A, B \in \mathbb{M}_n^+$ with $B > 0$ if and only if $P_{\alpha}(A, B) \prec \log Q_{\alpha, z/r}(A, B)$ (resp., $Q_{\alpha, z/r}(A, B) \prec \log P_{\alpha}(A, B)$) for every $A, B \in \mathbb{M}_n^+$ with $B > 0$. Thus, we can extend Theorem 4.1 in the following way:

**Proposition 5.1.** Let $\alpha, r, z > 0$ with $\alpha \neq 1$

(a) The following conditions are equivalent:

(i) $P_{\alpha, r}(A, B) \prec \log Q_{\alpha, z}(A, B)$ for every $A, B \in \mathbb{M}_n^+$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, with $B > 0$;

(ii) either $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $r, z > 0$ are arbitrary, or $\alpha > 1$ and $0 < z/r \leq \min\{\alpha/2, \alpha - 1\}$.

(b) The following conditions are equivalent:

(i)$'$ $Q_{\alpha, z}(A, B) \prec \log P_{\alpha, r}(A, B)$ for every $A, B \in \mathbb{M}_n^+$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, with $B > 0$;

(ii)$'$ $\alpha > 1$ and $z/r \geq \max\{\alpha/2, \alpha - 1\}$.

Although Proposition 5.1 is just a slight modification of Theorem 4.1, it can be used to show the following log-majorization supplementary to (5.1) and (5.2):

**Corollary 5.2.** Assume that $\alpha \geq 2$. For every $A, B \in \mathbb{M}_n^+$ with $B > 0$,

$$P_{\alpha, r}(A, B) \prec \log P_{\alpha, r'}(A, B) \quad \text{if} \quad 0 < r' \leq \frac{\alpha}{2(\alpha - 1)} r.$$  

Hence $P_{\alpha, r}(A, B) \prec \log P_{\alpha, r'}(A, B)$ for all $\alpha \geq 2$ if $0 < r' \leq r/2$.  


Proof. Let $\alpha \geq 2$. By Proposition 5.1(a) we have

$$P_{\alpha,r}(A, B) \prec_{\log} Q_{\alpha,r/2}(A, B).$$

Since $(r\alpha/2)/r' \geq \alpha - 1$, Proposition 5.1(b) implies that

$$Q_{\alpha,r/2}(A, B) \prec_{\log} P_{\alpha,r'}(A, B),$$

so that the asserted log-majorization follows.

\[\square\]

**Problem 5.3.** Although the assumption $\beta = 1 - \alpha \in [-1, 0]$ (or $1 < \alpha \leq 2$) seems essential in the proof of (5.2) in [16], it is unknown whether (5.2) holds true even for $\alpha > 2$ (i.e., the bound $\alpha/2(\alpha - 1)$ in the corollary can be removed or not). For example, when $\alpha = m + 1 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $m \geq 2$, noting $P_{m+1}(A, B) = (AB^{-1})^mA$ and replacing $B^{-1}$ with $B$ and $1/r$ with $r$, (5.2) is equivalent to the following extended Araki’s log-majorization for every $A, B \in \mathbb{M}^+_n$:

$$((AB)^mA)^r \prec_{\log} (A^rB^r)^mA^r \quad \text{if } r \geq 1,$$

which seems difficult to hold in general, while no counter-example is at the moment known to us. But Corollary 5.2 implies that $((AB)^mA)^r \prec_{\log} (A^rB^r)^mA^r$ for $r \geq 2m/(m + 1)$. Here is a simple argument when $m = 2$. For $m = 2$, to prove (5.3), it suffices to show that for $0 < p \leq 1$, $ABABA \leq I \implies A^pB^pA^pB^pA^p \leq I$. Assume the left-hand inequality, i.e., $(A^{1/2}BA^{1/2})^2 \leq A^{-1}$; then $B \leq A^{-3/2}$ and so $A^p \leq B^{-2p/3}$. Hence $A^pB^pA^pB^pA^p \leq A^pB^{4p/3}A^p$. If $p \leq 3/4$, then $B^{4p/3} \leq A^{-2p}$ and so $A^pB^pA^pB^pA^p \leq I$. Therefore, $(ABABA) \prec_{\log} A^rB^rA^rB^rA^r$ if $r \geq 4/3$, which is just the case $\alpha = 3$ of the corollary. The same argument works well when $\alpha = m + 1$ for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $m \geq 2$, proving directly the $\alpha = m + 1$ case of the corollary.

## 6 Norm inequalities and their equality cases

A norm $\| \cdot \|$ on $\mathbb{M}_n$ is said to be **unitarily invariant** if $\|UXV\| = \|X\|$ for all $X \in \mathbb{M}_n$ and all unitaries $U, V \in \mathbb{U}_n$. We say (see [11]) that a unitarily invariant norm $\| \cdot \|$ is **strictly increasing** if for $X, Y \in \mathbb{M}_n^+$, $X \leq Y$ and $\|X\| = \|Y\|$ imply $X = Y$. For example, the Schatten $p$-norm $\|X\|_p := (\text{Tr } |X|^p)^{1/p}$ is strictly increasing when $1 \leq p < \infty$.

Theorem 5.4 implies the following:

**Corollary 6.1.** Let $A, B \in \mathbb{M}_n^+$ with $B > 0$ and $\| \cdot \|$ be a unitarily invariant norm on $\mathbb{M}_n$.

(1) If $0 < \alpha < 1$, then $\|P_{\alpha}(A, B)\| \leq \|Q_{\alpha,z}(A, B)\|$ for all $z > 0$.

(2) If $\alpha > 1$ and $0 < z \leq \min\{\alpha/2, \alpha - 1\}$, then $\|P_{\alpha}(A, B)\| \leq \|Q_{\alpha,z}(A, B)\|$.
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(3) If $\alpha > 1$ and $z \geq \max\{\alpha/2, \alpha - 1\}$, then $\|Q_{\alpha, z}(A, B)\| \leq \|P_{\alpha}(A, B)\|$.

**Remark 6.2.** The norm inequalities with negative power $\beta$ in [16, Theorem 4.4] can be rephrased as follows (by letting $\alpha = 1 - \beta$): When $A, B > 0$, for every unitarily invariant norm,

$$
\|Q_{\alpha, z}(B, A)\| \leq \|P_{\alpha}(B, A)\| \quad \text{if} \quad \alpha \in (1, 2], \quad z \geq 2,

\|P_{\alpha}(B, A)\| \leq \|Q_{\alpha, 1/2}(B, A)\| \leq \|Q_{\alpha, z}(B, A)\| \quad \text{if} \quad \alpha \in [3/2, 2], \quad 0 < z \leq 1/2.
$$

These inequalities are indeed included in (2) and (3) of Corollary 6.1 (and (2.1)).

**Lemma 6.3.** Assume that $\alpha > 0$ and $\alpha \neq 1$. Let $\| \cdot \|$ be a strictly increasing unitarily invariant norm on $\mathbb{M}_n$. If $\|Q_{\alpha, z}(A, B)\| = \|Q_{\alpha, z'}(A, B)\|$ for some $z, z' > 0$ with $z \neq z'$, then $AB = BA$.

**Proof.** By [11, Theorem 2.1] the assumed norm equality implies that $A^{\alpha}$ and $B^{1-\alpha}$ commute and hence $AB = BA$. \qed

Concerning the equality cases of the inequalities in Corollary 6.1 we have:

**Proposition 6.4.** Let $\| \cdot \|$ be a strictly increasing unitarily invariant norm on $\mathbb{M}_n$. Then we have $AB = BA$ if $\|P_{\alpha}(A, B)\| = \|Q_{\alpha, z}(A, B)\|$ for some $\alpha, z$ satisfying one of the following:

1. $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $z > 0$,
2. $\alpha > 1$ and $0 < z < \min\{\alpha/2, \alpha - 1\}$,
3. $\alpha > 1$ and $z \geq \max\{\alpha/2, \alpha - 1\}$.

**Proof.** (1) Assume that $\|P_{\alpha}(A, B)\| = \|Q_{\alpha, z}(A, B)\|$ for some $\alpha, z$ in (1). Choose $z' > z$. By (2.1) and Corollary 6.1(1) we have

$$
\|P_{\alpha}(A, B)\| = \|Q_{\alpha, z}(A, B)\| \geq \|Q_{\alpha, z'}(A, B)\| \geq \|P_{\alpha}(A, B)\|,
$$

implying $AB = BA$ by Lemma 6.3.

(2) Assume that $\|P_{\alpha}(A, B)\| = \|Q_{\alpha, z}(A, B)\|$ for some $\alpha, z$ in (2). Choose $z'$ with $z < z' < \min\{\alpha/2, \alpha - 1\}$. By (2.1) and Corollary 6.1(2),

$$
\|P_{\alpha}(A, B)\| = \|Q_{\alpha, z}(A, B)\| \geq \|Q_{\alpha, z'}(A, B)\| \geq \|P_{\alpha}(A, B)\|,
$$

implying $AB = BA$ by Lemma 6.3.

(3) Assume that $\|P_{\alpha}(A, B)\| = \|Q_{\alpha, z}(A, B)\|$ for some $\alpha, z$ in (3). Choose $z'$ with $z > z' > \max\{\alpha/2, \alpha - 1\}$. Then $AB = BA$ follows similarly to the proof for (2). \qed
7 Logarithmic trace inequalities

For every $p > 0$ and every $A, B \in \mathbb{M}_n^+$ with $B > 0$, the logarithmic trace inequalities

\[
\frac{1}{p} \text{Tr} A \log(B^{-p/2} A^p B^{-p/2}) \leq \text{Tr} A(\log A - \log B) \\
\leq \frac{1}{p} \text{Tr} A \log(A^{p/2} B^{-p} A^{p/2}). \tag{7.1}
\]

were shown in [15], and supplementary logarithmic trace inequalities were also in [2]. In particular, the latter inequality for $p = 1$ was first proved in [14], giving the comparison between the Umegaki relative entropy and the Belavkin-Staszewski relative entropy [6] (see Remark 8.5 below). Recall that this can readily be verified by taking the derivatives at $\alpha = 1$ of $\text{Tr} P_\alpha(A, B) = \text{Tr} A(A^{1/2}B^{-1}A^{1/2})^{\alpha-1}$ and $\text{Tr} Q_\alpha(A, B) = \text{Tr} A^\alpha B^{1-\alpha}$ from Corollary 6.1. By the derivatives at $\alpha = 2$ we have more logarithmic trace inequalities in the following:

**Proposition 7.1.** For every $A, B \in \mathbb{M}_n^+$ with $B > 0$,

\[
\text{Tr} AB^{-1} A(\log A - \log B) \leq \text{Tr} A^{1/2} B^{-1} A^{3/2} \log(A^{1/2} B^{-1} A^{1/2}) \\
= \text{Tr} B^{-1/2} A^2 B^{-1/2} \log(B^{-1/2} A B^{-1/2}) \\
= \text{Tr} A^{3/2} B^{-1} A^{1/2} \log(A^{1/2} B^{-1} A^{1/2}) \\
\leq \text{Tr} A^2 B^{-1}(\log A - \log B). \tag{7.2}
\]

**Proof.** To prove the inequalities and the equalities above, we may assume by continuity that $A > 0$ as well as $B > 0$. The inequalities in the middle of (7.2) are easily verified as

\[
\text{Tr} A^{1/2} B^{-1} A^{3/2} \log(A^{1/2} B^{-1} A^{1/2}) = \text{Tr} A \log(A^{1/2} B^{-1} A^{1/2}) \cdot A^{1/2} B^{-1} A^{1/2} \\
= \text{Tr} A^{3/2} B^{-1} A^{1/2} \log(A^{1/2} B^{-1} A^{1/2}) \\
= \text{Tr} A^{3/2} B^{-1/2} \log(B^{-1/2} A B^{-1/2}) \cdot B^{-1/2} A^{1/2} \\
= \text{Tr} B^{-1/2} A^2 B^{-1/2} \log(B^{-1/2} A B^{-1/2}),
\]

where we have used (2.6) for the third equality. To prove the inequalities, we use Corollary 6.1(2) for $z = 1$ to have

\[
\text{Tr} P_\alpha(A, B) \leq \text{Tr} Q_\alpha(A, B) \quad \text{for } \alpha \geq 2.
\]

Since $\text{Tr} P_2(A, B) = \text{Tr} A^2 B^{-1} = \text{Tr} Q_2(A, B)$, if follows that

\[
\left. \frac{d}{d\alpha} \text{Tr} P_\alpha(A, B) \right|_{\alpha=2} \leq \left. \frac{d}{d\alpha} \text{Tr} Q_\alpha(A, B) \right|_{\alpha=2}. \tag{7.3}
\]

The left-hand side of (7.3) is

\[
\text{Tr} B(B^{-1/2} A B^{-1/2})^2 \log(B^{-1/2} A B^{-1/2})
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
= \text{Tr } B^{1/2} A B^{-1} A B^{-1/2} \log(B^{-1/2} A B^{-1/2}) \\
= \text{Tr } B^{1/2} A B^{-1} A^{1/2} \log(A^{1/2} B^{-1} A^{1/2}) \cdot A^{1/2} B^{-1/2} \\
= \text{Tr } A^{3/2} B^{-1} A^{1/2} \log(A^{1/2} B^{-1} A^{1/2}),
\end{align*}
\]
where we have used (2.6) again for the second equality. On the other hand, the right-hand side of (7.3) is
\[
\text{Tr } A^2 \log A \cdot B^{-1} - \text{Tr } A^2 B^{-1} \log B = \text{Tr } A^2 B^{-1} (\log A - \log B).
\]
Hence the latter inequality in (7.2) follows.

Next, set \(C := B^{-1/2} A B^{-1/2}\) so that \(A = B^{1/2} C B^{1/2}\). Then
\[
\text{Tr } B^{-1/2} A^2 B^{-1/2} \log(B^{-1/2} A B^{-1/2}) = \text{Tr } C B C \log C
\]
and
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Tr } A^2 B^{-1} (\log A - \log B) \\
= \text{Tr } B^{1/2} C B C B^{-1/2} (\log(B^{1/2} C B^{1/2}) - \log B) \\
= \text{Tr } C^{1/2} B C B^{-1/2} \log(B^{1/2} C B^{1/2}) \cdot B^{1/2} C B^{1/2} - \text{Tr } C B C \log B \\
= \text{Tr } C^{1/2} B C^3/2 \log(C^{1/2} B C^{1/2}) - \text{Tr } C B C \log B.
\end{align*}
\]
by (2.6) once again. Hence the latter inequality in (7.2) is rephrased as
\[
\text{Tr } C B C (\log C + \log B) \leq \text{Tr } C^{1/2} B C^3/2 \log(C^{1/2} B C^{1/2}).
\]
Replacing \(C, B\) with \(A, B^{-1}\), respectively, we have the first inequality in (7.2). \(\Box\)

**Remark 7.2.** It is obvious that if \(A, B\) are commuting, then all the inequalities of (7.1) and (7.2) become equality. In the converse direction, it is seen from [2, Theorem 5.1] and [11, Theorem 4.1] that the equality case of the second inequality of (7.1) (for some \(p > 0\)) implies \(AB = BA\). Here we note that if equality holds in both inequalities of (7.2) then \(AB = BA\). Indeed, the inequality between both ends of (7.2) means that
\[
\text{Tr } A B^{-1} A \log B^{-1} \leq \text{Tr } A^2 B^{-1} \log B^{-1},
\]
which is considered as a kind of so-called gathering inequalities (see, e.g., [9] and [3]). To prove that the equality case of (7.4) implies \(AB = BA\), we may assume that \(B\) is diagonal, so \(B^{-1} = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n)\). Then for \(A = [a_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^n\), equality in (7.4) means that
\[
\sum_{i,j=1}^n |a_{ij}|^2 \lambda_i \log \lambda_j = \sum_{i,j=1}^n |a_{ij}|^2 \lambda_i \log \lambda_i,
\]
which is rewritten as
\[
\sum_{i,j=1}^n |a_{ij}|^2 (\lambda_i - \lambda_j) (\log \lambda_i - \log \lambda_j) = 0.
\]
Since \((\lambda_i - \lambda_j)(\log \lambda_i - \log \lambda_j) > 0\) when \(\lambda_i \neq \lambda_j\), we must have \(a_{ij} = 0\) for all \(i, j\) with \(\lambda_i \neq \lambda_j\), implying \(AB = BA\).

We may naturally conjecture that if either inequality of (7.2) holds with equality then \(AB = BA\).

### 8 Applications to Rényi divergences

In this section we apply our log-majorization results to the relations between Rényi type divergences \(D_\alpha\), \(\hat{D}_\alpha\), \(\hat{D}_\alpha\) and \(D_{\alpha,z}\) defined in the Introduction.

The equivalences (ii) \(\iff\) (iv) and (ii)' \(\iff\) (iv)' of Theorem 4.1 immediately yield the following:

**Corollary 8.1.** Let \(\alpha, z > 0\) with \(\alpha \neq 1\).

(a) The following conditions are equivalent:

(i) \(\hat{D}_\alpha(A\|B) \leq D_{\alpha,z}(A\|B)\) for every \(A, B \in M^+_n\), \(n \in \mathbb{N}\), with \(A \neq 0\) and \(B > 0\);

(ii) \(\alpha > 1\) and \(z \leq \min\{\alpha/2, \alpha - 1\}\).

(b) The following conditions are equivalent:

(i)' \(D_{\alpha,z}(A\|B) \leq \hat{D}_\alpha(A\|B)\) for every \(A, B \in M^+_n\), \(n \in \mathbb{N}\), with \(A \neq 0\) and \(B > 0\);

(ii)' either \(0 < \alpha < 1\) and \(z > 0\) is arbitrary, or \(\alpha > 1\) and \(z \geq \max\{\alpha/2, \alpha - 1\}\).

Moreover, specializing Corollary 8.1 to \(z = 1, \alpha\) and the trace-norm, we have:

**Corollary 8.2.** Let \(A, B \in M^+_n\) with \(A \neq 0\) and \(B > 0\). If \(0 < \alpha \leq 2\) and \(\alpha \neq 1\) then

\[
\hat{D}_\alpha(A\|B) \leq D_\alpha(A\|B) \leq \tilde{D}_\alpha(A\|B),
\]

and if \(\alpha \geq 2\) then

\[
\tilde{D}_\alpha(A\|B) \leq \hat{D}_\alpha(A\|B) \leq D_\alpha(A\|B).
\]

**Corollary 8.3.** Let \(A, B \in M^+_n\) with \(A \neq 0\) and \(B > 0\). If some two of \(D_\alpha(A\|B)\), \(\hat{D}_\alpha(A\|B)\), and \(\tilde{D}_\alpha(A\|B)\) are equal for some \(\alpha \in (0, \infty) \setminus \{1, 2\}\), then \(AB = BA\).

**Proof.** Note that \(D_\alpha = \hat{D}_\alpha\) means \(\text{Tr} Q_{\alpha,1} = \text{Tr} P_\alpha\), and \(\tilde{D}_\alpha = \hat{D}_\alpha\) means \(\text{Tr} Q_{\alpha,\alpha} = \text{Tr} P_\alpha\). Also, note that if \(1 < \alpha < 2\) then \(\alpha > 1 > \max\{\alpha/2, \alpha - 1\}\), and if \(\alpha > 2\) then \(1 < \min\{\alpha/2, \alpha - 1\}\) and \(\alpha > \max\{\alpha/2, \alpha - 1\}\). Hence by Proposition 6.4, either equality of \(D_\alpha(A\|B) = \hat{D}_\alpha(A\|B)\) or \(\tilde{D}_\alpha(A\|B) = \hat{D}_\alpha(A\|B)\) implies \(AB = BA\). Furthermore, \(D_\alpha(A\|B) = \tilde{D}_\alpha(A\|B)\) implies \(AB = BA\) by Lemma 6.3. \(\Box\)
Remark 8.4. In [13] we studied the standard \( f \)-divergence \( S_f(A\|B) \) and the maximal \( f \)-divergence \( \hat{S}_f(A\|B) \), which are defined as

\[
S_f(A\|B) := \text{Tr} B^{1/2} f(L_A R_{B^{-1}})(B^{1/2}), \quad \hat{S}_f(A\|B) := \text{Tr} P_f(A, B)
\]

for \( A, B \in \mathbb{M}_n^+ \), \( A, B > 0 \) (and extended to general \( A, B \in \mathbb{M}_n^+ \) by convergences), where \( L_A \) is the left multiplication on \( \mathbb{M}_n \) by \( A \) and \( R_{B^{-1}} \) is the right multiplication by \( B^{-1} \). It is known [13, Proposition 4.1] (see also [19]) that

\[
S_f(A\|B) \leq \hat{S}_f(A\|B)
\]

holds whenever \( f \) is an operator convex function on \((0, \infty)\). When \( f(x) = -x^\alpha \) for \( 0 < \alpha < 1 \) or \( f(x) = x^\alpha \) for \( 1 < \alpha \leq 2 \), this becomes the second inequality of (8.1). Corollaries 8.2 and 8.3 say that this is no longer true if \( f \) is a general convex function on \((0, \infty)\). Furthermore, a special case of [13, Theorem 4.3] says that \( D_\alpha(A\|B) = \hat{D}_\alpha(A\|B) \) for some \( \alpha \in (0, 2) \setminus \{1\} \) implies \( AB = BA \), which is included in Corollary 8.3.

Remark 8.5. Let \( A, B \in \mathbb{M}_n^+ \) with \( A \neq 0 \) and \( B > 0 \) as above. It is well-known (and readily verified) that

\[
\lim_{\alpha \to 1} D_\alpha(A\|B) = D_1(A\|B) := \frac{D(A\|B)}{\text{Tr} A},
\]

where \( D(A\|B) := \text{Tr} A(\log A - \log B) \), the Umegaki relative entropy. It is also known [20] that

\[
\lim_{\alpha \to 1} \hat{D}_\alpha(A\|B) = D_1(A\|B).
\]

On the other hand, we note that

\[
\lim_{\alpha \to 1} \hat{D}_\alpha(A\|B) = \frac{1}{\text{Tr} A} \text{Tr} B^{1/2} A B^{-1/2} \log(B^{-1/2} A B^{-1/2}) = \frac{D_{BS}(A\|B)}{\text{Tr} A},
\]

where \( D_{BS}(A\|B) := \text{Tr} A \log(A^{1/2} B^{-1} A^{1/2}) \), the Belavkin-Staszewski relative entropy [6] (see also [13, Example 4.4]). By Corollary 8.2 we have \( D(A\|B) \leq D_{BS}(A\|B) \), which was first obtained in [14].
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