NUMERICAL RADIUS INEQUALITIES FOR HILBERT SPACE OPERATORS
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Abstract. In this work, an improvement of Hölder-McCarty inequality is established. Based on that, several refinements of the generalized mixed Schwarz inequality are obtained. Consequently, some new numerical radius inequalities are proved. New inequalities for numerical radius of \( n \times n \) matrix of Hilbert space operators are proved as well. Some refinements of some earlier results were proved in literature are also given. Some of the presented results are refined and it shown to be better than earlier results were proved in literature.

1. Introduction

Let \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) be the Banach algebra of all bounded linear operators defined on a complex Hilbert space \( (\mathcal{H}; \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle) \) with the identity operator \( 1_{\mathcal{H}} \) in \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \). A bounded linear operator \( A \) defined on \( \mathcal{H} \) is selfadjoint if and only if \( \langle Ax, x \rangle \in \mathbb{R} \) for all \( x \in \mathcal{H} \). The spectrum of an operator \( A \) is the set of all \( \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \) for which the operator \( \lambda I - A \) does not have a bounded linear operator inverse, and is denoted by \( \text{sp} (A) \). Consider the real vector space \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{sa} \) of self-adjoint operators on \( \mathcal{H} \) and its positive cone \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{sa}^+ \) of positive operators on \( \mathcal{H} \). Also, \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_I \) denotes the convex set of bounded self-adjoint operators on the Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H} \) with spectra in a real interval \( I \). A partial order is naturally equipped on \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{sa} \) by defining \( A \leq B \) if and only if \( B - A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{sa}^+ \). We write \( A \geq 0 \) to mean that \( A \) is a strictly positive operator, or equivalently, \( A \geq 0 \) and \( A \) is invertible. When \( \mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^n \), we identify \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) with the algebra \( M_{n \times n} \) of \( n \times n \) complex matrices. Then, \( M_{n \times n}^+ \) is just the cone of \( n \times n \) positive semidefinite matrices.

For a bounded linear operator \( T \) on a Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H} \), the numerical range \( W(T) \) is the image of the unit sphere of \( \mathcal{H} \) under the quadratic form \( x \mapsto \langle Tx, x \rangle \) associated with the operator. More precisely,

\[
W(T) = \{ \langle Tx, x \rangle : x \in \mathcal{H}, \|x\| = 1 \}
\]

Also, the numerical radius is defined to be

\[
w(T) = \sup \{ |\lambda| : \lambda \in W(T) \} = \sup_{\|x\|=1} |\langle Tx, x \rangle|.
\]

The spectral radius of an operator \( T \) is defined to be

\[
r(T) = \sup \{ |\lambda| : \lambda \in \text{sp}(T) \}.
\]

Let \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) be the Banach algebra of all bounded linear operators defined on a complex Hilbert space \( (\mathcal{H}; \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle) \) with the identity operator \( 1_{\mathcal{H}} \) in \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \).
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For a bounded linear operator $T$ on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, the numerical range $W(T)$ is the image of the unit sphere of $\mathcal{H}$ under the quadratic form $x \rightarrow \langle Tx, x \rangle$ associated with the operator. More precisely,

$$W(T) = \{ \langle Tx, x \rangle : x \in \mathcal{H}, \|x\| = 1 \}$$

Also, the numerical radius is defined to be

$$w(T) = \sup \{ |\lambda| : \lambda \in W(T) \} = \sup_{\|x\|=1} |\langle Tx, x \rangle|.$$ 

The spectral radius of an operator $T$ is defined to be

$$r(T) = \sup \{ |\lambda| : \lambda \in \text{sp}(T) \}.$$

We recall that, the usual operator norm of an operator $T$ is defined to be

$$\|T\| = \sup \{ \|Tx\| : x \in H, \|x\| = 1 \}.$$

and

$$\ell(T) : = \inf \{ \|Tx\| : x \in \mathcal{H}, \|x\| = 1 \} = \inf \{ |\langle Tx, y \rangle| : x, y \in \mathcal{H}, \|x\| = \|y\| = 1 \}.$$ 

It's well known that the numerical radius is not multiplicative, but it is weakly submultiplicative i.e., $w(TS) \leq 4w(T)\|S\|$ for all $T, S \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. If $T, S$ are commutes then $w(TS) \leq 2w(T)\|S\|$. Moreover, if $T, S$ are normal then $w(\cdot)$ is submultiplicative $w(TS) \leq w(T)\|S\|$.

Denotes $|T| = (T^*T)^{1/2}$ the absolute value of the operator $T$, then we have $w(|T|) = \|T\|$.

It's convenient to mention that, the numerical radius norm is weakly unitarily invariant; i.e., $w(U^*TU) = w(T)$ for all unitary $U$. Also, let us don't miss the chance to mention the important property that $w(T) = w(T^*)$ and $w(T^*T) = w(TT^*)$ for every $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$.

The popular problem that, do the numerical radius of the product of operators commutes, i.e., $w(TS) = w(ST)$ for any operators $T, S \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$?

This problem took a serious attention by many authors and in several resources (see [13], for example). Fortunately, it has been shown recently that, for one of such operators must be a multiple of a unitary operator, and we needs only to check $w(TS) = w(ST)$ for all rank one operators $S \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ to arrive at the conclusion. This fact was proved by Chien et al. in [6]. For other related problems involving numerical ranges and radius see [6] and [7] as well as the elegant work of Li [28] and the references therein. For more classical and recent properties of numerical range and radius, see [6] [7], [28] and the comprehensive books [13], [15] and [16].

On the other hand, it is well known that $w(\cdot)$ defines an operator norm on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ which is equivalent to operator norm $\|\cdot\|$. Moreover, we have

$$\frac{1}{2}\|T\| \leq w(T) \leq \|T\|$$ (1.1)

for any $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. The inequality is sharp.

In 2003, Kittaneh [20] refined the right-hand side of (1.1), where he proved that

$$w(T) \leq \frac{1}{2} (\|T\| + \|T^2\|^{1/2})$$ (1.2)

for any $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. 


After that in 2005, the same author in [18] proved that
\[
\frac{1}{4}\|A^*A + AA^*\| \leq w^2(T) \leq \frac{1}{2}\|A^*A + AA^*\|.
\] (1.3)
The inequality is sharp. This inequality was also reformulated and generalized in [12] but in terms of Cartesian decomposition.

In 2007, Yamazaki [31] improved both (1.1) and (1.2) by proving that
\[
w(T) \leq \frac{1}{2}\left(\|T\| + w\left(\widetilde{T}\right)\right) \leq \frac{1}{2}\left(\|T\| + \|T^2\|^{1/2}\right)
\] (1.4)
where \(\widetilde{T} = |T|^{1/2}U|T|^{1/2}\) with unitary \(U\).

In 2008, Dragomir [11] used Buzano inequality to improve (1.1), as follows:
\[
w^2(T) \leq \frac{1}{2}\left(\|T\| + w\left(T^2\right)\right)
\] (1.5)
This result was also recently generalized by Sattari et al. in [30].

This work, is divided into three sections, after this introduction, Section 2 is devoted to recall some facts about superquadratic functions and the mixed Schwarz inequality. In Section 3, we refine the Jesnen and Hölder–McCarty inequalities for positive operators which in turn allow us to refine the generalized mixed Schwarz inequality with of its some consequences. In Section 4, new inequalities for numerical radius of \(n \times n\) matrix of Hilbert space operators are proved. Some refinements of some earlier results were proved in literature are also given.

2. Lemmas

2.1. Superquadratic functions. A function \(f : J \to \mathbb{R}\) is called convex iff
\[
f(t \alpha + (1 - t) \beta) \leq tf(\alpha) + (1 - t)f(\beta),
\]
for all points \(\alpha, \beta \in J\) and all \(t \in [0, 1]\). If \(-f\) is convex then we say that \(f\) is concave. Moreover, if \(f\) is both convex and concave, then \(f\) is said to be affine.

Geometrically, for two point \((x, f(x))\) and \((y, f(y))\) on the graph of \(f\) are on or below the chord joining the endpoints for all \(x, y \in I, x < y\). In symbols, we write
\[
f(t) \leq \frac{f(y) - f(x)}{y - x}(t - x) + f(x)
\]
for any \(x \leq t \leq y\) and \(x, y \in J\).

Equivalently, given a function \(f : J \to \mathbb{R}\), we say that \(f\) admits a support line at \(x \in J\) if there exists a \(\lambda \in \mathbb{R}\) such that
\[
f(t) \geq f(x) + \lambda(t - x)
\]
for all \(t \in J\).

The set of all such \(\lambda\) is called the subdifferential of \(f\) at \(x\), and it’s denoted by \(\partial f\). Indeed, the subdifferential gives us the slopes of the supporting lines for the graph of \(f\). So that if \(f\) is convex then \(\partial f(x) \neq \emptyset\) at all interior points of its domain.

From this point of view Abramovich et al. [1] extend the above idea for what they called superquadratic functions. Namely, a function \(f : [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}\) is called superquadratic provided that for all \(x \geq 0\) there exists a constant \(C_x \in \mathbb{R}\) such that
\[
f(t) \geq f(x) + C_x(t - x) + f(|t - x|)
\]
for all \( t \geq 0 \). We say that \( f \) is subquadratic if \(-f\) is superquadratic. Thus, for a superquadratic function we require that \( f \) lie above its tangent line plus a translation of \( f \) itself.

Prima facie, superquadratic function looks to be stronger than convex function itself but if \( f \) takes negative values then it may be considered as a weaker function. Therefore, if \( f \) is superquadratic and non-negative. Then \( f \) is convex and increasing [1].

Moreover, the following result holds for superquadratic function.

**Lemma 1.** [1] Let \( f \) be superquadratic function. Then

1. \( f(0) \leq 0 \)
2. If \( f \) is differentiable and \( f(0) = f'(0) = 0 \), then \( C_x = f'(x) \) for all \( x \geq 0 \).
3. If \( f(x) \geq 0 \) for all \( x \geq 0 \), then \( f \) is convex and \( f(0) = f'(0) = 0 \).

The next result gives a sufficient condition when convexity (concavity) implies super(sub)quadraticity.

**Lemma 2.** [1] If \( f' \) is convex (concave) and \( f(0) = f'(0) = 0 \), then \( f \) is super(sub)quadratic. The converse of is not true.

**Remark 1.** Subquadraticity does always not imply concavity; i.e., there exists a subquadratic function which is convex. For example, \( f(x) = x^p \), \( x \geq 0 \) and \( 1 \leq p \leq 2 \) is subquadratic and convex. For more about subquadratic see [24].

Among others, Abramovich et al. [1] proved that the inequality

\[
f \left( \int \varphi d\mu \right) \leq f(\varphi(s)) - \int f \left( \| \varphi(s) - \int f d\mu \| \right) d\mu(s)
\]

holds for all probability measures \( \mu \) and all nonnegative, \( \mu \)-integrable functions \( \varphi \) if and only if \( f \) is superquadratic. This inequality plays a main role overall our presented results below.

### 2.2. The mixed Schwarz inequality

The mixed Schwarz inequality was introduced in [27], as follows:

**Lemma 3.** Let \( A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^+ \), then

\[
|\langle Ax, y \rangle|^2 \leq \langle |A|^{2\alpha} x, x \rangle \langle |A^*|^{2(1-\alpha)} y, y \rangle, \quad 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1.
\]

(2.2)

for any vectors \( x, y \in \mathcal{H} \)

In order to generalize (2.2), Kittaneh in [23] used the key lemma

**Lemma 4.** Let \( A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^+ \). Then \( \begin{bmatrix} A & C^* \\ C & B \end{bmatrix} \) is positive in \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H}) \) if and only if \( |\langle Cx, y \rangle|^2 \leq \langle Ax, x \rangle \langle By, y \rangle \) for every vectors \( x, y \in \mathcal{H} \),

to prove that

**Lemma 5.** Let \( A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) such that \( |A|B = B^*|A| \). If \( f \) and \( g \) are nonnegative continuous functions on \([0, \infty)\) satisfying \( f(t)g(t) = t \) \( (t \geq 0) \), then

\[
|\langle ABx, y \rangle| \leq r(B) \|f(\|A\|)x\| \|g(\|A^*\|)y\|
\]

(2.3)

for any vectors \( x, y \in \mathcal{H} \).
Clearly, by setting $B = 1_{\mathcal{H}}$ and choosing $f(t) = t^\alpha$, $g(t) = t^{1-\alpha}$ we refer to (2.2).

The following interesting estimates of spectral radius also obtained by Kittaneh in [19].

**Lemma 6.** If $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Then

$$ r(AB) \leq \frac{1}{4} \left( \|AB\| + \|BA\| + \sqrt{(\|AB\| - \|BA\|)^2 + 4 \min \{ \|A\| \|BAB\|, \|B\| \|ABA\| \}} \right) \quad (2.4) $$

In some of our results we need the following two fundamental norm estimates, which are:

$$ \|A + B\| \leq \frac{1}{2} \left( \|A\| + \|B\| + \sqrt{(\|A\| - \|B\|)^2 + 4 \|A^{1/2}B^{1/2}\|^2} \right) \quad (2.5) $$

and

$$ \|A^{1/2}B^{1/2}\| \leq \|AB\|^{1/2}. \quad (2.6) $$

Both estimates are valid for all positive operators $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$.

3. Refining H"older-McCarty inequality and mixed Schwarz inequality

In this part we give some new refinements of the ‘mixed’ Schwarz inequality and its generalization based on a new refinement of H"older–McCarty inequality. The next lemma plays a main role in our main results.

**Lemma 7.** Let $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^+$, then

$$ \langle Ax, x \rangle^p \leq \langle A^p x, x \rangle - \langle |A - \langle Ax, x \rangle|_H^p x, x \rangle \leq \langle A^p x, x \rangle $$

for all $p \geq 2$, and

$$ \langle Ax, x \rangle^p \geq \langle A^p x, x \rangle - \langle |A - \langle Ax, x \rangle|_H^p x, x \rangle $$

for all $0 < p < 2$ and every $x \in \mathcal{H}$.

**Proof.** Since $A$ is positive then there $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $A = B^*B$. Also, since $B^*B$ is always positive and selfadjoint, thus by the spectral representation theorem $A$ can be represented as $A = \int_0^\infty t dE(t)$. Employing the inequality (2.1) for the superquadratic function $f(t) = t^p$, $t \in [0, \infty)$ $p \geq 2$, then we have

$$ \langle Ax, x \rangle^p = \left( \int_0^\infty t \langle dE(t) x, x \rangle \right)^p $$

$$ \leq \int_0^\infty t^p \langle dE(t) x, x \rangle - \int_0^\infty |t - \int_0^\infty s \langle dE(s) x, x \rangle \rangle^p \langle dE(t) x, x \rangle $$

$$ \langle A^p x, x \rangle - \langle |A - \langle Ax, x \rangle|_H^p x, x \rangle. $$

The inequality (3.2) follows in similar manner by applying the reverse of (3.1) for the subquadratic function $f(t) = t^p$, $0 < p \leq 2$. \qed

The inequalities (3.1) and (3.2) were proved in [4] in different context and only for positive selfadjoint operators. Also, we should note that, a stronger version for positive selfadjoint operators was proved earlier in [26] (see also [25]) where different approach were used. Our presented proof above is more general and completely different.
Remark 2. Let $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^+$, then the McCatry inequality reads that

$$\langle Ax, x \rangle^p \geq \langle A^p x, x \rangle, \quad 0 < p \leq 1.$$  \hfill (3.3)

Using (3.2), we have the following refinement

$$\langle Ax, x \rangle^p \geq \langle A^p x, x \rangle - \langle |A - \langle Ax, x \rangle 1_H|^p x, x \rangle, \quad 0 < p \leq 1$$

for every $x \in \mathcal{H}$.

The following refinement of Cauchy-Schwarz inequality holds.

Lemma 8. Let $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^+$, then

$$|\langle Ax, y \rangle|^2 \leq \left[ \langle |A|^p x, x \rangle - \langle ||T|| - \langle |T| x, x \rangle 1_H|^p x, x \rangle \right]$$

$$\times \left[ \langle |T^*|^p y, y \rangle - \langle ||T^*|| - \langle |T^*| y, y \rangle 1_H|^p y, y \rangle \right]$$

$$\leq \langle |A|^p x, x \rangle \langle |T^*|^p y, y \rangle$$

for all $p \geq 2$ and every $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$.

Proof. By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we have

$$|\langle Ax, y \rangle|^2 \leq \langle Ax, x \rangle \langle Ay, y \rangle$$

for every $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$, and this implies that

$$|\langle Ax, y \rangle|^2 \leq \langle Ax, x \rangle^p \langle Ay, y \rangle^p, \quad p \geq 2.$$ 

Employing (3.1) we get the desired result. \hfill \Box

Corollary 1. If $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, then

$$|\langle Tx, y \rangle|^2 \leq \left[ \langle |T|^p x, x \rangle - \langle ||T|| - \langle |T| x, x \rangle 1_H|^p x, x \rangle \right]$$

$$\times \left[ \langle |T^*|^p y, y \rangle - \langle ||T^*|| - \langle |T^*| y, y \rangle 1_H|^p y, y \rangle \right]$$

$$\leq \langle |T|^p x, x \rangle \langle |T^*|^p y, y \rangle$$

for all $p \geq 2$. In particular, we have

$$|\langle Tx, x \rangle| \leq \left[ \langle |T|^p x, x \rangle - \langle ||T|| - \langle |T| x, x \rangle 1_H|^p x, x \rangle \right]^{1/p}$$ \hfill (3.6)

Proof. Recall that, if $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, then \( \begin{bmatrix} |T| & T^* \\ T & |T^*| \end{bmatrix} \) is positive in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H})$, (see [23]). Therefore, by (2.1) we have

$$|\langle Tx, y \rangle|^2 \leq \langle |T|^p x, x \rangle \langle |T^*| y, y \rangle$$

and this gives by (3.1) that;

$$|\langle Tx, y \rangle|^2 \leq \langle |T|^p x, x \rangle^p \langle |T^*|^p y, y \rangle^p$$

$$\leq \left[ \langle |T|^p x, x \rangle - \langle ||T|| - \langle |T| x, x \rangle 1_H|^p x, x \rangle \right]$$

$$\times \left[ \langle |T^*|^p y, y \rangle - \langle ||T^*|| - \langle |T^*| y, y \rangle 1_H|^p y, y \rangle \right]$$

$$\leq \langle |T|^p x, x \rangle \langle |T^*|^p y, y \rangle$$

as desired. \hfill \Box

A generalization of the above result in Kittaneh like inequality (2.3) is considered in the following result.
Corollary 2. Let \( T, S \in \mathcal{B} (\mathcal{H}) \) such that \(|T| S = S^* |T|\). If \( f \) and \( g \) are nonnegative continuous functions on \([0, \infty)\) satisfying \( f(t) g(t) = t \) (\( t \geq 0 \)), then
\[
\langle TSx, y \rangle \leq r(S) 2^{p}\sqrt{\langle f^{2p} (|T|) x, x \rangle - \langle f^{2} (|T|) - f^{2} (|T|) x, x \rangle} 1_{\mathcal{H}} |_{p} x, x
\]
\[
\times 2^{p}\sqrt{\langle g^{2p} (|T^*|) y, y \rangle - \langle g^{2} (|T^*|) - g^{2} (|T^*|) y, y \rangle} 1_{\mathcal{H}} |_{p} y, y
\]
\[
\leq r(S) 2^{p}\sqrt{\langle f^{2p} (|T|) x, x \rangle - \langle f^{2} (|T|) - f^{2} (|T|) x, x \rangle} 1_{\mathcal{H}} |_{p} x, x
\]
\[
\times 2^{p}\sqrt{\langle g^{2p} (|T^*|) y, y \rangle - \langle g^{2} (|T^*|) - g^{2} (|T^*|) y, y \rangle} 1_{\mathcal{H}} |_{p} y, y
\]
for all \( p \geq 2 \) and any vectors \( x, y \in \mathcal{H} \).

Proof. Using (2.3), and by employing (3.4) we have
\[
\langle TSx, y \rangle \leq r(S) \|f (|T|) x\| \|g (|T^*|) y\|
\]
\[
= r(S) \langle f^{2} (|T|) x, x \rangle^{1/2} \langle g^{2} (|T^*|) y, y \rangle^{1/2}
\]
\[
\leq r(S) 2^{p}\sqrt{\langle f^{2p} (|T|) x, x \rangle - \langle f^{2} (|T|) - f^{2} (|T|) x, x \rangle} 1_{\mathcal{H}} |_{p} x, x
\]
\[
\times 2^{p}\sqrt{\langle g^{2p} (|T^*|) y, y \rangle - \langle g^{2} (|T^*|) - g^{2} (|T^*|) y, y \rangle} 1_{\mathcal{H}} |_{p} y, y
\]
which proves the result. \( \square \)

Corollary 3. Let \( T, S \in \mathcal{B} (\mathcal{H}) \) such that \(|T| S = S^* |T|\). Then
\[
\langle TSx, y \rangle \leq r(S) 2^{p}\sqrt{\langle |T|^{2p_{1}} x, x \rangle - \langle |T|^{2} x, x \rangle} 1_{\mathcal{H}} |_{p} x, x
\]
\[
\times 2^{p}\sqrt{\langle |T^*|^{2(1-\alpha)} x, x \rangle - \langle |T^*|^{2(1-\alpha)} x, x \rangle} 1_{\mathcal{H}} |_{p} x, x
\]
\[
\leq r(S) 2^{p}\sqrt{\langle |T|^{2p_{1}} x, x \rangle 2^{p}\sqrt{\langle |T^*|^{2(1-\alpha)} x, x \rangle}
\]
for all \( p \geq 2 \) and any vectors \( x, y \in \mathcal{H} \). In particular, we have
\[
\langle TSx, y \rangle \leq r(S) 2^{p}\sqrt{\langle |T|^{2} x, x \rangle - \langle |T| x, x \rangle} 1_{\mathcal{H}} |_{p} x, x
\]
\[
\times 2^{p}\sqrt{\langle |T^*|^{2} x, x \rangle - \langle |T^*| x, x \rangle} 1_{\mathcal{H}} |_{p} x, x
\]
\[
\leq r(S) 2^{p}\sqrt{\langle |T|^{2} x, x \rangle} 2^{p}\sqrt{\langle |T^*|^{2} x, x \rangle}
\]
Proof. Setting \( f(t) = t^{\alpha} \) and \( g(t) = t^{1-\alpha} \) in (3.7) we get the inequality (3.8). Choosing \( p = 2 \) and \( \alpha = \frac{1}{2} \) in (3.8), we get the second inequality (3.9). \( \square \)

Remark 3. By employing the McCarty inequality (3.3) for \( 0 < p < 1 \) in the last inequality (3.8), we get
\[
\langle TSx, y \rangle \leq r(S) \langle |T|^{1/2} x, x \rangle \langle |T^*|^{1/2} x, x \rangle.
\]
Similarly, but in more general case we have from the last inequality (3.9), we have
\[ |\langle TSx, y \rangle| \leq r(S) (|T|^0 x, x) \langle |T^*|^{1-\alpha} x, x \rangle, \]
which is sharper than Kato’s inequality (2.2) itself.

4. Numerical radius inequalities

This section is divided into two parts; the first part concerning numerical inequalities for general Hilbert space operators. The second part deals with Numerical radius inequalities for \( n \times n \) matrix operators.

4.1. Numerical radius inequalities. In this section, some numerical radius inequalities based on results of Section 2 are obtained. Before that, we need to recall that in some recent works, some authors used the concept of infimum norm (or \( \ell \)-norm) which is defined as:

\[ \ell (T) : = \inf \{ \|Tx\| : x \in \mathcal{H}, \|x\| = 1 \} \]
\[ = \inf \{ \langle Tx, y \rangle : x, y \in \mathcal{H}, \|x\| = \|y\| = 1 \}. \]

The next result gives a numerical radius bound of product of two operators based on the refinement of Kittaneh inequality (3.7).

Theorem 1. Let \( T, S \in \mathcal{B} (\mathcal{H}) \) such that \( |T|S = S^*|T| \). If \( f \) and \( g \) are nonnegative continuous functions on \( [0, \infty) \) satisfying \( f(t)g(t) = t \) \( (t \geq 0) \), then

\[ w(TS) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left( \|S\| + \|S^2\|^{1/2} \right) \left[ \|f^p(|T|)\|^2 - \ell \left( \|f^2(|T|)\| - f(|T|)\|T\|\right)^p \right]^{\frac{1}{2p}} \]
\[ \times \left[ \|g^p(|T^*|)\|^2 - \ell \left( \|g^2(|T^*|)\| - g(|T^*|)\|T^*\|\right)^p \right]^{\frac{1}{2p}} \]

for all \( p \geq 2 \).

Proof. From the first inequality in (3.7), we have

\[ |\langle TSx, y \rangle|^{2p} \]
\[ \leq r^{2p}(S) \left[ \langle f^{2p}(|T|)x, x \rangle - \langle f^2(|T|) - f^2(|T|)x, x \rangle 1_{\mathcal{H}} \right]^{p} \]
\[ \times \left[ \langle g^{2p}(|T^*|)y, y \rangle - \langle g^2(|T^*|) - g^2(|T^*|)y, y \rangle 1_{\mathcal{H}} \right]^{p} \]

Let \( y = x \) and taking the supremum over \( x \in \mathcal{H} \), we observe that

\[ \sup_{\|x\|=1} |\langle TSx, x \rangle|^{2p} \]
\[ \leq r^{2p}(S) \sup_{\|x\|=1} \left[ \langle f^{2p}(|T|)x, x \rangle - \langle f^2(|T|) - f^2(|T|)x, x \rangle 1_{\mathcal{H}} \right]^{p} \]
\[ \times \left[ \langle g^{2p}(|T^*|)x, x \rangle - \langle g^2(|T^*|) - g^2(|T^*|)x, x \rangle 1_{\mathcal{H}} \right]^{p} \]
\[ \leq r^{2p}(S) \sup_{\|x\|=1} \left[ \langle f^{2p}(|T|)x, x \rangle - \langle f^2(|T|) - f^2(|T|)x, x \rangle 1_{\mathcal{H}} \right]^{p} \]
\[ \times \sup_{\|x\|=1} \left[ \langle g^{2p}(|T^*|)x, x \rangle - \langle g^2(|T^*|) - g^2(|T^*|)x, x \rangle 1_{\mathcal{H}} \right]^{p} \]
\[ \leq r^{2p}(S) \sup_{\|x\|=1} \left[ \langle f^{2p}(|T|)x, x \rangle - \langle f^2(|T|) - f^2(|T|)x, x \rangle 1_{\mathcal{H}} \right]^{p} \]
\[ \times \sup_{\|x\|=1} \left[ \langle g^{2p}(|T^*|)x, x \rangle - \langle g^2(|T^*|) - g^2(|T^*|)x, x \rangle 1_{\mathcal{H}} \right]^{p} \]
\[ \leq r^{2p}(S) \left\{ \sup_{\|x\|=1} \left\langle f^{2p}(|T|)x, x \right\rangle - \inf_{\|x\|=1} \left\langle \left| f^2(|T|) - \sup_{\|x\|=1} \left\langle f^2(|T|)x, x \right\rangle \right| \right\|_{\mathcal{H}}^{p} x, x \right\rangle \right\} \times \left\{ \sup_{\|x\|=1} \left\langle g^{2p}(|T^*|)x, x \right\rangle - \inf_{\|x\|=1} \left\langle \left| g^2(|T^*|) - \sup_{\|x\|=1} \left\langle g^2(|T^*|)x, x \right\rangle \right| \right\|_{\mathcal{H}}^{p} x, x \right\rangle \right\} \leq r^{2p}(S) \cdot \left\| f^p(|T|) \right\|^2 - \ell \left( \left\| f^2(|T|) - \sup_{\|x\|=1} \left\langle f^2(|T|)x, x \right\rangle \right\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right) \right\} \times \left\{ \left\| g^p(|T^*|) \right\|^2 - \ell \left( \left\| g^2(|T^*|) - \sup_{\|x\|=1} \left\langle g^2(|T^*|)x, x \right\rangle \right\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right) \right\} .
\]

Now, from Lemma 6 with \( A = S, B = 1_{\mathscr{H}}, \) we have
\[ r(S) \leq \frac{1}{4} \left( 2 \|S\| + \sqrt{4 \min \left\{ \|S^2\|, \|S\|^2 \right\}} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \|S\| + \|S^2\|^{1/2} \right) .
\]

Substituting in the above inequality we obtain the result in (4.1).

\[ \Box \]

**Corollary 4.** Let \( T, S \in \mathcal{B} (\mathscr{H}) \) such that \(|T|S = S^*|T|\). Then
\[ w(TS) \leq r(S) \cdot \left[ \left\| \langle |T| \rangle^p \right\| - \ell^2 \left( \left\| \langle |T| \rangle^{2p} - \left\| \langle |T| \rangle^p \right\| \right) \right] \frac{1}{p} \]
\[ \times \left[ \left\| \langle |T^*| \rangle^{p(1-\alpha)} \right\| - \ell^2 \left( \left\| \langle |T^*| \rangle^{2(1-\alpha)} - \left\| \langle |T^*| \rangle^{(1-\alpha)} \right\| \right) \right] \frac{1}{p} \]
\[ \leq r(S) \cdot \left\| \langle |T| \rangle^{p(1/2)} \right\| \left\| \langle |T^*| \rangle^{p(1/2)} \right\|^{1/p} \]

for all \( p \geq 2 \). In particular, we have
\[ w(TS) \leq r(S) \cdot \left[ \left\| |T| \right\| - \ell^2 \left( \left\| |T|^{1/2} \right\| \right) \right] \frac{1}{4} \]
\[ \times \left[ \left\| T \right\| - \ell^2 \left( \left\| T^{1/2} \right\| \right) \right] \frac{1}{4} \]
\[ \leq r(S) \left\| T \right\| .
\]

**Proof.** Setting \( f(t) = t^\alpha \) and \( g(t) = t^{1-\alpha} \) in (4.1), we get the inequality (4.2). Choosing \( p = 2 \) and \( \alpha = \frac{1}{2} \) in (4.2) and use the fact that \( \|T\| = \|T^*\| = \|T\| \), we get the second inequality (4.3).

\[ \Box \]

Another generalization of the above inequalities under Kittaneh’s assumptions is embedded as follows:
**Corollary 5.** Under the assumptions of Theorem 1, we have

\[
|TSx, x| \leq r(S) \sqrt{(\|\langle T \rangle x, x \rangle)^p} \sqrt{(\|\langle T^* \rangle x, x \rangle)^p}
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{2} r(S) \left( \|f^p(T)\| + \|g^p(T^*)\| \right) \quad \text{(by AM-GM inequality)}
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{2} r(S) \left( \|f^p(T)\|^2 + \|g^p(T^*)\|^2 \right)
\]

\[
+ \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{\left( \|f^p(A)\| - \|g^p(A^*)\| \right)^2 + 4 \|f^p(A)\| g^p(A^*)\|^2}
\]

for all \( p \geq 2 \).

**Proof.** In the second inequality in (3.7), let \( x = y \) then we have

\[
|TSx, x| \leq r(S) \sqrt{(\|\langle T \rangle x, x \rangle)^p} \sqrt{(\|\langle T^* \rangle x, x \rangle)^p}
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{2} r(S) \left( \|f^p(T)\| + \|g^p(T^*)\| \right) \quad \text{(by AM-GM inequality)}
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{2} r(S) \left( \|f^p(T)\|^2 + \|g^p(T^*)\|^2 \right)
\]

\[
+ \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{\left( \|f^p(A)\| - \|g^p(A^*)\| \right)^2 + 4 \|f^p(A)\| g^p(A^*)\|^2}
\]

Now, using (2.5) and (2.6) in the last inequality and use the inequality

\[
r(S) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left( \|S\| + \|S^2\|^{1/2} \right)
\]

Substituting all together in the last inequality and taking the supremum for all \( x \in \mathcal{H} \), we get the desired result. \( \square \)

### 4.2. Numerical radius inequalities for \( n \times n \) matrix Operators

On the other hand, several refinements inequalities for numerical radius of \( n \times n \) operator matrices have been recently obtained by many other authors see for example [3], [8]–[10], [20]–[22], [29]. Among others, three important facts are obtained by different authors are summarized together in the following result.

Let \( A = [A_{ij}] \in \mathcal{B}(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \mathcal{H}_i) \). Then

\[
w(A) \leq \begin{cases}
\omega \left( \left[ t_{ij}^{(1)} \right] \right), & \text{Hou & Du in [17]} \\
\omega \left( \left[ t_{ij}^{(2)} \right] \right), & \text{BaniDomi & Kittaneh in [5]}; \\
\omega \left( \left[ t_{ij}^{(3)} \right] \right), & \text{AbuOmar & Kittaneh in [2]}
\end{cases}
\]

where

\[
t_{ij}^{(1)} = \omega (\|T_{ij}\|), \quad t_{ij}^{(2)} = \begin{cases}
\frac{1}{2} \left( \|T_{ii}\| + \|T_{ii}^2\|^{1/2} \right), & i = j \\
\|T_{ij}\|, & i \neq j
\end{cases}
\]
Our next result gives a new bound for Numerical radius of $n \times n$ matrix Hilbert Operators.

**Theorem 2.** Let $A = [A_{ij}] \in \mathcal{B} (\bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \mathcal{H}_i)$ and $f, g$ be as in Lemma 5. Then

$$w(A) \leq w([a_{ij}]) \quad (4.5)$$

where

$$a_{ij} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{4} B_{ii}, & i = j \\ \| A_{ij} \|, & i \neq j \end{cases}$$

such that

$$B_{ii} = \| f^2 (|A_{ii}|) \| + \| g^2 (|A_{ii}^*|) \|$$

$$+ \sqrt{\| f^2 (|A_{ii}|) \| - \| g^2 (|A_{ii}^*|) \|}^2 + 4 \| f (|A_{ii}|) g (|A_{ii}^*|) \|^2$$

**Proof.** Let $x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)^T \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \mathcal{H}_i$, with $\| x \| = 1$. Then we have

$$|\langle Ax, x \rangle|$$

$$= \left|\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \langle A_{ij} x_j, x_i \rangle\right|$$

$$\leq \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} |\langle A_{ij} x_j, x_i \rangle|$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\langle A_{ii} x_i, x_i \rangle| + \sum_{j \neq i}^{n} |\langle A_{ij} x_j, x_i \rangle|$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( f^2 (|A_{ii}|) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( g^2 (|A_{ii}^*|) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \| x_i \|^{\frac{1}{2}} + \sum_{j \neq i}^{n} |\langle A_{ij} x_j, x_i \rangle|$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \| f^2 (|A_{ii}|) \| + \| g^2 (|A_{ii}^*|) \| \| x_i \|^2 + \sum_{j \neq i}^{n} \| A_{ij} \| \| x_i \| \| x_j \|$$

(by AM-GM inequality)

$$\leq \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \| f^2 (|A_{ii}|) \| + \| g^2 (|A_{ii}^*|) \| \right)$$

$$+ \sqrt{\| f^2 (|A_{ii}|) \| - \| g^2 (|A_{ii}^*|) \|}^2 + 4 \| f (|A_{ii}|) g (|A_{ii}^*|) \|^2 \| x_i \|^2$$

$$+ \sum_{j \neq i}^{n} \| A_{ij} \| \| x_i \| \| x_j \|$$

$$= \langle [a_{ij}] y, y \rangle$$
where \( y = (\|x_1\| \|x_2\| \cdots \|x_n\|)^T \). Taking the supremum for all \( x \in \mathcal{H} \), we get the desired result. \( \square \)

**Corollary 6.** If \( A = \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix} \) in \( \mathcal{B} (\mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2) \), then
\[
 w(A) \leq w(\hat{a}_{ij}) \tag{4.7}
\]

where
\[
 \hat{a}_{ij} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{4} \hat{B}_{ii}, & i = j \\ \|A_{ij}\|, & i \neq j \end{cases}
\]
such that
\[
 \hat{B}_{ii} = \left\| |A_{ii}|^{2\alpha} \right\| + \left\| |A_{ii}^*|^{2(1-\alpha)} \right\|
\]
\[
 + \sqrt{\left( \left\| |A_{ii}|^{2\alpha} \right\| - \left\| |A_{ii}^*|^{2(1-\alpha)} \right\| \right)^2 + 4 \left\| |A_{ii}|^{\alpha} |A_{ii}^*|^{1-\alpha} \right\|^2}
\]
\[(\hat{\mathcal{B}}(\alpha))\]

**Proof.** Setting \( f(t) = t^\alpha \) and \( g(t) = t^{1-\alpha} \) in (4.5), then we get
\[
 w\left( \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix} \right) \leq w\left( \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{4} \hat{B}_{11} & \|A_{12}\| \\ \|A_{21}\| & \frac{1}{4} \hat{B}_{22} \end{bmatrix} \right)
\]
\[
 = \frac{1}{2} \left( \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \hat{B}_{11} & \|A_{12}\| \|A_{21}\| \\ \|A_{21}\| \|A_{12}\| & \frac{1}{2} \hat{B}_{22} \end{bmatrix} \right)
\]
\[
 = \frac{1}{4} \left( \hat{B}_{11} + \hat{B}_{22} + \sqrt{\left( \hat{B}_{11} - \hat{B}_{22} \right)^2 + (\|A_{12}\| + \|A_{21}\|)^2} \right)
\]
which gives the required result. \( \square \)

**Remark 4.** Setting \( \alpha = \frac{1}{2} \) in (4.7) and employing the facts (2.5) and (2.6), so that we get (1.2).

**Theorem 3.** Let \( A = [A_{ij}] \in \mathcal{B} (\bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \mathcal{H}_i) \) and \( f, g \) be as in Lemma 3. Then
\[
 w(A) \leq w([h_{ij}]) \tag{4.8}
\]

where
\[
 h_{ij} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{4} (D_{ii} - d_{ii}), & i = j \\ \|A_{ij}\|, & i \neq j \end{cases}
\]
such that
\[
 D_{ii} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \left\| f^4 \left( |A_{ii}| \right) \right\| + \left\| g^4 \left( |A_{ii}^*| \right) \right\| 
\]
\[
 + \sqrt{\left( \left\| f^4 \left( |A_{ii}| \right) \right\| - \left\| g^4 \left( |A_{ii}^*| \right) \right\| \right)^2 + 4 \left\| f^2 \left( |A_{ii}| \right) g^2 \left( |A_{ii}^*| \right) \right\|^{1/2}} \right)
\]
and

\[ d_{ii} = \left\| f^2(|A_{ii}|) - \left\| f^2(|A_{ii}|) \right\| ^2 + g^2(|A_{ii}^*|) - \left\| g^2(|A_{ii}^*|) \right\| ^2 \right\| \]

**Proof.** From (4.6) we have

\[
|\langle Ax, x \rangle| \\
\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\{ \frac{\sqrt[4]{f^4(|A_{ii}|) x, x} - \langle f^2(|A_{ii}|) - \langle f^2(|A_{ii}|) x, x \rangle 1_{\mathcal{H}}\rangle^2 x, x \rangle}{\sqrt[4]{g^4(|A_{ii}^*|) y, y} - \langle g^2(|A_{ii}^*|) - \langle g^2(|A_{ii}^*|) y, y \rangle 1_{\mathcal{H}}\rangle^2 y, y} \cdot ||x||^2 \right\} \\
+ \sum_{j \neq i} \|A_{ij}\| \|x_i\| \|x_j\| 
\]

(by (3.9) with \( S = 1_{\mathcal{H}} \))

\[
\leq \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\{ \left\| f^4(|A_{ii}|) + g^4(|A_{ii}^*|) \right\| \right. \\
- \left\| f^2(|A_{ii}|) - \left\| f^2(|A_{ii}|) \right\| ^2 + g^2(|A_{ii}^*|) - \left\| g^2(|A_{ii}^*|) \right\| ^2 \right\} \|x_i\|^2 \\
+ \sum_{j \neq i} \|A_{ij}\| \|x_i\| \|x_j\| 
\]

(by GM – AM inequality)

\[
\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\{ \frac{1}{8} \left( \left\| f^4(|A_{ii}|) \right\| + \left\| g^4(|A_{ii}^*|) \right\| \right. \\
+ \sqrt{\left( \left\| f^4(|A_{ii}|) \right\| - \left\| g^4(|A_{ii}^*|) \right\| \right)^2 + 4 \left\| f^2(|A_{ii}|) g^2(|A_{ii}^*|) \right\| ^2} \\
- \frac{1}{4} \left\| f^2(|A_{ii}|) - \left\| f^2(|A_{ii}|) \right\| ^2 + g^2(|A_{ii}^*|) - \left\| g^2(|A_{ii}^*|) \right\| ^2 \right\} \|x_i\|^2 \\
+ \sum_{j \neq i} \|A_{ij}\| \|x_i\| \|x_j\| 
\]
\[ = \frac{1}{8} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\|f^4 (|A_{ii}|)\| + \|g^4 (|A_{ii}^*|)\| \]
\[ + \sqrt{\Big(\|f^4 (|A_{ii}|)\| - \|g^4 (|A_{ii}^*|)\|\Big)^2 + 4 \|f^2 (|A_{ii}|) g^2 (|A_{ii}^*|)\|^2} \cdot \|x_i\|^2 \]
\[ - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{4} \Big(\|f^2 (|A_{ii}|) - |f^2 (|A_{ii}|)|\|^2 + |g^2 (|A_{ii}^*|) - \|g^2 (|A_{ii}^*|)\|^2\| \cdot \|x_i\|^2 \]
\[ + \sum_{j \neq i} \|A_{ij}\| \|x_i\| \|x_j\| \]
\[ = \langle [h_{ij}] y, y \rangle \]

where \( y = \left( \|x_1\| \|x_2\| \cdots \|x_n\| \right)^T \). Taking the supremum for all \( x \in \mathcal{H} \), we get the desired result. \( \square \)

**Corollary 7.** If \( A = \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix} \) in \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2) \), then

\[ w \left( \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix} \right) \leq \frac{1}{4} \left\{ \left( \tilde{D}_{11} - \tilde{d}_{11} \right) + \left( \tilde{D}_{22} - \tilde{d}_{22} \right) \right. \]
\[ + \sqrt{\left( \left( \tilde{D}_{11} - \tilde{d}_{11} \right) - \left( \tilde{D}_{22} - \tilde{d}_{22} \right) \right)^2 + \left( \|A_{12}\| + \|A_{21}\| \right)^2} \left\} \]

where

\[ \tilde{h}_{ij} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{4} \left( \tilde{D}_{ii} - \tilde{d}_{ii} \right), & i = j \\ \|A_{ij}\|, & i \neq j \end{cases} \]

such that

\[ \tilde{D}_{ii} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \| |A_{ii}|^{4\alpha} \| + \| |A_{ii}^*|^{4(1-\alpha)} \| \right) \]
\[ + \sqrt{\left( \| |A_{ii}|^{4\alpha} \| - \| |A_{ii}^*|^{4(1-\alpha)} \| \right)^2 + 4 \| |A_{ii}|^{2\alpha} |A_{ii}^*|^{2(1-\alpha)} \|^2} \]

and

\[ \tilde{d}_{ii} = \left( \| |A_{ii}|^{2\alpha} - \| |A_{ii}^*|^{2\alpha} \| \|^2 + \| |A_{ii}^*|^{2(1-\alpha)} - \| |A_{ii}^*|^{2(1-\alpha)} \| \|^2 \right) \]
Proof. Setting \( f(t) = t^\alpha \) and \( g(t) = t^{1-\alpha} \) in (4.8), then we get

\[
\begin{align*}
w \left( \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix} \right) &\leq w \left( \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{4} (\tilde{D}_{11} - \tilde{d}_{11}) & \|A_{12}\| \\ \|A_{21}\| & \frac{1}{4} (\tilde{D}_{22} - \tilde{d}_{22}) \end{bmatrix} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \left( \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} (\tilde{D}_{11} - \tilde{d}_{11}) & \|A_{12}\| + \|A_{21}\| \\ \|A_{21}\| + \|A_{12}\| & \frac{1}{2} (\tilde{D}_{22} - \tilde{d}_{22}) \end{bmatrix} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{4} \left\{ (\tilde{D}_{11} - \tilde{d}_{11}) + (\tilde{D}_{22} - \tilde{d}_{22}) + \sqrt{((\tilde{D}_{11} - \tilde{d}_{11}) - (\tilde{D}_{22} - \tilde{d}_{22}))^2 + (\|A_{12}\| + \|A_{21}\|)^2} \right\} .
\end{align*}
\]

The following results refines the first and the second inequalities in (4.4)

**Corollary 8.** If \( A = \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix} \) in \( B(\mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2) \), then

\[
w \left( \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix} \right) \leq \frac{1}{4} \left( \tilde{R}_{11} + \tilde{R}_{22} + \sqrt{\left( \tilde{R}_{11} - \tilde{R}_{22} \right)^2 + (\|A_{12}\| + \|A_{21}\|)^2} \right) ,
\]

where

\[
\tilde{h}_{ij} = \begin{cases} R_{ii}, & i = j \\ \|A_{ij}\|, & i \neq j \end{cases}
\]

such that \( R_{ii} = \frac{1}{2} \|A_{ii}^2\| - \frac{1}{4} \|A_{ii}| - \|A_{ii}\| |^2 + \|A_{ii}^*\| - \|A_{ii}\| |^2 \| \)

**Proof.** Setting \( \alpha = \frac{1}{2} \) in Corollary 7.

Clearly, the obtained bounds in Corollary 8 are better than the first and the second bounds in (4.4).
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