

HADAMARD WEIGHTED GEOMETRIC MEAN INEQUALITIES FOR THE SPECTRAL AND ESSENTIAL SPECTRAL RADIUS OF POSITIVE OPERATORS ON BANACH FUNCTION AND SEQUENCE SPACES

KATARINA BOGDANOVIĆ¹, ALJOŠA PEPERKO^{2,3,*}

ABSTRACT. We prove new inequalities for the spectral radius, essential spectral radius, operator norm, measure of noncompactness and numerical radius of Hadamard weighted geometric means of positive kernel operators on Banach function and sequence spaces. Several inequalities appear to be new even in the finite dimensional case.

Math. Subj. Classification (2010): Primary: 47A10; 47B65; 47A63;

Secondary: 46E30; 46B45; 15A42; 15A60.

Key words: spectral radius, essential spectral radius, operator norm, positive operators, kernel operators

1. INTRODUCTION AND PRELIMINARIES

Let μ be a σ -finite positive measure on a σ -algebra \mathcal{M} of subsets of a non-void set X . Let $M(X, \mu)$ be the vector space of all equivalence classes of (almost everywhere equal) complex measurable functions on X . A Banach space $L \subseteq M(X, \mu)$ is called a *Banach function space* if $f \in L$, $g \in M(X, \mu)$, and $|g| \leq |f|$ imply that $g \in L$ and $\|g\| \leq \|f\|$. We assume that X is the carrier of L , that is, there is no subset Y of X of strictly positive measure with the property that $f = 0$ a.e. on Y for all $f \in L$ (see [47]).

Let R denote the set $\{1, \dots, N\}$ for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$ or the set \mathbb{N} of all natural numbers. Let $S(R)$ be the vector lattice of all complex sequences $(x_n)_{n \in R}$. A Banach space $L \subseteq S(R)$ is called a *Banach sequence space* if $x \in S(R)$, $y \in L$ and $|x| \leq |y|$ imply that $x \in L$ and $\|x\|_L \leq \|y\|_L$. Observe that a Banach sequence space is a Banach function space over

Date: February 1, 2022.

Faculty of Mathematics¹, University of Belgrade, Studentski trg 16, SRB-11000 Belgrade, Serbia,
email: katarinabgd77@gmail.com

Faculty of Mechanical Engineering², University of Ljubljana, Aškerčeva 6, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia,
Institute of Mathematics, Physics and Mechanics³, Jadranska 19, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

e-mail: aljosa.peperko@fs.uni-lj.si

* Corresponding author .

a measure space (R, μ) , where μ denotes the counting measure on R . Denote by \mathcal{L} the collection of all Banach sequence spaces L satisfying the property that $e_n = \chi_{\{n\}} \in L$ and $\|e_n\|_L = 1$ for all $n \in R$. For $L \in \mathcal{L}$ the set R is the carrier of L .

Standard examples of Banach function spaces are Euclidean spaces, the space c_0 of all null convergent sequences (equipped with the usual norms and the counting measure), the well-known spaces $L^p(X, \mu)$ ($1 \leq p \leq \infty$) and other less known examples such as Orlicz, Lorentz, Marcinkiewicz and more general rearrangement-invariant spaces (see e.g. [6], [10] and the references cited there), which are important e.g. in interpolation theory. Recall that the cartesian product $L = E \times F$ of Banach function spaces is again a Banach function space, equipped with the norm $\|(f, g)\|_L = \max\{\|f\|_E, \|g\|_F\}$.

If $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset M(X, \mu)$ is a decreasing sequence and $f = \inf\{f_n \in M(X, \mu) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, then we write $f_n \downarrow f$. A Banach function space L has an *order continuous norm*, if $0 \leq f_n \downarrow 0$ implies $\|f_n\|_L \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. It is well known that spaces L^p , $1 \leq p < \infty$, have order continuous norm. Moreover, the norm of any reflexive Banach function space is order continuous. In particular, we will be interested in Banach function spaces L such that L and its Banach dual space L^* have order continuous norms. Examples of such spaces are $L^p(X, \mu)$, $1 < p < \infty$, while the space $L = c_0 \in \mathcal{L}$ is an example of a non-reflexive Banach sequence (function) space, such that L and $L^* = l^1 \in \mathcal{L}$ have order continuous norms.

By an *operator* on a Banach function space L we always mean a linear operator on L . An operator K on L is said to be *positive* if it maps nonnegative functions to nonnegative ones, i.e., $KL_+ \subset L_+$, where L_+ denotes the positive cone $L_+ = \{f \in L : f \geq 0 \text{ a.e.}\}$. Given operators K and H on L , we write $K \geq H$ if the operator $K - H$ is positive. Recall that a positive operator K is always bounded, i.e., its operator norm

$$(1) \quad \|K\| = \sup\{\|Kf\|_L : f \in L, \|f\|_L \leq 1\} = \sup\{\|Kf\|_L : f \in L_+, \|f\|_L \leq 1\}$$

is finite (the second equality in (1) follows from $|Kf| \leq K|f|$ for $f \in L$). Also, its spectral radius $r(K)$ is always contained in the spectrum.

In the special case $L = L^2(X, \mu)$ we can define the *numerical radius* $w(K)$ of a bounded operator K on $L^2(X, \mu)$ by

$$w(K) = \sup\{|\langle Kf, f \rangle| : f \in L^2(X, \mu), \|f\|_2 = 1\}.$$

If, in addition, K is positive, then it is easy to prove that

$$w(K) = \sup\{\langle Kf, f \rangle : f \in L^2(X, \mu)_+, \|f\|_2 = 1\}.$$

From this it follows easily that $w(K) \leq w(H)$ for all positive operators K and H on $L^2(X, \mu)$ with $K \leq H$.

An operator K on a Banach function space L is called a *kernel operator* if there exists a $\mu \times \mu$ -measurable function $k(x, y)$ on $X \times X$ such that, for all $f \in L$ and for almost all $x \in X$,

$$\int_X |k(x, y)f(y)| d\mu(y) < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad (Kf)(x) = \int_X k(x, y)f(y) d\mu(y).$$

One can check that a kernel operator K is positive iff its kernel k is non-negative almost everywhere.

Let L be a Banach function space such that L and L^* have order continuous norms and let K and H be positive kernel operators on L . By $\gamma(K)$ we denote the Hausdorff measure of non-compactness of K , i.e.,

$$\gamma(K) = \inf \{ \delta > 0 : \text{there is a finite } M \subset L \text{ such that } K(D_L) \subset M + \delta D_L \},$$

where $D_L = \{f \in L : \|f\|_L \leq 1\}$. Then $\gamma(K) \leq \|K\|$, $\gamma(K + H) \leq \gamma(K) + \gamma(H)$, $\gamma(KH) \leq \gamma(K)\gamma(H)$ and $\gamma(\alpha K) = \alpha\gamma(K)$ for $\alpha \geq 0$. Also $0 \leq K \leq H$ implies $\gamma(K) \leq \gamma(H)$ (see e.g. [30, Corollary 4.3.7 and Corollary 3.7.3]). Let $r_{ess}(K)$ denote the essential spectral radius of K , i.e., the spectral radius of the Calkin image of K in the Calkin algebra. Then

$$(2) \quad r_{ess}(K) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \gamma(K^j)^{1/j} = \inf_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \gamma(K^j)^{1/j}$$

and $r_{ess}(K) \leq \gamma(K)$. Note that (2) is valid for any bounded operator K on a given complex Banach space L (see e.g. [30, Theorem 4.3.13]).

It is well-known that kernel operators play a very important, often even central, role in a variety of applications from differential and integro-differential equations, problems from physics (in particular from thermodynamics), engineering, statistical and economic models, etc (see e.g. [24], [4], [29], [11] and the references cited there). For the theory of Banach function spaces and more general Banach lattices we refer the reader to the books [47], [6], [1], [2].

Let K and H be positive kernel operators on L with kernels k and h respectively, and $\alpha \geq 0$. The *Hadamard (or Schur) product* $K \circ H$ of K and H is the kernel operator with kernel equal to $k(x, y)h(x, y)$ at point $(x, y) \in X \times X$ which can be defined (in general) only on some order ideal of L . Similarly, the *Hadamard (or Schur) power* $K^{(\alpha)}$ of K is the kernel operator with kernel equal to $(k(x, y))^\alpha$ at point $(x, y) \in X \times X$ which can be defined only on some order ideal of L .

Let K_1, \dots, K_n be positive kernel operators on a Banach function space L , and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ positive numbers such that $\sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j = 1$. Then the *Hadamard weighted geometric mean* $K = K_1^{(\alpha_1)} \circ K_2^{(\alpha_2)} \circ \dots \circ K_n^{(\alpha_n)}$ of the operators K_1, \dots, K_n is a positive kernel operator

defined on the whole space L , since $K \leq \alpha_1 K_1 + \alpha_2 K_2 + \dots + \alpha_n K_n$ by the inequality between the weighted arithmetic and geometric means.

A matrix $K = [k_{ij}]_{i,j \in R}$ is called *nonnegative* if $k_{ij} \geq 0$ for all $i, j \in R$. For notational convenience, we sometimes write $k(i, j)$ instead of k_{ij} . We say that a nonnegative matrix K defines an operator on L if $Kx \in L$ for all $x \in L$, where $(Kx)_i = \sum_{j \in R} k_{ij} x_j$. Then $Kx \in L_+$ for all $x \in L_+$ and so K defines a positive kernel operator on L .

Let us recall the following result which was proved in [15, Theorem 2.2] and [33, Theorem 5.1 and Example 3.7] (see also e.g. [36, Theorem 2.1], [37], [34], [35], [17]).

Theorem 1.1. *Let K, K_1, \dots, K_n and $\{K_{ij}\}_{i=1, j=1}^{l,n}$ be positive kernel operators on a Banach function space L . Assume $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n$ are positive numbers such that $s_n = \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j = 1$ and define the positive kernel operator H on L by*

$$H := \left(K_{11}^{(\alpha_1)} \circ \dots \circ K_{1n}^{(\alpha_n)} \right) \dots \left(K_{l1}^{(\alpha_1)} \circ \dots \circ K_{ln}^{(\alpha_n)} \right).$$

(i) *Then the following inequalities hold for $\rho \in \{\|\cdot\|, r\}$:*

$$(3) \quad \rho(K_1^{(\alpha_1)} \circ K_2^{(\alpha_2)} \circ \dots \circ K_n^{(\alpha_n)}) \leq \rho(K_1)^{\alpha_1} \rho(K_2)^{\alpha_2} \dots \rho(K_n)^{\alpha_n},$$

$$(4) \quad H \leq (K_{11} \dots K_{l1})^{(\alpha_1)} \circ \dots \circ (K_{1n} \dots K_{ln})^{(\alpha_n)},$$

$$(5) \quad \begin{aligned} \rho(H) &\leq \rho((K_{11} \dots K_{l1})^{(\alpha_1)} \circ \dots \circ (K_{1n} \dots K_{ln})^{(\alpha_n)}) \\ &\leq \rho(K_{11} \dots K_{l1})^{\alpha_1} \dots \rho(K_{1n} \dots K_{ln})^{\alpha_n}. \end{aligned}$$

If, in addition, L and L^ have order continuous norms, then (3) and (5) hold also for $\rho \in \{\gamma, r_{ess}\}$.*

If, in addition, $L = L^2(X, \mu)$ then (3) and (5) hold also for $\rho = w$.

(ii) *If $L \in \mathcal{L}$, $t \geq 1$ and $s_n \geq 1$, then $K^{(t)}$, $K_1^{(\alpha_1)} \circ K_2^{(\alpha_2)} \circ \dots \circ K_n^{(\alpha_n)}$ and H define operators on L and the inequalities*

$$(6) \quad k(i, j) \leq \|K\| \text{ for all } i, j \in R,$$

$$(7) \quad K_1^{(t)} \dots K_n^{(t)} \leq (K_1 \dots K_n)^{(t)},$$

$$(8) \quad \rho(K_1^{(t)} \dots K_n^{(t)}) \leq \rho(K_1 \dots K_n)^t,$$

(3) and (5) hold for $\rho \in \{\|\cdot\|, r\}$.

In the finite-dimensional case Inequality (3) for the spectral radius goes back to Kingman [28] implicitly, and it was later considered by several authors ([21], [5], [19], [25],

[44], [13], [23], [45]), using different methods. In [19] (see also [21]) the method of linearization was applied to generalize the result of Cohen (see [8], [9], [20], [18], [12], [21, Corollary 5.7.13], [19], [5, Theorem 3.5.9]) that asserts that the spectral radius, considered as a function of the diagonal entries of a nonnegative matrix, is a convex function. In [16] the generalization to the setting of infinite dimensional matrices was established and very recently in [40] a version for the essential spectral radius was proved. It should be mentioned that a very general extension of Cohen's theorem was proved in the setting of Banach ordered spaces by Kato [26], who used extensively the theory of strongly continuous semigroups of operators. Let us also point out that Inequalities (5) are actually results on the joint and generalized spectral radius and their essential versions (see e.g. [33], [35], [36], [38]) and have been applied to obtain several inequalities involving the Hadamard and ordinary products of operators (see, e.g., [42], [43], [35], [7], [17], [36], [37], [38], [48], [31], [32], [41], [40]).

Let $K_1 = [k_1(i, j)]_{i, j \in R}, \dots, K_n = [k_n(i, j)]_{i, j \in R}$ be nonnegative matrices and let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ be nonnegative numbers such that $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i = 1$. The nonnegative matrix $C(K_1, \dots, K_n, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) = [c(i, j)]_{i, j \in R}$ ([16], [19], [21]) is defined by

$$c(i, j) = \begin{cases} k_1^{\alpha_1}(i, j) \cdots k_n^{\alpha_n}(i, j) & \text{if } i \neq j \\ \alpha_1 k_1(i, i) + \dots + \alpha_n k_n(i, i) & \text{if } i = j \end{cases}.$$

In other words, the diagonal part of $C(K_1, \dots, K_n, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ is equal to the diagonal part of $\alpha_1 K_1 + \dots + \alpha_n K_n$, while its nondiagonal part equals the nondiagonal part of $K_1^{(\alpha_1)} \circ K_2^{(\alpha_2)} \circ \dots \circ K_n^{(\alpha_n)}$.

By the inequality between weighted geometric and weighted arithmetic means, we have

$$(9) \quad K_1^{(\alpha_1)} \circ K_2^{(\alpha_2)} \circ \dots \circ K_n^{(\alpha_n)} \leq C(K_1, \dots, K_n, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \leq \alpha_1 K_1 + \dots + \alpha_n K_n.$$

From the right-hand inequality it follows that the matrix $C(K_1, \dots, K_n, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ defines an operator on L provided the matrices K_1, \dots, K_n define operators on $L \in \mathcal{L}$.

The following generalization of Cohen's theorem was obtained in [16, Theorem 2.1] and in [40, Theorem 2.2].

Theorem 1.2. *Given L in \mathcal{L} , let K_1, \dots, K_n be nonnegative matrices that define operators on L and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ nonnegative numbers such that $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i = 1$. Then for $\rho = r$ we have*

$$(10) \quad \rho(C(K_1, \dots, K_n, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)) \leq \alpha_1 \rho(K_1) + \dots + \alpha_n \rho(K_n).$$

In particular, if K_1, \dots, K_n have the same non-diagonal part, then

$$(11) \quad \rho(\alpha_1 K_1 + \dots + \alpha_n K_n) \leq \alpha_1 \rho(K_1) + \dots + \alpha_n \rho(K_n).$$

In other words, if D_1, \dots, D_n are diagonal matrices and K a matrix such that $K + D_1, \dots, K + D_n$ are nonnegative matrices that define operators on L , then we have

$$(12) \quad \rho(\alpha_1(K + D_1) + \dots + \alpha_n(K + D_n)) \leq \alpha_1\rho(K + D_1) + \dots + \alpha_n\rho(K + D_n).$$

If, in addition, L and L^* have order continuous norms then under the above conditions inequalities (10), (11) and (12) hold also for $\rho = r_{ess}$.

Recall also the following well known inequality (see e.g. [33], [15], [45]) for nonnegative measurable functions and for α and β nonnegative numbers such that $\alpha + \beta \geq 1$:

$$(13) \quad f_1^\alpha g_1^\beta + \dots + f_m^\alpha g_m^\beta \leq (f_1 + \dots + f_m)^\alpha (g_1 + \dots + g_m)^\beta.$$

The rest of the article is organized as follows. In Section 2 we first state Theorem 2.1 which we will need in our proofs and follows directly from results of [40]. Then we prove new results on geometric symmetrizations of positive kernel operators and their weighted versions, which generalize several results from [14], [40], [15], [33] and [45] and we prove new versions of these results. We conclude the article with Section 3, where we establish some new additional results on Hadamard weighted geometric means of operators. In particular, in Section 3 we extend the main results of [48] and some results of [37].

2. RESULTS ON WEIGHTED GEOMETRIC SYMMETRIZATIONS

Given a nonnegative matrix K that defines an operator on L in \mathcal{L} , let us denote $\|K\|_\infty = \sup_{i,j \in R} k(i, j)$. Then we have $\|K\|_\infty \leq \|K\|$ by (6).

In the following result we state versions of (5). The result follows from Inequalities (4), and (5) combined with [40, Theorem 2.6] applied to the matrix H from (14).

Theorem 2.1. *Given L in \mathcal{L} , let $\{K_{ij}\}_{i=1, j=1}^{l,n}$ be nonnegative matrices that define operators on L and $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n$ positive numbers such that $s_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \geq 1$. Let*

$$(14) \quad \begin{aligned} H &:= \left(K_{11}^{(\alpha_1)} \circ \dots \circ K_{1n}^{(\alpha_n)} \right) \dots \left(K_{l1}^{(\alpha_1)} \circ \dots \circ K_{ln}^{(\alpha_n)} \right), \\ H_i &:= K_{1i} \dots K_{li}, \quad M = \max_{i=1, \dots, n} \|H_i\|_\infty, \\ \beta &= M^{s_n-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_i = \frac{\alpha_i}{s_n} \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned}$$

Then inequalities

$$\begin{aligned}
H &\leq H_1^{(\alpha_1)} \circ \dots \circ H_n^{(\alpha_n)} \leq \beta H_1^{(\beta_1)} \circ \dots \circ H_n^{(\beta_n)} \\
&\leq \beta C(H_1, \dots, H_n, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n) \leq \beta(\beta_1 H_1 + \dots + \beta_n H_n), \\
\rho(H) &\leq \rho(H_1^{(\alpha_1)} \circ \dots \circ H_n^{(\alpha_n)}) \leq \beta \rho(H_1^{(\beta_1)} \circ \dots \circ H_n^{(\beta_n)}) \\
&\leq \beta \rho(H_1)^{\beta_1} \dots \rho(H_n)^{\beta_n} \leq \beta(\beta_1 \rho(H_1) + \dots + \beta_n \rho(H_n)) \\
(15) \quad &\leq \beta(\alpha_1 \rho(H_1) + \dots + \alpha_n \rho(H_n)), \\
\rho(H) &\leq \rho(H_1^{(\alpha_1)} \circ \dots \circ H_n^{(\alpha_n)}) \leq \beta \rho(H_1^{(\beta_1)} \circ \dots \circ H_n^{(\beta_n)}) \\
(16) \quad &\leq \beta \rho(C(H_1, \dots, H_n, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n)) \leq \beta(\beta_1 \rho(H_1) + \dots + \beta_n \rho(H_n))
\end{aligned}$$

hold for all $\rho \in \{r, \|\cdot\|\}$ and inequalities

$$\begin{aligned}
d(H) &\leq d(H_1^{(\alpha_1)} \circ \dots \circ H_n^{(\alpha_n)}) \leq \beta d(H_1^{(\beta_1)} \circ \dots \circ H_n^{(\beta_n)}) \\
&\leq \beta d(C(H_1, \dots, H_n, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n)) \leq \beta d(\beta_1 H_1 + \dots + \beta_n H_n) \\
(17) \quad &\leq \beta(\beta_1 d(H_1) + \dots + \beta_n d(H_n))
\end{aligned}$$

hold for $d = \|\cdot\|$.

If, in addition, L and L^* have order continuous norms then inequalities (15) and (16) hold also for all $\rho \in \{r_{ess}, \gamma\}$ and inequalities (17) hold also for $d = \gamma$.

If, in addition, $L = l^2(R)$, then inequalities (15) and (17) (and (16)) hold also for $\rho = w$ and for $d = w$.

If, in addition, the matrices H_1, \dots, H_n are $m \times m$ matrices and the diagonal part of $H_1^{(\alpha_1)} \circ \dots \circ H_n^{(\alpha_n)}$ is equal to zero, then

$$(18) \quad r(H) \leq r(H_1^{(\alpha_1)} \circ \dots \circ H_n^{(\alpha_n)}) \leq (m-1)\delta,$$

where $\delta = \max\{M^{s_n}, 1\}$.

Let us recall the notion of geometric symmetrization of positive kernel operators on $L^2(X, \mu)$. Let K be a positive kernel operator on $L^2(X, \mu)$ with kernel k . The geometric symmetrization $S(K)$ of K is the positive **selfadjoint** kernel operator on $L^2(X, \mu)$ with kernel equal to $\sqrt{k(x, y)k(y, x)}$ at point $(x, y) \in X \times X$. Note that $S(K) = K^{(1/2)} \circ (K^*)^{(1/2)}$, since the kernel of the adjoint operator K^* is equal to $k(y, x)$ at point $(x, y) \in X \times X$.

Next we extend several results from [14], [40], [15], [33] and [45] to the setting of weighted geometric “symmetrizations” $S_\alpha(\cdot)$ of positive kernel operators and prove new related results to those from the above references. Let K be a positive kernel operator on $L^2(X, \mu)$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. Denote $S_\alpha(K) = K^{(\alpha)} \circ (K^*)^{(1-\alpha)}$, which is a kernel operator on $L^2(X, \mu)$ with a kernel $k^\alpha(x, y)k^{1-\alpha}(y, x)$. Observe that $(S_\alpha(K))^* = S_\alpha(K^*) = S_{1-\alpha}(K)$.

The following result generalizes and refines [40, Propositions 3.1 and 3.2].

Proposition 2.2. *Let K, K_1, \dots, K_n be positive kernel operators on $L^2(X, \mu)$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. Then we have*

$$(19) \quad \begin{aligned} & \rho(S_\alpha(K_1) \cdots S_\alpha(K_n)) \\ & \leq \rho((K_1 \cdots K_n)^{(\alpha)} \circ ((K_n \cdots K_1)^*)^{(1-\alpha)}) \leq \rho(K_1 \cdots K_n)^\alpha \rho(K_n \cdots K_1)^{1-\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

$$(20) \quad \rho(S_\alpha(K_1) + \cdots + S_\alpha(K_m)) \leq \rho(S_\alpha(K_1 + \cdots + K_m)) \leq \rho(K_1 + \cdots + K_m)$$

for all $\rho \in \{r, r_{ess}, \gamma, \|\cdot\|, w\}$. In particular, for all $\rho \in \{r, r_{ess}, \gamma, \|\cdot\|, w\}$ we have

$$(21) \quad \rho(S_\alpha(K)) \leq \rho(K).$$

We also have

$$(22) \quad \rho(S_\alpha(K_1)S_\alpha(K_2)) \leq \rho((K_1K_2)^{(\alpha)} \circ ((K_2K_1)^*)^{(1-\alpha)}) \leq \rho(K_1K_2).$$

for $\rho \in \{r, r_{ess}\}$.

Proof. By (5) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(S_\alpha(K_1) \cdots S_\alpha(K_n)) &= \rho\left((K_1^{(\alpha)} \circ (K_1^*)^{(1-\alpha)}) \cdots (K_n^{(\alpha)} \circ (K_n^*)^{(1-\alpha)})\right) \\ &\leq \rho((K_1 \cdots K_n)^{(\alpha)} \circ ((K_n \cdots K_1)^*)^{(1-\alpha)}) \\ &\leq \rho(K_1 \cdots K_n)^\alpha \rho((K_n \cdots K_1)^*)^{1-\alpha} = \rho(K_1 \cdots K_n)^\alpha \rho(K_n \cdots K_1)^{1-\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves (19). Inequality (21) is a special cases of (19) while (22) follows from (19) and $\rho(K_1K_2) = \rho(K_2K_1)$ for $\rho \in \{r, r_{ess}\}$.

Inequalities (20) follow from (13) and (21). \square

If K is a nonnegative matrix that defines an operator on $l^2(R)$ and if α and β are nonnegative numbers such that $\alpha + \beta \geq 1$, then a nonnegative matrix $S_{\alpha,\beta}(K) = K^{(\alpha)} \circ (K^*)^{(\beta)}$ also defines an operator on $l^2(R)$ by Theorem 1.1(ii). The following result is proved in a similar way as Proposition 2.2.

Proposition 2.3. *Let K, K_1, \dots, K_n be nonnegative matrices that define operators on $l^2(R)$ and let α and β be nonnegative numbers such that $\alpha + \beta \geq 1$. Then we have*

$$(23) \quad \begin{aligned} & \rho(S_{\alpha,\beta}(K_1) \cdots S_{\alpha,\beta}(K_n)) \\ & \leq \rho((K_1 \cdots K_n)^{(\alpha)} \circ ((K_n \cdots K_1)^*)^{(\beta)}) \leq \rho(K_1 \cdots K_n)^\alpha \rho(K_n \cdots K_1)^\beta, \end{aligned}$$

$$(24) \quad \rho(S_{\alpha,\beta}(K)) \leq \rho(K)^{\alpha+\beta},$$

$$(25) \quad \rho(S_{\alpha,\beta}(K_1) + \cdots + S_{\alpha,\beta}(K_m)) \leq \rho(S_{\alpha,\beta}(K_1 + \cdots + K_m)) \leq \rho(K_1 + \cdots + K_m)^{\alpha+\beta}$$

for all $\rho \in \{r, \|\cdot\|\}$. We also have

$$(26) \quad \rho(S_{\alpha,\beta}(K_1)S_{\alpha,\beta}(K_2)) \leq \rho(K_1K_2)^{\alpha+\beta}$$

for $\rho = r$. Moreover, we have

$$(27) \quad \begin{aligned} \rho(S_{\alpha,\beta}(K_1) \cdots S_{\alpha,\beta}(K_n)) &\leq \rho((K_1 \cdots K_n)^{(\alpha)} \circ ((K_n \cdots K_1)^*)^{(\beta)}) \\ &\leq \delta \rho\left((K_1 \cdots K_n)^{(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\beta})} \circ ((K_n \cdots K_1)^*)^{(\frac{\beta}{\alpha+\beta})}\right) \leq \delta \cdot \rho(K_1 \cdots K_n)^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\beta}} \rho(K_n \cdots K_1)^{\frac{\beta}{\alpha+\beta}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta = \max\{\|K_1 \cdots K_n\|_\infty, \|K_n \cdots K_1\|_\infty\}^{\alpha+\beta-1}$, and

$$(28) \quad \rho(S_{\alpha,\beta}(K)) \leq \|K\|_\infty^{\alpha+\beta-1} \rho\left(S_{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\beta}}(K)\right) \leq \|K\|_\infty^{\alpha+\beta-1} \rho(K),$$

$$(29) \quad \begin{aligned} \rho(S_{\alpha,\beta}(K_1) + \dots + S_{\alpha,\beta}(K_m)) &\leq \rho(S_{\alpha,\beta}(K_1 + \dots + K_m)) \\ &\leq \|K_1 + \dots + K_m\|_\infty^{\alpha+\beta-1} \rho\left(S_{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\beta}}(K_1 + \dots + K_m)\right) \leq \|K_1 + \dots + K_m\|_\infty^{\alpha+\beta-1} \rho(K_1 + \dots + K_m) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\rho \in \{r, r_{ess}, \gamma, \|\cdot\|, w\}$. We also have

$$(30) \quad \begin{aligned} \rho(S_{\alpha,\beta}(K_1)S_{\alpha,\beta}(K_2)) &\leq \rho((K_1K_2)^{(\alpha)} \circ ((K_2K_1)^*)^{(\beta)}) \\ &\leq \max\{\|K_1K_2\|_\infty, \|K_2K_1\|_\infty\}^{\alpha+\beta-1} \rho\left((K_1K_2)^{(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\beta})} \circ ((K_2K_1)^*)^{(\frac{\beta}{\alpha+\beta})}\right) \\ &\leq \max\{\|K_1K_2\|_\infty, \|K_2K_1\|_\infty\}^{\alpha+\beta-1} \rho(K_1K_2) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\rho \in \{r, r_{ess}\}$.

Proof. Inequalities (23) are proved in similar way as Inequalities (19) by applying Theorem 1.1(ii). Inequalities (27) follow from (15). Inequalities (24) and (28) are special cases of (23) and (27), respectively. Inequalities (25) and (29) follow from (13), (24) and (28), while Inequalities (26) and (30) follow from (23) and (27). \square

The following two results generalize [14, Lemma 2.1], [14, Theorem 2.2] and [40, Theorem 3.5] by employing a similar but more general method of proof.

Lemma 2.4. (i) If K is a positive kernel operator on $L^2(X, \mu)$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, then

$$(31) \quad S_\alpha(K^2) \geq S_\alpha(K)^2.$$

(ii) If K is a nonnegative matrix that defines an operator on $l^2(R)$ and if α and β are nonnegative numbers such that $\alpha + \beta \geq 1$, then

$$(32) \quad S_{\alpha,\beta}(K^2) \geq S_{\alpha,\beta}(K)^2.$$

Proof. The kernel of $S_\alpha(K^2)$ at $(x, y) \in X \times X$ equals

$$\left(\int_X k(x, z)k(z, y)d\mu(z) \right)^\alpha \left(\int_X k(y, z)k(z, x)d\mu(z) \right)^{1-\alpha}.$$

By Hoelder's inequality this is larger or equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_X (k(x, z)k(z, y))^\alpha (k(y, z)k(z, x))^{1-\alpha} d\mu(z) \\ &= \int_X k(x, z)^\alpha k(z, x)^{1-\alpha} k(z, y)^\alpha k(y, z)^{1-\alpha} d\mu(z) \end{aligned}$$

and this equals the kernel of $S_\alpha(K)^2$ at (x, y) , which proves (31).

Inequality (32) is proved in a similar way by [33, Proposition 4.1]. \square

Theorem 2.5. (i) Let K be a positive kernel operator on $L^2(X, \mu)$, $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and let $\rho_n = \rho(S_\alpha(K^{2^n}))^{2^{-n}}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $\rho \in \{r, r_{ess}\}$. Then for each n

$$\rho(S_\alpha(K)) = \rho_0 \leq \rho_1 \leq \dots \leq \rho_n \leq \rho(K).$$

(ii) Let K be a nonnegative matrix that defines an operator on $l^2(R)$ and α and β nonnegative numbers such that $\alpha + \beta \geq 1$. If $r_n = \rho(S_{\alpha, \beta}(K^{2^n}))^{2^{-n}}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $\rho \in \{r, r_{ess}\}$, then

$$\rho(S_{\alpha, \beta}(K)) = r_0 \leq r_1 \leq \dots \leq r_n \leq \min\{\rho(K)^{\alpha+\beta}, \|K^{2^n}\|_\infty^{\frac{\alpha+\beta-1}{2^n}} \rho(K)\} \text{ for } \rho = r,$$

$$\rho(S_{\alpha, \beta}(K)) = r_0 \leq r_1 \leq \dots \leq r_n \leq \|K^{2^n}\|_\infty^{\frac{\alpha+\beta-1}{2^n}} \rho(K) \text{ for } \rho = r_{ess} \text{ and}$$

$$r_n \leq \|K^{2^n}\|_\infty^{\frac{\alpha+\beta-1}{2^n}} \rho \left(S_{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\beta}}(K^{2^n}) \right)^{2^{-n}} \leq \|K^{2^n}\|_\infty^{\frac{\alpha+\beta-1}{2^n}} \rho(K).$$

Proof. To prove (i) we first observe that by (31) (or by (22)) we have

$$(33) \quad \rho(S_\alpha(K^2)) \geq \rho(S_\alpha(K)^2) = \rho(S_\alpha(K))^2.$$

By (21) $\rho(S_\alpha(K^{2^n})) \leq \rho(K^{2^n}) = \rho(K)^{2^n}$ and so $\rho_n \leq \rho(K)$. Since $\rho_{n-1} \leq \rho_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ by (33) the proof of (i) is completed.

In a similar way (ii) is proved by applying (24), (28) and (30). \square

The following result generalizes and extends [45, Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 3.2 (3)].

Proposition 2.6. Let K be a positive kernel operators on $L^2(X, \mu)$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. Then for all $\rho \in \{r, r_{ess}, \gamma, \|\cdot\|, w\}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$(34) \quad \rho(S(K)) \leq \rho(S_\alpha(K)) \leq \rho(K) \text{ and}$$

$$(35) \quad \rho(S(K^n))^{\frac{1}{n}} \leq \rho(S_\alpha(K^n))^{\frac{1}{n}} \leq \rho(K).$$

Proof. Since $S(K) = S(S_\alpha(K))$ Inequalities (34) follow from (21). Inequalities (35) follow from (34). \square

The following result generalizes and extends [45, Theorems 2.3 and 3.3]. It is proved in similar way as [45, Theorem 2.3] by applying (21). To avoid too much repetition of ideas we omit the details of the proof.

Theorem 2.7. *Let K be a positive kernel operators on $L^2(X, \mu)$.*

For $\rho \in \{r, r_{ess}, \gamma, \|\cdot\|, w\}$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ define $f_\rho(\alpha) = \rho(S_\alpha(K))$. Then f_ρ is decreasing in $[0, 0.5]$ and increasing in $[0.5, 1]$.

3. ADDITIONAL RESULTS ON WEIGHTED GEOMETRIC MEANS

The following refinement of inequality (3) was proved in [38, Corollary 3.10].

Theorem 3.1. *Let K_1, \dots, K_n be positive kernel operators on a Banach function space L . If $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ are positive numbers such that $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i = 1$ and if $m \in \mathbb{N}$ then*

$$(36) \quad \rho(K_1^{(\alpha_1)} \circ \dots \circ K_n^{(\alpha_n)}) \leq \rho((K_1^m)^{(\alpha_1)} \circ \dots \circ (K_n^m)^{(\alpha_n)})^{\frac{1}{m}} \leq \rho(K_1)^{\alpha_1} \dots \rho(K_n)^{\alpha_n}$$

for $\rho = r$.

If, in addition, L and L^ have order continuous norms then Inequalities (36) hold also for $\rho = r_{ess}$.*

By iterating (36) we obtain its refinement.

Corollary 3.2. *Let K_1, \dots, K_n be positive kernel operators on a Banach function space L . If $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ are positive numbers such that $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i = 1$ and if $m, l \in \mathbb{N}$ then*

$$(37) \quad \begin{aligned} & \rho(K_1^{(\alpha_1)} \circ \dots \circ K_n^{(\alpha_n)}) \leq \rho((K_1^m)^{(\alpha_1)} \circ \dots \circ (K_n^m)^{(\alpha_n)})^{\frac{1}{m}} \\ & \leq \rho((K_1^{ml})^{(\alpha_1)} \circ \dots \circ (K_n^{ml})^{(\alpha_n)})^{\frac{1}{ml}} \leq \rho(K_1)^{\alpha_1} \dots \rho(K_n)^{\alpha_n} \end{aligned}$$

for $\rho = r$.

If, in addition, L and L^ have order continuous norms then Inequalities (37) hold also for $\rho = r_{ess}$.*

The following result follows from (37) and Theorem 2.1.

Corollary 3.3. *Given L in \mathcal{L} , let K_1, \dots, K_n be nonnegative matrices that define operators on L and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ nonnegative numbers such that $s_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \geq 1$. Let*

$$M = \max_{i=1, \dots, n} \|K_i\|_\infty, \quad \beta = M^{s_n-1}$$

and $\beta_i = \frac{\alpha_i}{s_n}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Then

$$(38) \quad \begin{aligned} \rho(K_1^{(\alpha_1)} \circ \dots \circ K_n^{(\alpha_n)}) & \leq \beta \rho(K_1^{(\beta_1)} \circ \dots \circ K_n^{(\beta_n)}) \leq \beta \rho((K_1^m)^{(\beta_1)} \circ \dots \circ (K_n^m)^{(\beta_n)})^{\frac{1}{m}} \\ & \leq \beta \rho((K_1^{ml})^{(\beta_1)} \circ \dots \circ (K_n^{ml})^{(\beta_n)})^{\frac{1}{ml}} \leq \beta \rho(K_1)^{\beta_1} \dots \rho(K_n)^{\beta_n} \end{aligned}$$

for all $m, l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\rho = r$.

If, in addition, L and L^* have order continuous norms then Inequalities (38) hold also for $\rho = r_{ess}$.

Next we prove (with a standard method from e.g. [15] and [33]) that in the case of sequence spaces $L \in \mathcal{L}$ inequalities (37) for the spectral radius hold also under the condition $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \geq 1$. In this case we also prove additional refinements of (36).

Theorem 3.4. *Given $L \in \mathcal{L}$, let K_1, \dots, K_n be nonnegative matrices that define operators on L . If $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ are nonnegative numbers such that $s_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \geq 1$ and if $m, l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\beta_i = \frac{\alpha_i}{s_n}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, then we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
 & r(K_1^{(\alpha_1)} \circ \dots \circ K_n^{(\alpha_n)}) \leq r((K_1^m)^{(\alpha_1)} \circ \dots \circ (K_n^m)^{(\alpha_n)})^{\frac{1}{m}} \\
 & \leq r((K_1^{ml})^{(\alpha_1)} \circ \dots \circ (K_n^{ml})^{(\alpha_n)})^{\frac{1}{ml}} \leq r((K_1^{ml})^{(\beta_1)} \circ \dots \circ (K_n^{ml})^{(\beta_n)})^{\frac{s_n}{ml}} \\
 (39) \quad & \leq r(K_1)^{\alpha_1} \dots r(K_n)^{\alpha_n}
 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 & r(K_1^{(\alpha_1)} \circ \dots \circ K_n^{(\alpha_n)}) \leq r((K_1^m)^{(\alpha_1)} \circ \dots \circ (K_n^m)^{(\alpha_n)})^{\frac{1}{m}} \\
 & \leq r((K_1^m)^{(\beta_1)} \circ \dots \circ (K_n^m)^{(\beta_n)})^{\frac{s_n}{m}} \leq r((K_1^{ml})^{(\beta_1)} \circ \dots \circ (K_n^{ml})^{(\beta_n)})^{\frac{s_n}{ml}} \\
 (40) \quad & \leq r(K_1)^{\alpha_1} \dots r(K_n)^{\alpha_n}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Proof. First we prove that (37) holds also under our assumptions. By (4) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left(K_1^{(\alpha_1)} \circ \dots \circ K_n^{(\alpha_n)} \right)^m = \left(K_1^{(\alpha_1)} \circ \dots \circ K_n^{(\alpha_n)} \right) \dots \left(K_1^{(\alpha_1)} \circ \dots \circ K_n^{(\alpha_n)} \right) \\
 (41) \quad & \leq (K_1^m)^{(\alpha_1)} \circ \dots \circ (K_n^m)^{(\alpha_n)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (41) and (3) that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & r(K_1^{(\alpha_1)} \circ \dots \circ K_n^{(\alpha_n)})^m = r\left((K_1^{(\alpha_1)} \circ \dots \circ K_n^{(\alpha_n)})^m \right) \\
 & \leq r((K_1^m)^{(\alpha_1)} \circ \dots \circ (K_n^m)^{(\alpha_n)}) \leq r(K_1^m)^{\alpha_1} \dots r(K_n^m)^{\alpha_n} = (r(K_1)^{\alpha_1} \dots r(K_n)^{\alpha_n})^m
 \end{aligned}$$

which proves (36) in this case. By iterating as before one obtains (37) under our assumptions.

Let us prove (40). Since $s_n \geq 1$ and $\alpha_i = \beta_i s_n$ it follows by the first inequality in (37) in the case $s_n \geq 1$, (8), (3) and (37) that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & r(K_1^{(\alpha_1)} \circ \dots \circ K_n^{(\alpha_n)}) \leq r((K_1^m)^{(\alpha_1)} \circ \dots \circ (K_n^m)^{(\alpha_n)})^{\frac{1}{m}} \\
 & = r\left(((K_1^m)^{(\beta_1)} \circ \dots \circ (K_n^m)^{(\beta_n)})^{(s_n)} \right)^{\frac{1}{m}} \leq r((K_1^m)^{(\beta_1)} \circ \dots \circ (K_n^m)^{(\beta_n)})^{\frac{s_n}{m}} \\
 & \leq r((K_1^{ml})^{(\beta_1)} \circ \dots \circ (K_n^{ml})^{(\beta_n)})^{\frac{s_n}{ml}} \leq (r(K_1^{ml})^{\alpha_1} \dots r(K_n^{ml})^{\alpha_n})^{\frac{1}{ml}} \\
 & = r(K_1)^{\alpha_1} \dots r(K_n)^{\alpha_n},
 \end{aligned}$$

which proves (40). Now (39) follows from (37) in the case $s_n \geq 1$ and (40), which completes the proof. \square

We conclude the article by extending the main results of [48] and some results of [37]. The following result is a new variation of [37, Theorem 4.1] for even m . By σ_m we denote the group of permutations of the set $\{1, \dots, m\}$.

Theorem 3.5. *Let m be even, $\{\tau, \nu\} \subset \sigma_m$ and let H_1, \dots, H_m be positive kernel operators on $L^2(X, \mu)$. For $j = 1, \dots, \frac{m}{2}$ denote $A_j = H_{\tau(2j-1)}^* H_{\tau(2j)}$ and $A_{\frac{m}{2}+j} = A_j^* = H_{\tau(2j)}^* H_{\tau(2j-1)}$. Let $P_i = A_{\nu(i)} \cdots A_{\nu(m)} A_{\nu(1)} \cdots A_{\nu(i-1)}$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$.*

(i) *Then*

$$(42) \quad \begin{aligned} \|H_1^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ H_m^{(\frac{1}{m})}\| &\leq r(A_1^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ A_m^{(\frac{1}{m})})^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq r\left(P_1^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ P_2^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ P_m^{(\frac{1}{m})}\right)^{\frac{1}{2m}} \leq r(A_{\nu(1)} \cdots A_{\nu(m)})^{\frac{1}{2m}}. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) *If H_1, \dots, H_m are nonnegative matrices that define operators on $l^2(R)$ and if $\alpha \geq \frac{1}{m}$, then*

$$(43) \quad \begin{aligned} \|H_1^{(\alpha)} \circ \dots \circ H_m^{(\alpha)}\| &\leq r(A_1^{(\alpha)} \circ \dots \circ A_m^{(\alpha)})^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq r\left(P_1^{(\alpha)} \circ P_2^{(\alpha)} \circ \dots \circ P_m^{(\alpha)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2m}} \leq r(A_{\nu(1)} \cdots A_{\nu(m)})^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. First we prove (42). By

$$(44) \quad \|H\| = r(H^* H)^{\frac{1}{2}} = r(H H^*)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

(5) and commutativity of Hadamard product we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|H_1^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ H_m^{(\frac{1}{m})}\| &= r((H_1^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ H_m^{(\frac{1}{m})})^* (H_1^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ H_m^{(\frac{1}{m})}))^{\frac{1}{2}} = \\ &= r[(((H_{\tau(1)}^*)^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ (H_{\tau(m-1)}^*)^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ (H_{\tau(2)}^*)^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ (H_{\tau(m)}^*)^{(\frac{1}{m})})) \cdot \\ &\quad (H_{\tau(2)}^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ H_{\tau(m)}^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ H_{\tau(1)}^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ H_{\tau(m-1)}^{(\frac{1}{m})})]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq r((H_{\tau(1)}^* H_{\tau(2)})^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ (H_{\tau(m-1)}^* H_{\tau(m)})^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ (H_{\tau(2)}^* H_{\tau(1)})^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ (H_{\tau(m)}^* H_{\tau(m-1)})^{(\frac{1}{m})})^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= r(A_1^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ A_m^{(\frac{1}{m})})^{\frac{1}{2}} = r(A_{\nu(1)}^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ A_{\nu(m)}^{(\frac{1}{m})})^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

which proves the first inequality in (3.5). The second and the third inequality in (42) follow from [37, Inequalities (4.2)].

Inequalities (43) are proved in a similar manner by applying Theorem 1.1(ii). \square

By interchanging H_i with H_i^* for all i in Theorem 3.5 we obtain the following result.

Corollary 3.6. *Let m be even, $\tau \in \sigma_m$, $\beta \in [0, 1]$ and let H_1, \dots, H_m be positive kernel operators on $L^2(X, \mu)$. Let A_j for $j = 1, \dots, m$ be as in Theorem 3.5 and denote $B_j = H_{\tau(2j-1)}H_{\tau(2j)}^*$ and $B_{\frac{m}{2}+j} = B_j^* = H_{\tau(2j)}H_{\tau(2j-1)}^*$ for $j = 1, \dots, \frac{m}{2}$.*

(i) *Then*

$$\|H_1^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ H_m^{(\frac{1}{m})}\| \leq r(B_1^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ B_m^{(\frac{1}{m})})^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

and

$$\|H_1^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ H_m^{(\frac{1}{m})}\| \leq r(A_1^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ A_m^{(\frac{1}{m})})^{\frac{\beta}{2}} r(B_1^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ B_m^{(\frac{1}{m})})^{\frac{1-\beta}{2}}.$$

(ii) *If H_1, \dots, H_m are nonnegative matrices that define operators on $l^2(R)$ and if $\alpha \geq \frac{1}{m}$, then*

$$\|H_1^{(\alpha)} \circ \dots \circ H_m^{(\alpha)}\| \leq r(B_1^{(\alpha)} \circ \dots \circ B_m^{(\alpha)})^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

and

$$\|H_1^{(\alpha)} \circ \dots \circ H_m^{(\alpha)}\| \leq r(A_1^{(\alpha)} \circ \dots \circ A_m^{(\alpha)})^{\frac{\beta}{2}} r(B_1^{(\alpha)} \circ \dots \circ B_m^{(\alpha)})^{\frac{1-\beta}{2}}.$$

Remark 3.7. In the special case of the identity permutation μ in Theorem 3.5 it holds

$$r(A_{\mu(1)} \cdots A_{\mu(m)})^{\frac{1}{2}} = \|H_{\tau(1)}^* H_{\tau(2)} H_{\tau(3)}^* H_{\tau(4)} \cdots H_{\tau(m-1)}^* H_{\tau(m)}\|$$

by (44).

The following two results extend, generalize and refine [48, Theorem 2.8] and give an extension and a different refinement of [37, Inequality (4.16)] in the case $\alpha \geq \frac{2}{m}$.

Theorem 3.8. *Let m be even, $\alpha \geq \frac{2}{m}$, $\tau \in \sigma_m$ and let H_1, \dots, H_m be nonnegative matrices that define operators on $l^2(R)$. Let A_j for $j = 1, \dots, m$ be as in Theorem 3.5 and denote $S_i = A_i \cdots A_{\frac{m}{2}} A_1 \cdots A_{i-1}$ for $i = 1, \dots, \frac{m}{2}$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|H_1^{(\alpha)} \circ \dots \circ H_m^{(\alpha)}\| \leq r(A_1^{(\alpha)} \circ \dots \circ A_m^{(\alpha)})^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq r(A_1^{(\alpha)} \circ \dots \circ A_{\frac{m}{2}}^{(\alpha)}) \\ & = r((H_{\tau(1)}^* H_{\tau(2)})^{(\alpha)} \circ (H_{\tau(3)}^* H_{\tau(4)})^{(\alpha)} \circ \dots \circ (H_{\tau(m-1)}^* H_{\tau(m)})^{(\alpha)}) \\ (45) \quad & \leq r\left(S_1^{(\alpha)} \circ S_2^{(\alpha)} \circ \dots \circ S_{\frac{m}{2}}^{(\alpha)}\right)^{\frac{2}{m}} \leq r(H_{\tau(1)}^* H_{\tau(2)} H_{\tau(3)}^* H_{\tau(4)} \cdots H_{\tau(m-1)}^* H_{\tau(m)})^{\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By the first inequality in (43) and (3) in Theorem 1.1(ii) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|H_1^{(\alpha)} \circ \dots \circ H_m^{(\alpha)}\| \leq r(A_1^{(\alpha)} \circ \dots \circ A_m^{(\alpha)})^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & = r(A_1^{(\alpha)} \circ \dots \circ A_{\frac{m}{2}}^{(\alpha)} \circ (A_1^*)^{(\alpha)} \circ \dots \circ (A_{\frac{m}{2}}^*)^{(\alpha)})^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq (r(A_1^{(\alpha)} \circ \dots \circ A_{\frac{m}{2}}^{(\alpha)}) r((A_1^{(\alpha)} \circ \dots \circ A_{\frac{m}{2}}^{(\alpha)})^*))^{\frac{1}{2}} = r(A_1^{(\alpha)} \circ \dots \circ A_{\frac{m}{2}}^{(\alpha)}) \\ & = r((H_{\tau(1)}^* H_{\tau(2)})^{(\alpha)} \circ (H_{\tau(3)}^* H_{\tau(4)})^{(\alpha)} \circ \dots \circ (H_{\tau(m-1)}^* H_{\tau(m)})^{(\alpha)}). \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} & ((H_{\tau(1)}^* H_{\tau(2)})^{(\alpha)} \circ (H_{\tau(3)}^* H_{\tau(4)})^{(\alpha)} \circ \cdots \circ (H_{\tau(m-1)}^* H_{\tau(m)})^{(\alpha)})^{\frac{m}{2}} = \\ & ((H_{\tau(1)}^* H_{\tau(2)})^{(\alpha)} \circ \cdots \circ (H_{\tau(m-1)}^* H_{\tau(m)})^{(\alpha)}) ((H_{\tau(3)}^* H_{\tau(4)})^{(\alpha)} \circ \cdots \circ (H_{\tau(1)}^* H_{\tau(2)})^{(\alpha)}) \\ & \cdots ((H_{\tau(m-1)}^* H_{\tau(m)})^{(\alpha)} \circ \cdots \circ (H_{\tau(m-3)}^* H_{\tau(m-2)})^{(\alpha)}), \end{aligned}$$

we obtain by (5) that

$$\begin{aligned} & r((H_{\tau(1)}^* H_{\tau(2)})^{(\alpha)} \circ (H_{\tau(3)}^* H_{\tau(4)})^{(\alpha)} \circ \cdots \circ (H_{\tau(m-1)}^* H_{\tau(m)})^{(\alpha)}) \leq \\ & r(S_1^{(\alpha)} \circ S_2^{(\alpha)} \circ \cdots \circ S_{\frac{m}{2}}^{(\alpha)})^{\frac{2}{m}} \leq (r(S_1)^\alpha \cdots r(S_{\frac{m}{2}})^\alpha)^{\frac{2}{m}} \\ & = r(H_{\tau(1)}^* H_{\tau(2)} H_{\tau(3)}^* H_{\tau(4)} \cdots H_{\tau(m-1)}^* H_{\tau(m)})^\alpha, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from $r(S_1) = \cdots = r(S_{\frac{m}{2}})$. \square

Corollary 3.9. *Let m be even, $\alpha \geq \frac{2}{m}$, $\tau \in \sigma_m$, $\beta \in [0, 1]$ and let H_1, \dots, H_m be nonnegative matrices that define operators on $l^2(R)$. Let A_j and B_j for $j = 1, \dots, m$ be as in Corollary 3.6 and denote $S_i = A_i \cdots A_{\frac{m}{2}} A_1 \cdots A_{i-1}$ and $T_i = B_i \cdots B_{\frac{m}{2}} B_1 \cdots B_{i-1}$ for $i = 1, \dots, \frac{m}{2}$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} (46) \quad & \|H_1^{(\alpha)} \circ \cdots \circ H_m^{(\alpha)}\| \leq r(A_1^{(\alpha)} \circ \cdots \circ A_m^{(\alpha)})^{\frac{\beta}{2}} r(B_1^{(\alpha)} \circ \cdots \circ B_m^{(\alpha)})^{\frac{1-\beta}{2}} \\ & \leq r((H_{\tau(1)}^* H_{\tau(2)})^{(\alpha)} \circ (H_{\tau(3)}^* H_{\tau(4)})^{(\alpha)} \circ \cdots \circ (H_{\tau(m-1)}^* H_{\tau(m)})^{(\alpha)})^\beta \cdot \\ & r((H_{\tau(1)} H_{\tau(2)}^*)^{(\alpha)} \circ (H_{\tau(3)} H_{\tau(4)}^*)^{(\alpha)} \circ \cdots \circ (H_{\tau(m-1)} H_{\tau(m)}^*)^{(\alpha)})^{1-\beta} \\ & \leq r(S_1^{(\alpha)} \circ S_2^{(\alpha)} \circ \cdots \circ S_{\frac{m}{2}}^{(\alpha)})^{\frac{2\beta}{m}} r(T_1^{(\alpha)} \circ T_2^{(\alpha)} \circ \cdots \circ T_{\frac{m}{2}}^{(\alpha)})^{\frac{2(1-\beta)}{m}} \\ & \leq r(H_{\tau(1)}^* H_{\tau(2)} H_{\tau(3)}^* H_{\tau(4)} \cdots H_{\tau(m-1)}^* H_{\tau(m)})^{\alpha\beta} r(H_{\tau(1)} H_{\tau(2)}^* H_{\tau(3)} H_{\tau(4)}^* \cdots H_{\tau(m-1)} H_{\tau(m)}^*)^{\alpha(1-\beta)}. \end{aligned}$$

The following result extends [48, Theorem 2.13] and [37, Theorem 4.1].

Theorem 3.10. *Let H_1, \dots, H_m be positive kernel operators on $L^2(X, \mu)$ and $\{\tau, \nu\} \subset \sigma_m$. Denote $Q_j = H_{\tau(j)}^* H_{\nu(j)} \cdots H_{\tau(m)}^* H_{\nu(m)} H_{\tau(1)}^* H_{\nu(1)} \cdots H_{\tau(j-1)}^* H_{\nu(j-1)}$ for $j = 1, \dots, m$.*

(i) *Then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|H_1^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \cdots \circ H_m^{(\frac{1}{m})}\| \leq r((H_{\tau(1)}^* H_{\nu(1)})^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \cdots \circ (H_{\tau(m)}^* H_{\nu(m)})^{(\frac{1}{m})})^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ (47) \quad & \leq r(Q_1^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \cdots \circ Q_m^{(\frac{1}{m})})^{\frac{1}{2m}} \leq r(H_{\tau(1)}^* H_{\nu(1)} \cdots H_{\tau(m)}^* H_{\nu(m)})^{\frac{1}{2m}}. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) *If H_1, \dots, H_m are nonnegative matrices that define operators on $l^2(R)$ and if $\alpha \geq \frac{1}{m}$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|H_1^{(\alpha)} \circ \cdots \circ H_m^{(\alpha)}\| \leq r((H_{\tau(1)}^* H_{\nu(1)})^{(\alpha)} \circ \cdots \circ (H_{\tau(m)}^* H_{\nu(m)})^{(\alpha)})^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ (48) \quad & \leq r(Q_1^{(\alpha)} \circ \cdots \circ Q_m^{(\alpha)})^{\frac{1}{2m}} \leq r(H_{\tau(1)}^* H_{\nu(1)} \cdots H_{\tau(m)}^* H_{\nu(m)})^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. First we prove (47). By (44) and (5) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|H_1^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ H_m^{(\frac{1}{m})}\| &= r((H_1^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ H_m^{(\frac{1}{m})})^* (H_1^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ H_m^{(\frac{1}{m})}))^{\frac{1}{2}} = \\ &= r(((H_{\tau(1)}^*)^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ (H_{\tau(m)}^*)^{(\frac{1}{m})})((H_{\nu(1)}^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ (H_{\nu(m)}^{(\frac{1}{m})})))^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq r((H_{\tau(1)}^* H_{\nu(1)})^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ (H_{\tau(m)}^* H_{\nu(m)})^{(\frac{1}{m})})^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} ((H_{\tau(1)}^* H_{\nu(1)})^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ (H_{\tau(m)}^* H_{\nu(m)})^{(\frac{1}{m})})^m &= ((H_{\tau(1)}^* H_{\nu(1)})^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ (H_{\tau(m)}^* H_{\nu(m)})^{(\frac{1}{m})}) \\ ((H_{\tau(2)}^* H_{\nu(2)})^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ (H_{\tau(1)}^* H_{\nu(1)})^{(\frac{1}{m})}) \dots &((H_{\tau(m)}^* H_{\nu(m)})^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ (H_{\tau(m-1)}^* H_{\nu(m-1)})^{(\frac{1}{m})}). \end{aligned}$$

It follows by (5) that

$$\begin{aligned} r((H_{\tau(1)}^* H_{\nu(1)})^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ (H_{\tau(m)}^* H_{\nu(m)})^{(\frac{1}{m})})^{\frac{1}{2}} &\leq r(Q_1^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ Q_m^{(\frac{1}{m})})^{\frac{1}{2m}} \\ &\leq (r(Q_1) \dots r(Q_m))^{\frac{1}{2m^2}} = r(H_{\tau(1)}^* H_{\nu(1)} \dots H_{\tau(m)}^* H_{\nu(m)})^{\frac{1}{2m}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from $r(Q_1) = \dots = r(Q_m)$. This completes the proof of (47). The proof of (48) is similar by applying Theorem 1.1(ii). \square

The following corollary is a refinement of [37, Inequality (4.11)], which differs from refinements in [37, Inequalities (4.15) and (4.17)]. It also extends and generalizes [48, Corollary 2.15].

Corollary 3.11. *Let m be odd and let H_1, \dots, H_m be positive kernel operators on $L^2(X, \mu)$.*

(i) *Then*

$$\begin{aligned} &\|H_1^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ H_m^{(\frac{1}{m})}\| \\ &\leq r((H_1^* H_2)^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ (H_{m-2}^* H_{m-1})^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ (H_m^* H_1)^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ (H_2^* H_3)^{(\frac{1}{m})} \circ \dots \circ (H_{m-1}^* H_m)^{(\frac{1}{m})})^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ (49) \quad &\leq r(H_1^* H_2 \dots H_{m-2}^* H_{m-1} H_m^* H_1 H_2^* H_3 \dots H_{m-1}^* H_m)^{\frac{1}{2m}}. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) *If H_1, \dots, H_m are nonnegative matrices that define operators on $l^2(R)$ and if $\alpha \geq \frac{1}{m}$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} &\|H_1^{(\alpha)} \circ \dots \circ H_m^{(\alpha)}\| \\ &\leq r((H_1^* H_2)^{(\alpha)} \circ \dots \circ (H_{m-2}^* H_{m-1})^{(\alpha)} \circ (H_m^* H_1)^{(\alpha)} \circ (H_2^* H_3)^{(\alpha)} \circ \dots \circ (H_{m-1}^* H_m)^{(\alpha)})^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ (50) \quad &\leq r(H_1^* H_2 \dots H_{m-2}^* H_{m-1} H_m^* H_1 H_2^* H_3 \dots H_{m-1}^* H_m)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The result follows by taking the permutations $\tau(j) = 2j - 1$ for $1 \leq j \leq \frac{m+1}{2}$; $\tau(j) = 2(j - \frac{m+1}{2})$ for $\frac{m+3}{2} \leq j \leq m$ and $\nu(j) = 2j$ for $1 \leq j \leq \frac{m-1}{2}$; $\nu(j) = 2(j - \frac{m-1}{2}) - 1$ for $\frac{m+1}{2} \leq j \leq m$ in Theorem 3.10. \square

The following corollary gives new lower bounds for the operator norm of the Jordan triple product ABA , which differ from the one obtained in [37, Corollary 4.10]. The result follows from Corollary 3.11 and Theorem 3.10 by taking $H_1 = A$, $H_2 = B^*$ and $H_3 = A$.

Corollary 3.12. *Let A and B be positive kernel operators on $L^2(X, \mu)$.*

(i) *Then*

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \|A^{(\frac{1}{3})} \circ (B^*)^{(\frac{1}{3})} \circ A^{(\frac{1}{3})}\| \\
 & \leq r^{\frac{1}{2}} \left((A^* B^*)^{(\frac{1}{3})} \circ (A^* A)^{(\frac{1}{3})} \circ (BA)^{(\frac{1}{3})} \right) \\
 & \leq r^{\frac{1}{6}} \left((A^* B^* A^* ABA)^{(\frac{1}{3})} \circ (A^* ABAA^* B^*)^{(\frac{1}{3})} \circ (BAA^* B^* A^* A)^{(\frac{1}{3})} \right) \\
 (51) \quad & \leq \|ABA\|^{\frac{1}{3}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

(ii) *If A and B are nonnegative matrices that define operators on $l^2(R)$ and if $\alpha \geq \frac{1}{3}$, then*

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \|A^{(\alpha)} \circ (B^*)^{(\alpha)} \circ A^{(\alpha)}\| \\
 & \leq r^{\frac{1}{2}} \left((A^* B^*)^{(\alpha)} \circ (A^* A)^{(\alpha)} \circ (BA)^{(\alpha)} \right) \\
 & \leq r^{\frac{1}{6}} \left((A^* B^* A^* ABA)^{(\alpha)} \circ (A^* ABAA^* B^*)^{(\alpha)} \circ (BAA^* B^* A^* A)^{(\alpha)} \right) \\
 (52) \quad & \leq \|ABA\|^\alpha.
 \end{aligned}$$

The following result generalizes [48, Inequality (2.12)].

Lemma 3.13. *Let $\alpha \geq \frac{1}{2}$ and let C be a nonnegative matrix that defines an operator on $l^2(R)$. Then*

$$r(C^{(\alpha)} \circ (C^*)^{(\alpha)}) \leq r(C^{(\alpha)} \circ C^{(\alpha)}) \leq r(C)^{2\alpha}.$$

Proof. By (3) in Theorem 1.1(ii) applied twice we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & r(C^{(\alpha)} \circ (C^*)^{(\alpha)}) = r((C^{(\alpha)} \circ C^{(\alpha)})^{(\frac{1}{2})} \circ ((C^*)^{(\alpha)} \circ (C^*)^{(\alpha)})^{(\frac{1}{2})}) \\
 & \leq r(C^{(\alpha)} \circ C^{(\alpha)})^{\frac{1}{2}} r((C^*)^{(\alpha)} \circ (C^*)^{(\alpha)})^{\frac{1}{2}} = r(C^{(\alpha)} \circ C^{(\alpha)}) \leq r(C)^{2\alpha},
 \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

The following result generalizes [48, Theorem 2.17] and refines [37, Inequalities (4.9)]. It follows e.g. from Theorem 3.10 (or [37, Inequalities (4.9)]) and Lemma 3.13.

Corollary 3.14. *Let $\alpha \geq \frac{1}{2}$ and let A and B be nonnegative matrices that define operators on $l^2(R)$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|A^{(\alpha)} \circ B^{(\alpha)}\| \leq r^{\frac{1}{2}} \left((A^*B)^{(\alpha)} \circ (B^*A)^{(\alpha)} \right) \\
(53) \quad & \leq r^{\frac{1}{2}} \left((A^*B)^{(\alpha)} \circ (A^*B)^{(\alpha)} \right) \leq r^\alpha (A^*B),
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.15. Several results of Section 3 can be further refined by applying Theorems 3.1 and 3.4 in the proofs. We omit the details.

Acknowledgments. The first author acknowledges a partial support of Erasmus+ European Mobility program (grant KA103), COST Short Term Scientific Mission program (action CA18232) and the Slovenian Research Agency (grants P1-0222 and P1-0288). The first author thanks the colleagues and staff at the Faculty of Mechanical Engineering and Institute of Mathematics, Physics and Mechanics for their hospitality during the research stay in Slovenia. The second author acknowledges a partial support of the Slovenian Research Agency (grants P1-0222, J1-8133 and J2-2512).

REFERENCES

- [1] Y.A. Abramovich and C.D. Aliprantis, *An invitation to operator theory*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, 2002.
- [2] C.D. Aliprantis and O. Burkinshaw, *Positive operators*, Academic Press, Orlando, 1985.
- [3] K.M.R. Audenaert, Spectral radius of Hadamard product versus conventional product for non-negative matrices, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 432 (2010), 366–368.
- [4] K. Balachandran and J.Y. Park, Existence of solutions and controllability of nonlinear integrodifferential systems in Banach spaces, *Math. Problems in Engineering* 2 (2003), 65–79.
- [5] R.B. Bapat and T.E.S. Raghavan, *Nonnegative Matrices and Applications*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications 64, Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- [6] C. Bennett and R. Sharpley, *Interpolation of Operators*, Academic Press, Inc., Orlando, 1988.
- [7] D. Chen and Y. Zhang, On the spectral radius of Hadamard products of nonnegative matrices, *Banach J. Math. Anal.* 9 (2015), 127–133.
- [8] J.E. Cohen, Random evolutions and the spectral radius of a nonnegative matrix, *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* 86 (1979), 345–350.
- [9] J.E. Cohen, Convexity of the dominant eigenvalue of an essentially nonnegative matrix, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 81 (1981), 657–658.
- [10] G.P. Curbera and W.J. Ricker, Compactness properties of Sobolev imbeddings for rearrangement invariant norms, *Transactions AMS* 359 (2007), 1471–1484.
- [11] P. Degond, J.-G. Liu and C. Ringhofer, Evolution of the distribution of wealth in an economic environment driven by local Nash equilibria, *Journal of Statistical Physics* 154 (2014), 751–780.
- [12] E. Deutsch, M. Neumann, Derivates of the Perron root at an essentially nonnegative matrix and the group inverse of an M-matrix, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 102 (1984), 1–29.
- [13] R. Drnovšek, Spectral inequalities for compact integral operators on Banach function spaces, *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* 112 (1992), 589–598.
- [14] R. Drnovšek, Sequences of bounds for the spectral radius of a positive operator, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 574, (2019), 40–45.
- [15] R. Drnovšek, A. Peperko, Inequalities for the Hadamard weighted geometric mean of positive kernel operators on Banach function spaces, *Positivity* 10 (2006), 613–626.
- [16] R. Drnovšek and A. Peperko, On the spectral radius of positive operators on Banach sequence spaces, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 433 (2010), 241–247.

- [17] R. Drnovšek and A. Peperko, Inequalities on the spectral radius and the operator norm of Hadamard products of positive operators on sequence spaces, *Banach J. Math. Anal.* 10 (2016), 800–814.
- [18] L. Elsner, On convexity properties of the spectral radius of nonnegative matrices, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 61 (1984), 31–35.
- [19] L. Elsner, C.R. Johnson and J.A. Dias Da Silva, The Perron root of a weighted geometric mean of nonnegative matrices, *Linear Mult. Algebra* 24 (1989), 1–13.
- [20] S. Friedland, Convex spectral functions, *Lin. Mult. Alg.* 9 (1981), 299–316.
- [21] R.A. Horn, C.R. Johnson, *Topics in matrix analysis*, Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- [22] R.A. Horn and F. Zhang, Bounds on the spectral radius of a Hadamard product of nonnegative or positive semidefinite matrices, *Electron. J. Linear Algebra* 20 (2010), 90–94.
- [23] W. Huang, C.-K. Li, H. Schneider, Norms and inequalities related to Schur products of rectangular matrices, *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.* 18 (1997), 334–347.
- [24] K. Jörgens, *Linear integral operators*, Surveys and Reference Works in Mathematics 7, Pitman Press, 1982.
- [25] S. Karlin, F. Ost, Some monotonicity properties of Schur powers of matrices and related inequalities, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 68 (1985), 47–65.
- [26] T. Kato, Superconvexity of the spectral radius, and convexity of the spectral bound and the type, *Math. Z.* 180 (1982), 265–273.
- [27] A.V. Kazhikhov and A.E. Mamontov, Transport equations and Orlicz spaces, 535–544. In: Jeltsch R., Fey M. (eds) *Hyperbolic Problems: Theory, Numerics, Applications*. International Series of Numerical Mathematics, vol 130. Birkhäuser, Basel, 1999.
- [28] J.F.C. Kingman, A convexity property of positive matrices, *Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2)* 12 (1961), 283–284.
- [29] J. Lafferty and G. Lebanon, Diffusion kernels on statistical manifolds, *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 6 (2005), 129–163.
- [30] P. Meyer-Nieberg, *Banach lattices*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991.
- [31] V. Müller and A. Peperko, Generalized spectral radius and its max algebra version, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 439 (2013), 1006–1016.
- [32] V. Müller, A. Peperko, Lower spectral radius and spectral mapping theorem for suprema preserving mappings, *Discrete Dynamical Systems – Series A* 38 (2018), no 8, 4117–4132.
- [33] A. Peperko, Inequalities for the spectral radius of nonnegative functions, *Positivity* 13 (2009), 255–272.
- [34] A. Peperko, On the functional inequality for the spectral radius of compact operators, *Linear Mult. Algebra* 59 (2011), no. 4, 357–364.
- [35] A. Peperko, Bounds on the generalized and the joint spectral radius of Hadamard products of bounded sets of positive operators on sequence spaces, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 437 (2012), 189–201.
- [36] A. Peperko, Bounds on the joint and generalized spectral radius of the Hadamard geometric mean of bounded sets of positive kernel operators, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 533 (2017), 418–427.
- [37] A. Peperko, Inequalities on the spectral radius, operator norm and numerical radius of the Hadamard weighted geometric mean of positive kernel operators, *Linear Mult. Algebra*, 67:8 (2019), 1637–1652.
- [38] A. Peperko, Inequalities on the joint and generalized spectral and essential spectral radius of the Hadamard geometric mean of bounded sets of positive kernel operators, *Linear Mult. Algebra* 67 (2019), 2159–2172.
- [39] A. Peperko, Logarithmic convexity of fixed points of stochastic kernel operators, *Positivity* 23 (2019), 367–377.
- [40] A. Peperko, Inequalities for the spectral radius and essential spectral radius of positive operators on Banach sequence spaces, *Positivity* (2021), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11117-021-00833-6>.
- [41] A. Rosenmann, F. Lehner, A. Peperko, Polynomial convolutions in max-plus algebra, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 578 (2019), 370–401.
- [42] A.R. Schep, Bounds on the spectral radius of Hadamard products of positive operators on l_p -spaces, *Electronic J. Linear Algebra* 22, (2011), 443–447.

- [43] A.R. Schep, Corrigendum for "Bounds on the spectral radius of Hadamard products of positive operators on l_p -spaces", (2011), *preprint at Research gate: Corrigendum-Hadamard*
- [44] A.J. Schwenk, Tight bounds on the spectral radius of asymmetric nonnegative matrices, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 75 (1986), 257–265.
- [45] S.-Q. Shen, T.-Z. Huang, Several inequalities for the largest singular value and the spectral radius of matrices, *Math. Inequal. Appl.* 10 (4) (2007), 713–722.
- [46] A.S. Wagh, Green function theory of dynamic conductivity, *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 81 (1975), 369–390.
- [47] A.C. Zaanen, *Riesz spaces II*, North Holland, Amsterdam, 1983.
- [48] Y. Zhang, Some spectral norm inequalities on Hadamard products of nonnegative matrices, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 556 (2018), 162–170.