

Logarithmic submajorization, uniform majorization and Hölder type inequalities for τ -measurable operators

PG Dodds, TK Dodds, FA Sukochev and D.Zanin

Dedicated to the memory of W.A.J. Luxemburg

Abstract. We extend the notion of the determinant function Λ , originally introduced by T.Fack for τ -compact operators, to a natural algebra of τ -measurable operators affiliated with a semifinite von Neumann algebra which coincides with that defined by Haagerup and Schultz in the finite case and on which the determinant function is shown to be submultiplicative. Application is given to Hölder type inequalities via general Araki-Lieb-Thirring inequalities due to Kosaki and Han and to a Weyl-type theorem for uniform majorization.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000). Primary 46L52; 47A63 Secondary 46E30, 47A30.

Keywords. measurable operators, logarithmic submajorisation, Fuglede-Kadison theorem, uniform majorisation, semifinite von Neumann algebra.

1. Introduction

In their study of Brown measures of unbounded operators affiliated with a finite von Neumann algebra (\mathcal{M}, τ) , Haagerup and Schultz extended the classical Fuglede-Kadison determinant

$$\Delta(x) = \exp \left(\int_0^{\tau(1)} \log t \, d(\tau e^{|x|})(s) \right), \quad x \in \mathcal{M}$$

The work of the third and fourth authors was supported by the Australian Research Council.

to a multiplicative functional Δ on the subalgebra \mathcal{M}^Δ consisting of those τ -measurable operators x affiliated with \mathcal{M} for which

$$\tau(\log_+ |x|) = \int_0^\infty \log_+ td(\tau e^{|x|})(t) < \infty$$

Here $e^{|x|}(\cdot) = \chi_{(\cdot)}(|x|)$ is the spectral measure of $|x|$ and $\tau e^{|x|}(\cdot) = \tau(e^{|x|}(\cdot))$ is the corresponding Borel measure supported on the spectrum $\sigma(|x|)$ of $|x|$.

A principal aim of this paper is to extend the Haagerup-Schultz approach from the setting of finite von Neumann algebras to the semifinite case. Our approach is via the determinant function $\Lambda(\cdot)$ given by setting

$$\Lambda(t; x) = \exp\left(\int_0^t \log \mu(s; x) ds\right), \quad t > 0, \quad x \in L_{\log_+}(\tau).$$

Here $\mu(\cdot; x)$ is the generalised singular value function (see below) and $L_{\log_+}(\tau)$ is the natural extension of the algebra \mathcal{M}^Δ of Haagerup-Schultz to the general semifinite setting. The determinant function Λ goes back to A.Grothendieck [20] and was studied by Fack [Fa83] in the case of τ -compact operators and subsequently by Fack and Kosaki [FK98] for operators satisfying a "Lorentz space"-type condition (see the definition of this condition in the comments following Proposition 3.1 below).

Basic properties of the class $L_{\log_+}(\tau)$ are studied in the third section where it is noted that this class is an algebra properly containing the space of τ -compact operators as well as those τ -measurable operators satisfying a "Lorentz space"-type condition. One of the principal results of the paper is given in Theorem 4.2 which establishes the submultiplicativity of the determinant Δ on the algebra $L_{\log_+}(\tau)$. A principal ingredient of the proof is the multiplicativity of the Haagerup-Schultz functional Δ on the algebra \mathcal{M}^Δ .

In subsequent sections, attention is directed to Hölder type inequalities for τ -measurable operators. Principal results in Section 5 include a submajorization inequality of Hölder type given in Proposition 5.5 and corresponding symmetric norm inequalities given in Proposition 5.7, which are established using techniques based on logarithmic submajorization. See, for example, Hiai [H1997] in the finite-dimensional setting. While these results extend inequalities for unitarily invariant norms given in [29] Theorem 3, the techniques given there do not extend to the more general setting and a crucial tool is a strengthened version [22] given in Proposition 6.1 of a submajorization inequality of Araki-Lieb-Thirring type due to Kosaki [K92] in the setting of semi-finite von Neumann algebras and based on properties of the Fuglede-Kadison determinant. This section then concludes with a convexity inequality (Proposition 5.11) which is due to Hiai and Zhan [HZ] in the matrix setting for unitarily invariant norms.

We show in Section 6 (Theorem 6.3) that Weyl's submajorization inequality for the singular values of a product ([17] Theorem 4.2(iii)) continues to hold for uniform majorization, a notion introduced by Kalton and Sukochev [KS] which is a

strengthening of the classical notion of submajorization in the sense of Hardy, Littlewood and Polya. This permits us to give a simple proof of generalized Hölder inequalities for general symmetric spaces proved recently by Bekjan and Ospanov [2] and Albadawi [1].

This paper is dedicated to the memory of Wim Luxemburg. It is with great affection that the first two authors recall his Caltech lectures on the theory of integration which introduced them to the paper of Grothendieck, and to the ideas of decreasing rearrangements of operators, and the determinant function which plays a central role in this paper.

2. Preliminaries and notation

Throughout this paper $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ will denote a semifinite von Neumann algebra on some Hilbert space \mathcal{H} (here, $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is the algebra of all bounded linear operators on \mathcal{H} equipped with the operator norm denoted by $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ or $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})}$). Unless otherwise stated, it will be assumed throughout that \mathcal{M} is equipped with a fixed faithful normal semifinite trace τ . For standard facts concerning von Neumann algebras, we refer to [6], [36]. The identity in \mathcal{M} is denoted by $\mathbf{1}$ and we denote by $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})$ the complete lattice of all (self-adjoint) projections in \mathcal{M} . A linear operator $x : \mathcal{D}(x) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$, with domain $\mathcal{D}(x) \subseteq \mathcal{H}$, is said to be *affiliated with \mathcal{M}* if $yx \subseteq xy$ for all y in the commutant \mathcal{M}' of \mathcal{M} (equivalently, $ux = xu$ for all unitary u in \mathcal{M}'). For any self-adjoint operator x on \mathcal{H} , its spectral measure is denoted by e^x . A self-adjoint operator x is affiliated with \mathcal{M} if and only if $e^x(B) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})$ for any Borel set $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}$.

The closed and densely defined operator x , affiliated with \mathcal{M} , is called τ -*measurable* if and only if there exists a number $s \geq 0$ such that

$$\tau\left(e^{|x|}(s, \infty)\right) < \infty.$$

The collection of all τ -measurable operators is denoted by $S(\tau)$. With the sum and product defined as the respective closures of the algebraic sum and product, it is well known that $S(\tau)$ is a $*$ -algebra. For $\epsilon, \delta > 0$, we denote by $V(\epsilon, \delta)$ the set of all $x \in S(\tau)$ for which there exists an orthogonal projection $p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})$ such that $p(\mathcal{H}) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(x)$, $\|xp\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} \leq \epsilon$ and $\tau(\mathbf{1} - p) \leq \delta$. The sets $\{V(\epsilon, \delta) : \epsilon, \delta > 0\}$ form a base at 0 for a metrizable Hausdorff topology on $S(\tau)$, which is called the *measure topology*. Equipped with this topology, $S(\tau)$ is a complete topological $*$ -algebra. These facts and their proofs can be found in the papers [32], [37]. See also [12].

The collection of all closed, densely defined operators x in H , affiliated with the von Neumann algebra \mathcal{M} and satisfying $\tau(e^{|x|}(\lambda, \infty)) < \infty$ for all $\lambda > 0$, will be denoted by $S_0(\tau)$. The elements of $S_0(\tau)$ are sometimes called τ -*compact operators*. Evidently, each $x \in S_0(\tau)$, is τ -measurable, that is, $S_0(\tau) \subseteq S(\tau)$.

For $x \in S(\tau)$, the (*generalised*) *singular value function* $\mu(x) = \mu(\cdot; x) = \mu(\cdot; |x|)$ is defined by

$$\mu(t; x) := \inf \{s \geq 0 : d(s; |x|) \leq t\}, \quad t \geq 0,$$

where

$$d(s; |x|) := \tau \left(e^{|x|} (s, \infty) \right), \quad s \geq 0.$$

It follows directly that the singular value function $\mu(x)$ is a decreasing, right-continuous function on the positive half-line $[0, \infty)$. Moreover, $\mu(uv) \leq \|u\|_\infty \|v\|_\infty \mu(x)$ for all $u, v \in \mathcal{M}$ and $x \in S(\tau)$ and $\mu(f(x)) = f(\mu(x))$ whenever $0 \leq x \in S(\tau)$ and f is an increasing continuous function on $[0, \infty)$ which satisfies $f(0) = 0$.

It should be observed that a sequence $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ in $S(\tau)$ converges to zero for the measure topology if and only if $\mu(t; x_n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all $t > 0$.

If m denotes Lebesgue measure on the semiaxis $[0, \infty)$, and if we consider $L^\infty(m)$ as an Abelian von Neumann algebra acting via multiplication on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = L^2(m)$, with the trace given by integration with respect to m , then $S(m)$ consists of all measurable functions on $[0, \infty)$ which are bounded except on a set of finite measure. In this case for $f \in S(m)$, the generalized singular value function $\mu(f)$ is precisely the classical decreasing rearrangement of the function $|f|$, which is usually denoted by f^* . In this setting, convergence for the measure topology coincides with the usual notion of convergence in measure.

If $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and τ is the standard trace, then $S(\tau) = \mathcal{M}$, the measure topology coincides with the operator norm topology. If $x \in S(\tau)$, then x is compact if and only if $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mu(t; x) = 0$; in this case,

$$\mu_n(x) = \mu(t; x), \quad t \in [n, n+1), \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots,$$

and the sequence $\{\mu_n(x)\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is just the sequence of eigenvalues of $|x|$ in non-increasing order and counted according to multiplicity.

The real vector space $S_h(\tau) = \{x \in S(\tau) : x = x^*\}$ is a partially ordered vector space with the ordering defined by setting $x \geq 0$ if and only if $\langle x\xi, \xi \rangle \geq 0$ for all $\xi \in \mathcal{D}(x)$. The positive cone in $S_h(\tau)$ will be denoted by $S(\tau)^+$. If $0 \leq x_\alpha \uparrow_\alpha x$ holds in $S(\tau)^+$, then $\sup_\alpha x_\alpha$ exists in $S(\tau)^+$. The trace τ extends to $S(\tau)^+$ as a non-negative extended real-valued functional which is positively homogeneous, additive, unitarily invariant and normal. This extension is given by

$$\tau(x) = \int_0^\infty \mu(t; x) dt, \quad x \in S(\tau)^+,$$

and satisfies $\tau(x^*x) = \tau(xx^*)$ for all $x \in S(\tau)$. It should be observed that if f is an increasing continuous function on $[0, \infty)$ satisfying $f(0) \geq 0$, then

$$f(\mu(x)) = \mu(f(|x|)) \tag{2.1} \quad \boxed{\text{eqn001}}$$

and if $f(0) = 0$ then

$$\tau(f(|x|)) = \int_0^\infty \mu(t; f(|x|)) dt = \int_0^\infty f(\mu(t; x)) dt \tag{2.2} \quad \boxed{\text{eq01}}$$

for all $x \in S(\tau)$.

If $x, y \in S(\tau)$ then x is said to be *submajorised* by y (in the sense of Hardy, Littlewood and Polya) if and only if

$$\int_0^t \mu(s; x) ds \leq \int_0^t \mu(s; y) ds$$

for all $t \geq 0$. We write $x \prec\prec y$, or equivalently, $\mu(x) \prec\prec \mu(y)$.

A linear subspace $E \subseteq S(\tau)$, equipped with a norm $\|\cdot\|_E$ will be called *symmetrically normed* if $x \in E, y \in S(\tau)$ and $\mu(y) \leq \mu(x)$ imply that $y \in E$ and $\|y\|_E \leq \|x\|_E$. If a symmetrically normed space is Banach, then it will be simply called a *symmetric space*. If \mathcal{M} is $L_\infty(m)$, then a symmetrically normed space $E \subseteq S(m)$ will be called, for simplicity, a symmetrically normed space on $[0, \infty)$. If $E \subseteq S(\tau)$ is a symmetrically normed space, then the embedding of E into $S(\tau)$ is continuous from the norm topology of E to the measure topology on $S(\tau)$.

A wide class of non-commutative symmetrically normed spaces may be constructed as follows. If $E \subseteq S(m)$ is symmetrically normed space on $[0, \infty)$, set

$$E(\tau) = \{x \in S(\tau) : \mu(x) \in E\}, \quad \|x\|_{E(\tau)} := \|\mu(x)\|_E$$

It may be shown (KS [28]; see also DDP1 [9], DDP2a [11]), that $(E(\tau), \|\cdot\|_{E(\tau)})$ is symmetrically normed and is a Banach space if E is a Banach space.

Important special cases of this construction occur when E is taken to be the familiar Lebesgue space $L_p, 1 \leq p \leq \infty$. In this particular case, the spaces $E(\tau) = L_p(\tau)$ are the familiar non-commutative L_p -spaces and in this setting we have that $L_\infty(\tau) = \mathcal{M}$. In the special case that \mathcal{M} is $B(\mathcal{H})$ the corresponding non-commutative L_p spaces are the familiar Schatten classes \mathfrak{S}_p . As is well-known, the space $L_1(\tau)$ may be identified with the von Neumann algebra predual \mathcal{M}_* of \mathcal{M} with respect to trace duality. We observe that, whenever $E \subseteq S(m)$ is a symmetric space, then the continuous inclusions

$$L_1(\tau) \cap \mathcal{M} \subseteq E(\tau) \subseteq L_1(\tau) + \mathcal{M}$$

hold and that, if $x \in S(\tau)$, then $x \in L_1(\tau) + \mathcal{M}$ if and only if $\int_0^t \mu(s; x) ds < \infty$ for at least one $t > 0$ or, equivalently, for all $t > 0$.

For further details and proofs, we refer the reader to DDP1 [9], DDP2 [7], DDP3 [28], DP2 [11], DPS [12], LSZ [31].

3. The algebra $L_{\log_+}(\tau)$

Throughout, we will write L_1, L_∞ rather than $L_1(m), L_\infty(m)$ for the usual Lebesgue spaces on the semiaxis $[0, \infty)$ equipped with Lebesgue measure m .

We set

$$L_{\log_+}(\tau) := \{x \in S(\tau) : \log_+ |x| \in L_1(\tau) + \mathcal{M}\} \tag{3.1} \quad \boxed{\text{eqnFK1}}$$

Here,

$$\log_+ t = \max\{\log t, 0\}, \quad t > 0.$$

Observing that

$$\mu(\log_+ |x|) = \log_+ \mu(x), \quad x \in S(\tau),$$

it follows that, if $x \in S(\tau)$, then

$$x \in L_{\log_+}(\tau) \iff \int_0^t \log_+ \mu(x) dm < \infty, \quad \forall t > 0 \quad (3.2) \quad \boxed{\text{eqnFK2}}$$

$$\iff \log_+ \mu(x) \in L_1 + L_\infty \quad (3.3)$$

$$\iff \int_0^1 \log_+ \mu(x) dm < \infty. \quad (3.4)$$

It is clear that if $x \in L_{\log}(\tau)$, then $x^*, |x|, u x v \in L_{\log}(\tau)$ for all unitary $u, v \in \mathcal{M}$; moreover, if $x \geq 0$ and $\alpha > 0$ then the equality $\mu(x^\alpha) = \mu(x)^\alpha$ readily implies that $x^\alpha \in L_{\log}(\tau)$.

If $\tau(\mathbf{1}) < \infty$, then it follows from [\[PPS, Chapter III\]](#), remarks preceding Lemma 3.6, that

$$\tau(\log_+ |x|) = \int_0^{\tau(\mathbf{1})} \log_+ \mu(x) dm = \int_0^{\tau(\mathbf{1})} \log_+ sd(\tau e^{|x|})(s).$$

Consequently, if $\tau(\mathbf{1}) < \infty$, then the class $L_{\log_+}(\tau)$ coincides with the class \mathcal{M}^Δ introduced by Haagerup and Schultz [\[HS, 21\]](#).

We now observe that the class $L_{\log_+}(\tau)$ is an algebra. First recall that, if $s > 0$ then the dilation operator σ is defined on $S(m)$ by setting

$$(\sigma_s x)(t) = x(t/s), \quad t > 0.$$

If $x, y \in S(\tau)$, then

$$\mu(x+y) \leq \sigma_2(\mu(x)) + \sigma_2(\mu(y)), \quad \mu(xy) \leq \sigma_2(\mu(x))\sigma_2(\mu(y)) \quad (3.5) \quad \boxed{\text{eqnDil}}$$

See, for example, [\[FaKo1986, 17\]](#) Lemma 2.5. See also [\[SZ, 31\]](#).

propFK **Proposition 3.1.** *If $x, y \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$, then $x+y, xy \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$.*

Proof. If $x, y \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$ then, using [\(eqnDil 3.5\)](#),

$$\mu(x+y) \leq \sigma_2(\mu(x)) + \sigma_2(\mu(y)) \leq \max\{2\sigma_2(\mu(x)), 2\sigma_2(\mu(y))\}.$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \log_+(\mu(x+y)) &\leq \log_+(\max\{2\sigma_2(\mu(x)), 2\sigma_2(\mu(y))\}) \\ &= \max\{\log_+(2\sigma_2(\mu(x))), \log_+(2\sigma_2(\mu(y)))\} \\ &\leq \log_+(2\sigma_2(\mu(x))) + \log_+(2\sigma_2(\mu(y))) \\ &= \sigma_2(\log_+(2\mu(x)) + \log_+(2\mu(y))) \\ &\leq \sigma_2(\log_+ \mu(x) + \log_+ \mu(y) + 2 \log 2) \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\log_+ \mu(x), \log_+ \mu(y) \in L_1 + L_\infty,$$

as follows from [\(eqnFK2 3.2\)](#), it follows that

$$\sigma_2(\log_+ \mu(x) + \log_+ \mu(y) + 2 \log 2) \in L_1 + L_\infty.$$

This implies that

$$\log_+ \mu(x + y) \in L_1 + L_\infty,$$

and accordingly, $x + y \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$.

To see that $xy \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$, observe first, again using [eqnD11 \(3.5\)](#), that

$$\mu(xy) \leq \sigma_2(\mu(x)\mu(y)) = \sigma_2(\mu(x))\sigma_2(\mu(y)).$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \log_+ \mu(xy) &\leq \log_+(\sigma_2(\mu(x))\sigma_2(\mu(y))) = \sigma_2(\log_+ \mu(x) + \log_+ \mu(y)) \\ &\in L_1 + L_\infty, \end{aligned}$$

and this implies that $xy \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$.

Finally, since $\mu(x) = \mu(x^*)$, the final assertion of the proposition is trivial. \square

It should be noted that if $x \in S(\tau)$ satisfies a (so-called) "Lorentz space"-type condition (see [Fako1986 \[17\]](#))

$$x \in \mathcal{M} \quad \text{or} \quad \mu(s; x) \leq Cs^{-\alpha} \quad (C, \alpha > 0), \quad s > 0 \quad (3.6)$$

eqnFK3

then $x \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$. Indeed, this assertion is clear if $x \in \mathcal{M}$. Assume then that $x \in S(\tau)$ and that $\mu(s; x) \leq Cs^{-\alpha}$ for some $C, \alpha > 0$ and all $s > 0$ and for simplicity, suppose that $C = 1$. Observe that

$$\int_0^1 \log_+ \mu(s; x) ds \leq \int_0^1 \log_+ s^{-\alpha} ds = -\alpha \int_0^1 \log s ds < \infty$$

and this suffices to show that $x \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$. In particular, it follows that if $x \in L^p(\tau)$ for some $0 < p < \infty$, then $x \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$. Indeed, as noted in [Fako1986 \[17\]](#), in this case

$$\mu(s; x)^p \leq s^{-1} \int_0^s \mu(x)^p dm \leq s^{-1} \|x\|_p^p$$

for all $s > 0$.

On the other hand, if $x \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$, then it need not be the case that x satisfies any Lorentz space condition. By way of example, if $f(t) = \exp(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}), t > 0$, then it is evident that $f \in L_{\log_+}$. However, since

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} t^{-\alpha} \exp(-t^{-\frac{1}{2}}) = 0, \quad \forall \alpha > 0,$$

it follows that f fails to satisfy any condition of the type [eqnFK3 \(3.6\)](#).

One immediate consequence of the preceding is that

$$L_1(\tau) + \mathcal{M} \subseteq L_{\log_+}(\tau) \subseteq S(\tau).$$

Note that the inclusion on the left hand side is, in general, proper by observing that, if $f(t) = 1/t, t > 0$, then $f \in L_{\log_+}$ but $\mu(f) \notin L_1 + L_\infty$.

The proposition which follows is due to L.G.Brown [\[5\]](#) Proposition 1.11. It is an extension of the Weyl majorization theorem given in [\[14\]](#) Corollary 4.2 which goes back to the paper of Weyl [\[33\]](#).

propBr

Proposition 3.2. *Suppose that $f, g : (0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be non-increasing. If $f, g \in L_{\log_+}$ then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) $\int_0^t \log f(s) ds \leq \int_0^t \log g(s) ds, \quad \forall t > 0.$
- (ii) $\int_0^\infty \log_+(rf(s)) ds \leq \int_0^\infty \log_+(rg(s)) ds, \quad \forall r > 0, \quad \forall t > 0.$
- (iii) $\int_0^t \varphi(f(s)) ds \leq \int_0^t \varphi(g(s)) ds, \quad \forall t > 0,$

for all continuous increasing functions $\varphi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that $\varphi(0) = 0$ and $\varphi \circ \exp$ is convex.

rmkLS

Remark 3.3. It should be observed that a simple consequence of Proposition [3.2](#) preceding is that if $x, y \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$ and if x is logarithmically submajorised by y in the sense that

$$\int_0^t \log \mu(s; x) ds \leq \int_0^t \log \mu(s; y) ds, \quad \forall t > 0,$$

then x is submajorised by y in the usual sense, that is,

$$\int_0^t \mu(s; x) ds \leq \int_0^t \mu(s; y) ds \quad \forall t > 0.$$

Indeed, one need only take $\varphi(t) = t, t \geq 0$.

4. The determinant function

If $x \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$ then the *determinant function* $\Lambda(x)$ is defined by setting, for all $t > 0$,

$$\Lambda(t; x) = \exp \left(\int_0^t \log \mu(s; x) ds \right).$$

Since $x \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$, it follows that the integral is well-defined in the sense that it is either finite or takes the value $-\infty$. Indeed,

$$\Lambda(t; x) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \int_0^t \log \mu(s; x) ds = -\infty$$

In the case that x is τ -compact, this function, which goes back to A. Grothendieck [\[20\]](#), was studied by T. Fack [\[14\]](#), [\[15\]](#) and extended further in [\[17\]](#) to the class of operators satisfying a "Lorentz space"-type condition.

We remark that, if $\tau(\mathbf{1}) < \infty$, then $\Delta(x) := \Lambda(\tau(\mathbf{1}); x)$ is precisely the extension of the classical Fuglede-Kadison determinant [\[16\]](#) to $S(\tau)$ given by Haagerup and Schultz [\[21\]](#) who proved the following fundamental result.

propHS

Proposition 4.1. *If $\tau(\mathbf{1}) < \infty$ and if $x, y \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$, then*

$$\Delta(xy) = \Delta(x)\Delta(y).$$

Let us note that if $\mathcal{M} = B(H)$ with standard trace and if $x \in \mathcal{M}$ is compact then

$$\Lambda(n+1; x) = \prod_{k=0}^n \mu(k; x).$$

We note first some elementary properties of the determinant function Λ which follow directly from the definition and properties of the singular value function (see [17] Lemma 2.5) together and the definition (3.1).

1. If $0 \leq x \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$ and $\alpha > 0$, then $x^\alpha \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$ and $\Lambda(x^\alpha) = \Lambda(x)^\alpha$.
2. If $x \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$, then x^* , $|x|$, $x^*x \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$ and

$$\Lambda(x) = \Lambda(|x|) = \Lambda(x^*) = \Lambda(x^*x)^{1/2}.$$

3. If $x \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$, then

$$\Lambda(x^*x) = \Lambda(xx^*).$$

4. If $x, y \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$ then

$$\Lambda(xy) = \Lambda(|x||y^*|).$$

5. If $x \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$, then $uxv \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$ for all unitary $u, v \in \mathcal{M}$, in which case

$$\Lambda(uxv) = \Lambda(x).$$

For example, to indicate the proof of 4. above, it suffices to show that

$$\mu(xy) = \mu(|x||y^*|).$$

To this end, let $x = u|x|$ be the polar decomposition, and observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(xy) &= \mu(u|x|y) \leq \mu(|x|y) \\ &= \mu(y^*|x|) \leq \mu(|y^*||x|) = \mu(|x||y^*|) \\ &= \mu(u^*x|y^*|) \leq \mu(x|y^*|) \\ &= \mu(|y^*|x^*) = \mu(y^*x^*) = \mu(xy), \end{aligned}$$

using repeatedly [17] Lemma 2.5 (vi).

The Theorem which follows is the principal result of this section and is a refinement of [17] Theorem 4.2 (ii). See also [20], Théorème 1, where it is stated for the case that a, b are compact operators in some Hilbert space.

thmFK **Theorem 4.2. (Weyl inequality)** *If $x, y \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$, then*

$$\Lambda(t; xy) \leq \Lambda(t; x)\Lambda(t; y), \quad \forall t > 0. \tag{4.1}$$

eqnWI

We shall need the following geometric characterisation of the singular value function: If $x \in S(\tau)$ and if $t > 0$, then

$$\mu(t; x) = \inf\{\|x - z\|_\infty : \tau(s(|z|)) \leq t\}. \tag{4.2}$$

eqnFK4

See, for example, [17] Proposition 2.4.

We prove first the following result.

lemFK1

Lemma 4.3. *If $a, b \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$ are such that $a, b \geq \mathbf{1}$, if $d(1; a), d(1; b) < \infty$ and if $r = e^a(1, \infty) \vee e^b(1, \infty)$, then*

$$\Lambda(t; ab) = \Lambda(t; a)\Lambda(t; b), \quad \forall t \geq \tau(r).$$

Proof. We set

$$p = \chi_{(1, \infty)}(a) = e^a(1, \infty), \quad q = \chi_{(1, \infty)}(b) = e^b(1, \infty), \quad r = p \vee q,$$

and note that

$$\tau(r) \leq \tau(p) + \tau(q) = d(1; a) + d(1; b) < \infty.$$

Since $a, b \geq \mathbf{1}$, it follows that

$$\mathbf{1} - p = \chi_{[0, 1]}(a) = \chi_{\{1\}}(a), \quad \mathbf{1} - q = \chi_{\{1\}}(b)$$

and so

$$\mathbf{1} - r = (\mathbf{1} - p) \wedge (\mathbf{1} - q) = \chi_{\{1\}}(a) \wedge \chi_{\{1\}}(b).$$

Consequently,

$$a(\mathbf{1} - r) = a\chi_{\{1\}}(a)(\mathbf{1} - r) = \chi_{\{1\}}(a)(\mathbf{1} - r) = (\mathbf{1} - r) \quad (4.3) \quad \text{eqnFKa}$$

and

$$(\mathbf{1} - r)a = (a(\mathbf{1} - r))^* = (\mathbf{1} - r). \quad (4.4) \quad \text{eqnFKb}$$

Similar reasoning applies with a replaced by b so that also

$$(\mathbf{1} - r)b = (b(\mathbf{1} - r))^* = (\mathbf{1} - r) \quad (4.5) \quad \text{eqnFKc}$$

and it follows, in particular, that a, b commute with r .

Using (4.3), (4.5), note further that

$$ab = rab + (\mathbf{1} - r)ab = rab + (\mathbf{1} - r). \quad (4.6) \quad \text{eqnFKe}$$

It will now be shown that

$$\mu(t; a) = \mu(t; rar), \quad \mu(t; b) = \mu(t; rbr), \quad t \in (0, \tau(r)). \quad (4.7) \quad \text{eqnFKcc}$$

Without loss of generality, it may be assumed that $\tau(r) = 1$. By [9] Lemma 2.4 (i), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(t; a) &= \mu(t; pap) = \mu(t; p \cdot rar \cdot p) \\ &\leq \mu(t; rar) \leq \mu(t; a), \quad t \in (0, \tau(p)), \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\mu(t; rar) = \mu(t; a), \quad t \in (0, \tau(p)).$$

Similarly,

$$\mu(t; rbr) = \mu(t; b), \quad t \in (0, \tau(q)).$$

If $\tau(p) = 1$, then the first equality in (4.7) follows immediately, and if $\tau(q) = 1$, then the second equality in (4.7) holds. Consequently, it may be assumed that $\tau(p) < 1$ and $\tau(q) < 1$.

Suppose now that $\tau(p) \leq t < 1$. Observing that $\tau(s(pa)) \leq \tau(p) \leq t$, it follows from (4.2) that

$$\mu(t; a) \leq \|a - pa\|_\infty = \|a\chi_{[0, 1]}(a)\|_\infty \leq 1.$$

Since $a \geq \mathbf{1}$, it follows that $\mu(t; a) \geq 1$ for all $t > 0$ and it now follows that

$$\mu(t; a) = 1 \quad \forall t \geq \tau(p). \quad (4.8) \quad \boxed{\text{eqnFKkka}}$$

The same argument shows that

$$\mu(t; b) = 1 \quad \forall t \geq \tau(q). \quad (4.9) \quad \boxed{\text{eqnFKkkb}}$$

In particular, $\mu(t; a) = 1$ for all $\tau(p) \leq t < 1$ and $\mu(t; b) = 1$ for all $\tau(q) \leq t < 1$.

At the same time, since a commutes with r , it follows that $a \geq rar \geq r$ since $a \geq \mathbf{1}$. This implies that

$$\mu(a) \geq \mu(rar) \geq \mu(r) = \chi_{[0, \tau(r)]}.$$

Consequently,

$$1 = \mu(t; a) \geq \mu(t; rar) \geq 1, \quad \tau(p) \leq t < \tau(r) = 1$$

so that

$$\mu(t; rar) = 1 = \mu(t; a), \quad \tau(p) \leq t < 1.$$

Similarly,

$$\mu(t; rbr) = 1 = \mu(t; a), \quad \tau(q) \leq t < 1.$$

This suffices to complete the proof of the equalities in [\(4.7\)](#) [eqnFKcc](#)

It will now be shown that

$$\mu(t; ab) = \mu(t; rabr) = \mu(t; rar \cdot rbr), \quad 0 < t < 1. \quad (4.10) \quad \boxed{\text{eqnFKf}}$$

Note first that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(rabr) &= \mu(rar \cdot rbr) = \mu^{\frac{1}{2}}(rbr(rar)^2 rbr) \\ &\geq \mu^{\frac{1}{2}}(rbr \cdot r \cdot rbr) = \mu(rbr) \geq \mu(r) = \chi_{[0, 1]} \end{aligned} \quad (4.11) \quad \boxed{\text{eqnFKg}}$$

Observe next that r commutes with $|rabr|$, since it is clear that r commutes with $|rabr|^2 = rb^* a^* rabr = rba^2 br$. From this it follows that

$$r|rabr|r = |rabr|. \quad (4.12) \quad \boxed{\text{eqnFKgg}}$$

Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} (r|rabr|r)^2 &= r|rabr|r|rabr|r = r|rabr|^2 r \\ &= rb^* a^* rabr = rb^* a^* abr = |rabr|^2 \end{aligned}$$

and the equality [\(4.12\)](#) follows by passing to square roots. We may now show that

$$|ab| = r|rabr|r + (\mathbf{1} - r) = |rabr| + (\mathbf{1} - r). \quad (4.13) \quad \boxed{\text{eqnFKee}}$$

In fact, using [\(4.6\)](#) and [\(4.12\)](#), observe that

$$\begin{aligned} |ab|^2 &= (ab)^*(ab) = rb^* a^* rabr + (\mathbf{1} - r) \\ &= |rabr|^2 + (\mathbf{1} - r) = (r|rabr|r)^2 + (\mathbf{1} - r) \\ &= (r|rabr|r + (\mathbf{1} - r))^2. \end{aligned}$$

Passing to square roots and again using eqnFKgg (4.12) now yields

$$|ab| = r|rabr|r + (1-r) = |rabr| + (1-r).$$

Observe now, that if $s > 0$, then, using eqnFKee (4.13)

$$\begin{aligned} d(s; ab) &= d(s; |rabr| + (1-r)) \\ &= \begin{cases} d(s; |rabr|), & s \geq 1, \\ d(s; |rabr|) + d(s; (1-r)), & 0 < s < 1. \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} d(s; |rabr|), & s \geq 1, \\ \infty, & 0 < s < 1. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

It follows readily that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(t; ab) &= \inf\{s \geq 0 : d(s; ab) \leq t\} \\ &= \mu(rabr)\chi_{[0,1)} + \chi_{[1,\infty)}, \end{aligned}$$

and this yields eqnFKf (4.10). In particular, it follows also that

$$\mu(t; ab) = 1, \quad t \geq 1. \quad (4.14) \quad \text{eqnFKk}$$

Finally, if $t \geq \tau(r) = 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda(t; ab) &= \exp \int_0^t \log \mu(s; ab) ds \stackrel{\text{eqnFKk}}{=} \exp \int_0^1 \log \mu(s; ab) ds \\ &= \stackrel{\text{eqnFKf}}{(4.10)} \exp \int_0^1 \log \mu(a; rabr) ds \\ &\stackrel{\text{propHS}}{=} \left(\exp \int_0^1 \log \mu(s; rar) ds \right) \left(\exp \int_0^1 \log \mu(s; rbr) ds \right) \\ &\stackrel{\text{eqnFKcc}}{=} \left(\exp \int_0^1 \log \mu(s; a) dt \right) \left(\exp \int_0^1 \log \mu(s; b) ds \right) \\ &\stackrel{\text{eqnFKkk}, \text{eqnFKkb}}{=} \left(\exp \int_0^t \log \mu(s; a) dt \right) \left(\exp \int_0^t \log \mu(s; b) ds \right) \end{aligned}$$

and this suffices to complete the proof of the Lemma. \square

We may now prove the following special case of Theorem thmFK 4.2.

lemFK2 **Lemma 4.4.** *If $a, b \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$ satisfy $\mu(s; a) > 0, \mu(s; b) > 0$ for every $s > 0$ then*

$$\Lambda(t; ab) \leq \Lambda(t; a)\Lambda(t; b), \quad \forall t > 0.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, it may be assumed that $a, b \geq 0$. Let $t > 0$ be given. It will be shown that

$$\int_0^t \log \mu(s; ab) ds \leq \int_0^t \log \mu(s; a) ds + \int_0^t \log \mu(s; b) ds \quad (4.15) \quad \text{eqnFKaa}$$

Since $\mu(t; a) > 0$ and $\mu(t; b) > 0$, it may be assumed further, by homogeneity, that $\mu(t; a) = 1 = \mu(t; b)$. Now set

$$x = a \vee \mathbf{1}, \quad y = b \vee \mathbf{1} \quad (4.16) \quad \boxed{\text{eqnFKaaa}}$$

and observe that

$$\mu(s; x) = \mu(s; a) \vee 1 = \begin{cases} \mu(s; a), & s \in (0, t), \\ 1, & s \in (t, \infty). \end{cases} \quad (4.17) \quad \boxed{\text{eqnFKac}}$$

and

$$\mu(s; y) = \mu(s; b) \vee 1 = \begin{cases} \mu(s; b), & s \in (0, t), \\ 1, & s \in (t, \infty). \end{cases} \quad (4.18) \quad \boxed{\text{eqnFKad}}$$

Now observe that

$$\mu(ab) \leq \mu(xy) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(xy) \geq 1. \quad (4.19) \quad \boxed{\text{eqnKaab}}$$

To see the first inequality, using the fact that $a \geq 0, b \geq 0$, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(ab) &= \mu(ba^2b)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \mu(b(a \vee \mathbf{1})^2b)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \mu((a \vee \mathbf{1})b) = \mu(((a \vee \mathbf{1})b)^*) = \mu(b(a \vee \mathbf{1})) \\ &\leq \mu((b \vee \mathbf{1})(a \vee \mathbf{1})) = \mu(((b \vee \mathbf{1})(a \vee \mathbf{1}))^*) = \mu((a \vee \mathbf{1})(b \vee \mathbf{1})). \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality follows by observing that $x^2 \geq 1, y^2 \geq 1$ and

$$\mu(xy) = \mu(yx^2y)^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq \mu(y^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq 1.$$

If $t \leq w = \tau(e^x(1, \infty) \vee e^y(1, \infty))$, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t \log \mu(s; ab) ds &\stackrel{\boxed{\text{eqnKaab}}}{\stackrel{(4.19)}{\leq}} \int_0^t \log \mu(s; xy) ds \leq \int_0^w \log \mu(s; xy) ds \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma 4.3}}{=} \int_0^w \log \mu(s; x) ds + \int_0^w \log \mu(s; y) ds \\ &\stackrel{\boxed{\text{eqnFKac}}, \boxed{\text{eqnFKad}}}{\stackrel{(4.17), (4.18)}{=}} \int_0^t \log \mu(s; x) ds + \int_0^t \log \mu(s; y) ds \\ &= \int_0^t \log \mu(s; a) ds + \int_0^t \log \mu(s; a) ds. \end{aligned}$$

□

Similarly, if $t \geq \tau(e^x(1, \infty) \vee e^y(1, \infty))$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t \log \mu(s; ab) ds &\stackrel{\boxed{\text{eqnKaab}}}{\stackrel{(4.19)}{\leq}} \int_0^t \log \mu(s; xy) ds \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma 4.3}}{=} \int_0^t \log \mu(s; x) ds + \int_0^t \log \mu(s; y) ds \\ &= \int_0^t \log \mu(s; a) ds + \int_0^t \log \mu(s; a) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Theorem 4.2 ^{thmFK} Assume that $x, y \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$. Without loss of generality, it may be assumed that $x, y \geq 0$. Let $t > 0$. We need to establish the equality

$$\int_0^t \log \mu(s; xy) ds \leq \int_0^t \log \mu(s; x) ds + \int_0^t \log \mu(s; y) ds. \quad (4.20) \quad \text{eqnFKz}$$

For each $n = 1, 2, \dots$, set $x_n = x + \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}$, $y_n = y + \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}$ and note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(xy) &= \mu(yx^2y)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \mu(yx_n^2y)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \mu(x_ny) = \mu((x_ny)^*) = \mu(yx_n) = \mu(x_ny^2x_n)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \mu(x_ny_n^2x_n)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \mu(y_nx_n) = \mu(x_ny_n), \quad n \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.4 ^{lemFK2}, we now have that

$$\int_0^t \log \mu(s; xy) ds \leq \int_0^t \log \mu(s; x_ny_n) ds \leq \int_0^t \log \mu(s; x_n) ds + \int_0^t \log \mu(s; y_n) ds.$$

By the monotone convergence theorem,

$$\int_0^t \log \mu(s; x_n) ds \downarrow \int_0^t \log \mu(s; x) ds, \quad \int_0^t \log \mu(s; y_n) ds \downarrow \int_0^t \log \mu(s; y) ds$$

and the inequality ^{eqnFKz} (4.20) follows directly.

5. Hölder type inequalities via logarithmic submajorization

The principal result of this section (Proposition 5.7 ^{propKIp4}) is a very general Hölder inequality which goes back to Kosaki [29] ^{Ko1998} in the special case of trace ideals. Our approach is based on logarithmic submajorization and while we follow the ideas of [29], ^{Ko1998} the methods given there fail to apply in the present setting. ^{Ko1998}

We shall need the following submajorization inequalities [30], [22].

propalt1

Proposition 5.1. *Let φ be a continuous increasing function on $[0, \infty)$ such that $\varphi(0) = 0$ and has the property that $\varphi \circ \exp(\cdot)$ is convex. If $0 \leq a, b \in S(\tau)$, then*

$$\int_0^t \varphi(\mu(|ab|^r)) dm \leq \int_0^t \varphi(\mu(a^r b^r)) dm, \quad r \geq 1 \quad t > 0. \quad (5.1) \quad \text{eqnKo5}$$

and

$$\int_0^t \varphi(\mu(|ab|^r)) dm \geq \int_0^t \varphi(\mu(a^r b^r)) dm, \quad 0 < r \leq 1 \quad t > 0. \quad (5.2) \quad \text{eqnKo6}$$

The preceding Araki-Lieb-Thirring type inequalities were first proved by Kosaki (Theorem 2) ^{Ko1992} for τ -measurable operators $0 \leq a, b$ which are τ -compact, i.e., the operators a, b satisfy the additional assumption that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mu(t; a) = 0 = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mu(t; b)$. It has been noted recently by Han ^{Ha} [22] Proposition 2.4 that Kosaki's arguments may be extended to the general case.

We note the following consequence which shows that the function $t \rightarrow |a^t b^t|^{\frac{1}{t}}$ is increasing with respect to submajorization, and is the counterpart for singular-value submajorization of a result of Wang and Gong [38] for positive semi-definite matrices. See also [4] Theorem 3.

corWG **Corollary 5.2.** *If $0 \leq a, b \in S(\tau)$ and if $0 < t \leq u < \infty$, then*

$$|a^t b^t|^{\frac{1}{t}} \prec\prec |a^u b^u|^{\frac{1}{u}}. \quad (5.3)$$

eqnWG

Proof. In equation (5.2), set $r = t/u$, $\varphi(\cdot) = (\cdot)^{\frac{1}{t}}$ to obtain

$$\mu(|a^{\frac{t}{u}} b^{\frac{t}{u}}|^{\frac{1}{t}}) = \left[\mu(a^{\frac{t}{u}} b^{\frac{t}{u}}) \right]^{\frac{1}{t}} \prec\prec \left[\mu(|ab|^{\frac{t}{u}}) \right]^{\frac{1}{t}} = \mu(|ab|^{\frac{1}{u}}).$$

The submajorisation (5.3) now follows by replacing a, b by a^u, b^u respectively. \square

Before proceeding, it is desirable to introduce some additional notation. If $x, y \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$, then we shall say that x is *logarithmically submajorized* by y , written $x \prec\prec_{\log} y$, if and only if

$$\int_0^t \log \mu(s; x) ds \leq \int_0^t \log \mu(s; y) ds$$

Observe that $x \prec\prec_{\log} y$ if and only if $\Lambda(x) \leq \Lambda(y)$. With this notation, it should also be noted, for ease of reference, that the Weyl inequality

$$\Lambda(xy) \leq \Lambda(x)\Lambda(y)$$

given in Theorem 4.2(ii) may be reformulated in terms of logarithmic submajorisation by the inequality

$$xy \prec\prec_{\log} \mu(x)\mu(y).$$

Indeed, one need only observe that, for all $t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t \log \mu(s; xy) ds &= \log \Lambda(t; xy) \\ &\leq \log \Lambda(t; x) + \log \Lambda(t; y) \\ &= \int_0^t \log \mu(s; x) ds + \int_0^t \log \mu(s; y) ds \\ &= \int_0^t \log(\mu(s; x)\mu(s; y)) ds. \end{aligned}$$

corKALT **Corollary 5.3.** *If $0 \leq a, b \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$ then*

$$\Lambda(|ab|^r) \leq \Lambda(a^r b^r), \quad r \geq 1; \quad (5.4)$$

eqnA9

and

$$\Lambda(|ab|^r) \geq \Lambda(a^r b^r), \quad 0 < r \leq 1. \quad (5.5)$$

eqnA10

The Corollary follows immediately from Proposition [5.1](#) via the implication (iii) \implies (i) of Proposition [5.2](#).

We need the following generalization of the polar decomposition given in [\[19\]](#) Theorem 2.7

lemGMMN

Lemma 5.4. *If $x \in S(\tau)$ has polar decomposition $x = u|x|$ and if ϕ, ψ are Borel functions on \mathbb{R} such that $\phi(\lambda)\psi(\lambda) = \lambda$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ then*

$$x = \phi(|x^*|)u\psi(|x|). \quad (5.6)$$

eqnBMMN

In particular, if $1/p + 1/q = 1$, then

$$x = |x^*|^{\frac{1}{p}}u|x|^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

propKIp3

Proposition 5.5. *If $a, b, x \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$ with $a, b \geq 0$, if $1/p + 1/q = 1$ and if $r > 0$ then*

$$\Lambda(|axb|^r) \leq \Lambda^{\frac{r}{p}}(a^p x) \Lambda^{\frac{r}{q}}(xb^q),$$

or, equivalently,

$$|axb|^r \prec_{\log} \mu(|a^p x|^{\frac{r}{p}}) \mu(|xb^q|^{\frac{r}{q}}). \quad (5.7)$$

eqnKIp3

Proof. If $x = u|x|$ is the polar decomposition, then it follows from Lemma [5.4](#) that

$$axb = a|x^*|^{\frac{1}{p}}u|x|^{\frac{1}{q}}b.$$

It follows from the inequality [\(4.1\)](#) that

$$\Lambda(axb) \leq \Lambda(a|x^*|^{\frac{1}{p}}) \Lambda(u|x|^{\frac{1}{q}}b) \leq \Lambda(a|x^*|^{\frac{1}{p}}) \Lambda(|x|^{\frac{1}{q}}b).$$

Using Corollary [5.3](#), observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda(a|x^*|^{\frac{1}{p}}) &\leq \Lambda^{\frac{1}{p}}(a^p|x^*|) = \Lambda^{\frac{1}{p}}(|x^*|a^p) = \Lambda^{\frac{1}{p}}(x^*a^p) = \Lambda^{\frac{1}{p}}(a^p x) \\ \Lambda(|x|^{\frac{1}{q}}b) &\leq \Lambda^{\frac{1}{q}}(|x|b^q) = \Lambda^{\frac{1}{q}}(xb^q) \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\Lambda(axb) \leq \Lambda^{\frac{1}{p}}(a^p x) \Lambda^{\frac{1}{q}}(xb^q),$$

and the assertion of the Proposition now follows by observing that

$$\Lambda(axb)^r = \Lambda(|axb|^r).$$

□

The following generalised Hölder inequality for normed order ideals is well-known. The simple proof is included for the sake of completeness.

propHo

Proposition 5.6. *Suppose that $E \subseteq S(m)$ is a normed order ideal. Suppose that $r, p, q > 0$ and that $1/r = 1/p + 1/q$. If $|x|^p \in E$, $|y|^q \in E$, then $|xy|^r \in E$ and*

$$\||xy|^r\|_E^{\frac{1}{r}} \leq \||x|^p\|_E^{\frac{1}{p}} \||y|^q\|_E^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

Proof. It suffices to assume that $\|x\|_{E^p} = 1 = \|y\|_{E^q}$. Using the well-known numerical Young's inequality, it follows that

$$\frac{|x|^r |y|^r}{r} \leq \frac{|x|^p}{p} + \frac{|y|^q}{q}.$$

Since $|x|^p, |y|^q \in E$, it follows from the linearity of E and the fact that E is an order ideal, that $|x|^r |y|^r \in E$. Consequently, using the fact that E is a normed ideal,

$$\| |xy|^r \|_E \leq r \left(\frac{\| |x|^p \|_E}{p} + \frac{\| |y|^q \|_E}{q} \right) \leq 1.$$

This suffices to complete the proof. \square

If $E \subseteq S(\tau)$ is a symmetric (Banach) space, then $E \subseteq L_1(\tau) + \mathcal{M}$ so that $E \subseteq L_{\log_+}(\tau)$. The norm on the symmetric space E is said to be *monotone with respect to logarithmic submajorization* if whenever $x \in E, y \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$ satisfy $y \prec_{\log} x$, it follows that $y \in E$ and $\|y\|_E \leq \|x\|_E$.

The principal result of this section now follows. In the setting of trace ideals, this result may be found in [29] Theorem 3; however, the proof given in [29] uses a standard trick with anti-symmetric tensors which is not available in the present more general setting.

propKI4

Proposition 5.7. *Suppose that E is a symmetric space on $[0, \infty)$ whose norm is monotone with respect to logarithmic submajorisation. Suppose that $x \in S(\tau)$, that $0 \leq a, b \in S(\tau)$ and that $1 < p, p' < \infty$ with conjugate exponents $q = p/(p-1)$, $q' = p'/(p'-1)$. If $r > 0$ and if $|a^p x|^{\frac{rp'}{p}}, |xb^q|^{\frac{rq'}{q}} \in E(\tau)$ then $|axb|^r \in E(\tau)$ and*

$$\| |axb|^r \|_{E(\tau)} \leq \| |a^p x|^{\frac{rp'}{p}} \|_{E(\tau)}^{\frac{1}{p'}} \| |xb^q|^{\frac{rq'}{q}} \|_{E(\tau)}^{\frac{1}{q'}}. \quad (5.8)$$

eqnHoIneq

Proof. Using the submajorization

$$|axb|^r \prec_{\log} \mu(|a^p x|^{\frac{rp'}{p}}) \mu(|xb^q|^{\frac{rq'}{q}})$$

given by (5.7), and observing that

$$\frac{1}{(p'r)} + \frac{1}{(q'r)} = \frac{1}{r},$$

it then follows from the first assertion of Proposition 5.6 and the assumptions

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(|a^p x|^{\frac{rp'}{p}}) &= \mu(|a^p x|^{\frac{1}{p}})^{rp'} \in E \\ \mu(|xb^q|^{\frac{rq'}{q}}) &= \mu(|xb^q|^{\frac{1}{q}})^{rq'} \in E \end{aligned}$$

that

$$\left(\mu(|a^p x|^{\frac{1}{p}}) \mu(|xb^q|^{\frac{1}{q}}) \right)^r = \mu(|a^p x|^{\frac{rp'}{p}}) \mu(|xb^q|^{\frac{rq'}{q}}) \in E.$$

Since the norm on E is monotone with respect to logarithmic submajorisation, it follows further that $|axb|^r \in E(\tau)$ and

$$\| |axb|^r \|_{E(\tau)} \leq \| \mu(|a^p x|^{\frac{rp'}{p}}) \mu(|xb^q|^{\frac{rq'}{q}}) \|_{E(\tau)}.$$

Now using the second assertion of Proposition [propHo](#) 5.6, it follows that

$$\|\mu(|a^p x|^{\frac{r}{p}})\mu(|xb^q|^{\frac{r}{q}})\|_{E(\tau)} \leq \| |a^p x|^{\frac{rp'}{p}} \|_{E(\tau)}^{\frac{1}{p'}} \| |xb^q|^{\frac{rq'}{q}} \|_{E(\tau)}^{\frac{1}{q'}},$$

and this suffices to complete the proof of the inequality [eqnHoIneq](#) (5.8). \square

Some special cases are worth noting explicitly.

corhia1

Corollary 5.8. ([Hiai](#) [\[24\]](#) [p.174](#); [\[1\]](#), [Theorem 7](#)) *Let E be a symmetric space on $[0, \infty)$ whose norm is monotone with respect to logarithmic submajorisation and suppose that $a, b, x \in S(\tau)$, that $r > 0$ and that $p, q > 1$ satisfy $1/p + 1/q = 1$. If $|a^*ax|^{\frac{rp}{2}}, |xbb^*|^{\frac{rq}{2}} \in E(\tau)$ then $|axb|^r \in E(\tau)$ and*

$$\| |axb|^r \|_{E(\tau)} \leq \| |a^*ax|^{\frac{rp}{2}} \|_{E(\tau)}^{\frac{1}{p}} \| |xbb^*|^{\frac{rq}{2}} \|_{E(\tau)}^{\frac{1}{q}}. \quad (5.9)$$

eqnHiai

The Corollary follows immediately from Proposition [propKIp4](#) 5.7 by taking $p = q = 2$, then replacing p', q' by p, q respectively and noting that

$$\mu(|axb|^r) = \mu^r(axb) = \mu^r(|a|x|b^*|) = \mu(|a|x|b^*| |^r).$$

As noted in [\[24\]](#), two further special cases of interest are the inequalities obtained by taking obtained $x = \mathbf{1}$, and $p = 2$ respectively:

corHiai3

Corollary 5.9. *Let E be a symmetric space on $[0, \infty)$ whose norm is monotone with respect to logarithmic submajorization. Suppose that $a, b, x \in S(\tau)$ and that $r > 0$.*

1. *Let $p, q > 1$ satisfy $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$. If $|a|^{rp} \in E(\tau)$ and $|b|^{rq} \in E(\tau)$, then $|ab|^r \in E(\tau)$ and*

$$\| |ab|^r \|_{E(\tau)} \leq \| |a|^{rp} \|_{E(\tau)}^{\frac{1}{p}} \| |b|^{rq} \|_{E(\tau)}^{\frac{1}{q}}, \quad (5.10)$$

eqnHa

2. *If $|a^*ax|^r \in E(\tau)$ and $|xbb^*|^r \in E(\tau)$ then*

$$\| |axb|^r \|_{E(\tau)}^2 \leq \| |a^*ax|^r \|_{E(\tau)} \| |xbb^*|^r \|_{E(\tau)}. \quad (5.11)$$

eqnHb

The first inequality uses the identity $\mu(bb^*) = \mu(b^*b)$. The second inequality in the case of trace ideals is due to Bhatia and Davis [\[4\]](#) [Theorem 1](#).

corhia2

Corollary 5.10. *Let E be a symmetric space on $[0, \infty)$ whose norm is monotone with respect to logarithmic submajorization and suppose that $0 \leq a, b \in S(\tau)$, that $x \in S(\tau)$ and $r > 0$. If $0 \leq \nu \leq 1$, and if $|ax|^r, |xb|^r \in E(\tau)$, then $|a^\nu xb^{1-\nu}|^r \in E(\tau)$ and*

$$\| |a^\nu xb^{1-\nu}|^r \|_{E(\tau)} \leq \| |ax|^r \|_{E(\tau)}^\nu \| |xb|^r \|_{E(\tau)}^{1-\nu} \quad (5.12)$$

eqnHiai2

$$\| |a^\nu xb^{1-\nu}|^r \|_{E(\tau)} \| |a^{1-\nu} xb^\nu|^r \|_{E(\tau)} \leq \| |ax|^r \|_{E(\tau)} \| |xb|^r \|_{E(\tau)} \quad (5.13)$$

eqnHiai3

The inequality [\(5.12\)](#) follows directly from Proposition [propKIp4](#) 5.7 by replacing a, b by $a^\nu, b^{1-\nu}$ respectively, and setting $p, p' = 1/\nu$. The inequality [\(5.13\)](#) then follows immediately.

For $n \times n$ matrices, the proposition which now follows is due to Hiai and Zhan [\[25\]](#). See also [\[23\]](#) in the case of non-commutative L_p -spaces.

prophiai3

Proposition 5.11. *Let E be a symmetric space on $[0, \infty)$ whose norm is monotone with respect to logarithmic submajorization and suppose that $x \in S(\tau)$, that $0 \leq a, b \in S(\tau)$ and that $r > 0$. If $0 \leq \nu \leq 1$, and if $|ax|^r, |xb|^r \in E(\tau)$, then the function*

$$f(\nu) = \| |a^\nu x b^{1-\nu}|^r \|_{E(\tau)} \| |a^{1-\nu} x b^\nu|^r \|_{E(\tau)}, \quad \nu \in [0, 1],$$

is convex on the interval $[0, 1]$ and attains its minimum at $\nu = 1/2$ and its maximum at the points $\nu = 0, 1$. In particular, for all $\nu \in [0, 1]$,

$$\| |a^{\frac{1}{2}} x b^{\frac{1}{2}}|^r \|_{E(\tau)}^2 \leq \| |a^\nu x b^{1-\nu}|^r \|_{E(\tau)} \| |a^{1-\nu} x b^\nu|^r \|_{E(\tau)} \leq \| |ax|^r \|_{E(\tau)} \| |xb|^r \|_{E(\tau)}. \tag{5.14}$$

eqn1con

In addition, if $a^{\frac{1}{2}} x b^{\frac{1}{2}} \neq 0$, then f is logarithmically convex on $[0, 1]$.

Proof. We observe first that it follows from (5.13) that f is bounded on $[0, 1]$. Consequently, to show that f is convex on $[0, 1]$, it suffices to show that f is midpoint convex. See, for example, [39], Chapter 5, 25.3. To this end, suppose that $t \pm s \in [0, 1]$ and using (5.11), observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \| |a^t x b^{1-t}|^r \|_{E(\tau)}^2 &= \| |a^s (a^{t-s} x b^{1-t-s}) b^s|^r \|_{E(\tau)}^2 \\ &\leq \| |a^{t+s} x b^{1-(t+s)}|^r \|_{E(\tau)} \cdot \| |a^{t-s} x b^{1-(t-s)}|^r \|_{E(\tau)} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \| |a^{1-t} x b^t|^r \|_{E(\tau)}^2 &= \| |a^s (a^{1-t-s} x b^{t-s}) b^s|^r \|_{E(\tau)}^2 \\ &\leq \| |a^{1-(t-s)} x b^{t-s}|^r \|_{E(\tau)} \cdot \| |a^{1-(t+s)} x b^{t+s}|^r \|_{E(\tau)}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$2f(t) \leq 2\sqrt{f(t+s)f(t-s)} \leq f(t+s) + f(t-s). \tag{5.15}$$

eqncon

It now follows that $f(\cdot; a, b, x)$ is convex on $[0, 1]$ whenever $|ax|^r, |xb|^r \in E(\tau)$. Since f is clearly symmetric about the point $1/2$, it follows that f attains its minimal value over $[0, 1]$ at $1/2$ and its maximal value at the points $0, 1$, and this establishes the first part of the proposition. Finally, if $a^{\frac{1}{2}} x b^{\frac{1}{2}} \neq 0$, then it follows from the equation (5.14) that the function $\log f$ is bounded on $[0, 1]$. It suffices to show that $\log f$ is midpoint convex. This, however, is immediate from the first inequality in (5.15). \square

rmkFS

Remark 5.12. We remark finally that there is a very substantial class of symmetric spaces $E \subseteq S(\tau)$ whose norm is monotone with respect to submajorization. Indeed, if E is *fully symmetric* in the sense that, if $x \in E, y \in S(\tau)$ satisfy $y \prec\prec x$ then $y \in E$ and $\|y\|_E \leq \|x\|_E$, then it is easily seen via remark 5.3 that the norm on E is monotone with respect to logarithmic submajorization. Such spaces are precisely the exact interpolation spaces for the pair $(L_1(\tau), \mathcal{M})$. See [8], [7]. If $E \subseteq S(m)$ is a fully symmetric space on $[0, \infty)$, then it follows directly that $E(\tau) \subset S(\tau)$ is fully symmetric. Important special cases occur if $E \subseteq S(m)$ is one of the familiar L_p -spaces, Orlicz spaces or Lorentz spaces. In the case that $\mathcal{M} = B(\mathcal{H})$, then all trace ideals in the sense of Gohberg and Krein [18] are fully symmetric. While it is well-known [35] that there are symmetric spaces on the $[0, \infty)$ which are not closed

subspaces of any fully symmetric space, we do not have an explicit example of a symmetric space on $[0, \infty)$ whose norm is monotone with respect to logarithmic submajorization but which is not fully symmetric. This seems to be a difficult problem.

6. A Weyl-type inequality for uniform majorisation and Hölder inequalities

The following direct consequence of the Weyl inequality given in Theorem 4.2 and the implication (i) \implies (iii) of Proposition 3.2 extends [17, Theorem 4.2(iii)].

WIp1

Theorem 6.1. *If $x, y \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$, and if $f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is any continuous increasing function $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ for which $f(0) = 0$ and $f \circ \exp$ is convex, then*

$$f(|xy|) \prec\prec f(\mu(x)\mu(y)).$$

We strengthen this as follows, using the notion of *uniform Hardy-Littlewood majorization* introduced in [28]; see also [31] Chapter 3.4. If $x, y \in S(\tau)$ then x is said to be *strongly majorized by y* , written $x \triangleleft y$, if there exists $\lambda > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\lambda a}^b \mu(x) dm \leq \int_a^b \mu(y) dm, \quad 0 < \lambda a \leq b.$$

It is the case that $x \prec\prec y$ if $x \triangleleft y$, but the converse is not valid. We shall need the following fundamental result, which is obtained by combining [28] Proposition 4.3 with [28] Theorem 6.3.

thmKS

Theorem 6.2. *Let $E \subseteq S(m)$ be a symmetric Banach space on $[0, \infty)$. If $y \in E(\tau)$ and if $x \in S(\tau)$ satisfies $x \triangleleft y$ then $x \in E(\tau)$ and $\|x\|_{E(\tau)} \leq \|y\|_{E(\tau)}$*

Our proof of the following theorem uses the approach from the proof of [34] Theorem 7.

thmWI

Theorem 6.3. *If $x, y \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$ and $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is an increasing and continuous function for which $f(0) = 0$ and $f \circ \exp$ is convex, then*

$$f(|xy|) \triangleleft f(\mu(x)\mu(y)).$$

Proof. Let a, b be positive scalars with $0 \leq 2a < b$. It will suffice to show that

$$\int_{2a}^b f(\mu(xy)) dm \leq \int_a^b f(\mu(x)\mu(y)) dm.$$

Without loss of generality, it may be assumed that \mathcal{M} is non-atomic. By [9] Lemma 2.4), there exist projections $p, q \in P(\mathcal{M})$ with $\tau(p) = \tau(q) = a$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} e^{|x|} ((\mu(a; x), \infty)) &\leq p \leq e^{|x|} ((\mu(a; x), \infty)), \\ e^{|y|} ((\mu(a; y), \infty)) &\leq q \leq e^{|y|} ((\mu(a; y), \infty)), \\ \mu(|x|p) = \mu(x)\chi_{[0, \tau(p)]} &= \mu(x)\chi_{[0, a]}, \quad \mu(|y|q) = \mu(y)\chi_{[0, \tau(q)]} = \mu(y)\chi_{[0, a]}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mu(|x|(\mathbf{1} - p)) = \mu(\cdot + a, x), \quad \mu(|y|(\mathbf{1} - q)) = \mu(\cdot + a, y)$$

Observe that, for all $t > 2a$,

$$\mu(t; xy) \leq \mu(a; xpy) + \mu(a; x(\mathbf{1} - p)yq) + \mu(t - 2a; x(\mathbf{1} - p)y(\mathbf{1} - q)).$$

Using [\[17\]](#) [Lemma 2.5](#) (vii), observe that, for all $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\mu(a + \epsilon; xpy) \leq \mu(a + \epsilon; |x|py) \leq \mu(a; |x|p)\mu(\epsilon; y) = 0$$

and

$$\mu(a + \epsilon; x(\mathbf{1} - p)yq) \leq \mu(\epsilon; x(\mathbf{1} - p))\mu(a; |y|q) = 0.$$

By right-continuity of the singular value function, it follows that

$$\mu(a; xpy) = \mu(a; x(\mathbf{1} - p)yq) = 0$$

and so

$$\mu(t; xy) \leq \mu(t - 2a; x(\mathbf{1} - p)y(\mathbf{1} - q)) \quad t > 2a.$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{2a}^b f(\mu(xy)) dm &\leq \int_{2a}^b f(\mu(\cdot - 2a; x(\mathbf{1} - p)y(\mathbf{1} - q))) dm \leq \int_0^{b-2a} f(\mu(x(\mathbf{1} - p)y(\mathbf{1} - q))) dm \\ &\leq \int_0^{b-2a} f(\mu(x(\mathbf{1} - p))\mu(y(\mathbf{1} - q))) dm \quad \text{using Theorem [6.1](#)} \\ &\leq \int_0^{b-2a} f(\mu(\cdot + a; x)\mu(\cdot + a; y)) dm \\ &= \int_a^{b-a} f(\mu(x)\mu(y)) dm \leq \int_a^b f(\mu(x)\mu(y)) dm \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. \square

corb1 **Corollary 6.4.** (cf. [\[2\]](#), [Lemma 4](#)) If $x, y \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$ and $r > 0$ then

$$|xy|^r \triangleleft \mu(x)^r \mu(y)^r.$$

Proof. The inequality follows immediately from [Theorem 6.3](#) by taking $f(t) = t^r$, $t > 0$. \square

A general Hölder inequality for arbitrary symmetric spaces now follows.

corHo **Corollary 6.5.** Suppose that $E \subseteq S(m)$ is a symmetric space, that $r, p, q > 0$ and that $1/r = 1/p + 1/q$. If $|x|^p, |y|^q \in E(\tau)$, then $|xy|^r \in E(\tau)$ and

$$\| |xy|^r \|_{E(\tau)}^{\frac{1}{r}} \leq \| |x|^p \|_{E(\tau)}^{\frac{1}{p}} \| |y|^q \|_{E(\tau)}^{\frac{1}{q}}$$

Proof. By assumption, $\mu(x)^p \in E$, $\mu(y)^q \in E$ and so by Proposition [propHo 5.6](#) $\mu(x)^r \mu(y)^r \in E$. The assumptions $|x|^p, |y|^q \in E(\tau) \subseteq L^1(\tau) + \mathcal{M}$ imply further that $|x|^p, |y|^p \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$ and so also $x, y \in L_{\log_+}(\tau)$.

By Corollary [corb1 6.4](#), the uniform submajorization

$$|xy|^r \triangleleft \mu(x)^r \mu(y)^r$$

together with Theorem [thmKS 6.2](#) yields that $|xy|^r \in E$ and

$$\| |xy|^r \|_{E(\tau)} \leq \| \mu(x)^r \mu(y)^r \|_E$$

The assertion of the corollary now follows from Proposition [propHo 5.6](#). \square

The preceding Corollary [corHo 6.5](#) is given in [\[2\]](#) Corollary 1 and in [\[34\]](#) Theorem 1 in the case that $r = 1$. The present approach is much more direct than that given in [\[2\]](#).

Let $E \subseteq S(m)$ be a symmetric space and let $x \in S(\tau)$. For ease of presentation, it will now be convenient to write $\|x\|_{E(\tau)} < \infty$ if $x \in E(\tau)$ and $\|x\|_{E(\tau)} = +\infty$ otherwise.

propHo2

Proposition 6.6. *Suppose that $E \subseteq S(m)$ is a symmetric space. Let $r > 0$ and suppose that $1 < p, q < \infty$ satisfy $1/p + 1/q = 1$. Let $\phi, \psi : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be Borel functions such that $\phi(\lambda)\psi(\lambda) = \lambda$, $\lambda > 0$. If $a, b, x \in S(\tau)$, then*

$$\| |a^*xb|^r \|_{E(\tau)} \leq \| (a^*\phi^2(|x^*|)a)^{\frac{pr}{2}} \|_{E(\tau)}^{\frac{1}{p}} \| (b^*\psi^2(|x|)b)^{\frac{qr}{2}} \|_{E(\tau)}^{\frac{1}{q}}, \quad (6.1)$$

eqnHo2

provided the right hand side is finite.

Proof. Let $a, x, b \in S(\tau)$ and note that it follows from Lemma [LemGMMN 5.4](#) that

$$a^*xb = a^*\phi(|x^*|)u\psi(|x|)b,$$

where $x = u|x|$ is the polar decomposition. Theorem [thmWI 6.3](#) with $f(\cdot) = (\cdot)^r$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} |a^*xb|^r &\triangleleft \mu^r(a^*\phi(|x^*|)u)\mu^r(\psi(|x|)b) \\ &\leq \mu^r(\phi(|x^*|)a)\mu^r(\psi(|x|)b) = \mu((a^*\phi^2(|x^*|)a)^{\frac{r}{2}})\mu((b^*\psi^2(|x|)b)^{\frac{r}{2}}). \end{aligned}$$

It now follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \| |a^*xb|^r \| &\leq \| \mu((a^*\phi^2(|x^*|)a)^{\frac{r}{2}})\mu((b^*\psi^2(|x|)b)^{\frac{r}{2}}) \|_E \\ &\leq \| \mu^p((a^*\phi^2(|x^*|)a)^{\frac{r}{2}}) \|_E^{\frac{1}{p}} \| \mu^q((b^*\psi^2(|x|)b)^{\frac{r}{2}}) \|_E^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ &= \| (a^*\phi^2(|x^*|)a)^{\frac{pr}{2}} \|_{E(\tau)}^{\frac{1}{p}} \| (b^*\psi^2(|x|)b)^{\frac{qr}{2}} \|_{E(\tau)}^{\frac{1}{q}}, \end{aligned}$$

and this completes the proof of the proposition. \square

For the special case that $\phi(\lambda) = \lambda^{1/2} = \psi(\lambda)$, $\lambda > 0$, we obtain the following inequality. See [\[2\]](#) Corollary 2.

corHo3 **Corollary 6.7.** *Suppose that $E \subseteq S(m)$ is a symmetric space. Let $r > 0$ and suppose that $1 < p, q < \infty$ satisfy $1/p + 1/q = 1$. If $a, b, x \in S(\tau)$, then*

$$\| |a^* x b|^r \|_{E(\tau)} \leq \| (a^* |x^*| a)^{\frac{pr}{2}} \|_{E(\tau)}^{\frac{1}{p}} \| (b^* |x| b)^{\frac{qr}{2}} \|_{E(\tau)}^{\frac{1}{q}}, \tag{6.2} \quad \text{eqnHo3}$$

whenever the right hand side is finite.

A standard argument (see, for example [2] Theorem 4, or [1] Theorem 21) now yields the following consequence.

corHo2 **Corollary 6.8.** *Suppose that $E \subseteq S(m)$ is symmetrically normed. Let $r > 0$ and suppose that $1 < p, q < \infty$ satisfy $1/p + 1/q = 1$. Let $\phi, \psi : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be Borel functions such that $\phi(\lambda)\psi(\lambda) = \lambda$, $\lambda > 0$. If $a_i, x_i, b_i \in S(\tau)$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, then*

$$\| | \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^* x_i b_i |^r \|_{E(\tau)} \leq \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i^* \phi^2(|x_i^*|) a_i \right)^{\frac{pr}{2}} \right\|_{E(\tau)}^{\frac{1}{p}} \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n b_i^* \psi^2(|x_i|) b_i \right)^{\frac{qr}{2}} \right\|_{E(\tau)}^{\frac{1}{q}}, \tag{6.3} \quad \text{eqnH022}$$

whenever the right hand side is finite.

We remark that Proposition 6.6 and Corollary 6.8 may be found in [1], Theorems 19 and 21 respectively, for the special case that $\mathcal{M} = B(H)$. See also [26]. In the present setting of τ -measurable operators, the special case of Proposition 6.6 and Corollary 6.8 obtained by setting $\phi(\lambda) = \lambda^{1/2} = \psi(\lambda)$, $\lambda > 0$ is proved in [2]. However, the present approach via Theorem 6.3 is more direct and transparent.

References

- [1] H. Albadawi, *Hölder type inequalities involving unitarily invariant norms*, Positivity **16** (2012) 255-270.
- [2] T.Bekjan and M.Ospanov, *Hölder type inequalities of measurable operators*, Positivity, (2016) (to appear).
- [3] R. Bhatia, *Matrix Analysis*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, **169** Springer-Verlag New York, 1996.
- [4] R.Bhatia and C.Davis, *A Cauchy-Schwartz inequality for operators with applications*, Lin. Alg. Appl.**223** (1995)119-129.
- [5] L.G.Brown, *Lidskii's theorem in the type II case*, in *Proc.U.S.-Japan Seminar, Kyoto 1983*, Pitman Research Notes, Math.Ser.,**123** (1986),3-19.
- [6] J. Dixmier, *von Neumann Algebras*, Mathematical Library **27**. Amsterdam: North Holland (1981).
- [7] P. G. Dodds, T. K.-Y. Dodds, and B. de Pagter, *Noncommutative Köthe duality*, Trans.Amer.Math.Soc.**339**(1993)717-750.
- [8] P. G. Dodds, T. K.-Y. Dodds, and B. de Pagter, *Fully symmetric operator spaces*, Integr Equat. Oper. Theory**15**(1992)942-972.
- [9] P. G. Dodds, T. K.-Y. Dodds, and B. de Pagter, *Noncommutative Banach function spaces*, Math.Zeit.**201**(1989)583-597.

- [10] P.G.Dodds, T.K.Dodds and F.A. Sukochev, *on p -convexity and q -concavity in non-commutative symmetric spaces*, Integral Equations and Operator Theory **78** (2014)91-114.
- [11] P.G. Dodds and B.de Pagter, *Normed Köthe spaces: A non-commutative viewpoint*, Indagationes Mathematicae **25** (2014) 206-249.
- [12] P.G.Dodds, B.de Pagter and F. Sukochev, *Theory of Noncommutative Integration*, unpublished monograph, to appear.
- [13] K.Dykema and A.Skripka, *Hölders inequality for roots of symmetric operator spaces*, Studia Math. **228**(2015) 47-54
- [14] T.Fack, *Sur la notion de valeur caractéristique*, J. Operator Theory **7** (1982) 307-333.
- [15] T. Fack, *Proof of the conjecture of A.Grothendieck on the Fuglede-Kadison determinant*, J.Functional Anal. **50** (1983) 215-228.
- [16] B.Fuglede and R.V.Kadison, *Determinant theory in finite factors*, Ann. of Math.**55** (1952) 520-530.
- [17] T. Fack and H. Kosaki, *Generalized s -numbers of τ -measurable operators* , Pacific J. Math. **123** (1986), no. 2, 269–300.
- [18] I.C.Gohberg and M.G.Krein, *Introduction to the theory of non-selfadjoint operators*, Transl.Math.Monographs, vol. 18, Amer.Math.Soc., 1969.Providence, R.I.,
- [19] F.Gesztesy, M. Malamud, M. Mitrea and S. Naboko, *Generalized Polar Decompositions for Closed Operators in Hilbert spaces and some Applications* Integral Equations Operator Theory **64**(2009) 83-113.
- [20] A. Grothendieck, *Réarrangements de fonctions et inégalités de convexité dans les algèbres de von Neumann munies d'une trace* Seminaire N.Bourbaki, 1954-1956 exp.no. 113, 127-139.
- [21] U. Haagerup and H. Schultz, *Brown measures of unbounded operators affiliated with a finite von Neumann algebra*, Math.Scand.**100** (2007), 209-263.
- [22] Y. Han, *On the Araki-Lieb-Thirring inequality in the semifinite von Neumann algebra*, Ann.Funct.Anal **7** (2016) 622-635.
- [23] Y. Han and J. Shao, *Some convexity inequalities in non-commutative L_p -spaces*, Journal of Inequalities and Applications,**385** (2014) 6pp.
- [24] F.Hiai, *Log-majorization and norm inequalities for exponential operators*, in "Linear Operators" Banach Center Publ. vol. 38 pp.119-181, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warszawa, 1997.
- [25] F.Hiai and X.Zhan, *Inequalities involving unitarily invariant norms and operator monotone functions*, Linear algebra and its Applications **341** (2002) 151-169.
- [26] F.Kittaneh, *Some norm inequalities for operators*, Canad. Math. Bull. **42** (1999)87-96.
- [27] S.G. Krein, Y.I. Petunin and E.M. Sememov, *Interpolation of linear operators*, In: Translations of Mathematical Monographs, vol. 54, American Mathematical Society, Providence (1982).
- [28] N.J. Kalton and F.A. Sukochev, *Symmetric norms and spaces of operators*, J.Reine Angew.Math **621**(2008) 81-121.

- [29] H. Kosaki, *Arithmetic-geometric mean and related inequalities for operators*, J. Functional Anal. **156** (1998) 426-451.
- [30] H. Kosaki, *An Inequality of Araki-Lieb-Thirring*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **114** (1992), 477-481.
- [31] S. Lord, F. Sukochev and D. Zanin, *Singular Traces: Theory and Applications* De Gruyter Studies in Mathematics, 46, De Gruyter, Berlin, (2013).
- [32] E. Nelson, *Notes on non-commutative integration*, J. Functional Anal. **15**(1974), 103-116.
- [33] H. Weyl, *Inequalities between the two kinds of eigenvalues of a linear transformation*, Proc. nat. Acad. Sci **35** (1949), 408-411.
- [34] F. Sukochev, *Hölder inequality for symmetric operator spaces and trace property of K -cycles*, Bull. London Math. Soc. **48** (2016) 637-647.
- [35] A.A. Sedaev, E.M. Semenov and F.A. Sukochev, *Fully symmetric function spaces without an equivalent Fatou norm*, Positivity **19** (2015) 419-437.
- [36] M. Takesaki, *Theory of Operator Algebras I*, Springer-Verlag, New-York-Heidelberg-Berlin, 1979.
- [37] M. Terp, *L^p -spaces associated with von Neumann algebras*, Notes, Copenhagen University (1981).
- [38] B.-Y. Wang and M.-P. Gong, *Some eigenvalue inequalities for positive semidefinite matrix power products*, Linear Algebra Appl. **184** (1993) 249-260
- [39] A.C. Zaanen, *Integration*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1967.

PG Dodds

College of Science and Engineering, Flinders University
GPO Box 2100, Adelaide 5001, Australia
e-mail: peter@csem.flinders.edu.au

TK Dodds

College of Science and Engineering, Flinders University
GPO Box 2100, Adelaide 5001, Australia
e-mail: theresa@csem.flinders.edu.au

FA Sukochev

School of Mathematics and Statistics, UNSW
Kensington, NSW 2052, Australia

e-mail: f.sukochev@nsw.edu.au

D. Zanin

School of Mathematics and Statistics, UNSW
Kensington, NSW 2052, Australia

e-mail: d.zanin@nsw.edu.au