

GENERALIZED EUCLIDEAN OPERATOR RADIUS INEQUALITIES OF A PAIR OF BOUNDED LINEAR OPERATORS

SUVENDU JANA

ABSTRACT. Let $\mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$ represent the C^* -algebra, which consists of all bounded linear operators on \mathcal{H} , and let $N(\cdot)$ be a norm on $\mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$. We define a norm $w_{(N,e)}(\cdot, \cdot)$ on $\mathbb{B}^2(\mathcal{H})$ by

$$w_{(N,e)}(B, C) = \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(\Re(e^{i\theta}(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C))),$$

for every $B, C \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{C}$. We investigate basic properties of this norm and prove some bounds involving it. In particular, when $N(\cdot)$ is the Hilbert-Schmidt norm, we prove some Hilbert-Schmidt Euclidean operator radius inequalities for a pair of bounded linear operators.

1. INTRODUCTION

Consider a complex Hilbert space \mathcal{H} with inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and the corresponding norm $\|\cdot\|$. Let $\mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$ represent the C^* -algebra, which consists of all bounded linear operators on \mathcal{H} , including the identity operator I . For $T \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$, T^* denotes the adjoint of T . The real part and imaginary part of T denoted by $\Re(T)$ and $\Im(T)$, are defined as $\Re(T) = \frac{1}{2}(T + T^*)$ and $\Im(T) = \frac{1}{2i}(T - T^*)$ respectively. The numerical range of T , denoted by $W(T)$, is defined as $W(T) = \{\langle Tx, x \rangle : x \in \mathcal{H}, \|x\| = 1\}$. We denote by $\|T\|$, $c(T)$ and $w(T)$ the operator norm, the Crawford number and the numerical radius of T , respectively. Note that

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

and

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

It is well known that the numerical radius $w(\cdot)$ defines a norm on $\mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and is equivalent to the operator norm $\|\cdot\|$. In fact, the following double inequality holds:

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

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 47A12, Secondary 15A60, 47A30, 47A50.

Key words and phrases. Euclidean operator radius; Numerical radius, Operator norm, Cartesian decomposition, Hilbert-Schmidt norm, Bounded linear operator.

The inequalities in (1.1) are sharp. The first inequality becomes equality if $T^2 = 0$, and the second one turns into equality if T is normal. Kittaneh [8] improved the inequalities in (1.1) by establishing that

$$\frac{1}{4}\|T^*T + TT^*\| \leq w^2(T) \leq \frac{1}{2}\|T^*T + TT^*\|. \quad (1.2)$$

For further improvements of (1.1) and (1.2) we refer the interested readers to the recent book [3]. Let $B, C \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$, the Euclidean operator radius of B and C , denoted by $w_e(B, C)$, is defined as

$$w_e(B, C) = \sup \left\{ \sqrt{|\langle Bx, x \rangle|^2 + |\langle Cx, x \rangle|^2} : x \in \mathcal{H}, \|x\| = 1 \right\}.$$

Following [10], $w_e(\cdot, \cdot) : \mathbb{B}^2(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is a norm that satisfies the inequality

$$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{4}\|B^*B + C^*C\|^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq w_e(B, C) \leq \|B^*B + C^*C\|^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (1.3)$$

The constants $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{4}$ and 1 are best possible in (1.3). If B and C are self-adjoint operators, then (1.3) becomes

$$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{4}\|B^2 + C^2\|^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq w_e(B, C) \leq \|B^2 + C^2\|^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (1.4)$$

We note that for self-adjoint operators B and C , $w_e(B, C) = w(B + iC)$, its proof follows easily from the definition of $w_e(B, C)$. In [4, Th. 1], Dragomir proved that if $B, C \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$, then

$$\frac{1}{2}w(B^2 + C^2) \leq w_e^2(B, C) \leq \|B^*B + C^*C\|, \quad (1.5)$$

where the constant $\frac{1}{2}$ is best possible in the sense that it cannot be replaced by a larger constant. For further extension of Euclidean operator radius and related inequalities we refer to [2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11]. In [12], Yamazaki gave an important and useful identity for $w(T)$,

$$w(T) = \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \|\Re(e^{i\theta}T)\|.$$

Motivated by the above characterization, Abu-Omar and Kittaneh [1] generalized the usual numerical radius as follows:

$$w_N(T) = \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(\Re(e^{i\theta}T)), \quad (1.6)$$

where $N(\cdot)$ is a norm on $\mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$.

They proved that $w_N(\cdot)$ defines a norm on $\mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and $w_N(\cdot)$ is self adjoint i.e, $w_N(T) = w_N(T^*)$. Also proved that $w_N(T) \geq \frac{1}{2}N(T)$ and $w_N(T) \leq N(T)$, if $N(T^*) = N(T)$, for every $T \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$.

Popescu [10, Section 2, Corollary 2.3], gave a characterization for Euclidean operator radius as follows:

$$w_e(B, C) = \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} w(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C),$$

where $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{C}$.

For 2-tuple operators $B = (B_1, B_2)$, $C = (C_1, C_2) \in \mathbb{B}^2(\mathcal{H})$, we write $B + C = (B_1 + C_1, B_2 + C_2)$, $BC = (B_1 C_1, B_2 C_2)$, and $\alpha B = (\alpha B_1, \alpha C_1)$, for any scalar $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$.

In Section 2, inspired by [1], for an arbitrary norm $N(\cdot)$ on $\mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$, we define the $w_{(N,e)}(\cdot, \cdot)$ as a generalization of the Euclidean operators radius of a pair of operator and investigate basic properties of this norm and prove inequalities involving it. In section 3, we prove some bounds for Hilbert-Schmidt Euclidean operators radius for pair of bonded linear operators when $N(\cdot)$ is the Hilbert-Schmidt norm $\|\cdot\|_2$.

2. A GENERALIZATION OF EUCLIDEAN OPERATOR RADIUS

In this section, we introduce our new norm on $\mathbb{B}^2(\mathcal{H})$, which generalizes the Euclidean operator radius and present basic properties of this norm.

Definition 2.1. Let $N(\cdot)$ be a norm on $\mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$. The function $w_{(N,e)}(\cdot, \cdot) : \mathbb{B}^2(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is defined as:

$$w_{(N,e)}(B, C) = \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(\Re(e^{i\theta}(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C))),$$

for every $B, C \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{C}$.

In our next theorem, we prove that $w_{(N,e)}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a norm on $\mathbb{B}^2(\mathcal{H})$. We use some ideas of [1, Theorems 1].

Theorem 2.2. $w_{(N,e)}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a norm on $\mathbb{B}^2(\mathcal{H})$.

Proof. Let $B, C \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Since $N(\cdot)$ is a norm on $\mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$, we have

$$N(\Re(e^{i\theta}(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C))) \geq 0 \text{ for every } \theta \in \mathbb{R}. \text{ Hence } \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(\Re(e^{i\theta}(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C))) \geq 0.$$

So $w_{(N,e)}(B, C) \geq 0$.

Let us assume that $w_{(N,e)}(B, C) = 0$. Then $N(\Re(e^{i\theta}(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C))) = 0$, for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1$. Taking $\theta = 0$, $\theta = \frac{\pi}{2}$, and $\lambda_1 = 1$, $\lambda_2 = 0$, we get $N(\Re B) = 0 = N(\Im B)$. So $B = 0$. In Similar way, we obviously get $C = 0$.

Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$. There exists $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\alpha = |\alpha|e^{i\phi}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
w_{(N,e)}(\alpha B, \alpha C) &= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(\Re(e^{i\theta}(\lambda_1 \alpha B + \lambda_2 \alpha C))) \\
&= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(\Re(e^{i(\theta+\phi)}(\lambda_1 |\alpha| B + \lambda_2 |\alpha| C))) \\
&= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} N(\Re(e^{it}(\lambda_1 |\alpha| B + \lambda_2 |\alpha| C))) \\
&= |\alpha| \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} N(\Re(e^{it}(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C))) \\
&= |\alpha| w_{(N,e)}(B, C).
\end{aligned}$$

Let $B_1, C_1, B_2, C_2 \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$.

$$\begin{aligned}
&w_{(N,e)}(B_1 + B_2, C_1 + C_2) \\
&= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(\Re(e^{i\theta}(\lambda_1(B_1 + B_2) + \lambda_2(C_1 + C_2)))) \\
&= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(\Re(e^{i\theta}((\lambda_1 B_1 + \lambda_2 C_1) + (\lambda_1 B_2 + \lambda_2 C_2)))) \\
&\leq \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(\Re(e^{i\theta}(\lambda_1 B_1 + \lambda_2 C_1))) \\
&\quad + \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(\Re(e^{i\theta}(\lambda_1 B_2 + \lambda_2 C_2))) \\
&= w_{(N,e)}(B_1, C_1) + w_{(N,e)}(B_2, C_2).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus $w_{N,e}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is sub additive and so $w_{(N,e)}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a norm on $\mathbb{B}^2(\mathcal{H})$. \square

In the next result we proof some properties of the norm $w_{(N,e)}(\cdot, \cdot)$.

Proposition 2.3. *Let $B, C \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Then*

- (a) $w_{(N,e)}(B, C) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} w_{(N,e)}(B + C, B - C)$.
- (b) $w_{(N,e)}(\Re B, \Im B) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} w_{(N,e)}(B, B^*) = w_N(B)$.
- (c) $w_{(N,e)}(B, B) = \sqrt{2} w_N(B)$.
- (d) *The norm $w_{(N,e)}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is self adjoint.*
- (e) *If the norm $N(\cdot)$ is weakly unitarily invariant, then so is $w_{(N,e)}(\cdot, \cdot)$.*
- (f) $w_{(N,e)}(B, C) = \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\substack{\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R} \\ \alpha^2 + \beta^2 = 1}} N(\alpha \Re(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C) + \beta \Im(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C))$.

Proof. (a) It follows from Definition 2.1 and (1.6) we have

$$w_{(N,e)}(B, C) = \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} w_N(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C). \quad (2.1)$$

It follows from (2.1),

$$\begin{aligned}
 w_{(N,e)}(B+C, B-C) &= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} w_N(B(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) + C(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)) \\
 &= \sqrt{2} \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} w_N(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C). \\
 &= \sqrt{2} w_{(N,e)}(B, C).
 \end{aligned}$$

(b) Again from (2.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 w_{(N,e)}(\Re B, \Im B) &= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} w_N(\lambda_1 \Re B + \lambda_2 \Im B) \\
 &= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \frac{1}{2} w_N(\lambda_1(B + B^*) + \lambda_2(-iB + iB^*)) \\
 &= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \frac{1}{2} w_N(B(\lambda_1 - i\lambda_2) + B^*(\lambda_1 + i\lambda_2)) \\
 &= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} w_N(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 B^*) \\
 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} w_{(N,e)}(B, B^*).
 \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
 w_{(N,e)}(B, B^*) &= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(\Re(e^{i\theta}(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 B^*))) \\
 &= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(\Re(e^{i\theta}(\lambda_1 B)) + \Re(e^{i\theta}(\bar{\lambda}_2 B))) \quad (2.2)
 \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(\Re(e^{i\theta}(\lambda_1 B)) + \Re(e^{i\theta}(\bar{\lambda}_2 B))) \\
 &\leq \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \left\{ \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(\Re(e^{i\theta}(\lambda_1 B))) + \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(\Re(e^{i\theta}(\bar{\lambda}_2 B))) \right\} \\
 &= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \{w_N(\lambda_1 B) + w_N(\bar{\lambda}_2 B)\} \\
 &= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \{|\lambda_1| + |\lambda_2|\} w_N(B) \\
 &= \sqrt{2} w_N(B).
 \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (2.2) that

$$\begin{aligned}
 w_{(N,e)}(B, B^*) &\geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(\Re(e^{i\theta} B) + \Re(e^{i\theta} B)) \\
 &= \sqrt{2} w_N(B).
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $w_{(N,e)}(B, C) = \sqrt{2} w_N(B)$.

(c)

$$\begin{aligned}
w_{(N,e)}(B, B) &= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(\Re(e^{i\theta}(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 B))) \\
&= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(\Re(e^{i\theta}((\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)B))) \\
&= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} w_N((\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)B) \\
&= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} |(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)| w_N(B) \\
&\leq \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} (|\lambda_1| + |\lambda_2|) w_N(B) \\
&= \sqrt{2} w_N(B).
\end{aligned}$$

Also $w_{(N,e)}(B, B) \geq \sqrt{2} w_N(B)$, as $w_{(N,e)}(B, B) = \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} |(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)| w_N(B)$.

Hence the result is proved.

(d)

$$\begin{aligned}
w_{(N,e)}(B^*, C^*) &= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(\Re(e^{i\theta}(\lambda_1 B^* + \lambda_2 C^*))) \\
&= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(\Re(e^{-i\theta}(\bar{\lambda}_1 B + \bar{\lambda}_2 C))) \\
&= w_{(N,e)}(B, C).
\end{aligned}$$

(e) Assume that $N(\cdot)$ is weakly unitarily invariant and let $U \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be unitary. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
w_{(N,e)}(U^*(B, C)U) &= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(\Re(e^{i\theta}(U^*(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C)U))) \\
&= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(U^* \Re(e^{i\theta}(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C)) U).
\end{aligned}$$

By the consideration we have $N(U^* \Re(e^{i\theta}(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C)) U) = N(\Re(e^{i\theta}(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C)))$.

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
w_{(N,e)}(U^*(B, C)U) &= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(\Re(e^{i\theta}(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C))) \\
&= w_{(N,e)}(B, C).
\end{aligned}$$

(f)

$$\begin{aligned}
w_{(N,e)}(B, C) &= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(\Re(e^{i\theta}(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C))) \\
&= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{2} N(e^{i\theta}(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C) + e^{-i\theta}(\bar{\lambda}_1 B^* + \bar{\lambda}_2 C^*)) \\
&= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(\cos\theta \Re(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C) - \sin\theta \Im(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C)).
\end{aligned}$$

Put $\alpha = \cos\theta$ and $\beta = -\sin\theta$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} w_{(N,e)}(B, C) &= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(\cos\theta \Re(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C) - \sin\theta \Im(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C)) \\ &= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\substack{\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R} \\ \alpha^2 + \beta^2 = 1}} N(\alpha \Re(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C) + \beta \Im(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C)) \end{aligned}$$

Hence the results are proved. □

Next we proof some bounds for generalized Euclidean operator radius of a pair of bounded linear operator.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $B, C \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$. then*

- (a) $w_{(N,e)}(B, C) \geq \max\{w_N(B), w_N(C)\}$.
- (b) $w_{(N,e)}(B, C) \leq \sqrt{w_N^2(B) + w_N^2(C)}$.

Proof. We have

$$w_{(N,e)}(B, C) = \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(\Re(e^{i\theta}(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C))),$$

for every $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{C}$. If we take $\lambda_1 = 1$ and $\lambda_2 = 0$ we have that

$$w_{(N,e)}(B, C) \geq \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(\Re(e^{i\theta} B)) = w_N(B).$$

In similar way, if we take $\lambda_1 = 0$ and $\lambda_2 = 1$ we get

$$w_{(N,e)}(B, C) \geq \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(\Re(e^{i\theta} C)) = w_N(C).$$

Hence the first result is proved.

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} w_{(N,e)}(B, C) &= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(\Re(e^{i\theta}(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C))) \\ &= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(\Re(e^{i\theta}(\lambda_1 B)) + \Re(e^{i\theta}(\lambda_2 C))) \\ &\leq \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \left\{ \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(\Re(e^{i\theta}(\lambda_1 B))) + \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(\Re(e^{i\theta}(\lambda_2 C))) \right\} \\ &= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \{w_N(\lambda_1 B) + w_N(\lambda_2 C)\} \\ &= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \{|\lambda_1|w_N(B) + |\lambda_2|w_N(C)\} \\ &= \sqrt{w_N^2(B) + w_N^2(C)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence the theorem is proved. □

It is easy to proof from the definition of $w_N(\cdot)$ that $w_N(T) = N(T)$, if $T \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is self adjoint.

The following corollary is an immediate consequence of the Theorem 2.4.

Corollary 2.5. *Let $B, C \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be any two self adjoint operator. Then*

$$\max \{N(B), N(C)\} \leq w_{(N,e)}(B, C) \leq \sqrt{N^2(B) + N^2(C)}.$$

Remark 2.6. If we replace B, C by $\Re T, \Im T$ respectively, for any $T \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$ in the above Theorem 2.4, we have

$$\max \{N(\Re T), N(\Im T)\} \leq w_N(T) \leq \sqrt{N^2(\Re T) + N^2(\Im T)}.$$

Next theorem state as follows:

Theorem 2.7. *Let $B, C \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$. then*

$$(a) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \max \{w_N(B + C), w_N(B - C)\} \leq w_{(N,e)}(B, C) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{w_N^2(B + C) + w_N^2(B - C)}.$$

Proof. We have

$$w_{(N,e)}(B, C) = \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N(\Re(e^{i\theta}(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C))),$$

for every $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{C}$. Consider $\lambda_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ and $\lambda_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ we have that

$$w_{(N,e)}(B, C) \geq \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N\left(\Re\left(e^{i\theta}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(B + C)\right)\right)\right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} w_N(B + C).$$

Consider $\lambda_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ and $\lambda_2 = \frac{-1}{\sqrt{2}}$ we have that

$$w_{(N,e)}(B, C) \geq \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} N\left(\Re\left(e^{i\theta}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(B - C)\right)\right)\right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} w_N(B - C).$$

Hence the first result is proved.

Replacing B, C by $B + C$ and $B - C$ respectively in Theorem 2.4(b) and using Proposition 2.3 we get desire second inequality. \square

Corollary 2.8. *Let $B, C \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be any two self adjoint operator. Then*

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \max \{N(B + C), N(B - C)\} \leq w_{(N,e)}(B, C) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{N^2(B + C) + N^2(B - C)}.$$

Now, if we consider $B = T$ and $C = T^*$ in Theorem 2.7, we get the following inequality.

Corollary 2.9. *Let $T \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$, then*

$$\frac{1}{2} \max \{w_N(T + T^*), w_N(T - T^*)\} \leq w_N(T) \leq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{w_N^2(T + T^*) + w_N^2(T - T^*)}.$$

Remark 2.10. If we replace B, C by $\Re T, \Im T$ respectively, for any $T \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$ in the above Theorem 2.7, we have

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \max \{N(\Re T + \Im T), N(\Re T - \Im T)\} \leq w_N(T) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{N^2(\Re T + \Im T) + N^2(\Re T - \Im T)}.$$

Next lower bound for $w_{(N,e)}(B, C)$ reads as follows.

Theorem 2.11. Let $B, C \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$, then

$$\frac{1}{2} w_N(B + e^{i\theta} C) + \frac{1}{2} |w_N(B) - w_N(C)| \leq w_{(N,e)}(B, C),$$

holds for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. It follows from Theorem 2.4 that,

$$\begin{aligned} w_{(N,e)}(B, C) &\geq \max \{w_N(B), w_N(C)\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (w_N(B) + w_N(C)) + \frac{1}{2} |w_N(B) - w_N(C)| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} w_N(B + e^{i\theta} C) + \frac{1}{2} |w_N(B) - w_N(C)| \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 2.12. (i) Clearly, from the bound in Theorem 2.11 we say that if $w_{(N,e)}(B, C) = \frac{1}{2} w_N(B + e^{i\theta} C)$ then $w_N(B) = w_N(C)$. By considering $C = B$ we conclude that converse is not true.

(ii) Replacing B by $\Re(T)$ and C by $\Im(T)$ in Theorem 2.11 we get the following lower bound for the numerical radius of $T \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$:

$$w_N(T) \geq \frac{1}{2} N(\Re(T) + e^{i\theta} \Im(T)) + \frac{1}{2} |N(\Re T) - N(\Im T)|.$$

(iii) Replacing B by T and C by T^* in Theorem 2.11 we get the following lower bound for the numerical radius of $T \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$:

$$w_N(T) \geq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} w_N(T + e^{i\theta} T^*). \quad (2.3)$$

We next obtain the following inequality.

To proof our next theorem we need following definition.

Definition 2.13. A norm $N(\cdot)$ on $\mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is an algebra norm if

$$N(AB) \leq N(A)N(B),$$

for every $A, B \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$.

Theorem 2.14. *Let $N(\cdot)$ is a algebra norm, self adjoint and $B, C \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$, then*

$$\frac{1}{8}N(C^*C + B^*B) + \frac{1}{2} \max \{w_N(B), w_N(C)\} |w_N(B + C) - w_N(B - C)| \leq w_{(N,e)}^2(B, C).$$

Proof. It follows from Theorem 2.7 that

$$\begin{aligned} w_{(N,e)}^2(B, C) &\geq \frac{1}{2} \max \{w_N^2(B + C), w_N^2(B - C)\} \\ &= \frac{1}{4} (w_N^2(B + C) + w_N^2(B - C) + |w_N^2(B + C) - w_N^2(B - C)|) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{16} (N^2(B + C) + N^2(B - C)) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} (w_N(B + C) + w_N(B - C)) |w_N(B + C) - w_N(B - C)| \\ &\quad (\text{because } w_N(B) \geq \frac{1}{2}N(B)) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{16} (N((B + C)(B + C)^*) + N((B - C)(B - C)^*)) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} (w_N(B + C) + w_N(B - C)) |w_N(B + C) - w_N(B - C)| \\ &\quad (\text{because } N(\cdot) \text{ is algebra norm on } \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{16} (N((B + C)(B + C)^*) + N((B - C)(B - C)^*)) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} w_N((B + C) + (B - C)) |w_N(B + C) - w_N(B - C)| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{16} (N((B + C)(B + C)^* + (B - C)(B - C)^*)) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} w_N(B) |w_N(B + C) - w_N(B - C)| \\ &= \frac{1}{8} N(BB^* + CC^*) + \frac{1}{2} w_N(B) |w_N(B + C) - w_N(B - C)|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$w_{(N,e)}^2(B, C) \geq \frac{1}{8} N(BB^* + CC^*) + \frac{1}{2} w_N(B) |w_N(B + C) - w_N(B - C)|. \quad (2.4)$$

Now interchanging B and C in (2.4), we have that

$$w_{(N,e)}^2(B, C) \geq \frac{1}{8} N(BB^* + CC^*) + \frac{1}{2} w_N(C) |w_N(B + C) - w_N(B - C)|. \quad (2.5)$$

Therefore, the desire inequality follows by combining the inequalities in (2.4) and (2.5). \square

Following Theorem 2.14, $w_{(N,e)}^2(B, C) = \frac{1}{8} N(BB^* + CC^*)$ implies $w_N(B + C) = w_N(B - C)$. But, by considering $C = 0$, we conclude that the converse part is not true.

The following corollary is an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.14 assuming B and C to be self adjoint operators.

Corollary 2.15. *Let $N(\cdot)$ is a algebra norm, self adjoint and $B, C \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be self adjoint, then*

$$\frac{1}{8}N(C^2 + B^2) + \frac{1}{2} \max \{N(B), N(C)\} |N(B + C) - N(B - C)| \leq w_{(N,e)}^2(B, C).$$

In particular, by considering $B = \Re T$ and $C = \Im T$ in Corollary 2.15 we obtain the following upper bounds for $w_N(T)$.

Corollary 2.16. *Let $N(\cdot)$ is a algebra norm, self adjoint and $T \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$, then*

$$\frac{1}{16}N(T^*T + TT^*) + \frac{1}{2} \max \{N(\Re T), N(\Im T)\} |N(\Re T + \Im T) - N(\Re T - \Im T)| \leq w_N^2(T).$$

Now, if we consider $B = T$ and $C = T^*$ in Theorem 2.14, we get the following inequality.

Corollary 2.17. *Let $N(\cdot)$ is a algebra norm, self adjoint and $T \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$, then*

$$\frac{1}{16}N(T^*T + TT^*) + \frac{1}{2}w_N(T)|N(\Re T) - N(\Im T)| \leq w_N^2(T).$$

Replacing B by $B + C$ and C by $B - C$ in Theorem 2.14 and using the Proposition 2.3 we have the following bounds for $w_{(N,e)}(B, C)$.

Corollary 2.18. *Let $N(\cdot)$ is a algebra norm, self adjoint and $B, C \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$, then*

$$\frac{1}{8}N(C^*C + B^*B) + \frac{1}{2} \max \{w_N(B + C), w_N(B - C)\} |w_N(B) - w_N(C)| \leq w_{(N,e)}^2(B, C).$$

3. HILBERT-SCHMIDT EUCLIDEAN OPERATOR RADIUS INEQUALITIES

In this section, we study the norm $w_{(N,e)}(\cdot, \cdot)$ when $N(\cdot)$ is the Hilbert-Schmidt norm. Recall that an operator $T \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is said to belong to the Hilbert-Schmidt class C_2 if $\sum_{i,j=1}^{\infty} |\langle Te_i, e_j \rangle|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \|Te_i\|^2$ is finite for some (hence, for any) orthonormal basis $\{e_i\}_1^{\infty}$. For $T \in C_2$, let $\|A\|_2 = (\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \|Te_i\|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ be the Hilbert-Schmidt norm of T . Note that for $T \in C_2$, $\|T\|_2^2 = \text{tr}(T^*T)$.

When $N(\cdot)$ is the Hilbert-Schmidt norm $\|\cdot\|_2$, the norm $w_N(\cdot)$ is denote as $w_2(\cdot)$ and the norm $w_{(N,e)}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is denoted by $w_{(2,e)}(\cdot, \cdot)$ and is defined by

$$w_{(2,e)}(B, C) = \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \|\Re(e^{i\theta}(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C))\|_2,$$

for every $B, C \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and called it Hilbert-Schmidt Euclidean operator radius.

Now we proof some bounds of Hilbert-Schmidt Euclidean operator radius.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $B, C \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Then*

$$w_{(2,e)}^2(B, C) \geq \frac{1}{4} (|tr(B^2) + tr(C^2) + 2tr(BC)|) \\ + \frac{1}{4} (\|B\|_2^2 + \|C\|_2^2 + 2Re(tr(BC^*))),$$

where $Re(z)$ is the real part of $z \in \mathbb{C}$.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} & w_{2,e}^2(B, C) \\ &= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \|\Re e^{i\theta}(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C)\|_2^2 \\ &= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} tr(\Re(e^{i\theta}(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C))^2) \\ &= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} tr\left[\frac{1}{2}\Re(e^{2i\theta}(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C)^2)\right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} (|\lambda_1|^2 BB^* + |\lambda_1|^2 B^* B + |\lambda_2|^2 CC^* + |\lambda_2|^2 C^* C) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} (2\Re(\lambda_1 \bar{\lambda}_2 BC^*) + 2\Re(\lambda_1 \bar{\lambda}_2 C^* B)) \\ &= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{2} \Re(e^{2i\theta} tr(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C)^2) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} (|\lambda_1|^2 \|B\|_2^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \|C\|_2^2) + \frac{1}{2} tr(\Re(\lambda_1 \bar{\lambda}_2 BC^*)) + \frac{1}{2} tr(\Re(\lambda_1 \bar{\lambda}_2 C^* B)) \\ &= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \frac{1}{2} |tr(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C)^2| \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} (|\lambda_1|^2 \|B\|_2^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \|C\|_2^2) + \frac{1}{2} tr(\Re(\lambda_1 \bar{\lambda}_2 BC^*)) + \frac{1}{2} tr(\Re(\lambda_1 \bar{\lambda}_2 C^* B)) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4} (|tr((B + C)^2)| + \|B\|_2^2 + \|C\|_2^2 + Re(tr(BC^*)) + Re(tr(C^* B))), \\ &\quad (\text{where } Re(z) \text{ is the real part of } z \in \mathbb{C}). \\ &= \frac{1}{4} (|tr(B^2) + tr(C^2) + 2tr(BC)| + \|B\|_2^2 + \|C\|_2^2 + 2Re(tr(BC^*))) \end{aligned}$$

□

The following corollaries are the immediate consequence of the above Theorem 3.1.

Replacing B by $B + C$ and C by $B - C$ in Theorem 3.1 and using the Proposition 2.3 we have the following bounds for $w_{2,e}(B, C)$.

Corollary 3.2. *Let $B, C \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} w_{(2,e)}^2(B, C) &\geq \frac{1}{8} (|tr((B+C)^2) + tr((B-C)^2) + 2tr((B+C)(B-C))|) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{8} (\|B+C\|_2^2 + \|B-C\|_2^2) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} Re(tr((B+C)(B-C)^*)), \end{aligned}$$

where $Re(z)$ is the real part of $z \in \mathbb{C}$.

Now, if we consider $B = T$ and $C = T$ in Theorem 3.1, and using the Proposition 2.3 we have the following bounds for $w_2(T)$.

Corollary 3.3. *Let $T \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Then*

$$w_2^2(T) \geq \frac{1}{2} \|T\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} |tr(T^2)|.$$

Theorem 3.4. *Let $B, C \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Then*

$$w_{(2,e)}^2(B, C) \leq \frac{1}{2} (\max\{|tr(B^2)|, |tr(C^2)|\} + |tr(BC)| + \max\{\|B\|_2^2, \|C\|_2^2\} + |tr(BC^*)|).$$

Proof. It follows from Theorem 3.1 that

$$\begin{aligned}
& w_{(2,e)}^2(B, C) \\
&= \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \left[\frac{1}{2} |tr(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C)|^2 + \frac{1}{2} (|\lambda_1|^2 \|B\|_2^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \|C\|_2^2) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} tr(\Re(\lambda_1 \bar{\lambda}_2 BC^*)) + \frac{1}{2} tr(\Re(\lambda_1 \bar{\lambda}_2 C^* B)) \right] \\
&\leq \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \left[\frac{1}{2} |tr(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C)|^2 + \frac{1}{2} (|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2) \max(\|B\|_2^2, \|C\|_2^2) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} Re(\lambda_1 \bar{\lambda}_2 tr(BC^*)) + \frac{1}{2} Re(\lambda_1 \bar{\lambda}_2 tr(C^* B)) \right] \\
&\leq \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} \left[\frac{1}{2} |tr(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C)|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \max(\|B\|_2^2, \|C\|_2^2) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} |\lambda_1| |\lambda_2| (|tr(BC^*)| + |tr(C^* B)|) \right] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} |tr(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C)|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \max(\|B\|_2^2, \|C\|_2^2) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} (|\lambda_1| |\lambda_2| (|tr(BC^*)| + |tr(C^* B)|)) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} |tr(\lambda_1 B + \lambda_2 C)|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \max(\|B\|_2^2, \|C\|_2^2) + \frac{1}{2} |tr(BC^*)|. \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} |tr((\lambda_1)^2 B^2) + tr((\lambda_2)^2 C^2) + 2\lambda_1 \lambda_2 tr(BC)| \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \max(\|B\|_2^2, \|C\|_2^2) + \frac{1}{2} |tr(BC^*)|. \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \sup_{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \leq 1} (\max\{|tr(B^2)|, |tr(C^2)|\} + 2|\lambda_1 \lambda_2| |tr(BC)|) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \max(\|B\|_2^2, \|C\|_2^2) + \frac{1}{2} |tr(BC^*)|. \\
&= \frac{1}{2} (\max\{|tr(B^2)|, |tr(C^2)|\} + |tr(BC)| + \max\{\|B\|_2^2, \|C\|_2^2\} + |tr(BC^*)|).
\end{aligned}$$

□

The following corollaries are the immediate consequence of the above Theorem 3.4.

Now, if we consider $B = T$ and $C = T$ in Theorem 3.4, and using the Proposition 2.3 we have the following bounds for $w_2(T)$.

Corollary 3.5. *Let $T \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Then*

$$w_2^2(T) \leq \frac{1}{2} \|T\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} |tr(T^2)|.$$

It follows from Corollary 3.3 and Corollary 3.5 that

$$w_2^2(T) = \frac{1}{2} \|T\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} |\operatorname{tr}(T^2)|,$$

which is also proved in [1].

Competing Interests.

On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author declares that there is no financial or non-financial interests that are directly or indirectly related to the work submitted for publication.

REFERENCES

1. A. Abu-Omar and F. Kittaneh, A generalization of the numerical radius, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 569(2019), 323–334.
2. P. Bhunia, S. Jana, K. Paul: Estimates of Euclidean numerical radius for block matrices; *Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. (Math. Sci.)* 134(20)(2024)[∞].
3. P. Bhunia, S. S. Dragomir, M. S. Moslehian, K. Paul, *Lecture on Numerical Radius Inequalities*, Infosys Science Foundation Series in Mathematical Science, Springer, 2022.
4. S.S. Dragomir, Some inequalities for the Euclidean operator radius of two operators in Hilbert spaces, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 419 (2006), 256–264.
5. S. Jana, P. Bhunia, K. Paul; Refinemenas of generalized Euclidean operaaor radius inequaliaies of 2-auple operaaors; *Filomat*, 38:8 (2024), 2587–2599.
6. S. Jana, P. Bhunia, K. Paul; Euclidean operaaor radius inequaliaies of d -auple operaaor and operaaor maarices; *Math. Slovaca*; 74(4) (2024); 947–962.
7. S. Jana, P. Bhunia, K. Paul; Euclidean operaaor radius inequaliaies of a pair of bounded linear operaaor and aheir applicaaions, *Bull. Braz. Math. Soc. (N.S)* 54 (2023), 14 pp.
8. F. Kittaneh, Numerical radius inequalities for Hilbert space operators, *Studia Math.*, 168 (2005), no. 1, 73–80.
9. M.S. Moslehian, M. Sattari and K. Shebrawi, Extensions of Euclidean operator radius inequalities, *Math. Scand.*, 120 (2017), no. 1, 129–144.
10. G. Popescu, Unitary invariants in multivariable operator theory, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 200 (2009), no. 941, vi+91 pp. ISBN: 978-0-8218-4396-3
11. S. Sahoo, N.C. Rout and M. Sababheh, Some extended numerical radius inequalities, *Linear Multilinear Algebra*, 69 (2021), no. 5, 907–920.
12. T. Yamazaki, On upper and lower bounds for the numerical radius and an equality condition, *Studia Math.*, 178 (2007), no. 1, 83–89.

¹ DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MAHISADAL GIRLS' COLLEGE, PURBA MEDINIPUR 721628, WEST BENGAL, INDIA

Email address: janasuva8@gmail.com