

Simultaneous Versions of Wielandt's Positivity Theorem (Joint work with Gordon MacDonald and Alexey Popov)

Today "positive" or "nonnegative"
operator shall mean an operator on a
function space that takes nonnegative
functions to themselves.

We write $T \succeq 0$ if T is a
nonnegative operator.†

$$T \succeq S \text{ means } T - S \succeq 0$$

† unless I forget and write $T \geq 0$.

In finite dimensions we fix a basis and consider matrices of operators.


$M \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$ is nonnegative if all its entries are nonnegative. If

$M = (\lambda_{ij})$, then $|M| = (|\lambda_{ij}|)$

by definition.

Wielandt (1950):

Let M be an indecomposable matrix.

(There is no permutation matrix p such that $p^{-1}Mp$ has the form .)

If $\rho(M) = \rho(|M|)$, then M is "effectively positivisable," that is,

\exists diagonal unitary D and $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$ such that $\lambda \bar{D}^{-1}MD = |M|$.

We'll consider operators on $\mathcal{X} = L^2(X, \mu)$
 (Almost everything is okay for L^p with $1 < p < \infty$.)

X Hausdorff-Lindelof

μ σ -finite regular Borel measure on X .

Def. A standard subspace (\equiv lattice ideal)
 of \mathcal{X} is any subspace of the form

$$\mathcal{X}_0 = \{f \in \mathcal{X} : f = 0 \text{ a.e. outside } X_0\},$$

where X_0 is a Borel subset of X .

We can identify \mathcal{X}_0 with $L^2(X_0, \mu|_{X_0})$.

A set of operators, nonnegative or not, is
 called decomposable iff every member
 of it leaves a fixed, nontrivial, standard
 subspace invariant.

It follows from Perron-Frobenius and De Pagter results that

if $K \geq 0$ is an indecomposable compact operator on $\mathcal{X} = L^2(X, \mu)$, then there is a unique idempotent $E \geq 0$ of finite rank r such that

$$E = \lim_m \left(\frac{K}{\rho(K)} \right)^{rm}$$

where $\rho(K)$ is the spectral radius of K .

We call E the Perron-Frobenius idempotent of K . If $r > 1$, then relative to a standard decomposition of $\mathcal{X} = L^p(X_1, \mu|_{X_1}) + \dots + L^p(X_r, \mu|_{X_r})$

$$K = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & K_r \\ K_1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & K_2 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & 0 & K_3 & \dots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \vdots & \vdots & \dots & K_{r-1} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } E = \begin{bmatrix} E_1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & E_2 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & E_r \end{bmatrix}$$

Wielandt (1950): Let M be an indecomposable matrix.

(You can't permute the basis to get a form

0	

 for M .)

If $\rho(M) = \rho(|M|)$, then M is "effectively positivisable", i.e., there is a diagonal (unitary) D and $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$ such that $\lambda D^{-1} M D = |M|$.

Bernik-Marcoux-R (2012): If K is a regular operator on $L^p(X, \mu)$ with $|K|$ power-compact and $\rho(K) = \rho(|K|)$, then there is $f \in L^\infty(X, \mu)$ with $|f|=1$ a.e. and $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$ such that

$$\lambda M_f^{-1} K M_f = |K|.$$

$|T|$?

$T \in \mathcal{B}(L^p(X, \mu))$ is real if it takes real-valued functions to themselves.

A real T is called regular if

$$T = R - S, \quad T \geq 0, \quad S \geq 0.$$

General T can be expressed as $T_1 + iT_2$, with T_1 and T_2 real. T is called regular if T_1 and T_2 are both regular.

Then the modulus of T can be defined as the nonnegative operator

$|T|$ given by

$$|T|f = \sup_{|g| \leq f} |Tg|$$

for $f \geq 0$.

\mathcal{S} will be a multiplicative semigroup of regular operators on $L^p(X, \mu)$.

We'll also assume it is positive-homogeneous: $\alpha S \in \mathcal{S}$ for $S \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+$.

Theorem 1. If

- (1) $|S|$ is compact for all $S \in \mathcal{S}$,
- (2) every nonzero $S \in \mathcal{S}$ is indecomposable,
- (3) $\rho(S) = \rho(|S|)$ for all $S \in \mathcal{S}$, and
- (4) $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ contains no zero divisors,

then there is $\varphi \in L^\infty(X, \mu)$, $|\varphi(x)| = 1$ a.e.

such that for all $S \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$\lambda_S M_\varphi^{-1} S M_\varphi = |S|.$$

($\lambda_S \in \mathbb{T}$ may of course depend on S .)

Translation into f.d.

Theorem. If \mathcal{S} is a positive-homogeneous semigroup $\subseteq M_n(\mathbb{C})$ such that

- (i) every nonzero $s \in \mathcal{S}$ is indecomposable,
- (ii) $\rho(s) = \rho(|s|)$ for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, and
- (iii) $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ contains no zero divisors,

then there is a diagonal unitary matrix D such that

$$\lambda_s \overline{D}^{-1} s D = |s|$$

for every $s \in \mathcal{S}$. $|\lambda_s| = 1 \forall s \in \mathcal{S}$.

9
None of the conditions are unnecessary.

For example, consider (iii):

$$\text{Let } E = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad F = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} \\ -\frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Choose α, β in $(0, 1)$ with

$$\alpha^n \neq \beta^m \text{ for all } m, n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Consider the positive-homogeneous semigroup \mathcal{S} generated by

$$S = E + \alpha F \quad \text{and} \quad T = F + \beta E.$$

A typical member of \mathcal{S} is

$$S^n T^m = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \beta^m + \alpha^n & \beta^m - \alpha^n \\ \beta^m - \alpha^n & \beta^m + \alpha^n \end{pmatrix}.$$

Every member is indecomposable.

$$\beta^m - \alpha^n > 0 \Rightarrow S^n T^m \succeq 0$$

$$\beta^m - \alpha^n < 0 \Rightarrow D^{-1}(S^n T^m)D \succeq 0 \text{ with } D = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\rho(S^n T^m) = \rho(|S^n T^m|).$$

Another example to show that indecomposability of \mathcal{S} as a whole is not enough:

$$\text{Let } P = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ 0 & \dots & \dots & \dots & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then

$$\{ \alpha D P^k : k \in \mathbb{N}, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+, D \text{ diagonal} \}$$

is an indecomposable, positive-homogeneous semigroup with no zero divisors.

Note $\bar{\mathcal{S}} = \mathcal{S}$, and $\varphi(s) = \varphi(|s|)$

for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$. But there are decomposable members. \mathcal{S} cannot be positivised:

Just think of all the diagonal members!

Some points of the proof of Theorem 1:

For $S \neq 0$ in \mathcal{S} , the Perron-Frobenius idempotent

$$E = \lim_m \left(\frac{|S|}{\rho(S)} \right)^{rm}$$

has to have rank $r=1$. Otherwise, $|S|^r$ and thus S^r are block-diagonal $\Rightarrow S^r$ is decomposable, contradiction.

Use extended Wielandt result on S :

$\exists D$ with $|S| = \lambda_s D S D^{-1}$. So

$$F = \lim_m \left(\frac{S}{\rho(S)} \right)^{rm}$$

is also rank-one. Show that it is indecomposable.

Easily verified: the Wielandt D for F is the same^{††} as that for S itself.

†† okay, except for a scalar coefficient.

So the problem of showing that the D_s for all S_s are the same (which completes the proof) reduces to the case where the rank is one. Here we use the hypothesis $EF \neq 0, FE \neq 0$ (where E and F are the rank-one idempotents in \mathcal{S}).

Let us look at the (quite typical) finite-dimensional case:

All entries of E and F are nonzero by indecomposability. Use Wielandt's theorem on E : get diagonal D such that $D^{-1}ED = |E|$. Apply $D^{-1}(\cdot)D$ to all of \mathcal{S} to assume with no loss of generality that $E \geq 0$.

so $E = UV^*$, $F = XY^*$, where

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} u_1 \\ \vdots \\ u_n \end{bmatrix}, \quad V = \begin{bmatrix} v_1 \\ \vdots \\ v_n \end{bmatrix}, \quad X = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_n \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad Y = \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ \vdots \\ y_n \end{bmatrix}$$

and $u_i > 0$, $v_i > 0$, $|x_i| > 0$, $|y_i| > 0 \quad \forall i$

No zero divisors $\implies v^*x \neq 0$, $y^*u \neq 0$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Now } |\text{tr } UV^*XY^*| &= |\text{tr}(EF)| = \rho(EF) = \rho(|EF|) \\ &= \text{tr}(|EF|) = \text{tr}(|UV^*XY^*|). \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{so } |v^*x| \cdot |\text{tr } UY^*| = |v^*x| \text{tr} |UY^*|$$

$$\text{or } |\text{tr } UY^*| = \text{tr} |UY^*|.$$

$$\text{This means } \left| \sum_{i=1}^n u_i \bar{y}_i \right| = \sum_{i=1}^n u_i |y_i|,$$

which implies that $\exists a$ with $y = a|y|$.

Similarly, using FE instead of EF , we get b with $x = b|x|$ and $xy^* = ab|x||y|^*$.

Thus F is already effectively positive. \square

What about the more desirable hypothesis of indecomposability for \mathcal{S} (and not for each member)?

Theorem 2. If $\mathcal{S} = \overline{\mathcal{S}}$ is a convex, positive-homogeneous, indecomposable $\frac{1}{2}$ group of regular operators such that

(1) $|S|$ is compact and $\rho(S) = \rho(|S|)$ for all $S \in \mathcal{S}$, and

(2) \mathcal{S} has no zero divisors, then there exists a unitary M_φ , $\varphi \in L^\infty(X, \mu)$, such that for all $S \in \mathcal{S}$

$$S = \lambda_S M_\varphi^{-1} |S| M_\varphi$$

with some $\lambda_S \in \mathbb{T}$.

Indication of proof for the discrete case $l^2(\mathbb{N})$ or \mathbb{C}^n

First,

an easy lemma needed in the proof:

If \mathcal{S} is a closed convex, positive-homogeneous set of operators on $l^2(\mathbb{N})$, then there is

$T \in \mathcal{S}$ with

$$\text{supp}(T) = \bigcup_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \text{supp } S.$$

(The (i, j) entry in the matrix of T is zero if and only if every $S \in \mathcal{S}$ has its (i, j) entry = 0.)

Five steps in the proof:

- (1) By the lemma, \exists an indecomposable member S_0 with maximal support.
- (2) These members form a dense set in \mathcal{S} :
 Given $S \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, the uncountable set $\{S + \lambda S_0 : |\lambda| < \varepsilon\}$ contains a member with support equal to $\text{supp } S_0$.
- (3) The Perron-Frobenius idempotents of these members have rank one — this time, because we look at the block-monomial form, and if $r > 1$, then $T^2 \neq 0$

$$\text{supp } T^2 \not\subseteq \text{supp } T,$$
 a contradiction. so $r = 1$.

(4) These P.-F. idempotents generate a subsemigroup \mathcal{S}_1 of \mathcal{S} in which every member has rank one. (There are no zero divisors in \mathcal{S} .) So Theorem 1 is applicable to \mathcal{S}_1 : One fixed M_φ does the job for all of \mathcal{S}_1 .

(5) Every member of the dense set of maximal-support members of \mathcal{S} has the same M_φ as its P.-F. idempotent (in \mathcal{S}_1)
 $\therefore \mathcal{S}$ is positivised by M_φ . \square