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Abstract

The weak hyponormalities of Hilbert space operators make important roles to study the gaps of operators. In particular, $p$-hyponormality, $p$-paranormality, and absolute $p$-paranormality has been considered to detect gaps of operators. But examples of those operators with weak hyponormality are not developed well still. In this note we consider rank-one perturbation of weighted shifts to detect examples for those operators and characterize weak hyponormalities of those operators. In addition, we discuss some related examples being distinct those weak hyponormalities.

1. Introduction. This is based on the joint work with G. Exner, I. Jung, and M. Lee([EJLL]) and was talked at the 2008 RIMS conference: Inequalities on linear operators and its applications, which was held at Kyoto University on January 30-February 1 in 2008.

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a separable, infinite dimensional, complex Hilbert space and let $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be the algebra of all bounded linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$. The study of operators with weak hyponormality has been discussed for recent 30 years (see [Fur]). An operator $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is said to be $p$-hyponormal $(0 < p < \infty)$ if $(T^*T)^p \geq (TT^*)^p$. In particular, if $p = \frac{1}{2}$, then $T$ is semi-hyponormal ([Xi]). And $T$ is said to be $\infty$-hyponormal if $T$ is $p$-hyponormal for all $p \in (0, \infty)$ ([MS]). Recall that an operator $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ has a unique polar decomposition $T = U|T|$, where $|T| = (T^*T)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $U$ is a partial isometry satisfying $\ker U = \ker |T| = \ker T$ and $\ker U^* = \ker T^*$. For each $p > 0$, an operator $T$ is absolute-$p$-paranormal if $|||T||^p T x|| \geq ||T x||^{p+1}$ for all unit vector $x \in \mathcal{H}$. Every absolute-$q$-paranormal operator is absolute-$p$-paranormal for $q \leq p$ ([Fur]). We call simply absolute-1-paranormal as paranormal. And $T$ is $p$-paranormal if $|||T||^p U |T|^p x|| \geq |||T||^p x||^2$ for all unit vectors $x \in \mathcal{H}$. In particular, the 1-paranormality is referred to as the paranormality. Every $q$-paranormal operator is $p$-paranormal for $q \leq p$ ([Fuj]). The implications among classes of operators mentioned above are as follows:

- $p$-hyponormal $\Rightarrow$ $p$-paranormal $\Rightarrow$ absolute-$p$-paranormal $(0 < p < 1)$;

\*2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 47A50, 47B20; Secondary 47A55.
\*Key words and phrases: rank-one perturbation, $p$-hyponormal operators, absolute $p$-paranormal operators.
• $p$-hyponormal ⇒ absolute-$p$-paranormal ⇒ $p$-paranormal ($p > 1$).

Seeing that examples for those operators are not abundant, it is worthwhile to develop examples to distinguish those classes. In [JLP] and [JLL] block matrix operators were considered to classify the above operators, but it was proved in their models that $p$-paranormality is equivalent to absolute-$p$-paranormality. Also, models of composition operators were discussed in [JLP] and [BJ] to classify those operators with weak hyponormality, but it also was shown that two such weak hyponormalities are equivalent ([BJ]). However, our rank-one perturbation models classify completely such two weak hyponormalities. In this paper we discuss rank-one perturbations of weighted shifts.

The paper consists of three sections. In Section 2 we characterize quasinormality and $p$-hyponormality for rank-one perturbation of a weighted shift, and obtain examples being distinct the classes of $p$-hyponormal operators. In Section 3, we also characterize absolute $p$-paranormal and $p$-paranormal operators, which provides examples being distinct the classes of such operators. Especially, we discuss via numerical table that the absolute $p$-paranormality is different from the $p$-paranormality as we said above.

Some of the calculations in this paper were obtained through computer experiments using the software tool Mathematica [Wol].

2. $p$-hyponormality

Let $W_\alpha$ be a weighted shift with weight sequence $\alpha = \{\alpha_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$ of nonnegative real numbers. Let $\{e_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$ be an orthonormal basis for $\mathcal{H} = \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_+)$.

Obviously, $W_\alpha$ is hyponormal if and only if $W_\alpha$ is $p$-hyponormal for any $p \in (0, \infty)$. In particular, $W_\alpha$ is normal if and only if $\alpha_n = 0$ for all $(n \geq 0)$, which is equivalent to that $W_\alpha$ is quasinormal. Hence the weighted shifts can not separate classes of $p$-hyponormal operators. But rank-one perturbations of weighted shifts with a positive real parameter separate the classes of $p$-hyponormal operators positively.

2.1. Characterizations of quasinormality. We consider a rank-one perturbation of weighted shift

$$ T(k, t) := W_\alpha + t(e_k \otimes e_k), \quad k \in \mathbb{N} \quad (2.1) $$

with parameter $t \in [0, \infty)$.

Proposition 2.1. Let $T := T(k, t)$ be as in (2.1). Then $T(k, t)$ is quasinormal if and only if it holds that

i) if $\alpha_k \neq 0$, then $\alpha_i = 0$ $(0 \leq i \leq k - 1)$ and $\alpha_i = \sqrt{\alpha_k^2 + t^2}$ $(i \geq k + 1)$;

ii) if $\alpha_k = 0$, then $\alpha_i = 0$ $(0 \leq i \leq k)$ and $\alpha_i = t$ $(i \geq k + 1)$.

2.2. Characterizations for $p$-hyponormality.

Theorem 2.2. Let $T(k, t)$ be as in (2.1). Suppose that $p \in (0, \infty)$. Then

(i) $T(0, t)$ is $p$-hyponormal if and only if $\alpha_1^2 \geq \alpha_0^2 + t^2$ and $\alpha_{i+1} \geq \alpha_i$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$;

(ii) $T(k, t)$ is $p$-hyponormal if and only if $\alpha_i \leq \alpha_{i+1}$ $(0 \leq i \leq k - 3)$, $\alpha_{i+k+1} \geq \alpha_{i+k}$ $(i \in \mathbb{N})$ and it holds that:

$$ \delta_{11} > 0, \delta_{11} \delta_{22} - \delta_{12}^2 > 0, \text{ and } \delta_{33} (\delta_{11} \delta_{22} - \delta_{12}^2) - \delta_{11} \delta_{23}^2 \geq 0. \quad (2.2) $$
\[ \delta_{11} = -\alpha_{k-2}^2 + \{(t^2 + \alpha_k^2 - \alpha_{k-1}^2 + \gamma_k)\lambda_k^p + (\alpha_{k-1}^2 - t^2 - \alpha_k^2 + \gamma_k)\mu_k^p\} / (2\gamma_k); \]
\[ \delta_{12} = \delta_{21} = \delta_{22} = \frac{\alpha_k^2 - \alpha_{k-1}^2}{2\gamma_k}; \]
\[ \delta_{23} = \delta_{32} = \frac{\lambda_k - \mu_k}{\gamma_k}; \]
\[ \delta_{33} = \frac{(t^2 + \alpha_k^2 - \gamma_k)^2}{2\gamma_k}; \]
\[ \lambda_k = \frac{t^2 + \alpha_k^2 + \alpha_{k-1}^2 - \gamma_k}{2}; \mu_k = \frac{t^2 + \alpha_k^2 + \alpha_{k-1}^2 + \gamma_k}{2}; \]
\[ \gamma_k = \left\{ t^2 + \alpha_k^2 + \alpha_{k-1}^2 \right\}^{1/2} \]

2.3. Examples for distinction of p-hyponormalities. Let \( W_{\alpha} \) be a weighted shift with weight sequence \( \alpha \) satisfying \( \alpha_n = 0 \) \( (0 \leq n \leq k-2), \alpha_{k-1} = \sqrt{x}, \alpha_k = 1, \alpha_n = 2(n \geq k+1) \).

Let \( T := T(k, t) = W_{\alpha} + te_k \otimes e_k \) for \( 0 \leq x \leq 1, t \in [0, \infty), \gamma = \sqrt{(1+x+t^2)^2 - 4x} \).

Applying Theorem 2.2 with \( x, t, \gamma \), we obtain that \( (TT)^p \geq (TT^*)^p \) if and only if \( A^p \geq B^p \) for \( 0 < p < \infty \), where
\[ A = \begin{pmatrix} x & t\sqrt{x} & 0 \\ 0 & t^2 + x & t \\ 0 & 0 & 4 \end{pmatrix} \]
and
\[ B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & t^2 + x & t \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \]

To compute \( A^p \) and \( B^p \), first we find eigenvalues and eigenvectors of \( A \) and \( B \) so that we may have \( D = P^{-1}AP \) and \( E = Q^{-1}BQ \) in usual fashion; in fact, \( D = \text{Diag}\{\lambda, \mu, 4\}, E = \text{Diag}\{0, \lambda, \mu\}, \lambda = \frac{1}{2}(1+x+t^2-\gamma), \mu = \frac{1}{2}(1+x+t^2+\gamma) \), and
\[ P = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{x-t^2-1-\gamma}{2\sqrt{x}} & \frac{x-t^2+1+\gamma}{2\sqrt{x}} & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad Q = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{x+t^2-1-\gamma}{2t} & \frac{x+t^2-1+\gamma}{2t} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \]

By a direct computation, \( \Delta = A^p - B^p = (\delta_{ij})_{3 \times 3} \) with
\[ \delta_{11} = \frac{1}{2\gamma}\{\lambda^p(-x+t^2+1+\gamma) + \mu^p(x-t^2-1+\gamma)\}, \]
\[ \delta_{12} = \delta_{21} = \frac{\lambda^p - \mu^p}{\gamma}t\sqrt{x}, \mu_k = \frac{1}{2}(1-x)(\mu^p - \lambda^p), \]
\[ \delta_{23} = \delta_{32} = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda^p - \mu^p)t, \]
\[ \delta_{33} = 4^{p} - \frac{1}{4\gamma}\{\mu^p(1-x-t^2 + \gamma) + \lambda^p(x+t^2+1+\gamma)\}, \]
\[ \delta_{ij} = 0 \] otherwise.

And, we write \( d^{(i)} \) \( (i = 1, 2, 3) \) for the determinant of the \( i \times i \) upper left corner of the matrix \( \Delta \). Since \( x - t^2 - 1 + \gamma > 0 \) and \( 0 < \lambda < \mu, d^{(1)} = \delta_{11} > 0 \). By simple calculation, we obtain
\[ f_1(x, t, p) := \frac{2\gamma^2}{\mu^p - \lambda^p} \cdot d^{(2)} = \lambda^p \left[ 1 - \gamma(x-1) - 2x + x^2 + t^2 + xt^2 \right] - \mu^p \left[ 1 + \gamma(x-1) + x^2 + t^2 + x(t^2 - 2) \right]. \]

And by more computation, we obtain that \( d^{(3)} = \frac{(\mu^p - \lambda^p)}{4\gamma^3} f_2(x, t, p), \) where
\[ f_2(x, t, p) = 2(\lambda^p - \mu^p) t^2 \{ \mu^p(-1 + \gamma + x - t^2) + \lambda^p(1 + \gamma - x + t^2) \} + \{ 2\cdot 4^p \gamma + \mu^p(-1 - \gamma + x + t^2) - \lambda^p(-1 + \gamma + x + t^2) \} \times [2(\lambda^p - \mu^p)xt^2 + (1-x) \{ \mu^p(-1 + \gamma + x - t^2) + \lambda^p(1 + \gamma - x + t^2) \}]. \]

Since \( \mu > \lambda \), \( d^{(3)} \geq 0 \) if and only if \( f_2(x, t, p) \geq 0 \) for \( 0 \leq x \leq 1 \), \( t \in [0, \infty) \) and \( p > 0 \). Hence \( T \) is \( p \)-hyponormal if and only if \( f_1 > 0 \) and \( f_2 \geq 0 \). And we obtain the regions for \( p \)-hyponormalities in Figure 2.1.
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3. **Weak hyponormalities** There are several kinds of weak hyponormalities that are weaker than \( p \)-hyponormality, for examples, \( p \)-paranormality, absolute \( p \)-paranormality, \( p \)-paranormality, absolute \( p \)-paranormality, A(\( p \))-class, normaloid, and spectraloid. It is not known whether the \( p \)-paranormality is different from the absolute \( p \)-paranormality for each \( p \in (0, \infty) \setminus \{1\} \). In this section we discuss \( p \)-paranormal and absolute \( p \)-paranormal operators and continue Example 2.3 to discuss distinction between \( p \)-paranormality and absolute \( p \)-paranormality.

3.1. **Absolute \( p \)-paranormality.** Let \( T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}) \). Then it follows from [Fur, p.174] that \( T \) is absolute \( p \)-paranormal if and only if \( T^*(T^*T)^p T - (p+1)T^*T s^p + ps^{p+1} \geq 0 \) for all \( s \in \mathbb{R}_+ \).

**Theorem 3.1.** Let \( T = T(k, t) \) be as in (2.1). Suppose \( k \geq 2 \). Then the following assertions are equivalent:

(i) \( T \) is absolute \( p \)-paranormal;

(ii) \( \alpha_{n+1} \geq \alpha_n \), \( n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \setminus \{k - i : i = 0, 1, 2 \} \); and for all \( s \in \mathbb{R}_+ \),

\[
\Omega_k(s) := \begin{pmatrix} \omega_{11} & \phi_2 \alpha_{k-1} \alpha_k - \alpha_{k-2} & t\phi_2 \alpha_k - 2 \\ \phi_2 \alpha_{k-1} \alpha_k - 2 & \omega_{22} & t\alpha_{k-1}(\phi_3 - (p+1)s^p) \\ t\phi_2 \alpha_k - 2 & t\alpha_{k-1}(\phi_3 - (p+1)s^p) & \omega_{33} \end{pmatrix} \geq 0,
\]
where
\[
\begin{align*}
\omega_{11} &= \omega_{11}(p, t) = \phi_{1}\alpha_{k-1}^{2} - (p + 1)\alpha_{k-2}^{2}s^{p} + ps^{p+1}; \\
\omega_{22} &= \omega_{22}(p, t) = \phi_{2}\alpha_{k-1}^{2} - (p + 1)\alpha_{k-2}^{2}s^{p} + ps^{p+1}; \\
\omega_{33} &= \omega_{33}(p, t) = t^{2}\phi_{3} + \alpha_{k}^{2}\alpha_{k+1}^{2p} - (p + 1)s^{p}(t^{2} + \alpha_{k}^{2}) + ps^{p+1}; \\
\phi_{1} &= \phi_{1}(k, p) = (\lambda_{k}^{p} + \mu_{k}^{p})/2 + (\lambda_{k}^{p} - \mu_{k}^{p})(t^{2} - \alpha_{k-1}^{2} + \alpha_{k}^{2})/(2\gamma_{k}); \\
\phi_{2} &= \phi_{2}(k, p) = t\alpha_{k-1}(\mu_{k}^{p} - \lambda_{k}^{p})/\gamma_{k}; \\
\phi_{3} &= \phi_{3}(k, p) = (\lambda_{k}^{p} + \mu_{k}^{p})/2 - (\lambda_{k}^{p} - \mu_{k}^{p})(t^{2} - \alpha_{k-1}^{2} + \alpha_{k}^{2})/(2\gamma_{k}).
\end{align*}
\]

**Proposition 3.2.** Under the same notation with Theorem 3.1, it holds that
i) \(T(0, t)\) is absolute \(p\)-paranormal if and only if \(\alpha_{k}^{2} \geq t^{2} + \alpha_{0}^{2}\) and \(\alpha_{n+1} \geq \alpha_{n} (n \geq 1);\)
ii) \(T(1, t)\) is absolute \(p\)-paranormal if and only if \(\alpha_{n+1} \geq \alpha_{n} (n \geq 2)\) and for all \(s \in \mathbb{R}_{+},\)
\[
\begin{align*}
&\left(\alpha_{0}^{2}\delta - (p + 1)s^{p}\alpha_{0}^{2} + ps^{p+1} \quad t\alpha_{0}(\delta - (p + 1)s^{p}) \quad t^{2}\delta + \alpha_{1}^{2}\alpha_{2}^{2p} - (p + 1)s^{p}(t^{2} + \alpha_{1}^{2}) + ps^{p+1}\right) \geq 0,
\end{align*}
\]
where \(\delta = \phi_{3}(1, p)\).

The following remark comes immediately from Proposition 3.2 above.

**Remark 3.3.** \(T(0, t)\) is absolute paranormal if and only if \(T(0, t)\) is absolute \(p\)-paranormal for all [some] \(p \in (0, \infty).\)

3.2. \(p\)-paranormality. Let \(T = U|T| \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}).\) Then is follows from [YY, Proposition 3] that \(T\) is \(p\)-paranormal if and only if \(|T|^{p} U^{*} |T|^{p} U |T|^{p} - 2s |T|^{2p} + s^{2} \geq 0\) for all \(s \in \mathbb{R}_{+}.\) Let \(T(k, t)\) be as in (2.1) and let \(T(k, t) = U(k, t)|T(k, t)|\) be a polar decomposition. Then \(U(k, t)\) has the form such that the \((i + 1, i)\)-terms are \(1, \cdots, 1, F_{k}, 1, \cdots (k \geq 1),\) where \(F_{k}\) is \((k + 1, k)\) term of \(U(k, t)\) and
\[
F_{k} = \frac{1}{\alpha_{k-1}\alpha_{k}} \begin{pmatrix}
(\alpha_{k-1}\phi_{3}(k, \frac{1}{2}) - t\phi_{2}(k, \frac{1}{2})) & (t\phi_{1}(k, \frac{1}{2}) - \alpha_{k-1}\phi_{2}(k, \frac{1}{2})) \\
-\alpha_{k}\phi_{2}(k, \frac{1}{2}) & \alpha_{k}\phi_{1}(k, \frac{1}{2})
\end{pmatrix};
\]
and others are 0. In particular, \(U(0, t) = W_{\beta} + \frac{t}{\sqrt{\alpha_{0}^{2}}} e_{0} \otimes e_{0},\) where \(\beta : \beta_{0} = \frac{\alpha_{0}}{\sqrt{\alpha_{0}^{2}}}.\beta_{k} = 1 (k \geq 1).\) For brevity we write \(u_{ij}(k)\) is the \((i, j)\) term of \(F_{k}.\) By the similar method of Theorem 3.1 and the above characterization for \(p\)-paranormality, we obtain the following results, but we omit the detail proof here.

**Proposition 3.4.** Let \(T(k, t)\) be as in (2.1) and let \(u_{ij}\) be as above. Then
i) \(T(0, t)\) is \(p\)-paranormal if and only if \(\alpha_{n+1} \geq \alpha_{n} (n \geq 1)\) and \(\alpha_{1}^{2} \geq \alpha_{0}^{2} + t^{2};\)
ii) \(T(1, t)\) is \(p\)-paranormal if and only if \(\alpha_{n+1} \geq \alpha_{n} (n \geq 1)\) and, for all \(s \in \mathbb{R}_{+},\)
\[
\begin{align*}
&\left(\psi_{1} - 2\phi_{1}(1, p)s + s^{2} \quad \psi_{2} - 2\phi_{2}(1, p)s \quad \psi_{3} - 2\phi_{3}(1, p)s + s^{2}\right) \geq 0
\end{align*}
\]
with
\[
\begin{align*}
\psi_{1} &= \phi_{3}(1, p)[\phi_{1}(1, \frac{p}{2})u_{11}(1) + \phi_{2}(1, \frac{p}{2})u_{12}(1) + \phi_{3}(1, \frac{p}{2})u_{21}(1) + \phi_{4}(1, \frac{p}{2})u_{22}(1)]^{2}, \\
\psi_{2} &= \phi_{3}(1, p)[\phi_{1}(1, \frac{p}{2})u_{11}(1) + \phi_{2}(1, \frac{p}{2})u_{12}(1)][\phi_{2}(1, \frac{p}{2})u_{11}(1) + \phi_{3}(1, \frac{p}{2})u_{12}(1)] \\
&\quad + \phi_{3}(1, p)[\phi_{2}(1, \frac{p}{2})u_{21}(1) + \phi_{3}(1, \frac{p}{2})u_{22}(1)][\phi_{2}(1, \frac{p}{2})u_{21}(1) + \phi_{3}(1, \frac{p}{2})u_{22}(1)] \\
\psi_{3} &= \phi_{3}(1, p)[\phi_{2}(1, \frac{p}{2})u_{11}(1) + \phi_{3}(1, \frac{p}{2})u_{12}(1)]^{2} + \phi_{3}(1, \frac{p}{2})u_{21}(1) + \phi_{3}(1, \frac{p}{2})u_{22}(1)]^{2}.
\end{align*}
\]
The following remark follows immediately from Proposition 3.4 (i).

**Remark 3.5.** $T(0,t)$ is paranormal if and only if $T(0,t)$ is $p$-paranormal for all \([some] \ p \in (0,\infty)\).

**Theorem 3.6.** Let $T(k,t)$ be as in (2.1) and let $u_{ij}$ and $\phi_j$ be as above. Suppose $k \geq 2$. Then $T(k,t)$ is $p$-paranormal if and only if $\alpha_{n+1} \geq \alpha_n$ \((0 \leq n \leq k-3; \ n \geq k+1)\) and, for all $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$,

$$
\Psi_k := \begin{pmatrix}
\varphi_{11} - 2\alpha_{k-2}^{2p} s + s^2 & \varphi_{12} & \varphi_{13} \\
\varphi_{12} & \varphi_{22} - 2s\phi_1(p) + s^2 & \varphi_{23} - 2\phi_2(p)s \\
\varphi_{13} & \varphi_{23} - 2\phi_2(p)s & \varphi_{33} - 2\phi_3(p)s + s^2
\end{pmatrix} \geq 0
$$

where

\begin{align*}
\varphi_{11} & := \alpha_{k-2}^{2p}\phi_1(p); \\
\varphi_{12} & := \alpha_{k-2}^{2p}\phi_2(p)[\phi_1(\frac{p}{2})u_{11}(k) + \phi_2(\frac{p}{2})u_{12}(k)]; \\
\varphi_{13} & := \alpha_{k-2}^{2p}\phi_2(p)[\phi_2(\frac{p}{2})u_{11}(k) + \phi_3(\frac{p}{2})u_{12}(k)]; \\
\varphi_{22} & := \phi_3(p)[\phi_1(\frac{p}{2})u_{11}(k) + \phi_2(\frac{p}{2})u_{12}(k)]^2 + \alpha_{k-1}^{2p}[\phi_1(\frac{p}{2})u_{21}(k) + \phi_2(\frac{p}{2})u_{22}(k)]^2; \\
\varphi_{23} & := \phi_3(p)[\phi_1(\frac{p}{2})u_{11}(k) + \phi_2(\frac{p}{2})u_{12}(k)][\phi_2(\frac{p}{2})u_{11}(k) + \phi_3(\frac{p}{2})u_{12}(k)] \\
& \quad + \alpha_{k+1}^{2p}[\phi_1(\frac{p}{2})u_{21}(k) + \phi_2(\frac{p}{2})u_{22}(k)][\phi_2(\frac{p}{2})u_{21}(k) + \phi_3(\frac{p}{2})u_{22}(k)]; \\
\varphi_{33} & := \phi_3(p)[\phi_1(\frac{p}{2})u_{11}(k) + \phi_3(\frac{p}{2})u_{12}(k)]^2 + \alpha_{k+1}^{2p}[\phi_2(\frac{p}{2})u_{21}(k) + \phi_3(\frac{p}{2})u_{22}(k)]^2;
\end{align*}

(we write $\phi_i(p)$ for $\phi_i(k,p)$ for brevity).

**Remark 3.7.** Recall that $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is an $A(p)$-class operator if $(T^*|T|^{2p}T)^{\frac{1}{2p+1}} \geq |T|^2$ \((0 < p < \infty)\). We can apply our method to this $A(p)$ class operators. We leave these computations to interesting readers.

**3.3. Examples for weak hyponormalities (continued from Example 2.3).** Let $T := T(k,t) = W_a + t\epsilon \otimes \epsilon$ \((0 \leq x \leq 1)\) be as in Example 2.3. In this example, we discuss operators $T(x,t)$ with absolute-$p$-paranormality but not $p$-paranormality for $p \in (0,1)$, and operators with $p$-paranormality but not absolute-$p$-paranormality for $p \in (1,\infty)$. In Table 3.1, $\Omega_k^{(2)}$ is the determinant of lower right $2 \times 2$ submatrix of $\Omega_k$ in Theorem 3.1, and $\Psi_k^{(1)}$ is the $(2,2)$-term of $\Psi_k$ and $\Psi_k^{(2)}$ is the determinant of lower right $2 \times 2$ submatrix of $\Psi_k$ in Theorem 3.6 (Note that $(1,2)$, $(1,3)$, $(2,1)$, and $(3,1)$ terms of $\Omega_k$ and $\Psi_k$ are zero and $(1,1)$ term of $\Psi_k$ is positive in this example.)

**Algorithm 3.8.** Under the same notation with Theorems 2.2, 3.1, and 3.4, we give steps to obtain examples being distinct $p$-hyponormal, absolute-$p$-paranormality, and $p$-paranormality.

I. Take $p, x, t$ such that $T(x,t)$ does not satisfy $p$-hyponormality in Figure 2.1, i.e., $f := f(x,t,p) < 0$;

II. For $p, x, t$ taken in Step I, check the positivity of $\omega_{11}$, $\omega_{22}$, and $\Omega_k^{(2)}$, for all $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$;

III. For $p, x, t$ taken in Step I, check the positivity $\Psi_k^{(1)}$, and $\Psi_k^{(2)}$, for all $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$. 

We give examples being distinct absolute-$p$-paranormality, and $p$-paranormality for $0 < p < 1$ and $p > 1$, respectively, as following.

**Example 3.9 (Absolute $p$-paranormal but not $p$-paranormal for $p < 1$).** If we take $p = .25$; $x = .4$; $t = 1.166$, then we have the following:

I. $f(x,t,p) \approx -2.24293$;

II. for all $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\omega_{11} \approx .276285 + .25s^{5/4} > 0$; $\omega_{22} \approx .482308 - .5s^{1/4} + .25s^{5/4} > 0$; $\Omega_k^{(2)} \approx .682086 - 1.30999s^{1/4} + .625s^{1/2} + .883958s^{5/4} - .862361s^{3/2} + .0625s^{5/2} > 0$;

III. for all $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\Psi_k^{(1)} \approx .865735 - 1.38143s + s^2 > 0$;

$\Psi_k^{(2)} \approx (-1.26429 + s)(-1.26321 + s)(.849122 - 1.26546s + s^2) \neq 0$.

Hence $T$ is absolute $p$-paranormal but not $p$-paranormal.

**Example 3.10 ($p$-paranormal but not absolute $p$-paranormal for $p > 1$).** If we take $p = 2$; $x = .7$; $t = 1.347$, then we have the following:

I. $f(x,t,p) \approx 2411.31$;

II. for all $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\omega_{11} \approx 1.23206 + 2s^3 > 0$; $\omega_{22} \approx 6.43369 - 2.1s^2 + 2s^3 > 0$

$\Omega_k^{(2)} \approx 4(-3.34444+s)(-3.25175+s)(1.01729+s)(1.66817+s)(1.39443-1.36088s+s^2) \neq 0$;

III. for all $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\Psi_k^{(1)} \approx 17.8439 - 3.52017s + s^2 > 0$;

$\Psi_k^{(2)} \approx 72.0573 - 24.6872s + 121.774s^2 + 21.9021s^3 + s^4 \geq 0$.

Hence $T$ is $p$-paranormal but not absolute $p$-paranormal.

Repeating these processes in Examples 3.9 and 3.10 with Algorithm 3.8 and some scales, we have the following table 3.1, which shows that the absolute-$p$-paranormality is different from $p$-paranormality in some numerical computations.

**Table 3.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$x$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>$\omega_{11}$</th>
<th>$\omega_{22}$</th>
<th>$\Omega_k^{(2)}$</th>
<th>$\Psi_k^{(1)}$</th>
<th>$\Psi_k^{(2)}$</th>
<th>$p$-H</th>
<th>A-p-P</th>
<th>p-P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>1.166</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1.189</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1.33523</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1.33524</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>1.347</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>1.6452</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.367</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.368</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1.5537</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p$-H = $p$-hyponormal; A-p-H = absolute $p$-hyponormal; p-P = $p$-paranormal
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