

# SOME EXAMPLES OF EP OPERATORS

K. SHARIFI

ABSTRACT. We give some examples of EP and non-EP operators to show that the main results of Mohammadzadeh Karizakia *et al* [Some results about EP modular operators, *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, DOI: 10.1080/03081087.2020.1844613] are not correct even in the case of Hilbert spaces.

## 1. MAIN RESULTS

A bounded adjointable linear operator  $T$  with closed range on a Hilbert  $C^*$ -module (or complex Hilbert space)  $H$  is called an *EP* operator if  $T$  and  $T^*$  have the same range. If a bounded adjointable operator  $T$  does not have closed range, then neither  $Ker(T)$  nor  $Ran(T)$  need to be orthogonally complemented. For the basic theory of Hilbert  $C^*$ -modules we refer to the book [4] and papers [1, 2]. Let  $H$  be a Hilbert module over an arbitrary  $C^*$ -algebra of coefficients  $\mathcal{A}$ . An operator  $T \in \mathcal{L}(H)$  is called *EP* if  $Ran(T)$  and  $Ran(T^*)$  have the same closure [6, Definition 2.1].

Mohammadzadeh Karizakia *et al* [5] investigate commuting EP operators and prove that  $\overline{Ran(T + S)} = \overline{Ran(T) + Ran(S)}$ , when  $T$  and  $S$  are EP modular operators on  $H$ . However, the main results of this paper is not correct even in the case of Hilbert spaces. Indeed, they have utilized some equalities and identities that are generally not valid for operators or matrices.

**Example 1.1.** Let bounded operators  $T$  and  $S$  on  $\ell_2$  be defined by

$$\begin{aligned} T(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, \dots) &= (x_1, x_2, x_2 + x_3, x_4, x_5, \dots) \\ S(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, \dots) &= (x_1 + x_2, 0, 0, x_4, x_5, \dots). \end{aligned}$$

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 47A05; Secondary 46L08.

*Key words and phrases.* Bounded adjointable operator, Hilbert  $C^*$ -module, closed range.

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
T^*(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, \dots) &= (x_1, x_2 + x_3, x_3, x_4, x_5, \dots) \\
S^*(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, \dots) &= (x_1, x_1, 0, x_4, x_5, \dots) \\
(T + S)(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, \dots) &= (2x_1 + x_2, x_2, x_2 + x_3, x_4, x_5, \dots) \\
(T + S)^*(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, \dots) &= (2x_1, x_1 + x_2 + x_3, x_3, x_4, x_5, \dots).
\end{aligned}$$

One can easily see that  $T$  and  $T + S$  are EP operators and  $S$  is not an EP operator, and so the part “ $\Leftarrow$ ” in [5, Theorem 2.7] is not correct.

**Example 1.2.** Let bounded operators  $T$  and  $S$  on  $\ell_2$  be defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
T(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, \dots) &= (x_1 - x_3, 0, x_3, x_4, x_5, \dots) \\
S(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, \dots) &= (x_3 - x_1, 0, x_3, x_4, x_5, \dots).
\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
T^*(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, \dots) &= (x_1, 0, x_3 - x_1, x_4, x_5, \dots) \\
S^*(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, \dots) &= (-x_1, 0, x_3 + x_1, x_4, x_5, \dots) \\
(T + S)(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, \dots) &= (0, 0, x_3, x_4, x_5, \dots) \\
(TT^* + SS^*)(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, \dots) &= (4x_1, 0, 2x_3, x_4, x_5, \dots).
\end{aligned}$$

One can easily see that  $T$  and  $S$  are EP operators and  $S$  is not an EP operator and

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\text{Ran}(T + S)} &\neq \overline{\text{Ran}(TT^*) + \text{Ran}(SS^*)}, \\
\overline{\text{Ran}(T + S)} &\neq \overline{\text{Ran}(T) + \text{Ran}(S)},
\end{aligned}$$

that is, the parts (iii), (iv), (v) and (vi) in [5, Theorem 2.10] are not correct.

*Remark 1.3.* Some mistakes of this paper based on the following gaps:

- It is known that

$$\bigoplus_{n=1}^{\infty} H = \{x = (x(n)) \in \prod_n H : \sum_n \langle x(n), x(n) \rangle \text{ converges in the norm of } \mathcal{A}\}$$

is a Hilbert  $\mathcal{A}$ -module. In the proof of Theorem 2.10, the matrix operators  $B'$  and  $C'$  take their values in  $\bigoplus_{n=1}^{\infty} H$ , and so one need to check that the matrix operators are well defined and  $\overline{\text{Ran}(B')} = \overline{\text{Ran}(C')}$ .

- Let  $T$  and  $S$  be bounded adjointable operators on  $H$  and let

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 \\ S & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{L}(H \oplus H).$$

The authors have applied the equality  $\overline{\text{Ran}(T)} \oplus \overline{\text{Ran}(S)} = \overline{\text{Ran}(A)}$  several times to prove Theorem 2.7, Theorem 2.9 and Theorem 2.10. One should be aware that the equality is not valid even for metrics.

One can consider various types of Hilbert modules and  $C^*$ -algebras to reinvestigate the range equalities of the paper [5]. In this regards, the papers [1, 2, 3, 7] might be useful.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] M. Frank, Self-duality and  $C^*$ -reflexivity of Hilbert  $C^*$ -modules, *Z. Anal. Anwendungen* **9** (1990), 165-176.
- [2] M. Frank, Geometrical aspects of Hilbert  $C^*$ -modules, *Positivity* **3** (1999), 215-243.
- [3] M. Frank, Characterizing  $C^*$ -algebras of compact operators by generic categorical properties of Hilbert  $C^*$ -modules, *J. K-Theory* **2** (2008), 453-462.
- [4] E. C. Lance, *Hilbert  $C^*$ -Modules*, LMS Lecture Note Series 210, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995.
- [5] M. Mohammadzadeh Karizaki, D. S. Djordjević, A. Hosseini and M. Jalaieian, Some results about EP modular operators, *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, DOI: 10.1080/03081087.2020.1844613
- [6] K. Sharifi, EP modular operators and their products, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **419** (2014), 870-877.
- [7] K. Sharifi, The product of operators with closed range in Hilbert  $C^*$ -modules, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **435** (2011), 1122-1130.

KAMRAN SHARIFI,

FACULTY OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, SHAHROOD UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, P. O. Box 3619995161-316, SHAHROOD, IRAN

*Email address:* sharifi.kamran@gmail.com