

# The Frobenius distances from projections to an idempotent matrix

Xiaoyi Tian<sup>a</sup>, Qingxiang Xu<sup>a</sup>, Chunhong Fu<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Department of Mathematics, Shanghai Normal University, Shanghai 200234, PR China*

<sup>b</sup>*Health School Attached to Shanghai University of Medicine & Health Sciences, Shanghai 200237, PR China*

---

## Abstract

For each pair of matrices  $A$  and  $B$  with the same order, let  $\|A - B\|_F$  denote their Frobenius distance. This paper deals mainly with the Frobenius distances from projections to an idempotent matrix. For every idempotent  $Q \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ , a projection  $m(Q)$  called the matched projection can be induced. It is proved that  $m(Q)$  is the unique projection whose Frobenius distance away from  $Q$  takes the minimum value among all the Frobenius distances from projections to  $Q$ , while  $I_n - m(Q)$  is the unique projection whose Frobenius distance away from  $Q$  takes the maximum value. Furthermore, it is proved that for every number  $\alpha$  between the minimum value and the maximum value, there exists a projection  $P$  whose Frobenius distance away from  $Q$  takes the value  $\alpha$ . Based on the above characterization of the minimum distance, some Frobenius norm upper bounds and lower bounds of  $\|P - Q\|_F$  are derived under the condition of  $PQ = Q$  on a projection  $P$  and an idempotent  $Q$ .

*Keywords:* Idempotent, projection, Frobenius norm, norm bound

*2000 MSC:* 65F35, 15A60, 15A09

---

## 1. Introduction

By a projection, we mean a Hermitian idempotent. The direct sum decompositions and the orthogonal decompositions of spaces are frequently used, so idempotents and projections (also known as skew projections and

---

*Email addresses:* [tianxytian@163.com](mailto:tianxytian@163.com) (Xiaoyi Tian), [qingxiang\\_xu@126.com](mailto:qingxiang_xu@126.com) (Qingxiang Xu), [fchlixue@163.com](mailto:fchlixue@163.com) (Chunhong Fu)

orthogonal projections) have been intensely studied, and various applications can be found in the literature. Yet, there are still some fundamental issues that remain to be unknown. One of which is concerned with the Frobenius distances from projections to an idempotent, which will be addressed in the following Problem 1.1.

Let  $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$  be the set of  $m \times n$  complex matrices, and let  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{C}^{n \times n})$  be the set consisting of all projections in  $\mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ . The identity matrix and the zero matrix in  $\mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  are denoted by  $I_n$  and  $0_n$ , respectively. Given a pair of matrices  $A$  and  $B$  in  $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ , the Frobenius norm  $\|A - B\|_F$  is referred to be the (Frobenius) distance between  $A$  and  $B$ . Suppose now that  $Q \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  is an idempotent. Let

$$\text{ran}_Q = \{\|P - Q\|_F : P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{C}^{n \times n})\}, \quad (1.1)$$

$$\min_Q = \inf \{\lambda : \lambda \in \text{ran}_Q\}, \quad \max_Q = \sup \{\lambda : \lambda \in \text{ran}_Q\}. \quad (1.2)$$

A couple of issues associated with a general idempotent  $Q$  can be raised naturally as follows.

**Problem 1.1.** *Suppose that  $Q \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  is an idempotent such that  $Q \neq I_n$  and  $Q \neq 0_n$ .*

- (i) *Is it possible to determine the numbers  $\min_Q$  and  $\max_Q$ ?*
- (ii) *Is it possible to find out projections  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  such that*

$$\|P_1 - Q\|_F = \min_Q \quad \text{and} \quad \|P_2 - Q\|_F = \max_Q?$$

- (iii) *If the answer to (ii) is positive, whether such projections  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  are unique?*
- (iv) *If the answer to (ii) is positive, whether it is true that  $[\min_Q, \max_Q] = \text{ran}_Q$ ?*

Evidently, the same problems are also worthwhile to be investigated in terms of the operator norm (spectral norm). Actually, in the latter case some partial answers can be found in [6, Section 4]. Specifically, a new term called the matched projection is introduced recently in [6, Section 3] for an arbitrary idempotent on a Hilbert  $C^*$ -module.

To get a deeper understanding of the distances from projections to an idempotents, in this paper we restrict our attention to the matrix case and adopt the Frobenius norm instead of the operator norm. Given an arbitrary idempotent  $Q \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ , let  $m(Q)$  be its matched projection defined as (2.2). In Lemma 3.1 of this paper, a formula for  $\|m(Q) - Q\|_F$  is derived. It is proved in Theorem 3.2 that  $\|m(Q) - Q\|_F \leq \|P - Q\|_F$  for every projection

$P \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ , and it is shown furthermore in Theorem 3.3 that the equality above occurs only if  $P = m(Q)$ . Thus, the optimal approximation from projections to an idempotent is clarified.

Based on the above characterization of the optimal approximation, in Section 4 of this paper we will provide the positive answers to all the remaining issues that stated in Problem 1.1; see Theorems 4.2 and 4.5 for the details. So, a complete answer to Problem 1.1 is carried out.

Let  $P \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  be a projection and  $Q \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  be an idempotent. Under the condition of  $PQ = Q$ , one lower bound and one upper bound of  $\|P - Q\|_F$  are derived in Theorems 5.1 and 5.2, respectively. As a result, an upper bound of  $\|P - Q^\dagger\|_F$  is also derived in Theorem 5.3. Note that the above condition is trivially satisfied when  $P$  is taken to be  $P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}$  (the projection from  $\mathbb{C}^n$  onto the range of  $Q$ ). It is particularly interesting to make a detailed comparison between  $\|m(Q) - Q\|_F$  and  $\|P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)} - Q\|_F$ , which is dealt with in Theorem 5.4 (see also Remark 5.3 for a supplement). Observe that the condition of  $PQ = Q$  is also trivially satisfied when  $P = AA^\dagger$  and  $Q = AX$ , in which  $A^\dagger$  denotes the Moore-Penrose inverse of  $A$ , while  $X$  is an arbitrary inner inverse or outer inverse of  $A$ . Hence, a unified way can be employed to deal with upper bounds and lower bounds of  $\|AA^\dagger - AX\|_F$ ; see Corollaries 5.6 and 5.7 in the special case that  $X$  is the Drazin inverse of  $A$ .

The paper is organized as follows. Some basic knowledge about trace, the weak majorization and the matched projection are included in Section 2. Section 3 is focused on the study of the minimum distance from projections to an idempotent, while Section 4 is devoted to clarifying the maximum distance and the range of the distances from projections to an idempotent. As applications, some Frobenius norm bounds are derived in the last section.

## 2. Some preliminaries

Throughout the rest of this paper,  $\mathbb{N}$  is the set of positive integers,  $\mathbb{C}_r^{m \times n}$  is the subset of  $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$  consisting of matrices with rank  $r$ . For each  $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ , its (column) range, conjugate transpose, Moore-Penrose inverse [8], Frobenius norm and spectral norm (2-norm) are denoted by  $\mathcal{R}(A)$ ,  $A^*$ ,  $A^\dagger$ ,  $\|A\|_F$  and  $\|A\|_2$ , respectively. When  $A$  is a square matrix,  $\text{tr}(A)$  stands for the trace of  $A$ . Let  $|A|$  be the square root of  $A^*A$ . The notation  $P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}$  is used for an idempotent  $Q \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  to denote the projection from  $\mathbb{C}^n$  onto  $\mathcal{R}(Q)$ .

We begin with an auxiliary lemma, which contains several elementary known results.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $A, B, T = (t_{ij}) \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ , and let  $x$  and  $y$  be elements in an inner-product space.*

- (i) *Suppose that  $A$  and  $B$  are Hermitian such that  $A - B$  is positive semi-definite. Then  $\text{tr}(A) \geq \text{tr}(B)$ , and  $\text{tr}(A) = \text{tr}(B)$  only if  $A = B$ .*
- (ii) *If  $\sum_{i=1}^n |t_{ii}|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2(T)$ , then  $T$  is diagonal, where  $\sigma_i(T)$  ( $1 \leq i \leq n$ ) denote the singular values of  $T$ .*
- (iii) *If  $\langle x, y \rangle = \|x\| \cdot \|y\|$ , then  $\|x\| \cdot y = \|y\| \cdot x$ .*

*Proof.* (i) Write  $(A - B)^{\frac{1}{2}}$  simply as  $C$ . Then

$$\text{tr}(A) - \text{tr}(B) = \text{tr}(A - B) = \|C\|_F^2.$$

Hence, the conclusion follows.

- (ii) The conclusion follows immediately from the following equations

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n |t_{ij}|^2 = \text{tr}(TT^*) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2(T).$$

- (iii) Put  $z = \|x\| \cdot y - \|y\| \cdot x$ . From the assumption it is easily seen that  $\langle z, z \rangle = 0$ , so the desired conclusion follows.  $\square$

Next, we recall some characterizations of the weak majorization associated with convex functions [10, Chapter 10]. Given  $a = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ ,  $b = (b_1, \dots, b_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , let  $a^\downarrow = (a_1^\downarrow, \dots, a_n^\downarrow)$  and  $b^\downarrow = (b_1^\downarrow, \dots, b_n^\downarrow)$  be the decreasing rearrangements of  $a$  and  $b$ , respectively. Recall that  $a$  is said to be weakly majorized by  $b$ , denoted by  $a \prec_w b$ , if

$$\sum_{i=1}^k a_i^\downarrow \leq \sum_{i=1}^k b_i^\downarrow \quad (1 \leq k \leq n).$$

**Lemma 2.2.** [10, Theorem 10.12] *Let  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be such that  $a \prec_w b$ . Then  $\sum_{i=1}^n f(a_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n f(b_i)$  for any increasing convex function  $f$  on an interval containing all  $a_i$  and  $b_i$ .*

**Lemma 2.3.** [10, Theorem 10.14] *Let  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be such that  $b$  is not a permutation of  $a$ . Then for any strictly increasing and strictly convex function  $f$  that contains all the components of  $a$  and  $b$ , we have*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n f(a_i) < \sum_{i=1}^n f(b_i) \quad \text{whenever } a \prec_w b.$$

As a consequence of Lemmas 2.2–2.3 and Lemma 2.1(ii), we have the following result.

**Lemma 2.4.** *For every  $T = (t_{ij}) \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ , we have*

$$\operatorname{tr} \left[ (I_n + TT^*)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \sqrt{1 + |t_{ii}|^2}. \quad (2.1)$$

Moreover, the equality above occurs only if  $T$  is diagonal.

*Proof.* Let  $f(x) = \sqrt{1 + x^2}$  for  $x \in [0, +\infty)$ . It is clear that  $f$  is a strictly increasing and strictly convex function on the interval  $[0, +\infty)$ , and

$$\operatorname{tr} \left[ (I_n + TT^*)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] = \sum_{i=1}^n f(\sigma_i(T)),$$

in which  $\sigma_i(T)$  ( $1 \leq i \leq n$ ) are the singular values of  $T$ . Denote by

$$|d(T)| = (|t_{11}|, |t_{22}|, \dots, |t_{nn}|), \quad \sigma(T) = (\sigma_1(T), \sigma_2(T), \dots, \sigma_n(T)).$$

By [10, Theorem 10.19]  $|d(T)| \prec_w \sigma(T)$ , which leads by Lemma 2.2 to

$$\sum_{i=1}^n f(\sigma_i(T)) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n f(|t_{ii}|).$$

This shows the validity of (2.1).

Suppose that (2.1) turns out to be an equality. Then by Lemma 2.3  $|d(T)| = \sigma(T)W$  for some permutation matrix  $W$ , which implies that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n |t_{ii}|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2(T).$$

Hence, due to Lemma 2.1(ii)  $T$  is a diagonal matrix.  $\square$

Now, we turn to the description of the matched projection.

**Definition 2.1.** [6, Definition 3.1 and Theorem 3.2] For each idempotent  $Q \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ , its matched projection is defined by

$$m(Q) = \frac{1}{2} (|Q^*| + Q^*) |Q^*|^\dagger (|Q^*| + I_n)^{-1} (|Q^*| + Q), \quad (2.2)$$

where  $|Q^*|^\dagger$  denotes the Moore-Penrose inverse of  $|Q^*|$ .

*Remark 2.1.* For every idempotent  $Q$ , it is known [6, Theorem 3.2] that

$$|Q^*|^\dagger = (P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}P_{\mathcal{R}(Q^*)}P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)})^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Note that the matrix  $m(Q)$  defined as above is a projection, which is equal to  $Q$  whenever  $Q$  is a projection. It is useful to derive block matrix representations for  $m(Q)$ . Given an idempotent  $Q \in \mathbb{C}_r^{n \times n}$  with  $1 \leq r < n$ , let  $U \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  be an arbitrary unitary such that

$$P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)} = U^* \begin{pmatrix} I_r & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} U. \quad (2.3)$$

It follows that

$$Q = U^* \begin{pmatrix} I_r & A \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} U \quad \text{for some } A \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times (n-r)}, \quad (2.4)$$

which gives

$$|Q^*| = U^* \begin{pmatrix} B & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} U,$$

where

$$B = (I_r + AA^*)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (2.5)$$

Since  $B \geq I_r$ , we have  $\text{tr}(B) \geq \text{tr}(I_r) = r$ . Therefore,

$$\text{tr}(|Q^*|) \geq \text{rank}(Q) = \text{tr}(Q) = \text{tr}(Q^*) = \text{tr}(P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}). \quad (2.6)$$

Furthermore, it can be concluded by Lemma 2.1(i) that

$$\text{tr}(|Q^*|) = \text{tr}(Q) \iff Q = P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)} \iff Q \text{ is a projection.} \quad (2.7)$$

**Lemma 2.5.** (cf. [6, Theorem 3.1]) *Suppose that  $Q$  is represented by (2.4). Then*

$$m(Q) = \frac{1}{2}U^* \begin{pmatrix} (B + I_r)B^{-1} & B^{-1}A \\ A^*B^{-1} & A^*[B(B + I_r)]^{-1}A \end{pmatrix} U, \quad (2.8)$$

where  $B$  is defined by (2.5).

*Proof.* A simple use of (2.2) and (2.4) yields the desired conclusion.  $\square$

We end this section by providing a formula for  $\|m(Q)\|_F$ .

**Lemma 2.6.** *For every idempotent  $Q \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ , we have*

$$\|m(Q)\|_F = \sqrt{\text{rank}(Q)}. \quad (2.9)$$

*Proof.* Let

$$V = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}(|Q^*| + Q^*)(|Q^*|^\dagger)^{\frac{1}{2}}(|Q^*| + I_n)^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

By [6, Theorem 3.6], we have

$$m(Q) = VV^* \quad \text{and} \quad P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)} = V^*V.$$

Hence,

$$\|m(Q)\|_F^2 = \text{tr}(m(Q)) = \text{tr}(P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}) = \text{rank}(Q). \quad (2.10)$$

This shows the validity of (2.9).  $\square$

### 3. The minimum distance

In this section, we study the minimum distance from projections to an idempotent  $Q$ . It is helpful to begin with a formula for  $\|m(Q) - Q\|_F$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** *For every idempotent  $Q \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ , we have*

$$\|m(Q) - Q\|_F = \sqrt{\text{tr}(|Q^*|^2 - |Q^*|)}. \quad (3.1)$$

*Proof.* Since  $Q$  is an idempotent and  $\mathcal{R}(|Q^*|) = \mathcal{R}(Q)$ , we have

$$Q|Q^*| = |Q^*| \quad \text{and} \quad |Q^*| \cdot |Q^*|^\dagger = |Q^*|^\dagger \cdot |Q^*| = P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}.$$

It follows that

$$Q(|Q^*| + Q^*)|Q^*|^\dagger = |Q^*|(I_n + |Q^*|)|Q^*|^\dagger = P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}(I_n + |Q^*|),$$

which is combined with (2.2) to get

$$Qm(Q) = \frac{1}{2}P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}(|Q^*| + Q) = \frac{1}{2}(|Q^*| + Q).$$

Taking  $*$ -operation yields  $m(Q)Q^* = \frac{1}{2}(|Q^*| + Q^*)$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} (m(Q) - Q)(m(Q) - Q)^* &= m(Q) - Qm(Q) - m(Q)Q^* + QQ^* \\ &= m(Q) - \frac{1}{2}(Q + Q^*) - |Q^*| + |Q^*|^2. \end{aligned}$$

In virtue of (2.6) and (2.10), we have

$$\text{tr}\left[m(Q) - \frac{1}{2}(Q + Q^*)\right] = 0.$$

Consequently,

$$\|m(Q) - Q\|_F^2 = \text{tr}\left[(m(Q) - Q)(m(Q) - Q)^*\right] = \text{tr}(|Q^*|^2 - |Q^*|).$$

So, the desired conclusion follows.  $\square$

Our first characterization of the minimum distance reads as follows.

**Theorem 3.2.** *For every idempotent  $Q \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ , we have*

$$\|m(Q) - Q\|_F \leq \|P - Q\|_F, \quad \forall P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{C}^{n \times n}). \quad (3.2)$$

*Proof.* Let  $r = \text{rank}(Q)$ . If  $r = 0$  or  $r = n$ , then  $m(Q) = Q$ , hence (3.2) is trivially satisfied.

Suppose now that  $1 \leq r < n$ . Let  $U \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  be a unitary such that  $Q$  is formulated by (2.4). For any projection  $P$  in  $\mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ , from [9, Theorem 2.14] we know that  $P$  can be represented by

$$P = U^* \begin{pmatrix} C & C^{\frac{1}{2}}(I_r - C)^{\frac{1}{2}}U_0^* \\ U_0C^{\frac{1}{2}}(I_r - C)^{\frac{1}{2}} & U_0(I_r - C)U_0^* + Q_0 \end{pmatrix} U, \quad (3.3)$$

where  $C \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times r}$  is a positive contraction,  $U_0 \in \mathbb{C}^{(n-r) \times r}$  is a partial isometry and  $Q_0 \in \mathbb{C}^{(n-r) \times (n-r)}$  is a projection satisfying

$$\mathcal{R}(U_0^*) = \mathcal{R}(C - C^2) \quad \text{and} \quad U_0^*Q_0 = 0. \quad (3.4)$$

Let

$$S = (Q + Q^* - I_n)P, \quad D = C^{\frac{1}{2}}(I_r - C)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (3.5)$$

Since  $\text{tr}(PQ^*) = \text{tr}(Q^*P)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|P - Q\|_F^2 &= \text{tr}[(P - Q)(P - Q)^*] = \text{tr}(QQ^* + P - QP) - \text{tr}(PQ^*) \\ &= \text{tr}(QQ^* - S) = \text{tr}(|Q^*|^2) - \text{tr}(S). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we may use (3.1) to get

$$\begin{aligned} \|P - Q\|_F^2 - \|m(Q) - Q\|_F^2 &= [\text{tr}(|Q^*|^2) - \text{tr}(S)] - [\text{tr}(|Q^*|^2 - |Q^*|)] \\ &= \text{tr}(|Q^*|) - \text{tr}(S) = \text{tr}[(I_r + AA^*)^{\frac{1}{2}}] - \text{tr}(S). \end{aligned}$$

In view of (2.4), (3.3) and (3.5), it is easy to verify that

$$S = U^* \begin{pmatrix} C + AU_0D & * \\ * & A^*DU_0^* - U_0(I_r - C)U_0^* - Q_0 \end{pmatrix} U,$$

which leads by  $\text{tr}(Q_0) \geq 0$  to

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(S) &= \text{tr}[C + AU_0D + A^*DU_0^* - U_0(I_r - C)U_0^* - Q_0] \\ &\leq \text{tr}[C + AU_0D + A^*DU_0^* - U_0(I_r - C)U_0^*]. \end{aligned}$$



Utilizing  $D = D^*$  and the observations

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{tr}(A^*DU_0^*) &= \overline{\operatorname{tr}(U_0DA)} = \overline{\operatorname{tr}(AU_0D)}, \\ \operatorname{tr}[U_0(I_r - C)U_0^*] &= \operatorname{tr}[U_0^*U_0(I_r - C)],\end{aligned}$$

we arrive at

$$\operatorname{tr}(S) \leq \operatorname{tr}(C) - \operatorname{tr}[U_0^*U_0(I_r - C)] + 2\operatorname{Re}[\operatorname{tr}(AU_0D)].$$

So, it is sufficient to prove that

$$\operatorname{tr}(C) - \operatorname{tr}[U_0^*U_0(I_r - C)] + 2\operatorname{Re}[\operatorname{tr}(AU_0D)] \leq \operatorname{tr}\left[(I_r + AA^*)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right]. \quad (3.6)$$

For this, we choose a unitary  $W \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times r}$  such that

$$C = W^* \cdot \operatorname{diag}(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_r) \cdot W, \quad (3.7)$$

in which  $c_i \in [0, 1]$  for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, r$ . Due to (3.5), we have

$$D = W^* \cdot \operatorname{diag}(d_1, d_2, \dots, d_r) \cdot W, \quad (3.8)$$

where  $d_i = \sqrt{c_i(1 - c_i)}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq r$ . Taking a permutation if necessary, we may as well assume that  $d_1 \geq d_2 \geq \dots \geq d_r \geq 0$ .

**Case 1.**  $d_r > 0$ . In this case,  $\operatorname{rank}(C - C^2) = \operatorname{rank}(D^2) = r$ , which implies that  $U_0^*U_0 = I_r$ , since  $U_0^*U_0$  is a projection satisfying the first equation in (3.4). Consequently, (3.6) can be simplified as

$$\operatorname{tr}(2C - I_r) + 2\operatorname{Re}[\operatorname{tr}(AU_0D)] \leq \operatorname{tr}\left[(I_r + AA^*)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right]. \quad (3.9)$$

Let  $T = WAU_0W^*$  with  $T = (t_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq r}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Re}[\operatorname{tr}(AU_0D)] &= \operatorname{Re}[\operatorname{tr}(AU_0W^* \cdot \operatorname{diag}(d_1, d_2, \dots, d_r) \cdot W)] \\ &= \operatorname{Re}[\operatorname{tr}(T \cdot \operatorname{diag}(d_1, d_2, \dots, d_r))] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^r \operatorname{Re}(t_{ii}) \cdot d_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^r |t_{ii}| \cdot d_i.\end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile,

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{tr}(2C - I_r) &= \operatorname{tr}[W^*(2 \cdot \operatorname{diag}(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_r) - I_r)W] \\ &= \operatorname{tr}[2 \cdot \operatorname{diag}(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_r) - I_r] = \sum_{i=1}^r (2c_i - 1),\end{aligned}$$

and

$$(2d_i)^2 + (2c_i - 1)^2 = 1 \quad (1 \leq i \leq r).$$

As a result, we may use Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and Lemma 2.4 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{tr}(2C - I_r) + 2\operatorname{Re} [\operatorname{tr}(AU_0D)] &\leq \sum_{i=1}^r (|t_{ii}| \cdot (2d_i) + (2c_i - 1)) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^r \left( \sqrt{1 + |t_{ii}|^2} \cdot \sqrt{(2d_i)^2 + (2c_i - 1)^2} \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^r \sqrt{1 + |t_{ii}|^2} \leq \operatorname{tr} \left[ (I_r + TT^*)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that  $U_0U_0^* \leq I_{n-r}$ , so we have

$$TT^* = WAU_0W^* \cdot WU_0^*A^*W^* = WAU_0U_0^*A^*W^* \leq WAA^*W^*,$$

which in turn gives

$$I_r + TT^* \leq W(I_r + AA^*)W^*,$$

hence by [4, Proposition 1.3.8] we have

$$(I_r + TT^*)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq [W(I_r + AA^*)W^*]^{\frac{1}{2}} = W(I_r + AA^*)^{\frac{1}{2}}W^*.$$

It follows that

$$\operatorname{tr} \left[ (I_r + TT^*)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \leq \operatorname{tr} \left[ W(I_r + AA^*)^{\frac{1}{2}}W^* \right] = \operatorname{tr} \left[ (I_r + AA^*)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right].$$

This shows the validity of (3.9).

**Case 2.**  $d_s > 0$  and  $d_{s+1} = 0$  for some  $s$  with  $1 \leq s \leq r - 1$ . In this case,

$$D = W^* \cdot \operatorname{diag}(d_1, d_2, \dots, d_s, 0_{r-s}) \cdot W.$$

Note that the positivity of  $D$  ensures  $\mathcal{R}(D^2) = \mathcal{R}(D)$ , so by (3.4)  $U_0^*U_0$  is a projection whose range is equal to that of  $D$ . Therefore,

$$U_0^*U_0 = W^* \cdot \operatorname{diag}(I_s, 0_{r-s}) \cdot W.$$

Let

$$c'_i = \begin{cases} 2c_i - 1, & 1 \leq i \leq s, \\ c_i, & s + 1 \leq i \leq r, \end{cases} \quad d'_i = \begin{cases} d_i, & 1 \leq i \leq s, \\ 0, & s + 1 \leq i \leq r. \end{cases}$$

Then  $(c'_i)^2 + (2d'_i)^2 \leq 1$  for  $1 \leq i \leq r$ , and

$$\operatorname{tr}(C) - \operatorname{tr}[U_0^* U_0 (I_r - C)] = \sum_{i=1}^r c_i - \sum_{i=1}^s (1 - c_i) = \sum_{i=1}^r c'_i.$$

Let  $T = (t_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq r}$  be defined as above. In virtue of

$$AU_0 D = AU_0 W^* \cdot \operatorname{diag}(d_1, d_2, \dots, d_s, 0_{r-s}) \cdot W,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Re}[\operatorname{tr}(AU_0 D)] &= \operatorname{Re}[\operatorname{tr}(T \cdot \operatorname{diag}(d_1, d_2, \dots, d_s, 0_{r-s}))] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^s \operatorname{Re}(t_{ii}) \cdot d_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^s |t_{ii}| \cdot d_i = \sum_{i=1}^r |t_{ii}| \cdot d'_i. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (3.6) can be derived by using the same arguments employed in the derivation of (3.9).

**Case 3.**  $d_i = 0$  for  $1 \leq i \leq r$ . In this case  $D = 0$ , so it can be concluded by (3.5) and (3.4) that  $U_0^* U_0 = 0$  and  $C$  is a projection. Hence,

$$\operatorname{tr}(C) \leq \operatorname{tr}(I_r) \leq \operatorname{tr}[(I_r + AA^*)^{\frac{1}{2}}]. \quad (3.10)$$

Therefore, (3.6) is also satisfied. This completes the proof.  $\square$

Our second characterization of the minimum distance is stated as follows.

**Theorem 3.3.** *Let  $Q \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  be an idempotent and  $P \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  be a projection. If  $\|P - Q\|_F = \|m(Q) - Q\|_F$ , then  $P = m(Q)$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\|P - Q\|_F = \|m(Q) - Q\|_F$ . It needs only to consider the case that  $Q$  is not a projection. In this case,  $Q \in \mathbb{C}_r^{n \times n}$  for some  $1 \leq r < n$ . We follow the notations as that in the proof of Theorem 3.2.

**Case 1.**  $d_r > 0$ . From Case 1 in the proof of Theorem 3.2, it can be inferred that

$$\begin{aligned} Q_0 &= 0, \quad \operatorname{Re}(t_{ii}) \cdot d_i = |t_{ii}| \cdot d_i \quad (1 \leq i \leq r), \\ |t_{ii}| \cdot (2d_i) + (2c_i - 1) &= \sqrt{1 + |t_{ii}|^2} \quad (1 \leq i \leq r), \\ \sum_{i=1}^r \sqrt{1 + |t_{ii}|^2} &= \operatorname{tr}[(I_r + TT^*)^{\frac{1}{2}}], \\ TT^* &= WAU_0 U_0^* A^* W^* = WAA^* W^* \quad (\text{by Lemma 2.1(i)}). \end{aligned}$$

So  $t_{ii} \geq 0$  for  $1 \leq i \leq r$ <sup>1</sup>, and a simple application of Lemma 2.1(iii) to the vectors  $(t_{ii}, 1)$  and  $(2d_i, 2c_i - 1)$  in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  yields

$$c_i = \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + t_{ii}^2}}{2\sqrt{1 + t_{ii}^2}}, \quad d_i = \frac{t_{ii}}{2\sqrt{1 + t_{ii}^2}} \quad (3.11)$$

for  $1 \leq i \leq r$ . Also, it can be concluded from Lemma 2.4 that  $T$  is a diagonal matrix. So,  $T$  is in fact a semi-positive definite diagonal matrix. Since  $W$  is unitary and  $WU_0U_0^*A^*W^* = WAA^*W^*$ , we have

$$AU_0U_0^*A^* = AA^*. \quad (3.12)$$

Also, by definition we have  $T = WAU_0W^*$ , so

$$AU_0 = W^*TW = (W^*TW)^* = U_0^*A^*,$$

which is combined with (3.12) to get  $AA^* = W^*T^2W$ , and thus

$$|A^*| = W^*TW = AU_0. \quad (3.13)$$

Therefore, we may use the first equation above to obtain

$$W^* \cdot \text{diag}(t_{11}, t_{22}, \dots, t_{rr}) \cdot W = |A^*|.$$

This, together with (3.7), (3.8) and (3.11), yields

$$C = \frac{1}{2}(B + I_r)B^{-1}, \quad D = \frac{1}{2}B^{-1}|A^*|, \quad (3.14)$$

in which  $B$  is defined by (2.5). Since  $U_0U_0^*$  is a projection, we may rewrite (3.12) as

$$[A(I_r - U_0U_0^*)][A(I_r - U_0U_0^*)]^* = 0,$$

which happens only if  $AU_0U_0^* = A$ . It follows from (3.13) that

$$|A^*|U_0^* = A. \quad (3.15)$$

Exploring (3.5), (3.14) and (3.15), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} C^{\frac{1}{2}}(I_r - C)^{\frac{1}{2}}U_0^* &= DU_0^* = \frac{1}{2}B^{-1}|A^*|U_0^* = \frac{1}{2}B^{-1}A, \\ I_r - C &= \frac{1}{2}(I_r - B^{-1}) = \frac{1}{2}|A^*| \cdot [B(B + I_r)]^{-1} \cdot |A^*| \quad (\text{by (2.5)}), \\ U_0(I_r - C)U_0^* &= \frac{1}{2}A^*[B(B + I_r)]^{-1}A. \end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>1</sup>Actually, since  $d_i$  is given by (3.11) and  $d_i > 0$ , we have  $t_{ii} > 0$ .

The arguments above together with (2.8) and (3.3) yield  $P = m(Q)$ .

**Case 2.**  $d_s > 0$  and  $d_{s+1} = 0$  for some  $s$  with  $1 \leq s \leq r - 1$ . By Case 2 in the proof of Theorem 3.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Q_0 &= 0, \quad \operatorname{Re}(t_{ii}) \cdot d_i = |t_{ii}| \cdot d_i \quad (1 \leq i \leq s), \\ |t_{ii}| \cdot (2d'_i) + c'_i &= \sqrt{1 + |t_{ii}|^2} \quad (1 \leq i \leq r), \\ \sum_{i=1}^r \sqrt{1 + |t_{ii}|^2} &= \operatorname{tr} \left[ (I_r + TT^*)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right], \\ TT^* &= WAU_0U_0^*A^*W^* = WAA^*W^*. \end{aligned}$$

So  $t_{ii} > 0$  for  $1 \leq i \leq s$ , (3.11) is true for  $1 \leq i \leq s$ , and

$$c_i = 1, \quad t_{ii} = 0 \quad (s + 1 \leq i \leq r).$$

Therefore, (3.11) is valid for every  $i$  with  $1 \leq i \leq r$ . The rest of the proof is the same as that employed in Case 1.

**Case 3.**  $d_i = 0$  for  $1 \leq i \leq r$ . As is shown before, in this case we have  $Q_0 = 0$ ,  $D = U_0^*U_0 = 0$  and  $C$  is a projection. By assumption  $\|P - Q\|_F = \|m(Q) - Q\|_F$ , so actually (3.6) turns out to be an equation. Therefore,

$$\operatorname{tr}(C) = \operatorname{tr} \left[ (I_r + AA^*)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right].$$

In view of (3.10), the above equality is valid if and only if  $C = I_r$  and meanwhile  $A = 0$ , which is exactly the case that  $P = Q = P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}$ . Hence,  $P = m(Q)$  as desired.  $\square$

#### 4. The maximum distance and the intermediate value theorem

The purpose of this section is to give positive answers to the remaining issues stated in Problem 1.1.

**Lemma 4.1.** *For every square matrix  $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ , the number*

$$\|P - A\|_F^2 + \|I_n - P - A\|_F^2$$

*is invariant with respect to the choice of the projection  $P$  in  $\mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ .*

*Proof.* For each projection  $P \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ , a simple computation yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|P - A\|_F^2 &= \operatorname{tr}(P - PA^* - AP + AA^*), \\ \|I_n - P - A\|_F^2 &= \operatorname{tr}[(I_n - P) - (I_n - P)A^* - A(I_n - P) + AA^*]. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$\|P - A\|_F^2 + \|I_n - P - A\|_F^2 = \text{tr}(I_n - A^* - A + 2AA^*),$$

which does not depend on the choice of  $P$ .  $\square$

Our characterization of the maximum distance reads as follows.

**Theorem 4.2.** *For every idempotent  $Q \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ , we have*

$$\|P - Q\|_F \leq \|I_n - m(Q) - Q\|_F, \quad \forall P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{C}^{n \times n}).$$

Moreover, the equality above occurs only if  $P = I_n - m(Q)$ .

*Proof.* For every projection  $P \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ , by Lemma 4.1, Theorems 3.2 and 3.3, we have

$$\|I_n - m(Q) - Q\|_F^2 - \|P - Q\|_F^2 = \|I_n - P - Q\|_F^2 - \|m(Q) - Q\|_F^2 \geq 0,$$

and the number zero is obtained only if  $I_n - P = m(Q)$ .  $\square$

To get a positive answer to Problem 1.1(iv), we need some additional lemmas.

**Lemma 4.3.** [6, Theorems 3.4 and 3.10] *For every idempotent  $Q \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ , we have*

$$m(Q^*) = m(Q), \quad m(I_n - Q) = I_n - m(Q).$$

**Lemma 4.4.** *For every idempotent  $Q \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ ,  $P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}$  and  $m(Q)$  as projections are homotopy equivalent.*

*Proof.* It needs only to consider the case that  $1 \leq r := \text{rank}(Q) \leq n - 1$ . Let  $Q$  be represented by (2.4). For each  $t \in [0, 1]$ , set

$$Q_t = U^* \begin{pmatrix} I_r & tA \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} U.$$

Clearly,  $Q_t (t \in [0, 1])$  is a norm-continuous path of idempotents in  $\mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  which starts at  $P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}$  and ends at  $Q$ . This shows that  $P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}$  and  $Q$  as idempotents are homotopy equivalent. The same is also true for  $Q$  and  $m(Q)$  by a direct use of [6, Theorem 2.1], since the operator norm and the Frobenius norm on  $\mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  are equivalent. As both of  $P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}$  and  $m(Q)$  are projections, there exists a norm-continuous path of projections from  $P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}$  to  $m(Q)$  [1, Proposition 4.6.3].  $\square$

We are now in the position to prove the following intermediate value theorem.

**Theorem 4.5.** *For any idempotent  $Q \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  with  $Q \neq 0_n$  and  $Q \neq I_n$ , we have  $\text{ran}_Q = [\min_Q, \max_Q]$ , where  $\text{ran}_Q$ ,  $\min_Q$  and  $\max_Q$  are defined by (1.1) and (1.2), respectively.*

*Proof.* By Theorems 3.2 and 4.2, we have

$$\min_Q = \|m(Q) - Q\|_F, \quad \max_Q = \|I_n - m(Q) - Q\|_F.$$

For simplicity, we put

$$\lambda_1 = \|P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)} - Q\|_F, \quad \lambda_2 = \|I_n - P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)} - Q\|_F.$$

From (2.3) and (2.4), it is easily seen that

$$\lambda_1^2 = \|A\|_F^2, \quad \lambda_2^2 = \|A\|_F^2 + n,$$

and thus  $\lambda_2 = \sqrt{\lambda_1^2 + n}$ . Therefore,  $[\min_Q, \max_Q] = J_1 \cup J_2 \cup J_3$ , where

$$J_1 = [\|m(Q) - Q\|_F, \lambda_1], \quad J_2 = [\lambda_1, \lambda_2], \quad J_3 = [\lambda_2, \|I_n - m(Q) - Q\|_F].$$

So, it is reduced to show that  $J_i \subseteq \text{ran}_Q$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ .

By Lemma 4.4, there exists a norm-continuous path of projections  $P(t) (t \in [0, 1])$  in  $\mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  such that  $P(0) = m(Q)$  and  $P(1) = P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}$ . Since the function:  $t \rightarrow \|P(t) - Q\|_F$  is continuous on  $[0, 1]$ , we see that  $J_1 \subseteq \text{ran}_Q$ . In view of Lemma 4.3, we have

$$\|I_n - m(Q) - Q\|_F = \|m(I_n - Q^*) - Q\|_F.$$

Observe that

$$P_{\mathcal{R}(I_n - Q^*)} = P_{\mathcal{N}(Q^*)} = I_n - P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)},$$

so it can be concluded by Lemma 4.4 that  $m(I_n - Q^*)$  and  $I_n - P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}$  are homotopy equivalent. Hence, similar reasoning shows that  $J_3 \subseteq \text{ran}_Q$ .

Now, we turn to prove that  $J_2 \subseteq \text{ran}_Q$ . By assumption we have  $1 \leq r := \text{rank}(Q) \leq n - 1$ . In virtue of

$$\|(I_n - P) - (I_n - Q^*)\|_F = \|[(I_n - P) - (I_n - Q^*)]^*\|_F = \|P - Q\|_F$$

for every projection  $P \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_{\mathcal{R}(I_n - Q^*)} - (I_n - Q^*)\|_F &= \|[P_{\mathcal{R}(I_n - Q^*)} - (I_n - Q^*)]^*\|_F = \lambda_1, \\ \text{rank}(I_n - Q^*) &= \text{rank}(I_n - Q) = n - r, \end{aligned}$$

we may as well assume that  $r \leq n - r$ . Let  $P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}$  and  $Q$  be represented by (2.3) and (2.4), respectively. For each  $t \in [0, 1]$ , let

$$c_t = \cos\left(\frac{\pi t}{2}\right), \quad s_t = \sin\left(\frac{\pi t}{2}\right), \quad P_t = \begin{pmatrix} c_t^2 I_r & s_t c_t I_r \\ s_t c_t I_r & s_t^2 I_r \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{2r \times 2r},$$

$$P_t^{(0)} = \left( \frac{P_t}{\mid} \begin{array}{c} 0_{n-2r} \end{array} \right), \quad P_t^{(1)} = \left( \frac{P_t}{\mid} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0_{n-2r-1} \end{array} \right),$$

$$P_t^{(2)} = \left( \frac{P_t}{\mid} \begin{array}{c} I_2 \\ 0_{n-2r-2} \end{array} \right), \dots, P_t^{(n-2r)} = \left( \frac{P_t}{\mid} \begin{array}{c} I_{n-2r} \end{array} \right).$$

For each  $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, n-2r\}$ , it is clear that  $P_t^{(i)}$  ( $t \in [0, 1]$ ) is a norm-continuous path of projections. Hence, as is observed before, a continuous function can be induced as

$$f_i(t) = \|P_t^{(i)} - Q\|_F \quad (t \in [0, 1]).$$

A simple calculation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} f_0(0) &= \|A\|_F = \lambda_1, & f_0(1) &= \sqrt{\lambda_1^2 + 2r}, \\ f_1(0) &= \sqrt{\lambda_1^2 + 1}, & f_1(1) &= \sqrt{\lambda_1^2 + 2r + 1}, \\ f_2(0) &= \sqrt{\lambda_1^2 + 2}, & f_2(1) &= \sqrt{\lambda_1^2 + 2r + 2}, \\ & \vdots & & \\ f_{n-2r}(0) &= \sqrt{\lambda_1^2 + n - 2r}, & f_{n-2r}(1) &= \sqrt{\lambda_1^2 + 2r + (n - 2r)} = \lambda_2. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $2r > 1$ , we see that

$$[\lambda_1, \lambda_2] = \bigcup_{i=0}^{n-2r} [f_i(0), f_i(1)] \subseteq \text{ran}_Q. \quad \square$$

## 5. Some Frobenius norm bounds

In this section, we study the Frobenius norm bounds of  $P - Q$  and  $P - Q^\dagger$  under the restriction of  $PQ = Q$  on a projection  $P$  and an idempotent  $Q$ .



**Theorem 5.1.** *Let  $P \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  be a projection and  $Q \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  be an idempotent such that  $PQ = Q$ . Then*

$$\|P - Q\|_F \geq \lambda_{P,Q}, \quad (5.1)$$

where

$$\lambda_{P,Q} = \sqrt{\|m(Q) - Q\|_F^2 + \text{rank}(P) - \text{rank}(Q)}. \quad (5.2)$$

Moreover, the equality above occurs if and only if  $Q$  is a projection.

*Proof.* Denote by  $\text{rank}(Q) = r$ . If  $r = 0$ , then  $Q = 0$ , so (5.1) is trivially satisfied. If  $r = n$ , then  $Q = I_n$ , which yields  $P = I_n$ , since by assumption  $PQ = Q$ . Therefore, (5.1) is also trivially satisfied.

Now, we suppose that  $1 \leq r < n$  and  $PQ = Q$ . In this case, we have  $\text{rank}(P) \geq \text{rank}(Q)$ . Rewrite  $QQ^*$  as  $QQ^* = PQQ^*P$ , which implies that

$$P|Q^*| = |Q^*| = |Q^*|P.$$

As a result,

$$QQ^* - 2|Q^*| + P = (|Q^*| - P)^2. \quad (5.3)$$

Meanwhile, since  $\text{tr}(QP) = \text{tr}(PQ)$  and  $Q^*P = (PQ)^* = Q^*$ , it can be derived from (2.6) that

$$\text{tr}(QP) = \text{tr}(Q) = \text{tr}(Q^*P).$$

Hence,

$$\text{tr}(S) = 2 \cdot \text{tr}(Q) - \text{tr}(P),$$

where  $S$  is defined by (3.5). As is shown in the proof of Theorem 3.2, we have

$$\|P - Q\|_F^2 = \text{tr}(QQ^* - S), \quad \|m(Q) - Q\|_F^2 = \text{tr}(QQ^* - |Q^*|).$$

It follows that

$$\|P - Q\|_F^2 = \text{tr}(QQ^*) - 2 \cdot \text{tr}(Q) + \text{tr}(P), \quad (5.4)$$

$$\lambda_{P,Q}^2 = \text{tr}(QQ^*) - \text{tr}(|Q^*|) + \text{tr}(P) - \text{tr}(Q). \quad (5.5)$$

So, we may use (2.6) and (2.7) to conclude that  $\|P - Q\|_F^2 \geq \lambda_{P,Q}^2$  and

$$\|P - Q\|_F^2 = \lambda_{P,Q}^2 \iff Q = P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}.$$

So, the desired conclusion follows.  $\square$

**Theorem 5.2.** *Under the condition of Theorem 5.1, we have*

$$\|P - Q\|_F \leq \sqrt{2} \cdot \lambda_{P,Q}, \quad (5.6)$$

where  $\lambda_{P,Q}$  is defined by (5.2). Moreover, the equality above occurs if and only if  $P = Q = P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}$ .

*Proof.* To avoid the triviality, we only consider the case that  $1 \leq \text{rank}(Q) < n$  and  $PQ = Q$ . Since  $|Q^*|$  and  $P$  are both Hermitian, we may use (5.5), (5.4) and (5.3) to obtain

$$2 \cdot \lambda_{P,Q}^2 - \|P - Q\|_F^2 = \text{tr} [(|Q^*| - P)^2] = \||Q^*| - P\|_F^2.$$

The above equalities together with (2.6) and (2.7) yield the conclusion.  $\square$

As an application of Theorem 5.2, an upper of  $\|P - Q^\dagger\|_F$  can be derived as follows.

**Theorem 5.3.** *Under the condition of Theorem 5.1, we have*

$$\|P - Q^\dagger\|_F \leq \sqrt{2} \cdot \sqrt{1 + \|Q^\dagger Q - QQ^\dagger\|_2^2} \cdot \lambda_{P,Q}, \quad (5.7)$$

where  $\lambda_{P,Q}$  is defined by (5.2). Moreover, the equality above occurs if and only if  $P = Q = P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}$ .

*Proof.* Since  $Q$  is an idempotent, we have

$$Q^\dagger = Q^\dagger Q \cdot QQ^\dagger = P_{\mathcal{R}(Q^*)} P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)},$$

which gives  $\|Q^\dagger\|_2 \leq 1$ . A direct use of [3, Theorem 1.2] yields

$$P - Q^\dagger = \Omega_1 + \Omega_2 + \Omega_3,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_1 &= -P(P - Q)Q^\dagger, & \Omega_2 &= (I_n - P)(P - Q)^*(Q^\dagger)^*Q^\dagger, \\ \Omega_3 &= P(P - Q)^*(I_n - QQ^\dagger). \end{aligned}$$

With the decomposition of  $P - Q^\dagger$  as above, it is clear that

$$\|P - Q^\dagger\|_F^2 = \sum_{i=1}^3 \|\Omega_i\|_F^2.$$

Since  $Q^2 = Q$  and by assumption  $PQ = Q$ , we have  $(P - Q)QQ^\dagger = 0$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Omega_1\|_F &= \|P(P - Q)Q^\dagger Q \cdot Q^\dagger\|_F \leq \|P\|_2 \cdot \|(P - Q)Q^\dagger Q\|_F \cdot \|Q^\dagger\|_2 \\ &\leq \|(P - Q)Q^\dagger Q\|_F = \|(P - Q)(Q^\dagger Q - QQ^\dagger)\|_F \\ &\leq \|P - Q\|_F \cdot \|Q^\dagger Q - QQ^\dagger\|_2.\end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Omega_2\|_F &\leq \|(I_n - P)(P - Q)^*\|_F \cdot \|Q^\dagger\|_2^2 \leq \|(I_n - P)(P - Q)^*\|_F \\ &= \|[ (P - Q)(I_n - P) ]^*\|_F = \|(P - Q)(I_n - P)\|_F,\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Omega_3\|_F &= \|\Omega_3^*\|_F = \|(I_n - QQ^\dagger)(P - Q)P\|_F \\ &\leq \|I_n - QQ^\dagger\|_2 \cdot \|(P - Q)P\|_F \leq \|(P - Q)P\|_F.\end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\|\Omega_2\|_F^2 + \|\Omega_3\|_F^2 \leq \|P - Q\|_F^2.$$

The above arguments together with (5.6) yield

$$\begin{aligned}\|P - Q^\dagger\|_F &\leq \sqrt{1 + \|Q^\dagger Q - QQ^\dagger\|_2^2} \cdot \|P - Q\|_F \\ &\leq \sqrt{2} \cdot \sqrt{1 + \|Q^\dagger Q - QQ^\dagger\|_2^2} \cdot \lambda_{P,Q}.\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, from the above derivation we see that if (5.7) becomes an equality, then so does for (5.6). Hence,  $P = Q = P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}$  as is desired.  $\square$

*Remark 5.1.* Since both of  $Q^\dagger Q$  and  $QQ^\dagger$  are projections, the well-known Krein-Krasnoselskii-Milman equality [2] indicates that  $\|Q^\dagger Q - QQ^\dagger\|_2 \leq 1$ .

For each idempotent  $Q$ , it is clear that  $P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}Q = Q$ . As is observed in (2.6), we have  $\text{rank}(P) = \text{rank}(Q)$  in the case that  $P = P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}$ . So, in view of Theorems 5.1 and 5.2, a bilateral inequality can be derived immediately as follows.

**Theorem 5.4.** *For every idempotent  $Q \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ , we have*

$$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \cdot \|P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)} - Q\|_F \leq \|m(Q) - Q\|_F \leq \|P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)} - Q\|_F. \quad (5.8)$$

*Moreover, each equality above occurs if and only if  $Q$  is a projection.*

*Remark 5.2.* The second inequality in (5.8) can also be obtained by a direct use of Theorem 3.2.

*Remark 5.3.* By Theorem 5.4, there exist constants  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in (0, +\infty)$  such that

$$\alpha_1 \cdot \|P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)} - Q\|_F \leq \|m(Q) - Q\|_F \leq \alpha_2 \cdot \|P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)} - Q\|_F \quad (5.9)$$

for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and every idempotent  $Q \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ . For each  $a > 0$ , let  $Q_a$  be the idempotent given by

$$Q_a = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & a \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2}.$$

Evidently,  $\|P_{\mathcal{R}(Q_a)} - Q_a\|_F = a$  and by (3.1) we have

$$\|m(Q_a) - Q_a\|_F = \sqrt{1 + a^2} - \sqrt{1 + a^2}.$$

Therefore,

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\|m(Q_a) - Q_a\|_F}{\|P_{\mathcal{R}(Q_a)} - Q_a\|_F} = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{a \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\|m(Q_a) - Q_a\|_F}{\|P_{\mathcal{R}(Q_a)} - Q_a\|_F} = 1.$$

The limitations above together with (5.8) indicate that  $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$  and 1 are the optimal numbers of  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  that ensure the validity of (5.9) for every idempotent  $Q$ .

Based on Theorems Theorem 3.2 and 5.4, an additional upper bound of  $\|P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)} - Q\|_F$  can be put forward as follows.

**Theorem 5.5.** *For every idempotent  $Q \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  and every projection  $P \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ , we have*

$$\|P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)} - Q\|_F \leq \sqrt{2} \cdot \|P - Q\|_F.$$

*Moreover, the equality above occurs if and only if  $P = Q$ .*

*Proof.* We may combine Theorems 5.4 and 3.2 to conclude that

$$\|P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)} - Q\|_F \leq \sqrt{2} \cdot \|m(Q) - Q\|_F \leq \sqrt{2} \cdot \|P - Q\|_F.$$

So, if  $\|P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)} - Q\|_F = \sqrt{2} \cdot \|P - Q\|_F$ , then  $\|P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)} - Q\|_F = \sqrt{2} \cdot \|m(Q) - Q\|_F$ , hence by Theorem 5.4  $Q = P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}$ , and thus  $\sqrt{2} \cdot \|P - Q\|_F = 0$ , which happens only if  $P = Q$ .  $\square$

*Remark 5.4.* It is obvious that  $PQ = Q$  for  $P = AA^\dagger$  and  $Q = AX$ , where  $X$  denotes an arbitrary generalized inverse of a matrix  $A$ , which includes the weighted Moore-Penrose inverse [5], the Drazin inverse [7] and so on. So, results obtained as above can be applied to deal with the Frobenius norm estimations for  $AA^\dagger - AX$ .

Taking the Drazin inverse as an example, in what follows we derive two Frobenius norm bounds for  $AA^\dagger - AA^d$ , where  $A^d$  denotes the Drazin inverse of a square matrix  $A$ . It is well-known that

$$\mathcal{R}(AA^d) = \mathcal{R}(A^d) = \mathcal{R}(A^k),$$

where  $k = \text{ind}(A)$ , which is called the Drazin index of  $A$ . It may happen that  $AA^d$  is a projection, whereas  $A^d \neq A^\dagger$ . For instance, if  $A$  is a non-zero nilpotent matrix, then  $A^d = 0$ , while  $A^\dagger \neq 0$ . However, if  $AA^d = AA^\dagger$ , then it can be shown easily that  $A^d$  and  $A^\dagger$  must be the same.

We may apply Theorems 5.1 and 5.2 to get the following norm bounds.

**Corollary 5.6.** *For every square matrix  $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ , we have*

$$\|AA^\dagger - AA^d\|_F \geq \sqrt{\|m(AA^d) - AA^d\|_F^2 + \text{rank}(A) - \text{rank}(A^d)}.$$

*Moreover, the equality above occurs if and only if  $AA^d$  is a projection.*

**Corollary 5.7.** *For every square matrix  $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ , we have*

$$\|AA^\dagger - AA^d\|_F \leq \sqrt{2} \cdot \sqrt{\|m(AA^d) - AA^d\|_F^2 + \text{rank}(A) - \text{rank}(A^d)}. \quad (5.10)$$

*Moreover, the equality above occurs if and only if  $A^d = A^\dagger$ .*

We end this paper by showing the optimality of  $\sqrt{2}$  associated with (5.10) in the case that  $\text{rank}(A) > \text{rank}(A^d)$ . For this, we put

$$A_{n,a} = \begin{pmatrix} I_{2n} & aI_{2n} \\ 0_{2n} & J_n \end{pmatrix}, \quad Q_{n,a} = \begin{pmatrix} I_{2n} & a(I_{2n} + J_n) \\ 0_{2n} & 0_{2n} \end{pmatrix}$$

for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $a \in (0, +\infty)$ , where  $J_n$  is a nilpotent defined by

$$J_n = \left( \begin{array}{cc|c} 0 & 1 & \\ 0 & 0 & \\ \hline & & 0_{2n-2} \end{array} \right) \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n}.$$

It is routine to verify that

$$A_{n,a}Q_{n,a} = Q_{n,a}A_{n,a} = Q_{n,a} = Q_{n,a}^2 = A_{n,a}^2,$$

which means that  $Q_{n,a} = A_{n,a}^d$  such that  $\text{ind}(A_{n,a}) = 2$ . Hence,

$$A_{n,d}A_{n,a}^d = A_{n,a}Q_{n,a} = Q_{n,a}.$$

Since  $\mathcal{R}(A_{n,a}) = \mathbb{C}^{2n} \oplus \mathcal{R}(J_n)$ , we have

$$A_{n,a}A_{n,a}^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} I_{2n} & \\ & J_n J_n^\dagger \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} I_{2n+1} & \\ & 0_{2n-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Consequently,  $\text{rank}(A_{n,a}) - \text{rank}(A_{n,a}^d) = 1$  and

$$\|A_{n,a}A_{n,a}^\dagger - A_{n,a}A_{n,a}^d\|_F^2 = \|A_{n,a}A_{n,a}^\dagger - Q_{n,a}\|_F^2 = 1 + (2n+1)a^2.$$

An easy calculation yields

$$Q_{n,a}Q_{n,a}^* = \left( \begin{array}{cc|c} 1+2a^2 & a^2 & \\ \hline a^2 & 1+a^2 & \\ \hline & & (1+a^2)I_{2n-2} \\ & & 0_{2n} \end{array} \right),$$

so the non-zero eigenvalues of  $Q_{n,a}$  read as

$$\lambda_{1,2} = \frac{(2+3a^2) \pm \sqrt{5}a^2}{2}, \quad \lambda_i = 1+a^2 \quad (3 \leq i \leq 2n).$$

Utilizing (3.1) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|m(Q_{n,a}) - Q_{n,a}\|_F^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^{2n} (\lambda_i - \sqrt{\lambda_i})^2 \\ &= b + (2n-2) \left[ (1+a^2) - \sqrt{1+a^2} \right]^2, \end{aligned}$$

in which

$$b = \lambda_1 - \sqrt{\lambda_1} + \lambda_2 - \sqrt{\lambda_2}.$$

Suppose now that  $\alpha_3$  is a constant such that

$$\|A_{n,a}A_{n,a}^\dagger - Q_{n,a}\|_F \leq \alpha_3 \cdot \sqrt{\|m(Q_{n,a}) - Q_{n,a}\|_F^2 + 1}$$

for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $a \in (0, +\infty)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_3^2 &\geq \lim_{a \rightarrow 0^+} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|A_{n,a}A_{n,a}^\dagger - Q_{n,a}\|_F^2}{\|m(Q_{n,a}) - Q_{n,a}\|_F^2} \\ &= \lim_{a \rightarrow 0^+} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1 + (2n+1)a^2}{b + (2n-2) \left[ (1+a^2) - \sqrt{1+a^2} \right]^2} \\ &= \lim_{a \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{a^2}{(1+a^2) - \sqrt{1+a^2}} = 2. \end{aligned}$$

This shows the optimality of  $\sqrt{2}$ .

### Acknowledgement

The authors thank Professor Fuzhen Zhang for bring our attention to the theory of the weak majorization, and for his contribution to the proofs of Lemmas 2.1 and 2.4.

### References

- [1] B. Blackadar, *K*-theory for operator algebras, Mathematical Sciences Research Institute Publications 5, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1986.
- [2] Y. Kato, Some theorems on projections of von Neumann algebras, *Math. Jpn.* 21 (1976), 367–370.
- [3] J. J. Koliha, Continuity and differentiability of the Moore-Penrose inverse in  $C^*$ -algebras, *Math. Scand.* 88 (2001), no. 1, 154–160.
- [4] G. K. Pedersen,  *$C^*$ -algebras and their automorphism groups* (London Math. Soc. Monographs 14), Academic Press, New York, 1979.
- [5] M. Qin, Q. Xu and A. Zamani, Weighted Moore-Penrose inverses of adjointable operators on indefinite inner-product spaces, *J. Korean Math. Soc.* 57 (2020), 691–706.
- [6] X. Tian, Q. Xu and C. Fu, The matched projections of idempotents on Hilbert  $C^*$ -modules, <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.12984>
- [7] Q. Xu, C. Song and Y. Wei, The stable perturbation of the Drazin inverse of the square matrices, *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.* 31 (2010), no. 3, 1507–1520.
- [8] Q. Xu, Y. Wei and Y. Gu, Sharp norm estimations for Moore-Penrose inverses of stable perturbations of Hilbert  $C^*$ -module operators, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 47 (2010), no. 6, 4735–4758.
- [9] Q. Xu and G. Yan, Harmonious projections and Halmos’ two projections theorem for Hilbert  $C^*$ -module operators, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 601 (2020), 265–284.
- [10] F. Zhang, *Matrix theory, Basic results and techniques* (Second edition), Universitext, Springer, New York, 2011.