

Proof of the Paszkiewicz conjecture about a product of positive contractions

Hiroshi Ando, Yuki Miyamoto, and Narutaka Ozawa

ABSTRACT. The Paszkiewicz conjecture about a product of positive contractions asserts that given a decreasing sequence $T_1 \geq T_2 \geq \dots$ of positive contractions on a separable infinite-dimensional Hilbert space, the product $S_n = T_n \dots T_1$ converges strongly. Recently, the first named author verified the conjecture for certain classes of sequences. In this paper, we prove the Paszkiewicz conjecture in full generality. Moreover, we show that in some cases, a generalized version of the Paszkiewicz conjecture also holds.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2020) 47A63, 47A65.

Keywords: positive contractions, operator products, Hilbert spaces, spectral theory

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Proof of the Paszkiewicz conjecture	2
3. Generalization of the Paszkiewicz conjecture	6
Acknowledgments	10
References	10

1. INTRODUCTION

Let H be a separable infinite-dimensional Hilbert space, which we fix throughout the paper. The Paszkiewicz's conjecture about a product of positive contraction is the following.

Conjecture 1.1 (Adam Paszkiewicz, 2018). *Let $T_1 \geq T_2 \geq \dots$ be a sequence of positive linear contractions on H . Then the sequence $S_n := T_n T_{n-1} \dots T_1$ converges strongly.*

Since $T_1 \geq T_2 \geq \dots$ is a decreasing sequence of positive contractions, the limit $T := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_n$ (SOT) exists (SOT stands for the strong operator topology). We will use the notation that for a Borel subset A of \mathbb{R} , $1_A(T)$ denotes the spectral projection of T corresponding to A . Let $P := 1_{\{1\}}(T)$. In [1], Conjecture 1.1 is shown to be equivalent to Conjecture 1.2 below.

Conjecture 1.2. *Let $T_1 \geq T_2 \geq \dots$ be as in Conjecture 1.1. Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n = P$ ($*$ -strongly).*

The Conjecture 1.2 is easily seen to be true in the following cases:

- Example 1.3.**
- (1) The constant sequence $T_n \equiv T$ ($\forall n$). Then $S_n = T^n \rightarrow P$ (SOT).
 - (2) Each T_n is a projection P_n . Then $T = \lim_n T_n$ is also a projection, say P , and $S_n = P_n \rightarrow P$ (SOT).
 - (3) $\|T_{n_0}\| < 1$ for some n_0 . Then because $\|T_{n+1}\| \leq \|T_n\| \leq \dots$, $\|S_{n_0+k-1}\| \leq \|T_{n_0}\|^k \rightarrow 0$ ($k \rightarrow \infty$). Thus, $S_n \rightarrow P = 0$ in norm.
 - (4) $T_n T_m = T_m T_n$ for all $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$. In this case, if X is the Gelfand spectrum of the unital abelian C^* -algebra generated by $\{T_1, T_2, \dots\}$, then we may view $T_n = f_n$ for some $f_n \in C(X)$ and $f_1(x) \geq f_2(x) \geq \dots \geq f(x) = \lim_n f_n(x)$ for $x \in X$. Thus $S_n(x) = f_n(x) \dots f_1(x)$. We may identify $H = L^2(X, \mu)$ for some Borel probability measure μ

Date: June 11, 2024.

on X with full support. Let $x \in X$. If $f(x) = 1$, then $f_k(x) = 1$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and thus $S_n(x) = 1$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If $f(x) < 1$, then there exists $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $f_k(x) < \frac{f(x)+1}{2} < 1$ for every $k \geq k_0$, and thus $S_{n+k_0}(x) \leq \left(\frac{f(x)+1}{2}\right)^n \rightarrow 0$ ($n \rightarrow \infty$). Thus, $S_n(x) \rightarrow 1_{f^{-1}(\{1\})}$ pointwise, whence $S_n \rightarrow P$ (SOT).

Moreover, it is proved in [1] that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n^* = P$ (SOT), and the Paszkiewicz conjecture is true if either (i) the von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{M} = W^*(T_1, T_2, \dots)$ generated by T_1, T_2, \dots is finite, i.e., it admits a faithful normal tracial state, or (ii) T_1, T_2, \dots has uniform spectral gap at 1, i.e., there exists $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sigma(T_n) \cap (1 - \delta, 1) = \emptyset$ holds for all $n \geq N$. However, these are restrictive classes of sequences. Indeed, any von Neumann algebra \mathcal{M} on H is of the form $\mathcal{M} = W^*(T_1, T_2, \dots)$ for some decreasing sequence of positive contractions $T_1 \geq T_2 \geq \dots$ (Proposition 2.6). In this paper, we show that the Paszkiewicz conjecture is true in full generality.

In §2, we give a proof of the Paszkiewicz conjecture. We add an example to show that nevertheless, a product of decreasing sequence of positive contractions can have similar behaviour to orthogonal transformations (Proposition 2.1).

In §3, we consider a generalization of the Paszkiewicz conjecture. The motivation behind such a generalization came from our experience that many of our earlier arguments we have discovered so far to prove the original Paszkiewicz conjecture for some classes of sequences rely not too much on the fact that in the definition of the product $S_n = T_n \dots T_1$, the operators appear in the monotone decreasing order, though it is crucial that the T_n converges to T . This leads us to consider the following generalization of the Paszkiewicz conjecture. We denote by \mathcal{S} the set of all self-maps $\sigma: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ which are proper. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$, define

$$S_n^\sigma = T_{\sigma(n)} \dots T_{\sigma(1)}.$$

Then one can show that the σ -Paszkiewicz subspace $H_\sigma = \left\{ \xi \in H \mid \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n^\sigma \xi = P\xi \right\}$ is a closed subspace of H , and we set

$$H_{\mathcal{S}} = \bigcap_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} H_\sigma.$$

We say that the generalized Paszkiewicz conjecture holds for $T_1 \geq T_2 \geq \dots$, if $H_{\mathcal{S}} = H$ holds. We show in Theorem 3.7 that if \mathcal{M} is a factor, then the generalized Paszkiewicz conjecture holds if and only if $H_{\mathcal{S}} \neq \{0\}$. We then remark that some classes of sequences do satisfy the generalized Paszkiewicz conjecture. In particular, we show that this is the case if either (1) T_1, T_2, \dots has uniform spectral gap at 1 (Theorem 3.8), extending the work [1], or (2) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|T_n - T\| = 0$ and 1 is isolated in the spectrum $\sigma(T)$ of T (the latter is a special case of the former, but it leads to the norm convergence of S_n . See Remark 3.11).

2. PROOF OF THE PASZKIEWICZ CONJECTURE

Here, we prove the Paszkiewicz conjecture (note that the separability of H is not required).

Proof of the Paszkiewicz conjecture. For each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $P_m = 1_{\{1\}}(T_m)$ and $P = 1_{\{1\}}(T)$, with $T = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_n$ (SOT). Then $P_1 \geq P_2 \geq \dots \geq P$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n = P$ (SOT) by [1, Lemma 2.2]. Since $T_n P = P T_n = P$, we have $S_n P = P$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, it suffices to show that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n P^\perp = 0$ (SOT). By $P_n^\perp \nearrow P^\perp$ (SOT), it suffices to show that $S_n P_m^\perp \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$ (SOT) for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\xi_1 \in P_m^\perp(H)$, and $\varepsilon > 0$ be given and set $\xi_n := T_{n-1} \xi_{n-1} = T_{n-1} \dots T_1 \xi_1$ for $n \geq 2$. It suffices to show $\lim_n \|\xi_n\|^2 \leq \varepsilon$. Note that $\xi_m \in P_m^\perp(H)$ by $T_j P_m = P_m T_j = P_m$ ($j \leq m$), and that the sequence $\|\xi_n\|$ is decreasing. Consider the positive increasing functions $f_k(t) := 1 - (1 - t)^{1/k}$ on $[0, 1]$. Since f_k converges to the characteristic function for $\{1\}$, one has

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \langle f_k(T_m) \xi_m, \xi_m \rangle = \|1_{\{1\}}(T_m) \xi_m\|^2 = 0.$$

Take k such that $\langle f_k(T_m)\xi_m, \xi_m \rangle \leq \varepsilon/4$ and write $f := f_k$. Since f is operator monotone, one has

$$\langle f(T_n)\xi_n, \xi_n \rangle \leq \langle T_{n-1}f(T_{n-1})T_{n-1}\xi_{n-1}, \xi_{n-1} \rangle \leq \langle f(T_{n-1})\xi_{n-1}, \xi_{n-1} \rangle \leq \cdots \leq \varepsilon/4$$

for all $n \geq m$. Let e_{T_n} be the spectral measure associated with T_n and $\mu_n = \langle e_{T_n}(\cdot)\xi_n, \xi_n \rangle$ the corresponding scalar-valued spectral measure for (T_n, ξ_n) . Fix $n \geq m$ for a moment and suppose that $\mu_n([0, 1]) = \|\xi_n\|^2 \geq \varepsilon$. Put $\gamma := f^{-1}(1/2) \in (0, 1)$. Since $\int f d\mu_n \leq \varepsilon/4$, one has $\mu_n([\gamma, 1]) \leq \varepsilon/2$ and so $\mu_n([0, \gamma]) \geq \varepsilon/2$. It follows that

$$(1 - \gamma^2)\varepsilon/2 \leq (1 - \gamma^2)\mu_n([0, \gamma]) \leq \int 1 - t^2 d\mu_n(t) = \|\xi_n\|^2 - \|\xi_{n+1}\|^2$$

as long as $\|\xi_n\|^2 \geq \varepsilon$. This implies $\|\xi_n\|^2 \leq \varepsilon$ for any $n \geq m + 2(1 - \gamma^2)^{-1}\varepsilon^{-1}\|\xi_m\|^2$. \square

We complement the proof with the following example.

Proposition 2.1. *For every $0 < \delta < 1$, there are $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and a decreasing sequence $I \geq T_1 \geq T_2 \geq \cdots \geq T_n$ of positive contractions on the 2-dimensional Hilbert space ℓ_2^2 that satisfy $T_n \geq (1 - \delta)I$ and*

$$T_n \cdots T_1 \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 - \delta \end{pmatrix}$$

We need a preparatory construction. For a vector ξ , we denote by P_ξ the rank-one orthogonal projection associated with ξ and set $P_\xi^\perp := I - P_\xi$. For a vector ξ , we denote by P_ξ the rank-one orthogonal projection associated with ξ and set $P_\xi^\perp := I - P_\xi$.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\varepsilon \in [0, 1/2]$, $\theta \in [0, \pi/3]$, $\xi := \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$, and $\eta := \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta \\ \sin \theta \end{pmatrix}$. Let $\phi \in [0, \pi/3]$, $\zeta = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \phi \\ \sin \phi \end{pmatrix}$, and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ be given by the equation*

$$(P_\eta + (1 - \varepsilon)P_\eta^\perp)\xi = \alpha\zeta.$$

Then, one has $\alpha \geq 1 - \varepsilon\theta^2$ and $|\phi - \varepsilon\theta| \leq C\varepsilon\theta^3$, where C is an absolute constant.

Proof. Write $c := \cos \theta$ and $s := \sin \theta \leq \theta$. Set $\eta' := \begin{pmatrix} c \\ -s \end{pmatrix}$. Then $\xi = c\eta + s\eta'$ and

$$(P_\eta + (1 - \varepsilon)P_\eta^\perp)\xi = c\eta + (1 - \varepsilon)s\eta'$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= (1 - 2\varepsilon s^2 + \varepsilon^2 s^2)^{1/2} = ((1 - \varepsilon s^2)^2 + \varepsilon^2 s^2(1 - s^2))^{1/2} \\ &= (1 - \varepsilon s^2)(1 + t)^{1/2} \geq 1 - \varepsilon\theta^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $t := \varepsilon^2 s^2(1 - s^2)/(1 - \varepsilon s^2)^2 = \varepsilon^2 s^2 + O(\varepsilon^2 s^4)$. This proves the first assertion. Since $(1 + t)^{1/2} = 1 + t/2 + O(t^2)$ and $(1 - u)^{-1} = 1 + u + O(u^2)$,

$$\alpha^{-1} = 1 + \varepsilon s^2 - \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2 s^2 + O(\varepsilon^2 s^4).$$

Thus

$$\cos \phi = \alpha^{-1}(1 - \varepsilon s^2) = 1 - \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2 s^2 + O(\varepsilon^2 s^4) = 1 - \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2 \theta^2 + O(\varepsilon^2 \theta^4),$$

by $s = \theta + O(\theta^3)$. Since $0 \leq \arccos(1 - x) - (2x)^{1/2} \leq x^{3/2}$ for $x \in [0, 1]$, one has

$$\phi = \varepsilon\theta + O(\varepsilon\theta^3).$$

This proves the second assertion (in fact for $C = 10$ if the details are worked out). \square

Lemma 2.3. *Let $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon + \varepsilon^2 < \kappa < 1/2$, $\xi := \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$, and $\zeta := \begin{pmatrix} \cos \phi \\ \sin \phi \end{pmatrix}$. Let $\beta \geq 0$ be the largest constant that satisfies*

$$(1) \quad P_\xi + (1 - \varepsilon)P_\xi^\perp \geq \beta(P_\zeta + (1 - \kappa)P_\zeta^\perp).$$

Then $1 - 2\phi^2 \leq \beta \leq 1$.

Proof. Note that (1) implies that βP_ζ is a positive contraction, whence $\beta \leq 1$ holds. We may exchange ξ and ζ .

Write $c := \cos \phi$ and $s := \sin \phi$. Thus, β is the smaller of the eigenvalues of

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & (1-\kappa)^{-1/2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1-\varepsilon s^2 & \varepsilon c s \\ \varepsilon c s & 1-\varepsilon c^2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & (1-\kappa)^{-1/2} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1-\varepsilon s^2 & (1-\kappa)^{-1/2} \varepsilon c s \\ (1-\kappa)^{-1/2} \varepsilon c s & 1+(1-\kappa)^{-1}(\kappa-\varepsilon+\varepsilon s^2) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since the eigenvalues of $\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ b & d \end{pmatrix}$ are $((a+d) \pm ((a-d)^2 + 4b^2)^{1/2})/2$, we estimate for the above matrix

$$a+d = 2 + \frac{\kappa-\varepsilon}{1-\kappa} + \frac{\kappa\varepsilon s^2}{1-\kappa} \geq 2 + \frac{\kappa-\varepsilon}{1-\kappa}$$

and, since $d-a = (1-\kappa)^{-1}(\kappa-\varepsilon + (2-\kappa)\varepsilon s^2) \geq (1-\kappa)^{-1}(\kappa-\varepsilon)$,

$$\begin{aligned} ((a-d)^2 + 4b^2)^{1/2} &\leq d-a + \frac{2b^2}{d-a} \\ &\leq \frac{\kappa-\varepsilon}{1-\kappa} + \frac{(2-\kappa)\varepsilon s^2}{1-\kappa} + \frac{2\varepsilon^2 c^2 s^2}{\kappa-\varepsilon} \\ &\leq \frac{\kappa-\varepsilon}{1-\kappa} + 4s^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\beta \geq 1 - 2s^2$. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.1. We may assume that $D := 2\delta^{-1} > 8$ and set $\varepsilon_k := (D+n-k)^{-1}$ and $\theta_k := (\log(D+n-k))^{-1}\theta$ for $k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\theta > 0$ are chosen later. Note that $\varepsilon_n \leq \delta/2$. We recursively define $\xi_k := \begin{pmatrix} \cos \phi_k \\ \sin \phi_k \end{pmatrix}$, $\eta_k := \begin{pmatrix} \cos \rho_k \\ \sin \rho_k \end{pmatrix}$, and α_k as follows. First, set $\phi_0 := 0$ and $\rho_0 := \theta_0$. For $k = 0, \dots, n-1$, set ϕ_{k+1} and α_{k+1} by the equation

$$(P_{\eta_k} + (1-\varepsilon_k)P_{\eta_k}^\perp)\xi_k = \alpha_{k+1}\xi_{k+1}.$$

Then, $\rho_{k+1} := \phi_{k+1} + \theta_{k+1}$. Note that, by Lemma 2.2, one has

$$\alpha_{k+1} \geq 1 - \varepsilon_k \theta_k^2$$

and

$$|\phi_{k+1} - \phi_k - \varepsilon_k \theta_k| \leq C\varepsilon_k \theta_k^3.$$

Note also that we may assume (by taking θ sufficiently small) that $C\varepsilon_k \theta_k^3 \ll \varepsilon_k \theta_k$, and in particular that $C\varepsilon_k \theta_k^3 \leq \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_k \theta_k$ and $1 - 18\varepsilon_k \theta_k^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}$ for all $k = 0, \dots, n-1$. We recall that $\log(\log(t))' = (t \log(t))^{-1}$. Thus,

$$\phi_n \approx \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \varepsilon_k \theta_k \approx \theta \log(\log n)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Since ϕ_n depends continuously on θ , by the intermediate value theorem, we may set n and θ to be such that $\phi_n = \pi/2$, i.e., $\xi_n = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$. We use the inequality $t^{-1}(\log t)^{-2} \leq \frac{3}{2}(t+1)^{-1}(\log(t+1))^{-2}$, ($t \geq 8$) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \theta_{k+1} - \theta_k &\leq (D+n-k-1)^{-1}(\log(D+n-k-1))^{-2}\theta \\ &\leq \frac{3}{2}(D+n-k)^{-1}(\log(D+n-k))^{-2}\theta \leq \frac{3}{2}\varepsilon_k \theta_k. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, one has

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \rho_{k+1} - \rho_k &= \theta_{k+1} - \theta_k + \phi_{k+1} - \phi_k \\ &\leq \frac{3}{2}\varepsilon_k \theta_k + \varepsilon_k \theta_k + C\varepsilon_k \theta_k^3 \\ &\leq 3\varepsilon_k \theta_k. \end{aligned}$$

Set $\beta_k > 0$ to be the largest constant that satisfies

$$(P_{\eta_{k-1}} + (1-\varepsilon_{k-1})P_{\eta_{k-1}}^\perp) \geq \beta_k (P_{\eta_k} + (1-\varepsilon_k)P_{\eta_k}^\perp).$$

Since $\varepsilon_k - \varepsilon_{k-1} = (D + n - k)^{-1}(D + 1 + n - k)^{-1} > \varepsilon_{k-1}^2$, Lemma 2.3 implies

$$\beta_k \geq 1 - 2(\rho_k - \rho_{k-1})^2 \geq 1 - 18\varepsilon_{k-1}^2\theta_{k-1}^2.$$

Finally, set $\beta_0 := 1$ and

$$T_k := \beta_0\beta_1 \cdots \beta_k(P_{\eta_k} + (1 - \varepsilon_k)P_{\eta_k}^\perp) \leq T_{k-1}.$$

Then, one has

$$T_{n-1} \cdots T_0 \xi_0 = \left(\prod_{k=1}^n \alpha_k \right) \left(\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} \beta_k^{n-k} \right) \xi_n.$$

For $B := \int_D^\infty (t(\log t)^2)^{-1} dt = (\log D)^{-1}$,

$$\sum_{k=1}^n (1 - \alpha_k) \leq \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \varepsilon_k \theta_k^2 \leq B\theta^2$$

and by $\varepsilon_k(n - k) \leq 1$,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (1 - \beta_k)(n - k) \leq 18 \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} \varepsilon_k^2 \theta_k^2 (n - k) \leq 18 \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \varepsilon_k \theta_k^2 \leq 18B\theta^2.$$

Since we arranged θ sufficiently small so that $0 \leq 1 - \alpha_k \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $0 \leq 1 - \beta_k \leq \frac{1}{2}$ for all $k = 1, \dots, n$ we have $\log(\alpha_k) = \log(1 - (1 - \alpha_k)) \geq -2(1 - \alpha_k)$ and $\log(\beta_k) \geq -2(1 - \beta_k)$ thanks to the inequality $\log(1 - x) \geq -2x$ ($0 \leq x \leq \frac{1}{2}$). Therefore,

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \log \alpha_k \geq \sum_{k=1}^n -2(1 - \alpha_k) \geq -2B\theta^2, \text{ one has}$$

and similarly

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \log(\beta_k^{n-k}) \geq -2 \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (n - k)(1 - \beta_k) \geq -32B\theta^2.$$

These imply that $(\prod_{k=1}^n \alpha_k)(\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} \beta_k^{n-k}) \geq \exp(-34B\theta^2)$.

Since $\theta > 0$ could have been arbitrarily small, we may have $\exp(-34B\theta) > 1 - \delta$. Then replacing T_n with λT_n , where $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ is chosen such that $\lambda(\prod_{k=1}^n \alpha_k)(\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} \beta_k^{n-k}) = 1 - \delta$, we are done. \square

We end this section with the following remarks. First, if x_1, x_2, \dots is a sequence of (not necessarily positive) contractions on H , then we have a decreasing sequence $T_1 \geq T_2 \geq \dots$ of positive contractions, where

$$T_n = y_n^* y_n, \quad y_n = x_n \cdots x_1, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Actually, any $T_1 \geq T_2 \geq \dots$ is of this form:

Proposition 2.4. *Let $T_1 \geq T_2 \geq \dots$ be a decreasing sequence of positive contractions on H . Then there exist a sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ of contractions such that*

$$T_n = y_n^* y_n, \quad y_n = x_n \cdots x_1, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Moreover, $W^*(T_1, T_2, \dots) = W^*(x_1, x_2, \dots)$ holds.

The following lemma is well-known. We include the proof for completeness.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $S, T \in \mathbb{B}(H)$ be such that $0 \leq S \leq T$. Then there exists a contraction $x \in W^*(S, T)$ such that $S^{\frac{1}{2}} = xT^{\frac{1}{2}}$.*

Proof. Set $\mathcal{M} = W^*(S, T) = W^*(S^{\frac{1}{2}}, T^{\frac{1}{2}})$. Consider the orthogonal decomposition $H = \overline{\text{ran}}(T^{\frac{1}{2}}) \oplus \ker T^{\frac{1}{2}}$. We first define $x_0: \text{ran}(T^{\frac{1}{2}}) \rightarrow H$ by $x_0(T^{\frac{1}{2}}\xi) = S^{\frac{1}{2}}\xi$ for $\xi \in H$. Note that by $0 \leq S \leq T$, we have $\|S^{\frac{1}{2}}\xi\| \leq \|T^{\frac{1}{2}}\xi\|$, so that x_0 is a well-defined contraction. Thus, it extends to a contraction from $\overline{\text{ran}}(T^{\frac{1}{2}})$ to H , still denoted by x_0 . We then define x by setting x_0 on $\overline{\text{ran}}(T^{\frac{1}{2}})$ and 0 on $\ker(T^{\frac{1}{2}})$. Then $S^{\frac{1}{2}} = xT^{\frac{1}{2}}$ holds. We show that $x \in \mathcal{M}$. Let y' be an element in the commutant \mathcal{M}' of \mathcal{M} . For each $\xi \in H$, we have $y'x_0(T^{\frac{1}{2}}\xi) = y'S^{\frac{1}{2}}\xi = S^{\frac{1}{2}}y'\xi = x_0(T^{\frac{1}{2}}y'\xi) = x_0y'(T^{\frac{1}{2}}\xi)$. Therefore, $y'x_0 = x_0y'$ on $\overline{\text{ran}}(T^{\frac{1}{2}})$. On the other hand, if $\xi \in \ker(T^{\frac{1}{2}})$, then $y'\xi \in \ker(T^{\frac{1}{2}})$ by $T^{\frac{1}{2}}y' = y'T^{\frac{1}{2}}$, whence $y'x\xi = xy'\xi = 0$. This shows that $y'x = y'x$. Therefore, we obtain $x \in \mathcal{M}'' = \mathcal{M}$. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.4. Set $x_1 = T_1^{\frac{1}{2}}$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we may apply Lemma 2.5 to $0 \leq T_{n+1} \leq T_n$ to find a contraction $x_{n+1} \in W^*(T_{n+1}, T_n)$ such that $T_{n+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} = x_{n+1}T_n^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Then $T_1 = x_1^*x_1$, and for $n \geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} T_n &= T_{n-1}^{\frac{1}{2}}x_n^*x_nT_{n-1}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= T_{n-2}^{\frac{1}{2}}x_{n-1}^*x_n^*x_nx_{n-1}T_{n-2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \cdots = x_1^* \cdots x_n^*x_n \cdots x_1 \\ &= y_n^*y_n, \end{aligned}$$

where $y_n = x_n \cdots x_1$ ($n \in \mathbb{N}$). Finally, since $T_n = y_n^*y_n \in W^*(x_1, x_2, \dots)$ ($n \in \mathbb{N}$), $W^*(T_1, T_2, \dots) \subset W^*(x_1, x_2, \dots)$ holds. On the other hand, $x_1 = T_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \in W^*(T_1, T_2, \dots)$ and $x_{n+1} \in W^*(T_{n+1}^{\frac{1}{2}}, T_n^{\frac{1}{2}}) \subset W^*(T_1, T_2, \dots)$ ($n \in \mathbb{N}$) implies that $W^*(x_1, x_2, \dots) \subset W^*(T_1, T_2, \dots)$. Therefore, $W^*(T_1, T_2, \dots) = W^*(x_1, x_2, \dots)$ holds. \square

Next, we show that any von Neumann algebra arises in the form of $W^*(T_1, T_2, \dots)$. Thus, the finiteness assumption of $W^*(T_1, T_2, \dots)$ in [1] is indeed quite restrictive.

Proposition 2.6. *Let \mathcal{M} be a von Neumann algebra on H . Then there exist positive contractions $T_1 \geq T_2 \geq \dots$ such that $\mathcal{M} = W^*(T_1, T_2, \dots)$ holds.*

Proof. Since H is separable, there exists a countable family of projections e_1, e_2, \dots in $\mathbb{B}(H)$ such that $\mathcal{M} = W^*(e_1, e_2, \dots)$. Then $x_n = \frac{1}{2}(e_n + 1)$, ($n \in \mathbb{N}$) is an invertible contraction and $W^*(x_1, x_2, \dots) = W^*(e_1, e_2, \dots) = \mathcal{M}$. Let $T_n = y_n^*y_n$, $y_n = x_n \cdots x_1$. Then $T_1 \geq T_2 \geq \dots$ is a decreasing sequence of positive contractions on H and $\tilde{\mathcal{M}} := W^*(T_1, T_2, \dots) \subset \mathcal{M}$ holds. Since all x_1, x_2, \dots are invertible, so are y_1, y_2, \dots . We have $x_1 = T_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}$. Assume we have shown that $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}$. Then $y_1, \dots, y_n \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}$, whence $T_{n+1} = y_n^*x_{n+1}^2y_n$ implies $x_{n+1} = ((y_n^*)^{-1}T_{n+1}y_n^{-1})^{\frac{1}{2}} \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}$. This shows that $\mathcal{M} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{M}}$. Therefore, $\tilde{\mathcal{M}} = \mathcal{M}$ holds. \square

3. GENERALIZATION OF THE PASZKIEWICZ CONJECTURE

In this section, we consider a generalization of the Paszkiewicz conjecture.

Definition 3.1. A map $\sigma: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is called proper, if for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the set $\sigma^{-1}(\{k\})$ is finite. The set of all proper maps from \mathbb{N} to itself is denoted by \mathcal{S} .

Remark 3.2. A map $\sigma: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is proper if and only if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(n) = \infty$, i.e., for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sigma(n) > N$ for every $n \geq n_0$.

Now for a proper map $\sigma: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, we set

$$S_n^\sigma = T_{\sigma(n)} \cdots T_{\sigma(1)}.$$

By $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(n) = \infty$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_{\sigma(n)} = T$ (SOT) holds. Then we have the following analogue of [1, Proposition 2.3]. The proof is essentially the same, so we do not repeat it here.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $T_1 \geq T_2 \geq \dots$ be a sequence of positive contractions on H , and let $S_n^\sigma := T_{\sigma(n)} \cdots T_{\sigma(1)}$. The following statements hold (WOT stands for the weak operator topology):*

- (1) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (S_n^\sigma)^* = P$ (SOT). In particular, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n^\sigma = P$ (WOT) holds.
- (2) Let $\xi \in H$. If the set $\{S_n^\sigma \xi \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is totally bounded, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|S_n^\sigma \xi - P\xi\| = 0$ holds.
- (3) For every $\xi \in H$ and every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|S_{n+k}^\sigma \xi - S_n^\sigma \xi\| = 0$ holds.

Next, we introduce the σ -Paszkiewicz subspace H_σ .

Proposition 3.4. *Let $T_1 \geq T_2 \geq \dots$ be positive contractions on H and let $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$. Then the set*

$$H_\sigma := \left\{ \xi \in H \mid \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|S_n^\sigma \xi - P\xi\| = 0 \right\} = \left\{ \xi \in H \mid \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|S_n^\sigma \xi\| = \|P\xi\| \right\}$$

is a closed subspace of H containing $P(H)$.

Proof. It is clear that H_σ is a vector subspace of H and that $P(H) \subset H_\sigma$ because $S_n^\sigma P\xi = P\xi$ for every $\xi \in H$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\xi \in \overline{H_\sigma}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there exists $\xi_0 \in H_\sigma$ such that $\|\xi - \xi_0\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}$ holds. Since $\xi_0 \in H_\sigma$, we may find an $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|S_m^\sigma \xi_0 - S_n^\sigma \xi_0\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}$ for every $n, m \geq n_0$. Then for every $n, m \geq n_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_m^\sigma \xi - S_n^\sigma \xi\| &\leq \|S_m^\sigma(\xi - \xi_0)\| + \|S_m^\sigma \xi_0 - S_n^\sigma \xi_0\| + \|S_n^\sigma \xi_0 - S_n^\sigma \xi\| \\ &< 2\|\xi - \xi_0\| + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} < \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Since ε is arbitrary, this shows that $(S_n^\sigma \xi)_{n=1}^\infty$ is Cauchy, whence it converges to $P\xi$ by Proposition 3.3 (2). Therefore, $\xi \in H_\sigma$ holds. This shows that H_σ is closed. Finally, to show the last equality, we show that for each $\xi \in H$ the following conditions are equivalent:

- (a) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|S_n^\sigma \xi - P\xi\| = 0$.
- (b) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|S_n^\sigma \xi\| = \|P\xi\|$.

(a) \implies (b) is clear. Assume (b). Then because $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n^\sigma = P$ (WOT), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_n^\sigma \xi - P\xi\|^2 &= \|S_n^\sigma \xi\|^2 + \|P\xi\|^2 - 2 \operatorname{Re}\langle S_n^\sigma \xi, P\xi \rangle \\ &\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \|P\xi\|^2 + \|P\xi\|^2 - 2 \operatorname{Re}\langle P\xi, P\xi \rangle = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (a) holds. This finishes the proof. \square

Then, inspired by the role played by the subspace “ Z ” in the work of Kopecká–Paszkiewicz [2, Lemma 3.4], we define the following closed subspace $H_{\mathcal{S}}$ of H :

Definition 3.5. We define the σ -Paszkiewicz subspace H_σ by

$$H_\sigma = \left\{ \xi \in H \mid \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n^\sigma \xi = P\xi \right\},$$

and then we set

$$H_{\mathcal{S}} = \bigcap_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} H_\sigma.$$

Let $\mathcal{M} = W^*(T_1, T_2, \dots)$.

Definition 3.6. We say that the generalized Paszkiewicz conjecture holds for $T_1 \geq T_2 \geq \dots$ if $H_{\mathcal{S}} = H$ holds.

Theorem 3.7. *The following statements hold.*

- (1) Both $H_{\mathcal{S}}$ is a closed subspace of H which are invariant under all T_n .
- (2) e is a central projection in \mathcal{M} . In particular, if \mathcal{M} is a factor, then the generalized Paszkiewicz conjecture holds for $T_1 \geq T_2 \geq \dots$ if and only if $H_{\mathcal{S}} \neq \{0\}$.

Proof. (1) Let $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$, $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\xi \in H_{\mathcal{S}}$. Then the map $\hat{\sigma}: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ defined by $\hat{\sigma}(1) = m$, $\hat{\sigma}(k+1) = \sigma(k)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is an element in \mathcal{S} . Thus,

$$S_n^\sigma(T_m \xi) = S_{n+1}^{\hat{\sigma}} \xi \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} P\xi = P(T_m \xi)$$

by $\xi \in H_{\delta}$. Therefore $T_m \xi \in H_{\mathcal{S}}$. This shows that $H_{\mathcal{S}}$ is invariant under T_m .

(2) By (1), e belongs to \mathcal{M}' . Assume that f is a projection in \mathcal{M}' such that $e \sim f$ in \mathcal{M}' (\sim denotes the Murray-von Neumann equivalence of projections). By $e \sim f$, there exists a partial isometry $u \in \mathcal{M}'$ such that $u^*u = e$ and $uu^* = f$. Let $\xi \in f(H)$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$. Then $u^*\xi \in e(H) \subset H_{\sigma}$. By $P, S_n^{\sigma} \in \mathcal{M}$ and $u \in \mathcal{M}'$, we have

$$S_n^{\sigma} \xi = S_n^{\sigma} u u^* \xi = u S_n^{\sigma} (u^* \xi) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} u P u^* \xi = P u u^* \xi = P \xi.$$

This shows that $\xi \in H_{\sigma}$. Since $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$ is arbitrary, we obtain $\xi \in H_{\mathcal{S}} = e(H)$. Therefore, $f \leq e$ holds. It then follows that

$$e \leq \bigvee \{ueu^* \mid u \in U(\mathcal{M}')\} \leq \bigvee \{f \in \text{Proj}(\mathcal{M}') \mid f \sim e\} \leq e,$$

whence $e = \bigvee \{ueu^* \mid u \in U(\mathcal{M}')\} = z(e)$ holds (here, $z(e)$ is the central support of e). The last claim is then immediate. \square

We then give examples of sequences for which the generalized Paszkiewicz conjecture holds (that many of such examples exist was the motivation for this generalization). It is clear that the generalized Paszkiewicz conjecture is true when $\mathcal{M} = W^*(T_1, T_2, \dots)$ is a finite von Neumann algebra, because $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (S_n^{\sigma})^* = P$ (SOT) for every $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$ and the $*$ -operation is SOT-continuous on the unit ball of \mathcal{M} . The next result shows that the generalized Paszkiewicz conjecture is true also for sequences with uniform spectral gap at 1, which generalizes [1].

Proposition 3.8. *If $T_1 \geq T_2 \geq \dots$ has uniform spectral gap at 1, then the generalized Paszkiewicz conjecture holds for it.*

Lemma 3.9. *Let $T_1 \geq T_2$ be positive contractions on H . Let $P_i = 1_{\{1\}}(T_i)$ ($i = 1, 2$). Then for each $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$, $T_i P_j^{\perp}(H) \subset P_{\max\{i, j\}}^{\perp}(H)$ holds.*

Proof. The case $i = j$ is trivial. Assume $i < j$. Then $T_i \geq T_j$, whence $P_i \geq P_j$ and $T_i P_j = P_j T_i = P_j$. Thus $T_i P_j^{\perp}(H) = P_j^{\perp} T_i(H) \subset P_j^{\perp}(H)$. If $i > j$, then $P_j \geq P_i$, whence $P_j^{\perp} \leq P_i^{\perp}$. Therefore, $T_i P_j^{\perp}(H) \subset T_i P_i^{\perp}(H) \subset P_i^{\perp}(H)$. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.8. Let $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\xi \in P^{\perp}(H)$ be a unit vector. Then there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|\xi - P_{n_0}^{\perp} \xi\| < \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon$ holds. By assumption, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$ such that $\sigma(T_n) \cap (1 - \delta, 1) = \emptyset$ for every $n \geq N$. We may assume that $N \geq n_0$. Using the properness of σ , we may find an increasing sequence of natural numbers

$$2 \leq n_1 < n_2 < \dots$$

such that $\sigma(n_k) > \max\{N, \sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(n_k - 1)\}$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Indeed, by the properness of σ , there exists $n_1 \geq 2$ such that $\sigma(n_1) \geq N$ holds. Assume that we have found $n_1 < n_2 < \dots < n_k$. Then by the properness of σ , there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ for which $n > n_k$ and $\sigma(n) > \sigma(n_k)$ holds. Let n_{k+1} be the smallest such n . Then $\sigma(n_{k+1}) > N, \sigma(n_k)$, and if $n < n_k$, then $\sigma(n) < \sigma(n_k) < \sigma(n_{k+1})$ and if $n_k \leq n < n_{k+1}$, then $\sigma(n_{k+1}) > \sigma(n_k) \geq \sigma(n)$ by the choice of n_{k+1} . By induction, we have the $n_1 < n_2 < \dots$ with the required properties. Choose $k \in \mathbb{N}$ for which $(1 - \delta)^k < \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon$ holds. Then for every $n \geq n_k$, we have

$$\|S_n^{\sigma} \xi\| \leq \|S_{n_k}^{\sigma} \xi\| \leq \|S_{n_k}^{\sigma} (\xi - P_{n_0}^{\perp} \xi)\| + \|S_{n_k}^{\sigma} P_{n_0}^{\perp} \xi\|$$

and by a repeated use of Lemma 3.9, we have

$$S_{n_k}^{\sigma} P_{n_0}^{\perp} \xi = T_{n_k} \left(\underbrace{T_{\sigma(n_k-1)} \cdots T_{\sigma(1)}}_{\in P_{\max\{\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(n_k-1), n_0\}}^{\perp}(H)} P_{n_0}^{\perp} \xi \right)$$

And by $\sigma(n_k) > \max(\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(n_k - 1), n_0, N)$, we have

$$P_{\max\{\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(n_k-1), n_0\}}^{\perp}(H) \subset P_{\sigma(n_k)}^{\perp}(H) = 1_{[0, 1-\delta]}(T_{\sigma(n_k)})(H).$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_{n_k}^\sigma P_{n_0}^\perp \xi\| &\leq (1-\delta) \|T_{\sigma(n_k-1)} \cdots T_{\sigma(n_k-1)+1} S_{n_k-1}^\sigma P_{n_0}^\perp \xi\| \\ &\leq (1-\delta) \|S_{n_k-1}^\sigma P_{n_0}^\perp \xi\| \\ &\leq \cdots \leq (1-\delta)^k \|S_{n_1-1}^\sigma P_{n_0}^\perp \xi\| \\ &\leq (1-\delta)^k < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\|S_n^\sigma \xi\| < \varepsilon$ ($n \geq n_k$). Since ε is arbitrary, we obtain $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|S_n^\sigma \xi\| = 0$ for every $\xi \in P^\perp(H)$, i.e., $H_\sigma = H$ holds. \square

Proposition 3.10. *Let $T_1 \geq T_2 \geq \cdots$ be a decreasing sequence of positive contractions on H . Assume that 1 is isolated in $\sigma(T)$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|T_n - T\| = 0$. Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|S_n^\sigma - P\| = 0$ for every $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$. In particular, the generalized Paszkiewicz conjecture is true for $T_1 \geq T_2 \geq \cdots$.*

Proof. By assumption, there exists $\delta \in (0, 1)$ such that $\sigma(T) \cap (1 - \delta, 1) = \emptyset$. In particular, $\|T^k - P\| = \|T^k P^\perp\| \leq (1 - \delta)^k \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} 0$. Therefore, for a given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|T^k - P\| < \varepsilon$. Then by $T_j P = P$ ($j \in \mathbb{N}$) and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|T_{\sigma(n+1)} \cdots T_{\sigma(n+k)} - T^k\| = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|(S_n^\sigma)^* - P\| &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|(S_{n+k}^\sigma)^* - P\| \\ &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|T_{\sigma(1)} \cdots T_{\sigma(n)} (T_{\sigma(n+1)} \cdots T_{\sigma(n+k)} - P)\| \\ &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|T_{\sigma(n+1)} \cdots T_{\sigma(n+k)} - P\| \\ &= \|T^k - P\| < \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Since ε is arbitrary, we obtain $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|(S_n^\sigma)^* - P\| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|S_n^\sigma - P\| = 0$. \square

Remark 3.11. If $T_1 \geq T_2 \geq \cdots$ is a decreasing sequence of positive contraction as in Proposition 3.10, then it has uniform spectral gap at 1 (this was pointed out by Hiroki Matui). Thus, Proposition 3.10 is a special case of Proposition 3.8. On the other hand, note that for a general decreasing sequence of positive contractions with uniform spectral gap at 1, one cannot hope that S_n converges in norm (consider e.g., the case where all T_n are projections).

If T_n converges to T faster (but 1 is possibly not isolated in $\sigma(T)$), then we also have a slightly weaker conclusion.

Proposition 3.12. *Let $T_1 \geq T_2 \geq \cdots$ be a sequence of positive contractions on H . Assume that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|T - T_n\| < \infty$ holds. Then for each $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \#\sigma^{-1}(\{n\}) < \infty$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n^\sigma = P$ (SOT) holds.*

Proof. Let $\xi \in H$ be a unit vector and $\varepsilon > 0$. By the hypothesis on σ , we have $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|T - T_{\sigma(n)}\| < \infty$.

Choose $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sum_{n=n_0+1}^{\infty} \|T - T_{\sigma(n)}\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ holds. Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T^n = P$ (SOT), there exists $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|T^n S_{n_0}^\sigma \xi - P S_{n_0}^\sigma \xi\| = \|T^n S_{n_0}^\sigma \xi - P \xi\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ for every $n \geq n_1$.

Let $S_{n, n_0+1}^\sigma = T_{\sigma(n+n_0)} \cdots T_{\sigma(n_0+1)}$ (n products). For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_{n, n_0+1}^\sigma - T^n\| &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \|T_{\sigma(n+n_0)} \cdots T_{\sigma(n_0+k+1)} (T_{\sigma(n_0+k)} - T) T^{k-1}\| + \|(T_{\sigma(n+n_0)} - T) T^{n-1}\| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=n_0+1}^{\infty} \|T - T_{\sigma(k)}\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by $S_{n+n_0}^\sigma = S_{n,n_0+1}^\sigma S_{n_0}^\sigma$, it holds that for every $n \geq n_1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_{n+n_0}^\sigma \xi - P\xi\| &\leq \|(S_{n,n_0+1}^\sigma - T^n)S_{n_0}^\sigma \xi\| + \|T^n S_{n_0}^\sigma \xi - P S_{n_0}^\sigma \xi\| \\ &< \|S_{n,n_0+1}^\sigma - T^n\| + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} < \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Since ε is arbitrary, this shows that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|S_n^\sigma \xi - P\xi\| = 0$. □

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank Professors Masaru Nagisa and Mitsuru Uchiyama for useful discussions regarding the spectral order which we used in an earlier version of the paper and for pointing us to related literatures, Professor Hiroki Matui for his useful comment at Remark 3.11. H. Ando is supported by Japan Society for the Promotion of Sciences (JSPS) KAKENHI 20K03647. N. Ozawa is partially supported by JSPS KAKENHI 20H00114 and 24K00527.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. ANDO, *Notes on a conjecture by Paszkiewicz on an ordered product of positive contractions*, arXiv:2404.17131, (2024).
- [2] E. KOPECKÁ AND A. PASZKIEWICZ, *Strange products of projections*, Israel J. Math., 219 (2017), pp. 271–286.

HIROSHI ANDO, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATICS, CHIBA UNIVERSITY, 1-33 YAYOI-CHO, INAGE, CHIBA, 263- 8522, JAPAN
Email address: hiroando@math.s.chiba-u.ac.jp

YUKI MIYAMOTO, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATICS, CHIBA UNIVERSITY, 1-33 YAYOI-CHO, INAGE, CHIBA, 263- 8522, JAPAN
Email address: 23wm0119@student.gs.chiba-u.jp

NARUTAKA OZAWA, RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, KYOTO UNIVERSITY KYOTO, 606-8502, JAPAN
Email address: narutaka@kurims.kyoto-u.ac.jp