

# INTERPOLATION THEOREMS FOR CONJUGATIONS AND APPLICATIONS

ZOUHEIR AMARA

**ABSTRACT.** Let  $H$  be a separable complex Hilbert space. A conjugate-linear map  $C : H \rightarrow H$  is a conjugation if it is an involutive isometry. In this paper, we consider the following interpolation problems: Let  $\{x_i\}_{i \in I}$  and  $\{y_i\}_{i \in I}$  be two orthogonal sets of vectors in  $H$ , and let  $N$  and  $\{N_k\}_{k \in K}$  be normal operators such that the  $N_k$ 's mutually commute. Then, under which conditions does there exist a conjugation  $C$  on  $H$  such that

- (a)  $Cx_i = y_i$  and  $CN_kC = N_k^*$  for all  $i \in I$  and  $k \in K$ ; or
- (b)  $Cx_i = y_i$ , for every  $i \in I$ , and  $CNC = -N^*$ .

We provide complete answers to problems (a) and (b). As a consequence of our results, we give necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of solutions of some equations in  $L^\infty(\mu)$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout this paper,  $H$  and  $K$  are separable complex Hilbert spaces. We use the notation  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  for the inner product of both  $H$  and  $K$ . The algebra of all bounded linear operators on  $H$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{B}(H)$ , and the identity operator on  $H$  is denoted by  $I_H$ ; if there is no ambiguity, we simply write  $I$ . The range and the null space of an operator  $T$  are denoted by  $\text{ran}(T)$  and  $\text{ker}(T)$ , respectively. All direct sums in this paper are orthogonal.

A *conjugation*  $C$  on  $H$  is a conjugate-linear map  $C : H \rightarrow H$  that satisfies

- (i)  $C^2 = I$ ;
- (ii)  $\langle Ch, Ck \rangle = \langle k, h \rangle$  for all  $h, k \in H$ .

The simplest example of a conjugation on  $H$  is the map given by  $C(\sum_i \lambda_i e_i) = \overline{\lambda_i} e_i$ , where  $\{e_i\}_i$  is an orthonormal basis of  $H$ . In fact, according to [13, Lemma 1], any conjugation can be represented in this manner with respect to some orthonormal basis.

Conjugations have been the subject of intensive study in recent years [5, 6, 11, 12, 20, 21], with origins in physics. The composition  $\mathcal{PT}$ , of the *parity* operator  $[\mathcal{P}f](x) = f(-x)$  and the *time-reversal* operator  $[\mathcal{T}f](x) = \overline{f(x)}$  defines a conjugation on  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$  which holds significant importance in the theory of

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 47B15, 47B38, 47A15.

*Key words and phrases.* Conjugations, interpolation, complex-symmetric operators, skew-symmetric operators.

$\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric quantum theory (see, for instance, [3, 4]). For more historical comments about conjugations, we refer the interested reader to [5, 26] and references therein. Recent investigations into conjugations have largely stemmed from their connections to complex-symmetric and skew-symmetric operators.

An operator  $T \in \mathcal{B}(H)$  is called *complex-symmetric* (resp. *skew-symmetric*) if there exists a conjugation  $C$  on  $H$  such that  $CTC = T^*$  (resp.  $CTC = -T^*$ ); in this case, we say more precisely that  $T$  is *C-symmetric* (resp. *C-skew symmetric*). An equivalent definition is that  $T$  has a symmetric (resp. skew-symmetric) matrix  $M$  with respect to some orthonormal basis; i.e.,  $M^{\text{tr}} = M$  (resp.  $M^{\text{tr}} = -M$ ) where  $\text{tr}$  stands for the transpose ([14, 17]). These classes of linear operators have received significant attention in the last two decades. Applications of complex symmetric operators and skew-symmetric matrices are found in various areas (see, for instance, [13, 14, 15, 24] and [7, 22, 23]).

In [18, 19, 26, 29], the authors investigated various interpolation problems for conjugations. In [18], Liu et al. established that for two orthogonal projections  $P$  and  $Q$  in  $\mathcal{B}(H)$ , a conjugation  $C$  on  $H$  exists with  $CPC = Q$  if and only if  $\text{ran}(P)$  and  $\text{ran}(Q)$  are in symmetric position; i.e.,

$$\dim(\text{ran}(P)^\perp \cap \text{ran}(Q)) = \dim(\text{ran}(P) \cap \text{ran}(Q)^\perp).$$

In [26], Wang et al. proved that for two commuting self-adjoint operators  $P, Q \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ , there exists a conjugation  $C$  on  $H$  satisfying  $CPC = Q$  if and only if there exists an isometric isomorphism  $U$  between Hilbert spaces such that

$$UPU^{-1} = B_1 \oplus B_2 \oplus A \quad \text{and} \quad UQU^{-1} = B_2 \oplus B_1 \oplus A$$

where  $B_1, B_2$  and  $A$  are self-adjoint operators such that  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  have the same underlying Hilbert space and commute.

It is well-known that for every normal operator  $N$ , there exists a conjugation  $C$  such that  $CNC = N^*$  ([13]). However, this is not always the case if it is also required that  $Cx_i = y_i$  for some families of vectors  $\{x_i\}_{i \in I}$  and  $\{y_i\}_{i \in I}$ . It is the purpose of this paper to investigate such a problem. The paper is structured as follows.

In Section 2, we present our primary results regarding the interpolation problem: when does there exist a conjugation  $C$  on  $H$  satisfying  $Cx_i = y_i$  and  $CN_kC = N_k^*$  for all  $i \in I$  and  $k \in K$ . Here,  $\{x_i\}_{i \in I}$  and  $\{y_i\}_{i \in I}$  are orthogonal subsets of  $H$ , and  $\{N_k\}_{k \in K}$  is a collection of mutually commuting normal operators on  $H$ . We establish geometric conditions to answer this question, along with several equivalent conditions. As a consequence of these results, we extend a recent result by Mashreghi et al. [20] concerning hyperinvariant subspaces of unitary operators (see Proposition 2.5).

In Section 3, we investigate a “skew-symmetric” version of the earlier interpolation problem. We aim to identify the conditions under which there exists a conjugation  $C$  on  $H$  that can fulfill the conditions  $Cx_i = y_i$  and  $CNC = -N^*$

for all  $i \in I$ , with  $N$  being a normal operator. The simplest answer is obtained when  $I$  is finite.

In the last section, we apply our main results to give necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of solutions of certain equations in  $L^\infty(\mu)$  with coefficients in  $L^2(\mu)$ .

## 2. INTERPOLATION THEOREMS FOR CONJUGATIONS : $\mathbb{C}$ -SYMMETRIC VERSIONS

Recall that a linear (or conjugate-linear) operator  $V$  on  $H$  is called *partial isometry* if the restriction of  $V$  to  $\ker(V)^\perp$  is an isometry.

### 2.1. Main results.

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be an abelian von Neumann algebra of operators in  $\mathcal{B}(H)$ , and let  $\{x_i\}_{i \in I}$  and  $\{y_i\}_{i \in I}$  be two orthogonal sets of non-zero vectors in  $H$ . The following statements are equivalents:*

(i) *There exists a conjugation  $C$  on  $H$  such that*

$$CTC = T^* \text{ and } Cx_i = y_i \text{ for all } T \in \mathcal{M} \text{ and } i \in I.$$

(ii) *There exists a conjugate-linear partial isometry  $V$  on  $H$  such that*

$$VT = T^*V, \quad x_i \in \ker(V)^\perp, \quad Vx_i = y_i \text{ and } Vy_i = x_i \text{ for all } T \in \mathcal{M} \text{ and } i \in I.$$

(iii) *For every orthogonal projection  $P \in \mathcal{M}$  and for all  $i, j \in I$ , we have*

$$\langle Px_i, x_j \rangle = \langle Py_j, y_i \rangle \text{ and } \langle Px_i, y_j \rangle = \langle Px_j, y_i \rangle.$$

*Remark 2.2.* Noting that  $C(\lambda I)C = (\lambda I)^*$  for all conjugations  $C$  and  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ , one can see that when  $\mathcal{M} = \{\lambda I : \lambda \in \mathbb{C}\}$ , we recapture [29, Theorem 2.1]. This theorem states that for two orthonormal sets  $\{x_i\}_{i \in I}$  and  $\{y_i\}_{i \in I}$  in  $H$ , there exists a conjugation  $C$  on  $H$  satisfying  $Cx_i = y_i$  for every  $i \in I$  if and only if  $\langle x_i, y_j \rangle = \langle x_j, y_i \rangle$  for all  $i, j \in I$ . It should be noted that their result is important in proving our main results.

For a normal operator  $N$ , we denote by  $E_N$  the associated spectral measure defined on Borel subsets of  $\mathbb{C}$ .

If  $\mathcal{M} = W^*(N_k : k \in K)$ , meaning that  $\mathcal{M}$  is the smallest von Neumann algebra containing a family of mutually commuting normal operators  $\{N_k\}_{k \in K}$ , then the conditions outlined in Theorem 2.1 can be refined as follows.

**Theorem 2.3.** *Let  $\{N_k\}_{k \in K} \subset \mathcal{B}(H)$  be a family of mutually commuting normal operators, and let  $\{x_i\}_{i \in I}$  and  $\{y_i\}_{i \in I}$  be two orthogonal sets of non-zero vectors in  $H$ . The following statements are equivalent:*

(i) *There exists a conjugation  $C$  on  $H$  such that  $CTC = T^*$  and  $Cx_i = y_i$  for all  $T \in W^*(N_k : k \in K)$  and  $i \in I$ .*

- (ii) There exists a conjugation  $C$  on  $H$  such that  $CN_kC = N_k^*$  and  $Cx_i = y_i$  for all  $k \in K$  and  $i \in I$ .
- (iii) There exists a conjugate-linear partial isometry  $V$  on  $H$  such that  $VN_k = N_k^*V$ ,  $x_i \in \ker(V)^\perp$ ,  $Vx_i = y_i$  and  $Vy_i = x_i$  for all  $k \in K$  and  $i \in I$ .
- (iv) For all finite subsets  $K_0 \subseteq K$ , Borel subsets  $\{\Delta_k\}_{k \in K_0}$  of  $\mathbb{C}$ , and  $i, j \in I$  we have

$$\left\langle \left( \prod_{k \in K_0} E_{N_k}(\Delta_k) \right) x_i, x_j \right\rangle = \left\langle \left( \prod_{k \in K_0} E_{N_k}(\Delta_k) \right) y_j, y_i \right\rangle$$

and

$$\left\langle \left( \prod_{k \in K_0} E_{N_k}(\Delta_k) \right) x_i, y_j \right\rangle = \left\langle \left( \prod_{k \in K_0} E_{N_k}(\Delta_k) \right) x_j, y_i \right\rangle.$$

Given non-zero vectors  $x, y \in H$ , we denote by  $x \otimes y$  the rank-one operator defined by  $(x \otimes y)h = \langle h, y \rangle x$  for every  $h \in H$ .

If  $I$  is of cardinal one, then Theorem 2.3 reduces to:

**Theorem 2.4.** Let  $\{N_k\}_{k \in K} \subset \mathcal{B}(H)$  be a family of mutually commuting normal operators, and let  $x, y \in H$  be non-zero vectors. The following statements are equivalent:

- (i) There exists a conjugation  $C$  on  $H$  satisfying  $CN_kC = N_k^*$  and  $Cx = y$  for every  $k \in K$ .
- (ii) There exists a unitary operator  $U \in \mathcal{B}(H)$  satisfying  $UN_k = N_kU$  and  $Ux = y$  for every  $k \in K$ .
- (iii) There exists a partial isometry  $V \in \mathcal{B}(H)$  satisfying  $x \in \ker(V)^\perp$ ,  $VN_k = N_kV$  and  $Vx = y$  for every  $k \in K$ .
- (iv) For all finite subsets  $K_0 \subseteq K$  and Borel subsets  $\{\Delta_k\}_{k \in K_0}$  of  $\mathbb{C}$ , we have

$$\left\| \left( \prod_{k \in K_0} E_{N_k}(\Delta_k) \right) x \right\| = \left\| \left( \prod_{k \in K_0} E_{N_k}(\Delta_k) \right) y \right\|.$$

- (v)  $\|x\| = \|y\|$  and there exists a conjugation  $C$  on  $H$  such that  $N_k + \lambda x \otimes y$  is  $C$ -symmetric for all  $k \in K$  and  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ .

The proofs of Theorems 2.1, 2.3, and 2.4 will be given later in this section, following the necessary preliminary preparations.

A slight reformulation of [1, Theorem 2.1] shows that if  $N \in \mathcal{B}(H)$  is a normal operator,  $U \in \mathcal{B}(H)$  is a unitary operator commuting with  $N$ , and  $x \in H$ , then for every  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ , there exists a conjugation  $C$  on  $H$  such that  $N + \lambda x \otimes Ux$  is  $C$ -symmetric. It can be seen that the implication (ii)  $\implies$  (v) in Theorem 2.4 generalizes this result, as the conjugation  $C$  is independent of  $\lambda$ .

A subspace  $M$  of  $H$  is said to be *hyperinvariant* for  $T \in \mathcal{B}(H)$  if  $M$  is invariant under every operator that commutes with  $T$ . Recently, in [20], Mashreghi et al. proved that  $M$  is hyperinvariant for a unitary operator  $U \in \mathcal{B}(H)$  if and only if

$CM \subseteq M$  for every conjugation  $C$  on  $H$  satisfying  $CUC = U^*$ . As a consequence of Theorem 2.4, this result is extended to all normal operators.

**Proposition 2.5.** *Let  $N \in \mathcal{B}(H)$  be normal and  $M$  a subspace of  $H$ . Then,  $M$  is hyperinvariant for  $N$  if and only if  $CM \subseteq M$  for every conjugation  $C$  on  $H$  satisfying  $CNC = N^*$ .*

The proof of the necessity is similar to the one in [20]. We include it here for the sake of completeness.

*Proof of Proposition 2.5.* Assume that  $M$  is hyperinvariant for  $N$  and denote by  $P \in \mathcal{B}(H)$  the orthogonal projection onto  $M$ . Let  $C$  be a conjugation on  $N$  satisfying  $CNC = N^*$ ; equivalently,  $CN = N^*C$ . Clearly, we need to show that  $CP = PC$ . According to [25, Proposition 6.9], there exists a Borel subset  $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$  such that  $P = E_N(\Delta)$ . Consequently, Lemma 2.11 implies that  $CP = CE_N(\Delta) = E_N(\Delta)C = PC$ .

For the sufficiency, we need to show that for each  $T \in \{N\}'$ , the commutant of  $N$ ,  $TM \subseteq M$ . Additionally, since  $\{N\}'$  is a von Neumann algebra, it is spanned by its unitary operators ([9, Page 61, Proposition 13.3 (b)]). Consequently, we can assume without loss of generality that  $T$  is unitary. Let  $x \in M$  be non-zero, and put  $y = Tx$ . Then, according to Theorem 2.4, there exists a conjugation  $C$  on  $H$  satisfying  $CNC = N^*$  and  $Cx = y$ . Hence, by hypothesis,  $Tx = y = Cx \in M$ . Since  $x$  was arbitrary, we conclude that  $TM \subseteq M$ .  $\square$

The following example shows that the result in Proposition 2.5 cannot be extended to an arbitrary operator in  $\mathcal{B}(H)$ .

*Example 2.6.* Let  $x$  and  $y$  be orthonormal vectors in  $H$ , and put  $T = A + iB$  where  $A = x \otimes x$  and  $B = (x + y) \otimes (x + y)$ . Clearly,  $A$  and  $B$  are self-adjoint operators; moreover,  $A = \frac{1}{2}(T + T^*)$ . It follows that if  $C$  is a conjugation on  $H$  such that  $CTC = T^*$ , then  $CAC = A$ . Hence, if  $M = \text{span}\{x\}$ , then  $CM = M$ . Therefore, the subspace  $M$  satisfies the necessary condition in Proposition 2.5; however,  $T \in \{T\}'$  and  $TM \not\subseteq M$ .

Given a conjugation  $C$  on  $H$ , an operator  $T \in \mathcal{B}(H)$  is said to be *C-normal* if  $CTT^*C = T^*T$ . When  $T$  is  $C$ -normal for some conjugation  $C$ , we say that  $T$  is *conjugate-normal*. It is easy to verify that if  $T$  is  $C$ -symmetric or  $C$ -skew symmetric, then it is also  $C$ -normal. Consequently, conjugate-normality is considered a more general type of symmetry. For further details and properties of such operators, the interested reader is referred to [27].

Another consequence of Theorem 2.4 is the following result, which characterizes normal operators in terms of complex symmetric and conjugate-normal ones.

**Corollary 2.7.** *Let  $T \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ . The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  $T$  is normal.
- (ii) For every non-zero  $x \in H$ , there exists a conjugation  $C$  on  $H$  such that  $T$  is  $C$ -symmetric and  $Cx = x$ ;
- (iii) For every non-zero  $x \in H$ , there exists a conjugation  $C$  on  $H$  such that  $T$  is  $C$ -normal and  $Cx = x$ .

*Proof.* The implication (i)  $\implies$  (ii) follows directly from Theorem 2.4 applied to the normal operator  $T$  and the vectors  $x = y$ .

(ii)  $\implies$  (iii) is obvious.

(iii)  $\implies$  (ii). Let  $x \in H$  be non-zero. Then, by hypothesis, there exists a conjugation  $C$  on  $H$  such that  $Cx = x$  and  $CTT^*C = T^*T$ . It follows that

$$\langle T^*Tx, x \rangle = \langle CTT^*Cx, x \rangle = \langle Cx, CCTT^*Cx \rangle = \langle x, TT^*x \rangle = \langle TT^*x, x \rangle.$$

Since  $x$  was arbitrary, we infer that  $T^*T = TT^*$ , the desired equality.  $\square$

**2.2. Proofs of Theorems 2.1, 2.3 and 2.4.** The proofs require some preparation and will be provided at the end of this section. In what follows, we denote the set of all complex polynomials in two variables by  $\mathbb{C}[x, y]$ . We begin with the following technical lemma.

**Lemma 2.8.** *Let  $N \in \mathcal{B}(H)$  and  $M \in \mathcal{B}(K)$  be normal operators, and let  $x, y \in H$  and  $h, k \in K$  be vectors such that*

$$\langle E_N(\Delta)x, y \rangle = \langle E_M(\Delta)h, k \rangle \quad \text{for every Borel subset } \Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}.$$

*Then, for every  $p \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$ , we have  $\langle p(N, N^*)x, y \rangle = \langle p(M, M^*)h, k \rangle$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $p \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$ , and put  $f(z) = p(z, \bar{z})\chi_K(z)$  where  $K = \sigma(N) \cup \sigma(M)$  and  $\chi_K$  is the characteristic function of  $K$ . Then,  $f$  is a bounded Borel function on  $\mathbb{C}$ ; furthermore,  $f(N) = p(N, N^*)$  and  $f(M) = p(M, M^*)$ . This implies that

$$\langle p(N, N^*)x, y \rangle = \langle f(N)x, y \rangle = \int f \, d\langle E_N(\cdot)x, y \rangle$$

and

$$\langle p(M, M^*)h, k \rangle = \langle f(M)h, k \rangle = \int f \, d\langle E_M(\cdot)h, k \rangle.$$

As the complex-valued measures  $\langle E_N(\cdot)x, y \rangle$  and  $\langle E_M(\cdot)h, k \rangle$  are presumed equal by hypothesis, we deduce  $\int f \, d\langle E_N(\cdot)x, y \rangle = \int f \, d\langle E_M(\cdot)h, k \rangle$ . Consequently,  $\langle p(N, N^*)x, y \rangle = \langle p(M, M^*)h, k \rangle$ .  $\square$

Given a normal operator  $N \in \mathcal{B}(H)$  and a family of vectors  $X \subset H$ , we denote

$$L_{N,X} = \bigvee \{ p(N, N^*)h : p \in \mathbb{C}[x, y] \text{ and } h \in X \}$$

where  $\bigvee$  denotes the closed linear span. It is easy to see that  $L_{N,X}$  is a reducing subspace of  $N$ . The restriction of  $N$  to  $L_{N,X}$  will be denoted by  $N_X$ .



**Proposition 2.9.** *Let  $N \in \mathcal{B}(H)$  and  $M \in \mathcal{B}(K)$  be normal operators, and let  $X = \{x_i\}_{i \in I} \subseteq H$  and  $Y = \{y_i\}_{i \in I} \subseteq K$  be two families of vectors such that*

$$\langle E_N(\Delta)x_i, x_j \rangle = \langle E_M(\Delta)y_j, y_i \rangle \quad \text{for all Borel subsets } \Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C} \text{ and } i, j \in I.$$

*Then, there exists a conjugate-linear surjective isometry  $W : L_{N,X} \rightarrow L_{M,Y}$  such that*

$$Wx_i = y_i \quad \text{and} \quad Wp(N_X, N_X^*) = p(M_Y, M_Y^*)^*W \quad \text{for all } i \in I \text{ and } p \in \mathbb{C}[x, y].$$

*Proof.* According to Lemma 2.8, for every polynomial  $p \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$  and all  $i, j \in I$ , we have

$$(2.1) \quad \langle p(N, N^*)x_i, x_j \rangle = \langle p(M, M^*)y_j, y_i \rangle.$$

For convenience, put

$$H_0 = \text{span}\{p(N, N^*)x_i : p \in \mathbb{C}[x, y], i \in I\}$$

and

$$K_0 = \text{span}\{p(M, M^*)y_i : p \in \mathbb{C}[x, y], i \in I\},$$

and let  $W : H_0 \rightarrow K_0$  be the conjugate-linear transformation given by

$$W(p(N, N^*)x_i) = p(M, M^*)^*y_i \quad \text{for all } p \in \mathbb{C}[x, y] \text{ and } i \in I.$$

We will first show that  $W$  is well-defined. Arbitrarily choose  $h \in H_0$ ; then, there exists a finite subset  $J$  of  $I$  and polynomials  $p_i \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$ , for  $i \in J$ , such that  $h = \sum_{i \in J} p_i(N, N^*)x_i$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \|h\|^2 &= \left\langle \sum_{i \in J} p_i(N, N^*)x_i, \sum_{j \in J} p_j(N, N^*)x_j \right\rangle \\ &= \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in J} \langle p_i(N, N^*)x_i, p_j(N, N^*)x_j \rangle \\ &= \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in J} \langle p_j(N, N^*)^* p_i(N, N^*)x_i, x_j \rangle \\ &= \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in J} \langle p_j(M, M^*)^* p_i(M, M^*)y_j, y_i \rangle \quad (\text{by (2.1)}) \\ &= \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in J} \langle p_j(M, M^*)^* y_j, p_i(M, M^*)^* y_i \rangle \\ &= \left\langle \sum_{j \in J} p_j(M, M^*)^* y_j, \sum_{i \in J} p_i(M, M^*)^* y_i \right\rangle = \|Wh\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, if  $h, k \in H_0$  are such that  $\|h - k\| = 0$ , we get  $\|Wh - Wk\| = \|W(h - k)\| = \|h - k\| = 0$ . Therefore,  $W$  is a well-defined conjugate-linear isometry. Moreover, by its construction,  $W$  is surjective. By density of  $H_0$  and  $K_0$  in  $L_{N,X}$  and  $L_{M,Y}$ , respectively, it follows that  $W$  can be extended to a conjugate-linear surjective

isometry from  $L_{N,X}$  to  $L_{M,Y}$ , which we also denote by  $W$ . Furthermore, it can be seen that  $Wx_i = y_i$  for every  $i \in I$ .

Now, fix  $p \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$  and let us check that  $Wp(N_X, N_X^*) = p(M_Y, M_Y^*)^*W$ . Let  $q \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$ ,  $i \in I$ , and put  $h = q(N, N^*)x_i$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} Wp(N_X, N_X^*)h &= Wp(N, N^*)h = Wp(N, N^*)q(N, N^*)x_i = p(M, M^*)^*q(M, M^*)^*y_i \\ &= p(M, M^*)^*Wq(N, N^*)x_i = p(M_Y, M_Y^*)^*Wh. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $q$  and  $i$  were arbitrary, and  $Wp(N_X, N_X^*)$  and  $p(M_Y, M_Y^*)^*W$  are both conjugate-linear, we obtain  $Wp(N_X, N_X^*)h = p(M_Y, M_Y^*)^*Wh$  for every  $h \in H_0$ . Consequently, by density of  $H_0$  in  $L_{N,X}$ , we conclude that  $Wp(N_X, N_X^*) = p(M_Y, M_Y^*)^*W$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.10.** *Let  $N \in \mathcal{B}(H)$  be normal, and let  $X = \{x_i\}_{i \in I}$  and  $Y = \{y_i\}_{i \in I}$  be two orthogonal sets of non-zero vectors in  $H$ . Let  $M \in \{N, -N\}$  and assume that for every Borel subset  $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$  and all  $i, j \in I$ , we have*

- (a)  $\langle E_N(\Delta)x_i, x_j \rangle = \langle E_M(\Delta)y_j, y_i \rangle$ ;
- (b)  $\langle E_N(\Delta)x_i, y_j \rangle = \langle E_M(\Delta)x_j, y_i \rangle$ .

Then, there exists a conjugation  $C$  on  $L_{N, X \cup Y}$  such that

$$CN_{X \cup Y}C = M_{X \cup Y}^* \quad \text{and} \quad Cx_i = y_i \quad \text{for every } i \in I.$$

*Proof.* First, note that  $L_{N, X \cup Y} = L_{M, X \cup Y}$ ; hence,  $N_{X \cup Y}$  and  $M_{X \cup Y}$  are both operators on  $L_{N, X \cup Y}$ , and so the statement  $CN_{X \cup Y}C = M_{X \cup Y}^*$  makes sense. Additionally, without loss of generality, we may assume that  $X$  and  $Y$  are orthonormal subsets of  $H$ . In fact, by condition (a),

$$r_i := \|x_i\| = \sqrt{\langle E_N(\mathbb{C})x_i, x_i \rangle} = \sqrt{\langle E_M(\mathbb{C})y_i, y_i \rangle} = \|y_i\|$$

for every  $i \in I$ ; thus, the orthonormal subsets  $\{r_i^{-1}x_i\}_{i \in I}$  and  $\{r_i^{-1}y_i\}_{i \in I}$  satisfy conditions (a) and (b).

Using condition (a), we infer from Proposition 2.9 that there exists a conjugate-linear surjective isometry  $W : L_{N,X} \rightarrow L_{M,Y}$  such that

$$(2.2) \quad Wx_i = y_i \quad \text{and} \quad Wp(N_X, N_X^*) = p(M_Y, M_Y^*)^*W \quad \text{for all } i \in I \text{ and } p \in \mathbb{C}[x, y].$$

In particular,

$$(2.3) \quad WN_X = M_Y^*W \quad \text{and} \quad WN_X^* = M_YW.$$

Choose an arbitrary orthonormal basis  $\{e_j\}_{j \in J}$  of  $L_{N,X}$  that contains  $X$  and, for each  $j \in J$ , put  $f_j = We_j$ . Then, since  $W$  is a conjugate-linear surjective isometry, the set  $\{f_j\}_{j \in J}$  must be an orthonormal basis of  $L_{M,Y}$ .

Note that, for each  $j \in J$ , there exist sequences of finite subsets  $I_{j,n} \subseteq I$  and polynomials  $p_{j,n,k} \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$ , for  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  and  $k \in I_{j,n}$ , such that

$$(2.4) \quad e_j = \lim_n \sum_{k \in I_{j,n}} p_{j,n,k}(N, N^*)x_k$$



hence, by (2.2),

$$(2.5) \quad f_j = We_j = \lim_n \sum_{k \in I_{j,n}} p_{j,n,k}(M, M^*)^* y_k.$$

Here,  $\mathbb{Z}^+$  stands for the set of positive integers.

**Claim:** For all  $i, j \in J$ , we have  $\langle e_i, f_j \rangle = \langle e_j, f_i \rangle$ . First, note that in the light of condition (b), Lemma 2.8 gives

$$(2.6) \quad \langle p(N, N^*)x_i, y_j \rangle = \langle p(M, M^*)x_j, y_i \rangle \quad \text{for all } i, j \in I \text{ and } p \in \mathbb{C}[x, y].$$

Now, fix  $i, j \in J$  and adopt the notations in (2.4) and (2.5); then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle e_i, f_j \rangle &= \lim_n \left\langle \sum_{k \in I_{i,n}} p_{i,n,k}(N, N^*)x_k, \sum_{l \in I_{j,n}} p_{j,n,l}(M, M^*)^* y_l \right\rangle \\ &= \lim_n \sum_{k \in I_{i,n}} \sum_{l \in I_{j,n}} \langle p_{i,n,k}(N, N^*)x_k, p_{j,n,l}(M, M^*)^* y_l \rangle \\ &= \lim_n \sum_{k \in I_{i,n}} \sum_{l \in I_{j,n}} \langle p_{j,n,l}(M, M^*)p_{i,n,k}(N, N^*)x_k, y_l \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, using (2.6), if  $M = N$ , we can see that

$$\langle e_i, f_j \rangle = \lim_n \sum_{k \in I_{i,n}} \sum_{l \in I_{j,n}} \langle p_{j,n,l}(N, N^*)p_{i,n,k}(N, N^*)x_l, y_k \rangle,$$

and if  $M = -N$ , we obtain

$$\langle e_i, f_j \rangle = \lim_n \sum_{k \in I_{i,n}} \sum_{l \in I_{j,n}} \langle p_{j,n,l}(N, N^*)p_{i,n,k}(-N, -N^*)x_l, y_k \rangle.$$

In both cases, we have

$$\langle e_i, f_j \rangle = \lim_n \sum_{k \in I_{i,n}} \sum_{l \in I_{j,n}} \langle p_{j,n,l}(N, N^*)p_{i,n,k}(M, M^*)x_l, y_k \rangle.$$

Consequently, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle e_i, f_j \rangle &= \lim_n \sum_{k \in I_{i,n}} \sum_{l \in I_{j,n}} \langle p_{j,n,l}(N, N^*)x_l, p_{i,n,k}(M, M^*)^* y_k \rangle \\ &= \lim_n \left\langle \sum_{l \in I_{j,n}} p_{j,n,l}(N, N^*)x_l, \sum_{k \in I_{i,n}} p_{i,n,k}(M, M^*)^* y_k \right\rangle \\ &= \langle e_j, f_i \rangle \quad (\text{by (2.4) and (2.5)}). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim.

Note that  $L_{N, X \cup Y} = \vee (L_{N, X} + L_{M, Y})$ ; hence,  $\{e_j\}_{j \in J}$  and  $\{f_j\}_{j \in J}$  are both orthonormal subsets of  $L_{N, X \cup Y}$ . By [29, Theorem 2.1], there exists a conjugation  $C$  on

$L_{N,XUY}$  such that  $Ce_j = f_j$  for every  $j \in J$ . In particular, since  $\{e_j\}_{j \in J}$  contains  $X$ , we get from (2.2) that

$$Cx_i = Wx_i = y_i \quad \text{for every } i \in I.$$

It remains to check that  $CN_{XUY}C = M_{XUY}^*$ . Noting that, for every  $j \in J$ ,  $Ce_j = f_j = We_j$  and  $Cf_j = C^2e_j = e_j = W^{-1}f_j$ , and taking into account that  $C, W$  and  $W^{-1}$  are conjugate-linear, it follows that  $W = C_1$  and  $W^{-1} = C_2$  where  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are defined as

$$C_1 : L_{N,X} \rightarrow L_{M,Y} \quad \text{and} \quad C_2 : L_{M,Y} \rightarrow L_{N,X} \\ h \mapsto Ch \quad \quad \quad h \mapsto Ch \quad .$$

Combining these facts with (2.3), we get that for every  $j \in J$ ,

$$CM_{XUY}Ce_j = CM_{XUY}We_j = CM_YWe_j = CWN_X^*e_j = C_2WN_X^*e_j = N_X^*e_j = N_{XUY}^*e_j$$

and

$$CN_{XUY}Cf_j = CN_{XUY}e_j = CN_Xe_j = C_1N_Xe_j = WN_Xe_j = M_Y^*We_j = M_Y^*f_j = M_{XUY}^*f_j.$$

Suppose that  $M = N$ ; it follows that  $CN_{XUY}Ce_j = N_{XUY}^*e_j$  and  $CN_{XUY}Cf_j = N_{XUY}^*f_j$  for every  $j \in J$ . Hence, since  $L_{N,XUY} = \vee (L_{N,X} + L_{M,Y}) = \vee (\{e_j, f_j\}_{j \in J})$ , we obtain  $CN_{XUY}C = N_{XUY}^*$ . On the other hand, if  $M = -N$ , we get  $CN_{XUY}Ce_j = -N_{XUY}^*e_j$  and  $CN_{XUY}Cf_j = -N_{XUY}^*f_j$  for every  $j \in J$ . Therefore,  $CN_{XUY}C = -N_{XUY}^*$ . In both cases, we have the desired result. This completes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

The following lemma will be very useful throughout the paper.

**Lemma 2.11.** *Let  $N \in \mathcal{B}(H)$  and  $M \in \mathcal{B}(K)$  be normal operators, and let  $T : H \rightarrow K$  be a bounded linear (or conjugate-linear) operator. The following statements hold:*

(i) *If  $T$  is linear (resp. conjugate-linear) and  $TN = MT$  (resp.  $TN = M^*T$ ), then*

$$TE_N(\Delta) = E_M(\Delta)T \quad \text{for every Borel subset } \Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}.$$

(ii) *If  $T$  is linear (resp. conjugate-linear) and  $TN = -MT$  (resp.  $TN = -M^*T$ ), then*

$$TE_N(\Delta) = E_M(-\Delta)T \quad \text{for every Borel subset } \Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}.$$

*Proof.* (i) Suppose first that  $T$  is linear and  $TN = MT$ , and put

$$L = \begin{bmatrix} N & 0 \\ 0 & M \end{bmatrix} \begin{matrix} H \\ K \end{matrix} \quad \text{and} \quad A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ T & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{matrix} H \\ K \end{matrix} .$$

Then,  $L$  and  $A$  are bounded linear operators acting on the Hilbert space  $H \oplus K$ . Furthermore, one can verify that  $AL = LA$ . Since  $L$  is normal, by the Fuglede Theorem,  $AE_L(\Delta) = E_L(\Delta)A$  for every Borel subset  $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ .

Fix a Borel subset  $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ , and note that

$$E_L(\Delta) = \begin{bmatrix} E_N(\Delta) & 0 \\ 0 & E_M(\Delta) \end{bmatrix} \begin{matrix} H \\ K \end{matrix} .$$

Therefore, the matrix equality  $AE_L(\Delta) = E_L(\Delta)A$  implies  $TE_N(\Delta) = E_M(\Delta)T$ .

Assume now that  $T$  is a conjugate-linear operator such that  $TN = M^*T$ , and let  $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$  be a Borel subset. Since  $M$  is normal, there exists a conjugation  $C$  on  $K$  such that  $CMC = M^*$ . Hence,  $TN = M^*T = (CMC)T$ , and since  $C^2 = I$ , we obtain

$$(2.7) \quad (CT)N = C^2MCT = M(CT).$$

Clearly,  $CT : H \rightarrow K$  is a bounded linear operator. By our previous result, we have

$$(2.8) \quad CTE_N(\Delta) = E_M(\Delta)CT.$$

By [8, Page 287, Lemma 8.7],  $E_M(\Delta) = \chi_\Delta(M) \in W^*(M)$ . Hence, there exists a net  $\{p_i\}_i$  in  $\mathbb{C}[x, y]$  such that  $p_i(M, M^*)$  converges to  $E_M(\Delta)$  in the weak operator topology. One can easily check that  $Cp_i(M, M^*)C = p_i(M, M^*)^*$ . Consequently, taking the limit in the weak operator topology, we get  $CE_M(\Delta)C = E_M(\Delta)^* = E_M(\Delta)$ . Therefore, from (2.8), we obtain

$$TE_N(\Delta) = C^2TE_N(\Delta) = CE_M(\Delta)CT = E_M(\Delta)T,$$

the desired equality.

(ii) Suppose that  $TN = -MT$  if  $T$  is linear and that  $TN = -M^*T$  if  $T$  is conjugate-linear. Applying the first part of lemma to  $N$  and  $-M$ , we get  $TE_N(\Delta) = E_{-M}(\Delta)T$  for every Borel subset  $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ . Since  $E_{-M}(\Delta) = \chi_\Delta(-M)$  and  $\chi_\Delta(-z) = \chi_{-\Delta}(z)$  for every  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ , we have

$$TE_N(\Delta) = E_{-M}(\Delta)T = \chi_\Delta(-M)T = \chi_{-\Delta}(M)T = E_M(-\Delta)T.$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

We are now in a position to prove Theorems 2.1 and 2.3 and 2.4.

*Proof of Theorem 2.1.* The implication (i)  $\implies$  (ii) follows directly from the properties of  $C$  as a conjugate-linear isometry, satisfying  $Cx_i = y_i$ ,  $Cy_i = C^2x_i = x_i$  and  $CT = CTC^2 = T^*C$  for all  $i \in I$  and  $T \in \mathcal{M}$ .

(ii)  $\implies$  (iii). Let  $V_0 : \ker(V)^\perp \rightarrow \text{ran}(V)$  be the invertible conjugate-linear isometry given by  $V_0h = Vh$ . Define the conjugate-linear map  $V^\# : H \rightarrow H$  by  $V^\#h = V_0^{-1}h$  if  $h \in \text{ran}(V)$  and  $V^\#h = 0$  if  $h \in \ker(V)^\perp$ . Then,  $V^\#V$  is the orthogonal projection onto  $\ker(V)^\perp$ . Moreover, using the polarization identity, it follows that  $\langle Vh, k \rangle = \langle V^\#k, h \rangle$  for all  $h \in \ker(V)^\perp$  and  $k \in \text{ran}(V)$ . Thus,

$$(2.9) \quad \langle Vh, k \rangle = \langle V^\#k, h \rangle \quad \text{for all } h, k \in H.$$

Now, let  $P \in \mathcal{M}$  be an orthogonal projection. Using the above relation, for all  $i, j \in I$ , we obtain

$$(2.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle Py_j, y_i \rangle &= \langle PVx_j, Vx_i \rangle = \langle VPx_j, Vx_i \rangle = \langle V^\#Vx_i, Px_j \rangle \\ &= \langle x_i, Px_j \rangle = \langle Px_i, x_j \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

and similarly, we have

$$(2.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle Px_j, y_i \rangle &= \langle PVy_j, Vx_i \rangle = \langle VPy_j, Vx_i \rangle = \langle V^\#Vx_i, Py_j \rangle \\ &= \langle x_i, Py_j \rangle = \langle Px_i, y_j \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

(iii)  $\implies$  (ii). According to [10, Page 52, Lemma II.2.8], there exists a self-adjoint operator  $A \in \mathcal{B}(H)$  such that  $\mathcal{M} = W^*(A)$ . It suffices to show that there exists a conjugation  $C$  on  $H$  such that  $CAC = A$  and  $Cx_i = y_i$  for every  $i \in I$ . In fact, any polynomial in  $A$  is  $C$ -symmetric; moreover, since the class of  $C$ -symmetric operators is closed in the weak operator topology, every operator in  $W^*(A)$ , and thus in  $\mathcal{M}$ , is  $C$ -symmetric.

Let  $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$  be a Borel subset. Then, by [8, Page 287, Lemma 8.7], the orthogonal projection  $E_A(\Delta)$  belongs to  $\mathcal{M}$ . Therefore, by hypothesis, for all  $i, j \in I$ , we have  $\langle E_A(\Delta)x_i, x_j \rangle = \langle E_A(\Delta)y_j, y_i \rangle$  and  $\langle E_A(\Delta)x_i, y_j \rangle = \langle E_A(\Delta)x_j, y_i \rangle$ .

For convenience, put  $Z = \{x_i, y_i\}_{i \in I}$ ,  $H_0 = L_{A,Z}$  and  $H_1 = L_{A,Z}^\perp$ . Then,  $H_0$  and  $H_1$  are reducing subspaces of  $A$  and  $Z \subset H_0$ . According to Theorem 2.10, there exists a conjugation  $C_0$  on  $H_0$  such that  $C_0A|_{H_0}C_0 = A_0$  and  $C_0x_i = y_i$  for every  $i \in I$ . Since  $A|_{H_1}$  is normal, there exists a conjugation  $C_1$  on  $H_1$  such that  $C_1A|_{H_1}C_1 = A|_{H_1}$ . Clearly,  $C = C_0 \oplus C_1$  is a conjugation on  $H$ ; additionally,  $CAC = A$  and  $Cx_i = C_0x_i = y_i$  for every  $i \in I$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.3.* The implication (i)  $\implies$  (ii) is obvious, and the implication (ii)  $\implies$  (iii) follows a similar argument as (i)  $\implies$  (ii) in Theorem 2.1.

To show that (iii)  $\implies$  (iv), first note that by Lemma 2.11, for all Borel subsets  $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$  and  $k \in K$ , we have  $VE_{N_k}(\Delta) = E_{N_k}(\Delta)V$ . Hence, for any finite subset  $K_0 \subseteq K$  and Borel subsets  $\{\Delta_k\}_{k \in K_0}$  of  $\mathbb{C}$ , we have  $V\left(\prod_{k \in K_0} E_{N_k}(\Delta_k)\right) = \left(\prod_{k \in K_0} E_{N_k}(\Delta_k)\right)V$ . Put  $P = \prod_{k \in K_0} E_{N_k}(\Delta_k)$ ; the remainder of the proof follows similarly to (2.10) and (2.11).

(iv)  $\implies$  (i). For convenience, put  $\mathcal{M} = W^*(N_k : k \in K)$ . By the Fuglede Theorem, we have  $N_kN_l^* = N_l^*N_k$  for any  $k, l \in K$ . Therefore, it is not hard to see that  $\mathcal{M}$  is an abelian von Neumann algebra. Hence, by Theorem 2.1, we need to show that for all orthogonal projections  $P \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $i, j \in I$ ,

$$(2.12) \quad \langle Px_i, x_j \rangle = \langle Py_j, y_i \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \langle Px_i, y_j \rangle = \langle Px_j, y_i \rangle.$$

First, we show that  $\mathcal{M} = \text{cl - WOT}\mathcal{M}_0$ ; i.e., the closure in the weak operator topology of

$$\mathcal{M}_0 = \text{span} \left\{ \prod_{k \in K_0} E_{N_k}(\Delta_k) : K_0 \subseteq K \text{ is finite and } \Delta_k \text{ is a Borel subset of } \mathbb{C} \right\}.$$

By [8, Page 287, Lemma 8.7], any spectral projection  $E_{N_k}(\Delta) = \chi_\Delta(N_k) \in W^*(N_k) \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ . Hence,  $\mathcal{M}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ , and consequently  $\text{cl - WOT}\mathcal{M}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ . Let us show the

other containment. According to spectral theory, for every  $k \in K$ , we have

$$N_k \in \bigvee \{E_{N_k}(\Delta) : \Delta \text{ is a Borel subset of } \mathbb{C}\}.$$

This implies that  $N_k \in \text{cl} - \text{WOT}\mathcal{M}_0$  for every  $k \in K$ . It is easy to see that  $\text{cl} - \text{WOT}\mathcal{M}_0$  is a self-adjoint subalgebra of  $\mathcal{B}(H)$  that contains the identity. Moreover, since, by the Fuglede Theorem, the spectral measures  $\{E_{N_k}\}_{k \in K}$  mutually commute and  $E_{N_k}(\Delta)E_{N_k}(D) = E_{N_k}(\Delta \cap D)$  for any Borel subsets  $\Delta$  and  $D$  of  $\mathbb{C}$ , one can easily show that  $\mathcal{M}_0$ , and thus  $\text{cl} - \text{WOT}\mathcal{M}_0$ , is also multiplicative. Hence,  $\text{cl} - \text{WOT}\mathcal{M}_0$  is a von Neumann algebra containing  $\{N_k\}_{k \in K}$ . Therefore, by definition of  $\mathcal{M}$ , we must have  $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \text{cl} - \text{WOT}\mathcal{M}_0$ .

Now, by hypothesis, any  $T \in \mathcal{M}_0$  satisfies the equalities (2.12). Then, by taking limits, in the weak operator topology, of operators in  $\mathcal{M}_0$ , we obtain that (2.12) is true for every  $T \in \mathcal{M}$ ; in particular, for orthogonal projections in  $\mathcal{M}$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.4.* The implication (ii)  $\implies$  (iii) is obvious.

The implication (iv)  $\implies$  (i) follows from Theorem 2.3 (iv)  $\implies$  (i). In fact, for any finite subset  $K_0 \subseteq K$  and Borel subsets  $\{\Delta_k\}_{k \in K_0}$  of  $\mathbb{C}$ , the orthogonal projections  $\{E_{N_k}(\Delta_k)\}_{k \in K_0}$  are mutually commuting. Thus, their product  $P$  is also an orthogonal projection; which gives

$$\langle Px, x \rangle = \langle P^2x, x \rangle = \langle Px, Px \rangle = \|Px\|^2 = \|Py\|^2 = \langle Py, y \rangle.$$

(iii)  $\implies$  (iv). Let  $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$  be a Borel subset and  $K_0 \subseteq K$  a finite set. Then,  $V\left(\prod_{k \in K_0} E_{N_k}(\Delta)\right) = \left(\prod_{k \in K_0} E_{N_k}(\Delta)\right)V$ . Noting that  $V^*V$  is the orthogonal projection onto  $\ker(V)^\perp$  and letting  $P = \prod_{k \in K_0} E_{N_k}(\Delta)$ , we get

$$\|Py\|^2 = \langle Py, y \rangle = \langle PVx, Vx \rangle = \langle Px, V^*Vx \rangle = \langle Px, x \rangle = \|Px\|^2.$$

(i)  $\implies$  (v). Clearly,  $\|x\| = \|Cx\| = \|y\|$ . It is easy to check that  $C(x \otimes y)C = (Cx) \otimes (Cy)$ ; hence, for any  $k \in K$  and  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ , we have

$$C(N_k + \lambda x \otimes y)C = CN_kC + \overline{\lambda}y \otimes x = N_k^* + \overline{\lambda}(x \otimes y)^* = (N_k + \lambda x \otimes y)^*;$$

that is,  $N_k + \lambda x \otimes y$  is  $C$ -symmetric.

(v)  $\implies$  (ii). Since the class of  $C$ -symmetric operators forms a subspace of  $\mathcal{B}(H)$ , we obtain, for every  $k \in K$ ,  $CN_kC = N_k^*$  and  $C(x \otimes y)C = (x \otimes y)^* = y \otimes x$ . Given that  $x$  and  $y$  have the same norm, the latter equality implies the existence of a unimodular  $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$  such that  $Cx = \alpha y$ .

Applying Theorem 2.3 (iv)  $\implies$  (ii) to  $\{x_i\}_i = \{y_i\}_i = \{x\}$ , we obtain a conjugation  $J$  on  $H$  such that  $JN_kJ = N_k^*$  for every  $k \in K$  and  $Jx = x$ . Put  $U = \overline{\alpha}CJ$ ; then, since  $C$  and  $J$  are both surjective isometries and  $\alpha$  is unimodular, the linear operator  $U : H \rightarrow H$  must be unitary. Moreover, we have

$$UN_k = \overline{\alpha}CJN_k = \overline{\alpha}CN_k^*J = \overline{\alpha}N_kCJ = N_kU$$

and  $Ux = \bar{\alpha}Cx = \bar{\alpha}C^*x = \bar{\alpha}\alpha y = y$ . This completes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

### 3. INTERPOLATION THEOREMS FOR CONJUGATIONS : $\mathbb{C}$ -SKEW SYMMETRIC VERSIONS

A conjugate-linear operator  $V$  on  $H$  is said to be *anti-unitary* if it is a surjective isometry. Clearly, every conjugation on  $H$  is anti-unitary.

For two operators  $A$  and  $B$  on Hilbert spaces, we denote  $A \cong B$  if there exists an isometric isomorphism  $U$  between the underlying Hilbert spaces such that  $UAU^{-1} = B$ ; or equivalently,  $UA = BU$ . It is worth mentioning that both complex symmetry and skew symmetry are preserved under the equivalence relation  $\cong$ .

For  $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, \infty\}$ , where  $\infty = \aleph_0$ ,  $H^{(k)}$  denotes the direct sum of  $H$  with itself  $k$  times. If  $T \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ , then  $T^{(k)} \in \mathcal{B}(H^{(k)})$  is the direct sum of  $T$  with itself  $k$  times.

#### 3.1. Main results.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $N \in \mathcal{B}(H)$  be normal, and let  $Z = X \cup Y$  where  $X = \{x_i\}_{i \in I}$  and  $Y = \{y_i\}_{i \in I}$  are orthogonal sets of non-zero vectors in  $H$ . Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *There exists a conjugation  $C$  on  $H$  such that  $CNC = -N^*$  and  $Cx_i = y_i$  for every  $i \in I$ .*
- (ii) *There exists an anti-unitary operator  $V$  on  $H$  such that  $VNV^{-1} = -N^*$ ,  $Vx_i = y_i$  and  $Vy_i = x_i$  for every  $i \in I$ .*
- (iii)  *$N|_{L_{N,Z}^\perp}$  is skew-symmetric and, for all Borel subsets  $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$  and  $i, j \in I$ , we have*

$$\langle E_N(\Delta)x_i, x_j \rangle = \langle E_N(-\Delta)y_j, y_i \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \langle E_N(\Delta)x_i, y_j \rangle = \langle E_N(-\Delta)x_j, y_i \rangle.$$

Before stating the second main result of this section, we recall some facts about normal operators on separable complex Hilbert spaces. Given a finite measure with compact support  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{C}$ , denote by  $M_\mu$  the operator defined on  $L^2(\mu)$  by  $[M_\mu f](z) = zf(z)$  for all  $f \in L^2(\mu)$ . According to spectral multiplicity theory (see, for instance, [8, Page 298, Theorem 10.16]), each normal operator  $N$  acting on  $H$  is unitarily equivalent to

$$(3.1) \quad M_{\mu_\infty}^{(\infty)} \oplus \bigoplus_{1 \leq i < \infty} M_{\mu_i}^{(i)}$$

where  $\mu_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq \infty$  (some of which may be zero), are mutually singular finite measures on Borel subsets of  $\mathbb{C}$ , each with compact support. Moreover, the previous decomposition is unique in the sense that if  $M$  is another normal operator with corresponding measures  $\nu_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq \infty$ , then  $N \cong M$  if and only if, for every  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \infty\}$ ,

$$(3.2) \quad \mu_i(\Delta) = 0 \iff \nu_i(\Delta) = 0 \quad \text{for every Borel subset } \Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}.$$



In [17, Theorem 1.11], Li et al. proved that  $N$  is skew-symmetric if and only if the sequence  $\{\mu_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq \infty}$  can be chosen so that, for every  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \infty\}$ ,

$$(3.3) \quad \mu_i(\Delta) = \mu_i(-\Delta) \quad \text{for every Borel subset } \Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}.$$

Given a normal operator  $N \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ , we write  $m(N) < \infty$  if the measure  $\mu_\infty$  in (3.1) is zero; in other words,  $M_{\mu_\infty}^{(\infty)}$  can be omitted from the decomposition (3.1). This definition makes sense due to the uniqueness property described in (3.2).

**Theorem 3.2.** *Let  $N \in \mathcal{B}(H)$  be a skew-symmetric normal operator, and let  $Z$  be the set in Theorem 3.1 such that  $m(N_{Z|\ker(N_Z)^\perp}) < \infty$ . Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *There exists a conjugation  $C$  on  $H$  such that  $CNC = -N^*$  and  $Cx_i = y_i$  for every  $i \in I$ .*
- (ii) *For every Borel subset  $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$  and all  $i, j \in I$ , we have*

$$\langle E_N(\Delta)x_i, x_j \rangle = \langle E_N(-\Delta)y_j, y_i \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \langle E_N(\Delta)x_i, y_j \rangle = \langle E_N(-\Delta)x_j, y_i \rangle.$$

*In particular, if  $I$  is finite, then  $m(N_{Z|\ker(N_Z)^\perp}) < \infty$  and the previous statements are equivalent.*

The reader can see from Theorem 3.1 that the implication (i)  $\implies$  (ii), in the previous theorem, is true without the assumption that  $m(N_{Z|\ker(N_Z)^\perp}) < \infty$ . However, the following example shows that this condition is not superfluous for the implication (ii)  $\implies$  (i).

*Example 3.3.* Suppose that  $H = K_1 \oplus K_2$ , where  $K_1$  and  $K_2$  are infinite-dimensional separable complex Hilbert spaces, and let  $\{e_i\}_{i \geq 1}$  and  $\{f_i\}_{i \geq 1}$  be orthonormal bases of  $K_1$  and  $K_2$ , respectively. For each  $i \geq 1$ , put  $x_i = e_i \oplus 0$  and  $y_i = 0 \oplus f_{i+1}$ . Let  $N$  be the normal operator on  $H$  given by  $N = I_{K_1} \oplus -I_{K_2}$ . Clearly,  $N \cong -N$ ; hence, by Lemma 3.5,  $N$  is skew-symmetric.

For convenience, put  $H_1 = \vee\{x_i : i \geq 1\}$ ,  $H_2 = \vee\{y_i : i \geq 1\}$  and  $H_3 = \vee\{f_1\}$ . Then,  $H = H_1 \oplus H_2 \oplus H_3$  and  $L_{N,Z} = H_1 \oplus H_2$ . Furthermore,

$$N_{Z|\ker(N_Z)^\perp} = N_Z = \begin{bmatrix} I_{H_1} & 0 \\ 0 & -I_{H_2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{matrix} H_1 \\ H_2 \end{matrix} \cong M_{\delta_1}^{(\infty)} \oplus M_{\delta_{-1}}^{(\infty)} \cong (M_{\delta_1} \oplus M_{\delta_{-1}})^{(\infty)} \cong M_\mu^{(\infty)}$$

where  $\mu = \delta_1 + \delta_{-1}$  and  $\delta_a$  denotes the Dirac measure, at  $a \in \mathbb{C}$ , on Borel subsets of  $\mathbb{C}$ . Thus,  $m(N_{Z|\ker(N_Z)^\perp}) \not< \infty$ .

Let us check that  $N$  satisfies the conditions in Theorem 3.2 (ii). One can easily see that, for every Borel subset  $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ , the spectral projections  $E_N(\Delta)$  and  $E_N(-\Delta)$  fall into one of the following possibilities:

- (a)  $E_N(\Delta) = E_N(-\Delta) = 0$ ;
- (b)  $E_N(\Delta) = E_N(-\Delta) = I_H$ ;
- (c)  $E_N(\Delta) = I_{K_1} \oplus 0$  and  $E_N(-\Delta) = 0 \oplus I_{K_2}$ ;

(d)  $E_N(\Delta) = 0 \oplus I_{K_2}$  and  $E_N(-\Delta) = I_{K_1} \oplus 0$ .

In all cases, we have

$$\langle E_N(\Delta)x_i, x_j \rangle = \langle E_N(-\Delta)y_j, y_i \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \langle E_N(\Delta)x_i, y_j \rangle = \langle E_N(-\Delta)x_j, y_i \rangle.$$

Now, let us show that there exists no conjugation  $C$  on  $H$  satisfying the first assertion of Theorem 3.2. Suppose for contradiction that such a conjugation exists. Then,

$$CH_1 = C \vee \{x_i : i \geq 1\} = \vee \{Cx_i : i \geq 1\} = \vee \{y_i : i \geq 1\} = H_2,$$

and since  $C^2 = I_H$ , we also have  $CH_2 = H_1$ . As  $C$  is a surjective isometry, it follows that  $CH_3 = C(H_1 + H_2)^\perp = (H_1 + H_2)^\perp = H_3$ . Therefore,  $C$  takes the form

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & * & 0 \\ * & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & C_3 \end{bmatrix} \begin{matrix} H_1 \\ H_2 \\ H_3 \end{matrix}$$

where  $C_3$  is a conjugation on  $H_3$ . Finally, since  $H_3$  reduces  $N$  and  $CNC = -N^*$ , we obtain  $-I_{H_3} = C_3(-I_{H_3})C_3 = C_3N|_{H_3}C_3 = -N^*|_{H_3} = I_{H_3}$ ; a contradiction.

When  $X = \{x\}$ ,  $Y = \{y\}$ , and  $\{x, y\}$  are linearly independent, we can add the following equivalent perturbation-type statement to Theorem 3.1.

**Theorem 3.4.** *Let  $N \in \mathcal{B}(H)$  be normal, and let  $\{x, y\}$  be linearly independent vectors in  $H$ . The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *There exists a conjugation  $C$  on  $H$  satisfying  $CNC = -N^*$  and  $Cx = y$ .*
- (ii) *There exists a conjugation  $C$  on  $H$  such that  $N + \lambda(x \otimes x - y \otimes y)$  is  $C$ -skew symmetric for every  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ .*

The proof of the previous theorem does not require preliminary results and can be presented here.

*Proof of Theorem 3.4.* (i)  $\implies$  (ii). Let  $C$  be a conjugation satisfying (i). Then, for every  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} C(N + \lambda(x \otimes x - y \otimes y))C &= CNC + \bar{\lambda}((Cx) \otimes (Cx) - (Cy) \otimes (Cy)) \\ &= -N^* + \bar{\lambda}(y \otimes y - x \otimes x) \\ &= -(N + \lambda(x \otimes x - y \otimes y))^*. \end{aligned}$$

(ii)  $\implies$  (i). For convenience, put  $T = x \otimes x - y \otimes y$ . By the fact that the class of  $C$ -skew symmetric operators is a subspace of  $\mathcal{B}(H)$ , we clearly have  $CNC = -N^*$  and  $CTC = -T^* = -T$ . Noting that  $T$  is skew-symmetric, it must have a skew-symmetric matrix with respect to some orthonormal basis. In particular, since  $T$  is a rank-two operator, its trace is well-defined and should be zero. Combining this with the fact that  $T$  is self-adjoint, it follows that there exists orthonormal vectors  $e_1, e_2 \in H$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\text{ran}(T) = \ker(T - \alpha I) \oplus \ker(T + \alpha I),$$

$$\ker(T - \alpha I) = \vee\{e_1\} \quad \text{and} \quad \ker(T + \alpha I) = \vee\{e_2\}.$$

As  $CTC = -T$ , we get  $C(T + \alpha I)C = -(T - \alpha I)$ ; hence

$$(3.4) \quad C(\vee\{e_1\}) = C\ker(T - \alpha I) = \ker(T + \alpha I) = \vee\{e_2\}.$$

Note that  $x$  and  $y$  have the same norm. In fact,  $\langle x, x \rangle - \langle y, y \rangle$  is the trace of  $T$ . Hence, using [29, Theorem 2.1], we obtain a conjugation  $J$  on  $H$  satisfying  $Jx = y$ ; one can check that  $JTJ = -T$ . The argument in (3.4) shows that  $J(\vee\{e_1\}) = \vee\{e_2\}$ . Then, since  $C$  and  $J$  are isometries, there exist unimodular scalars  $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$  such that  $Ce_1 = ae_2$  and  $Je_1 = be_2$ . Furthermore, since  $C^2 = J^2 = I$ , we get  $Ce_2 = \bar{a}e_1$  and  $Je_2 = \bar{b}e_1$ . Noting that  $C$  and  $J$  are both conjugate-linear, we get  $Ch = \bar{a}\bar{b}Jh$  for every  $h \in \vee\{e_1, e_2\}$ . In particular, since  $x, y \in \text{ran}(T) = \vee\{e_1, e_2\}$ , we obtain  $Cx = \bar{a}\bar{b}Jx = \bar{a}\bar{b}y$ . Put  $\tilde{C} = \bar{a}\bar{b}C$ ; one can easily check that  $\tilde{C}$  is a conjugation that satisfies  $\tilde{C}N\tilde{C} = -N^*$  and  $\tilde{C}x = y$ . This ends the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

The remainder of this section is devoted to proving Theorems 3.1 and 3.2.

**3.2. Proof of Theorem 3.1 and 3.2.** First, we begin with the following characterization of skew-symmetric normal operators.

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $N \in \mathcal{B}(H)$  be a normal operator. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *There exists a unitary operator  $U$  on  $H$  such that  $UNU^* = -N$ .*
- (ii) *There exists a conjugation  $C$  on  $H$  such that  $CNC = -N^*$ .*
- (iii) *There exists an anti-unitary operator  $V$  on  $H$  such that  $VNV^{-1} = -N^*$ .*

*Proof.* The implication (ii)  $\implies$  (iii) is obvious.

(iii)  $\implies$  (i). Let  $V$  be an anti-unitary operator on  $H$  such that  $VNV^{-1} = -N^*$ . By normality of  $N$ , there exists a conjugation  $J$  on  $H$  that satisfies  $JNJ = N^*$ . Hence, we have  $VNV^{-1} = -JNJ$ , and so, since  $J^2 = I$ , we get

$$(JV)N(V^{-1}J) = -J^2N^2 = -N.$$

Put  $U = JV$ ; then  $U \in \mathcal{B}(H)$  is unitary and  $U^* = U^{-1} = (JV)^{-1} = V^{-1}J^{-1} = V^{-1}J$ . Therefore,  $UNU^* = -N$ .

(i)  $\implies$  (ii). Let  $U \in \mathcal{B}(H)$  be a unitary operator satisfying  $UN = -NU$ . Fix a Borel subset  $\Delta_0 \subset \mathbb{C}$  such that  $\mathbb{C} \setminus \Delta_0 = -\Delta_0 \cup \{0\}$ . By Lemma 2.11, we have  $UE_N(\Delta_0) = E_N(-\Delta_0)U$  and  $UE_N(-\Delta_0) = E_N(\Delta_0)U$ . Consequently,

$$U\text{ran}(E_N(\Delta_0)) = \text{ran}(E_N(-\Delta_0)) \quad \text{and} \quad U\text{ran}(E_N(-\Delta_0)) = \text{ran}(E_N(\Delta_0)).$$

Given that  $\mathbb{C} = \Delta_0 \cup (-\Delta_0) \cup \{0\}$  is a partition, it follows from the above equalities that  $U$  has the form

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & * & 0 \\ W & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & * \end{bmatrix} \begin{matrix} \text{ran}(E_N(\Delta_0)) \\ \text{ran}(E_N(-\Delta_0)) \\ \text{ran}(E_N(\{0\})) \end{matrix}$$

Where  $W$  is an isometric isomorphism between Hilbert spaces. Noting that  $N$  can also be written as

$$N = \begin{bmatrix} N_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & N_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{matrix} \text{ran}(E_N(\Delta_0)) \\ \text{ran}(E_N(-\Delta_0)) \\ \text{ran}(E_N(\{0\})) \end{matrix},$$

and since  $UN = -NU$ , simple matrix calculations show that  $WN_1 = -N_2W$ . This implies that  $N_1 \cong -N_2$ , and hence  $N_{|\ker(N)^\perp} = N_1 \oplus N_2 \cong N_1 \oplus -N_1$ . Therefore,  $N$  is skew symmetric by [17, Theorem 1.10].  $\square$

Note that every bounded linear  $T$  acting on a Hilbert space can be written as  $T = N \oplus A$  where  $N$  is normal and  $A$  is an operator that has no reducing subspace for which the restriction of  $A$  is normal (of course, either  $N$  or  $A$  could be absent). In fact,  $N$  is the restriction of  $T$  to the reducing subspace

$$(3.5) \quad H_{\text{nor}} = \bigcap_{1 \leq n, m < \infty} \ker(T^{*n}T^m - T^mT^{*n}).$$

The operator  $N$  is called the *normal part* of  $T$ , while  $A$  is called the *abnormal part* of  $T$ . In this case, we denote  $T_{\text{nor}} = N$  and  $T_{\text{abnor}} = A$ .

Using (3.5), one can easily see that if  $M$  is a normal operator, then

$$(3.6) \quad (M \oplus T)_{\text{nor}} = M \oplus T_{\text{nor}} \quad \text{and} \quad (M \oplus T)_{\text{abnor}} = T_{\text{abnor}}.$$

The following lemma is an immediate consequence of [28, Proposition 3.10] and (3.6).

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $M \in \mathcal{B}(H)$  be normal and  $T \in \mathcal{B}(K)$  such that  $M \oplus T$  is skew-symmetric. Then,  $M \oplus T_{\text{nor}}$  and  $T_{\text{abnor}}$  are skew-symmetric.*

**Lemma 3.7.** *Let  $N \in \mathcal{B}(H)$  be a skew-symmetric normal operator and  $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$  a Borel subset such  $\Delta = -\Delta$ . Then, the restriction of  $N$  to the reducing subspace  $\text{ran}(E_N(\Delta))$  is skew-symmetric.*

*Proof.* Let  $C$  be a conjugation on  $H$  such that  $CNC = -N^*$ . By Lemma 2.11, we have  $CE_N(\Delta) = E_N(-\Delta)C = E_N(\Delta)C$ ; hence,  $C\text{ran}(E_N(\Delta)) = \text{ran}(E_N(\Delta))$ . Let  $C_0$  and  $N_0$  denote the restrictions of  $C$  and  $N$  to  $\text{ran}(E_N(\Delta))$ , respectively. Then,  $C_0$  is a conjugation on  $E_N(\Delta)$ . Moreover, it follows immediately from the equality  $CNC = -N^*$  that  $C_0N_0C_0 = -N_0^*$ .  $\square$

In [16, Lemma 3.2] and [2, Corollary 3.4], the authors proved that if  $N$  is normal, then a direct sum  $N \oplus T$  is complex symmetric (resp. conjugate-normal) if and only if  $T$  is complex-symmetric (resp. conjugate-normal). However, this property does not hold for skew-symmetry even if  $N$  is skew-symmetric. The next result provides a complete description of normal operators  $N$  that satisfy this property.

**Theorem 3.8.** *Let  $N \in \mathcal{B}(H)$  be normal. The followings statements are equivalents:*

(i) For every separable complex Hilbert space  $K$  and every  $T \in \mathcal{B}(K)$ ,

$$N \oplus T \text{ is skew-symmetric} \iff T \text{ is skew-symmetric.}$$

(ii)  $N$  is skew-symmetric and  $m(N|_{\ker(N)^\perp}) < \infty$ .

*Proof.* (i)  $\implies$  (ii). Suppose statement (i) holds. Taking  $T = 0$ , the zero operator on any Hilbert space  $K$ , we obtain that  $N \oplus 0$  is skew-symmetric. By [17, Lemma 2.1], it follows that  $N|_{(\ker N)^\perp}$  is skew-symmetric. Therefore,  $N = N|_{(\ker N)^\perp} \oplus 0$  is skew-symmetric.

For convenience, put  $N_1 = N|_{\ker(N)^\perp}$ , and let  $N_1 \cong M_{\mu_\infty}^{(\infty)} \oplus \bigoplus_{1 \leq i < \infty} M_{\mu_i}^{(i)}$  be the canonical decomposition in (3.1) of  $N_1$ .

We need to show that  $\mu_\infty = 0$ . Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that  $\mu_\infty \neq 0$ . Hence,  $M_{\mu_\infty}$  is not absent and is not zero due to the injectivity of  $N_1$ . Since  $\sigma(M_{\mu_\infty}) \neq \{0\}$ , using the spectral theorem, we can write  $M_{\mu_\infty} = M \oplus L$ , where  $L$  is a normal operator with  $\sigma(L) \neq -\sigma(L)$ ; in particular,  $L \neq -L$  and thus not skew-symmetric by Lemma 3.5.

Let us verify that  $N \oplus L$  is skew symmetric. We have

$$\begin{aligned} N_1 \oplus L &\cong M_{\mu_\infty}^{(\infty)} \oplus \bigoplus_{1 \leq i < \infty} M_{\mu_i}^{(i)} \oplus L \cong (M \oplus L)^{(\infty)} \oplus L \oplus \bigoplus_{1 \leq i < \infty} M_{\mu_i}^{(i)} \\ &\cong M^{(\infty)} \oplus L^{(\infty)} \oplus L \oplus \bigoplus_{1 \leq i < \infty} M_{\mu_i}^{(i)} \\ &\cong M^{(\infty)} \oplus L^{(\infty)} \oplus \bigoplus_{1 \leq i < \infty} M_{\mu_i}^{(i)} \\ &\cong N_1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $N \oplus L \cong N$ ; in particular,  $N \oplus L$  is skew-symmetric; a contradiction. Therefore,  $m(N_1) < \infty$ .

(ii)  $\implies$  (i). Since  $N$  is skew-symmetric, the reverse implication in (i) is always true. Fix a bounded linear operator  $T$ , assume that  $N \oplus T$  is skew-symmetric, and let us show that  $T$  is skew-symmetric.

In view of Lemma 3.6 and [17, Lemma 2.1], we can assume without loss of generality that  $T$  is normal and  $N = N|_{\ker(N)^\perp}$ . Moreover, by (3.1) and (3.3), we may directly assume that

$$N = \bigoplus_{1 \leq i < \infty} M_{\mu_i}^{(i)} \quad \text{and} \quad H = \bigoplus_{1 \leq i < \infty} L^2(\mu_i)^{(i)}$$

where the  $\mu_i$ 's are mutually singular and satisfy  $\mu_i(\Delta) = \mu_i(-\Delta)$  for every Borel subset  $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ . Since the measures  $\mu_i$ 's are mutually singular and satisfy (3.3), it is elementary to see that there exist mutually disjoint Borel subsets  $\{\Delta_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^+}$  of  $\mathbb{C}$  such that for all  $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  with  $i \neq j$ ,

$$(3.7) \quad \Delta_i = -\Delta_i, \quad \mu_i(\Delta) = \mu_i(\Delta \cap \Delta_i), \quad \mu_i(\Delta_j) = 0 \quad \text{for every Borel } \Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}.$$

Let  $\Delta_0 = \mathbb{C} \setminus \cup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^+} \Delta_i$ ; clearly,  $\Delta_0 = -\Delta_0$ . For convenience, put  $N_i = M_{\mu_i}^{(i)}$ ,  $H_i = L^2(\mu_i)^{(i)}$  for  $i \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ , and let  $T = T_0 \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^+} T_i$  be the decomposition of  $T$  with respect to the orthogonal decomposition  $K = \text{ran}(E_T(\Delta_0)) \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^+} \text{ran}(E_T(\Delta_i))$ . For  $0 \leq i < \infty$ , put  $K_i = \text{ran}(E_T(\Delta_i))$ .

Since by (3.7),  $\mu_i(\Delta_0) = \mu_i(\Delta_j) = 0$  all  $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  with  $i \neq j$ , it follows that  $E_{N_i}(\Delta_0) = E_{N_i}(\Delta_j) = 0$ . Therefore,

$$\text{ran}(E_{N \oplus T}(\Delta_0)) = K_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{ran}(E_{N \oplus T}(\Delta_i)) = H_i \oplus K_i \quad \text{for every } i \in \mathbb{Z}^+.$$

It follows that

$$(N \oplus T)|_{\text{ran}(E_{N \oplus T}(\Delta_0))} = T_0 \quad \text{and} \quad (N \oplus T)|_{\text{ran}(E_{N \oplus T}(\Delta_i))} = N_i \oplus T_i \quad \text{for every } i \in \mathbb{Z}^+.$$

Consequently, by Lemma 3.7,  $T_0$  and  $N_i \oplus T_i$ , for  $i \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ , are skew-symmetric operators. In particular, by Lemma 3.5, we have

$$(3.8) \quad N_i \oplus T_i \cong -N_i \oplus -T_i \quad \text{for every } i \in \mathbb{Z}^+.$$

Fix  $i \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ , and let us prove that  $T_i$  is skew-symmetric. Given  $\mu_i(\Delta) = \mu_i(-\Delta)$  for every Borel subset  $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ , [17, Theorem 1.11] implies that  $N_i$  is skew-symmetric; hence,  $N_i \cong -N_i$  by Lemma 3.5. Combining this with (3.8), we obtain  $N_i \oplus T_i \cong N_i \oplus -T_i$ . Since  $M_{\mu_i}$  is a star-cyclic normal operator ([8, Page 269, Theorem 3.4]), applying [8, Page 295, Proposition 10.6]  $i$  times to  $M_{\mu_i}$ , we conclude that  $T_i \cong -T_i$ , and so  $T_i$  is skew-symmetric by Lemma 3.5.

Thus,  $T = T_0 \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^+} T_i$  is skew-symmetric as a direct sum of skew-symmetric operators.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.9.** *Let  $N \in \mathcal{B}(H)$  be normal, and suppose that there exist reducing subspaces  $\{H_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq r}$ ,  $r < \infty$ , of  $N$  such that  $H = \vee(\sum_{i=1}^r H_i)$  and  $N|_{H_i}$  is star-cyclic for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ . Then, for every reducing subspace  $L$  of  $N$ , we have  $m(N|_L) < \infty$ .*

*Proof.* First, let us show that  $N$  is a finite direct sum of star-cyclic normal operators. We will proceed by induction on  $r$ . The result is clear when  $r = 1$ . Assume the lemma holds for some integer  $r \geq 1$ . Let  $H_1, H_2, \dots, H_{r+1}$  be  $r + 1$  reducing subspaces of  $N$  such that  $H = \vee(\sum_{i=1}^{r+1} H_i)$  and  $N|_{H_i}$  is star cyclic for  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, r+1\}$ . Let  $K = \vee(\sum_{i=1}^r H_i)$  and  $P \in \mathcal{B}(H)$  be the orthogonal projection onto  $K$ . Then,  $K$  reduces  $N$ ; moreover, by the induction hypothesis,  $N|_K$  is a finite direct sum of star-cyclic operators.

By star-cyclicity of  $N|_{H_{r+1}}$ , there exists  $h \in H$  such that  $H_{r+1} = L_{N,h}$ . To complete the proof, it is clear that it suffices to show that  $H = K \oplus L_{N,(I-P)h}$ . Note that  $K$  and  $L_{N,(I-P)h}$  are orthogonal. In fact, since  $K$  reduces  $N$ , its orthogonal projection  $P$ , and hence  $(I - P)$ , commutes with  $N$  and  $N^*$ . Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} L_{N,(I-P)h} &= \bigvee \left\{ p(N, N^*)(I - P)h : p \in \mathbb{C}[x, y] \right\} \\ &= (I - P) \bigvee \left\{ p(N, N^*)h : p \in \mathbb{C}[x, y] \right\} \subseteq K^\perp. \end{aligned}$$



It remains to prove that  $H = K + L_{N,(I-P)h}$ ; we need only to show that  $H_{r+1} \subseteq K + L_{N,(I-P)h}$ . For  $p \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$ , we have  $p(N, N^*)h = p(N, N^*)Ph + p(N, N^*)(I - P)h$ . Since  $Ph \in K$  and  $K$  reduces  $p(N, N^*)$ , we have  $p(N, N^*)Ph \in K$ . Hence,  $p(N, N^*)h \in K + L_{N,(I-P)h}$ , and thus  $H_{r+1} \subseteq K + L_{N,(I-P)h}$ .

Now, let  $L$  be a reducing subspace of  $N$  and assume, for contradiction, that  $m(N|_L) \not\prec \infty$ . According to (3.1),  $N|_L$  has a reducing subspace for which its restriction is unitarily equivalent to  $M_\mu^{(\infty)}$  for some finite non-zero compactly supported measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{C}$ . Thus, we can write  $N \cong N_0 \oplus M_\mu^{(\infty)}$  for some normal operator  $N_0$ . This implies

$$N \oplus M_\mu^{(2)} \cong N_0 \oplus M_\mu^{(\infty)} \oplus M_\mu^{(2)} \cong N_0 \oplus M_\mu^{(\infty)} \oplus M_\mu \cong N \oplus M_\mu.$$

Since  $N$  is a direct sum of  $n$  star-cyclic normal operators  $M_1, M_2, \dots, M_n$  with  $n < \infty$ , applying [8, Page 295, Proposition 10.6] to each  $M_i$ , we conclude  $M_\mu \cong M_\mu^{(2)}$ ; which contradicts (3.2).  $\square$

We are now ready to prove Theorems 3.1 and 3.2.

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* The implication (i)  $\implies$  (ii) is clear.

(ii)  $\implies$  (iii). First, let us show that  $N|_{L_{N,Z}^\perp}$  is skew-symmetric. By the argument in (2.7), there exists a conjugation  $J$  on  $H$  so that  $(JV)N = -N(JV)$  and  $JN^*J = N$ . By the Fuglede-Putnam Theorem, it follows that  $(JV)N^* = -N^*(JV)$ ; hence,  $VN^* = J^2VN^* = -JN^*JV = -NV$ . Consequently, for any polynomial  $p \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$ , one can easily see that  $Vp(N, N^*) = p(-N, -N^*)^*V$ . Therefore, for every  $i \in I$ ,

$$Vp(N, N^*)x_i = p(-N, -N^*)^*Vx_i = p(-N, -N^*)^*y_i$$

and

$$Vp(N, N^*)y_i = p(-N, -N^*)^*Vy_i = p(-N, -N^*)^*x_i.$$

This implies that if  $L_0 = \text{span}\{p(N, N^*)x_i + q(N, N^*)y_i : p, q \in \mathbb{C}[x, y], i \in I\}$ , then  $VL_0 = L_0$ . Taking the closure of  $L_0$  in  $H$ , we obtain  $VL_{N,Z} = L_{N,Z}$ ; moreover, since  $V$  is anti-unitary, we get  $VL_{N,Z}^\perp = L_{N,Z}^\perp$ .

Let  $V_1$  and  $N_1$  denote the restrictions of  $V$  and  $N$  to  $L_{N,Z}^\perp$ , respectively. Then,  $V_1$  is anti-unitary on  $L_{N,Z}^\perp$ , and the relation  $VN = -N^*V$  implies  $V_1N_1 = -N_1^*V_1$ . Consequently,  $N_1$  is skew-symmetric by Lemma 3.5.

Now, by Lemma 2.11, for every Borel subset  $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ , we have  $VE_N(-\Delta) = E_N(\Delta)V$ . Hence, using (2.9), for all  $i, j \in I$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle E_N(\Delta)x_i, y_j \rangle &= \langle E_N(\Delta)Vy_i, Vx_j \rangle = \langle VE_N(-\Delta)y_i, Vx_j \rangle \\ &= \langle V^{-1}Vx_j, E_N(-\Delta)y_i \rangle = \langle E_N(-\Delta)x_j, y_i \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

and similarly,  $\langle E_N(\Delta)x_i, x_j \rangle = \langle E_N(-\Delta)y_j, y_i \rangle$ .

(iii)  $\implies$  (i). Let  $M = -N$ . For every Borel subset  $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$  and for all  $i, j \in I$ ,

$$\langle E_N(\Delta)x_i, y_j \rangle = \langle E_N(-\Delta)x_j, y_i \rangle = \langle E_{-N}(\Delta)x_j, y_i \rangle = \langle E_M(\Delta)x_j, y_i \rangle,$$

and similarly,  $\langle E_N(\Delta)x_i, x_j \rangle = \langle E_M(\Delta)y_j, y_i \rangle$ . For convenience, put  $H_0 = L_{N,Z}$ ,  $H_1 = H_0^\perp$ ,  $N_0 = N|_{H_0}$  and  $N_1 = N|_{H_1}$ . By Theorem 2.10, there exists a conjugation  $C_0$  on  $H_0$  such that  $C_0 N_0 C_0 = -N_0^*$  and  $C_0 x_i = y_i$  for every  $i \in I$ . Since  $N_1$  is skew-symmetric, there exists a conjugation  $C_1$  on  $H_1$  such that  $C_1 N_1 C_1 = -N_1^*$ , and thus the conjugation  $C = C_0 \oplus C_1$  satisfies all required properties.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 3.2.* The implication (i)  $\implies$  (ii) follows directly from Theorem 3.1.

(ii)  $\implies$  (i). Let  $N_0$  and  $N_1$  be the normal operators in the proof of Theorem 3.2. In the light of the same theorem, we only need to show that  $N_1$  is skew-symmetric. This follows immediately from Theorem 3.8 and the facts that  $m(N_0|_{\ker(N_0)^\perp}) < \infty$  and  $N = N_0 \oplus N_1$  is skew-symmetric.

Let us now prove the second part of the theorem. Assume that  $I$  is finite. Since

$$H_0 = \bigvee \left( \sum_{i \in I} L_{N, \{x_i\}} + L_{N, \{y_i\}} \right) = \bigvee \left( \sum_{i \in I} L_{N_0, \{x_i\}} + L_{N_0, \{y_i\}} \right)$$

and the restrictions of  $N_0$  to  $L_{N_0, \{x_i\}}$  and  $L_{N_0, \{y_i\}}$  are star-cyclic, Lemma 3.9 implies that  $m(N_0|_{\ker(N_0)^\perp}) < \infty$ . This concludes the proof.  $\square$

#### 4. APPLICATIONS TO SOME EQUATIONS IN $L^\infty(\mu)$

Throughout this section, let  $\mu$  denote a finite measure on Borel subsets of  $\mathbb{C}$  with compact support, and let  $n$  be a positive integer. All functions are considered defined on  $\mathbb{C}$ . For a given function  $f$ , the notation  $\widetilde{f}$  stands for the function defined by  $\widetilde{f}(z) = \overline{f(-z)}$  for  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ .

Let  $[\phi_{i,j}]_{1 \leq i,j \leq n}$  be a matrix of functions in  $L^\infty(\mu)$ . We denote  $[\phi_{i,j}]_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \in \mathcal{U}(\mu, n)$  if the matrix  $[\phi_{i,j}(z)]_{1 \leq i,j \leq n}$  is unitary for  $\mu$ -almost every  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ . If, in addition, the functions  $\phi_{i,j}$  satisfy the condition  $\phi_{i,j}(z) = \phi_{j,i}(-z)$  for  $\mu$ -almost every  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ , then we write  $[\phi_{i,j}]_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \in \mathcal{SU}(\mu, n)$ .

For a function  $\phi \in L^\infty(\mu)$ ,  $M_\phi$  denotes the multiplication operator by  $\phi$  on  $L^2(\mu)$ ; that is,  $[M_\phi f](z) = \phi(z)f(z)$  for every  $f \in L^2(\mu)$ .

Let  $\{f_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$  and  $\{g_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$  be functions in  $L^2(\mu)$  so that  $\sum_{k=1}^n |f_k|^2 = \sum_{k=1}^n |g_k|^2$   $\mu$ -almost everywhere ( $\mu$ -a.e.). It is clear that we can find functions  $\phi_{i,j}$  so that, for  $\mu$ -almost every  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ , the matrix  $[\phi_{i,j}(z)]_{1 \leq i,j \leq n}$  is unitary and

$$\left[ \phi_{i,j}(z) \right]_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \left[ f_1(z), f_2(z), \dots, f_n(z) \right]^{\text{tr}} = \left[ g_1(z), g_2(z), \dots, g_n(z) \right]^{\text{tr}}.$$

However, it is not clear whether the functions  $\phi_{i,j}$  can be chosen to be Borel measurable. The next theorem provides a positive answer.

**Theorem 4.1.** Let  $\{f_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$  and  $\{g_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$  be two families of functions in  $L^2(\mu)$ . Then, the following equation

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{cases} \sum_{k=1}^n \phi_{1,k} f_k = g_1 \\ \sum_{k=1}^n \phi_{2,k} f_k = g_2 \\ \vdots \\ \sum_{k=1}^n \phi_{n,k} f_k = g_n \end{cases} \quad \mu\text{-a.e.}$$

has a solution  $[\phi_{i,j}]_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \in \mathcal{U}(\mu, n)$  if and only if  $\sum_{k=1}^n |f_k|^2 = \sum_{k=1}^n |g_k|^2$   $\mu$ -a.e.

**Lemma 4.2.** Let  $U \in \mathcal{B}(L^2(\mu)^{(n)})$ . Then,  $U$  is unitary and commutes with  $M_\mu^{(n)}$  if and only if  $U = [M_{\phi_{i,j}}]_{1 \leq i,j \leq n}$  for some  $[\phi_{i,j}]_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \in \mathcal{U}(\mu, n)$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $U = [M_{\phi_{i,j}}]_{1 \leq i,j \leq n}$  for some  $[\phi_{i,j}]_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \subset L^\infty(\mu)$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} UU^* &= \left[ \sum_{k=1}^n M_{\phi_{i,k}} M_{\phi_{j,k}}^* \right]_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} = \left[ \sum_{k=1}^n M_{\phi_{i,k}} \overline{M_{\phi_{j,k}}} \right]_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \\ &= \left[ \sum_{k=1}^n M_{\phi_{i,k} \overline{\phi_{j,k}}} \right]_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} = \left[ M_{\sum_{k=1}^n \phi_{i,k} \overline{\phi_{j,k}}} \right]_{1 \leq i,j \leq n}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,  $U^*U = \left[ M_{\sum_{k=1}^n \overline{\phi_{k,i}} \phi_{k,j}} \right]_{1 \leq i,j \leq n}$ . Hence, the operator  $U$  is unitary if and only if, for all  $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ ,

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \phi_{i,k} \overline{\phi_{j,k}} = \delta_{ij} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{k=1}^n \overline{\phi_{k,i}} \phi_{k,j} = \delta_{ij} \quad \mu\text{-a.e.}$$

where  $\delta_{ij}$  denotes the Kronecker delta. That is,  $[\phi_{i,j}]_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \in \mathcal{U}(\mu, n)$ . The desired equivalence follows now directly from [8, Page 276, Proposition 6.1 (b)] and [8, Page 279, Corollary 6.9].  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 4.1.* In the light of the previous lemma, the equation (4.1) has a solution in  $\mathcal{U}(\mu, n)$  if and only if there exists a unitary operator  $U$  commuting with  $M_\mu^{(n)}$  such that  $UF = G$ , where

$$F = [f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n]^{\text{tr}} \quad \text{and} \quad G = [g_1, g_2, \dots, g_n]^{\text{tr}}.$$

By Theorem 2.4, this is true if and only if  $\|E_{M_\mu^{(n)}}(\Delta)F\|_{L^2(\mu)^{(n)}} = \|E_{M_\mu^{(n)}}(\Delta)G\|_{L^2(\mu)^{(n)}}$  for every Borel subset  $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ . Note that

$$E_{M_\mu^{(n)}}(\Delta) = \bigoplus_{k=1}^n E_{M_\mu}(\Delta) = \bigoplus_{k=1}^n M_{\chi_\Delta}$$



for every  $f \in L^2(\mu)$ . Hence,

$$(4.3) \quad JM_\phi J = M_{\bar{\phi}}.$$

In particular,  $J^{(n)}M_\mu^{(n)}J^{(n)} = -M_\mu^{(n)*}$ , and  $M_\mu^{(n)}$  is skew-symmetric since  $J^{(n)}$  is a conjugation on  $L^2(\mu)^{(n)}$ .

**Claim:** An operator  $U \in \mathcal{B}(L^2(\mu)^{(n)})$  is unitary, commutes with  $M_\mu^{(n)}$  and satisfies  $J^{(n)}UJ^{(n)} = U^*$  if and only if  $U = [M_{\phi_{i,j}}]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$  for some  $[\phi_{i,j}]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \in \mathcal{SU}(\mu, n)$ . By Lemma 4.2, it suffices to show that if  $U = [M_{\phi_{i,j}}]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ , then

$$J^{(n)}UJ^{(n)} = U^* \iff \phi_{i,j}(z) = \phi_{j,i}(-z) \text{ } \mu\text{-a.e. for all } 1 \leq i, j \leq n.$$

In fact, simple matrix calculations show that

$$\begin{aligned} J^{(n)}UJ^{(n)} = U^* &\iff (JM_{\phi_{i,j}}J)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} = (M_{\phi_{j,i}}^*)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \\ &\iff (JM_{\phi_{i,j}}J)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} = (M_{\bar{\phi}_{j,i}})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \\ &\iff M_{\bar{\phi}_{i,j}} = M_{\bar{\phi}_{j,i}} \text{ for all } 1 \leq i, j \leq n \text{ (by (4.3))} \\ &\iff \phi_{i,j}(z) = \phi_{j,i}(-z) \text{ } \mu\text{-a.e. for all } 1 \leq i, j \leq n. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim.

Now, one can see that the equation (4.2) has a solution in  $\mathcal{SU}(\mu, n)$  if and only if, there exists a unitary operator  $U$  on  $L^2(\mu)^{(n)}$  commuting with  $M_\mu^{(n)}$  such that  $J^{(n)}UJ^{(n)} = U^*$  and

$$U[f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n]^{\text{tr}} = [g_1, g_2, \dots, g_n]^{\text{tr}}.$$

By Lemma 4.4, this true if and only if there exists a conjugation  $C$  on  $L^2(\mu)^{(n)}$  such that  $J^{(n)}C$  commutes with  $M_\mu^{(n)}$  and

$$(4.4) \quad J^{(n)}C[f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n]^{\text{tr}} = [g_1, g_2, \dots, g_n]^{\text{tr}}.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} J^{(n)}CM_\mu^{(n)} = M_\mu^{(n)}J^{(n)}C &\iff CM_\mu^{(n)}C = J^{(n)}M_\mu^{(n)}J^{(n)} \\ &\iff CM_\mu^{(n)}C = -M_\mu^{(n)*} \text{ (by (4.3)).} \end{aligned}$$

Hence, taking into account (4.4), the equation (4.2) has a solution in  $\mathcal{SU}(\mu, n)$  if and only if there exists a conjugation  $C$  on  $L^2(\mu)^{(n)}$  such that  $CM_\mu^{(n)}C = -M_\mu^{(n)*}$  and

$$C[f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n]^{\text{tr}} = J^{(n)}[g_1, g_2, \dots, g_n]^{\text{tr}} = [\tilde{g}_1, \tilde{g}_2, \dots, \tilde{g}_n]^{\text{tr}}.$$

For convenience, put  $F = [f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n]^{\text{tr}}$  and  $\widetilde{G} = [\widetilde{g}_1, \widetilde{g}_2, \dots, \widetilde{g}_n]^{\text{tr}}$ . Then, by Theorem 3.2, the equation (4.2) has a solution in  $\mathcal{SU}(\mu, n)$  if and only if

$$\left\langle E_{M_\mu^{(n)}}(\Delta)F, \widetilde{G} \right\rangle_{L^2(\mu)^{(n)}} = \left\langle E_{M_\mu^{(n)}}(-\Delta)F, \widetilde{G} \right\rangle_{L^2(\mu)^{(n)}}$$

and

$$\left\langle E_{M_\mu^{(n)}}(\Delta)F, F \right\rangle_{L^2(\mu)^{(n)}} = \left\langle E_{M_\mu^{(n)}}(-\Delta)\widetilde{G}, \widetilde{G} \right\rangle_{L^2(\mu)^{(n)}}$$

for every Borel subset  $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ . That is,

$$\left\langle \left( \bigoplus_{i=1}^n M_{\chi_\Delta} \right) F, \widetilde{G} \right\rangle_{L^2(\mu)^{(n)}} = \left\langle \left( \bigoplus_{i=1}^n M_{\chi_{-\Delta}} \right) F, \widetilde{G} \right\rangle_{L^2(\mu)^{(n)}}$$

and

$$\left\langle \left( \bigoplus_{i=1}^n M_{\chi_\Delta} \right) F, F \right\rangle_{L^2(\mu)^{(n)}} = \left\langle \left( \bigoplus_{i=1}^n M_{\chi_{-\Delta}} \right) \widetilde{G}, \widetilde{G} \right\rangle_{L^2(\mu)^{(n)}}$$

for every Borel subset  $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ ; which means that

$$\int \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(z)g_i(-z)\chi_\Delta \, d\mu = \int \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(z)g_i(-z)\chi_{-\Delta} \, d\mu$$

and

$$\int \sum_{i=1}^n |f_i(z)|^2 \chi_\Delta \, d\mu = \int \sum_{i=1}^n |g_i(-z)|^2 \chi_{-\Delta} \, d\mu$$

for every Borel subset  $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ . Therefore, by symmetry of  $\mu$ , for every Borel subset  $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ ,

$$\int \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(z)g_i(-z)\chi_\Delta \, d\mu = \int \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(-z)g_i(z)\chi_\Delta \, d\mu$$

and

$$\int \sum_{i=1}^n |f_i(z)|^2 \chi_\Delta \, d\mu = \int \sum_{i=1}^n |g_i(z)|^2 \chi_\Delta \, d\mu;$$

which lead to the desired conditions.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] Z. AMARA AND M. OUDGHIRI, *Finite rank perturbations of complex symmetric operators*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **495** (2021), no. 1, 124720.
- [2] Z. AMARA AND M. OUDGHIRI, *C-normality of rank-one perturbations of normal operators*, Linear Multilinear Algebra **71** (2023), no. 15, 2426–2440.
- [3] C. M. BENDER, *Making sense of non-Hermitian Hamiltonians*, Rep. Prog. Phys. **70** (2007), no. 6, 947–1018.
- [4] C. M. BENDER AND S. BOETTCHER, *Real spectra in non-Hermitian Hamiltonians having  $\mathcal{PT}$  symmetry*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80** (1998), no. 24, 5243–5246.



- [5] M. C. CÂMARA, K. KLIŚ-GARLICKA, B. ŁANUCHA AND M. PTAK, *Conjugations in  $L^2$  and their invariants*, Anal. Math. Phys. **10** (2020), no. 2, 22.
- [6] M. C. CÂMARA, K. KLIŚ-GARLICKA, B. ŁANUCHA AND M. PTAK, *Conjugations in  $L^2(\mathcal{H})$* , Integral Equations Operator Theory **92** (2020), no. 6, 48.
- [7] W. CAO AND L. HU, *Projective interpolation of polynomial vectors and improved key recovery attack on SFLASH*, Des. Codes Cryptogr. **73** (2014), no. 3, 719–730.
- [8] J. B. CONWAY, *A Course in Functional Analysis*, Second edition, Grad. Texts Math. **96**, Springer-Verlag, New York (1990).
- [9] J. B. CONWAY, *A Course in Operator Theory*, Grad. Stud. Math. **21**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI (2000).
- [10] K. R. DAVIDSON,  *$C^*$ -algebras by example*, Fields Inst. Monogr. **6**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI (1996).
- [11] P. DYMEK, A. PLANETA AND M. PTAK, *Conjugations preserving Toeplitz kernels*, Integral Equations Operator Theory **94** (2022), no. 4, 39.
- [12] P. DYMEK, A. PLANETA AND M. PTAK, *Conjugations on  $L^2$  space on the real line*, Results Math. **79** (2024), no. 1, 39.
- [13] S. R. GARCIA AND M. PUTINAR, *Complex symmetric operators and applications*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **358** (2006), no. 3, 1285–1315.
- [14] S. R. GARCIA AND M. PUTINAR, *Complex symmetric operators and applications II*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **359** (2007), no. 8, 3913–3931.
- [15] S. R. GARCIA, E. PRODAN AND M. PUTINAR, *Mathematical and physical aspects of complex symmetric operators*, J. Phys. A **47** (2014), no. 35, 353001.
- [16] K. GUO, Y. JI AND S. ZHU, *A  $C^*$ -algebra approach to complex symmetric operators*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **367** (2015), no. 10, 6903–6942.
- [17] C. G. LI AND S. ZHU, *Skew symmetric normal operators*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **141** (2013), no. 8, 2755–2762.
- [18] T. LUI, L. SHI, C. WANG AND S. ZHU, *An interpolation problem for conjugations*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **500** (2021), no. 1, 125118.
- [19] T. LIU, X. XIE AND S. ZHU, *An interpolation problem for conjugations II*, Mediterr. J. Math. **19** (2022), no. 4, 153.
- [20] J. MASHREGHI, M. PTAK AND W. T. ROSS, *Conjugations of unitary operators, I*, Anal. Math. Phys. **14** (2024), no. 3, 62.
- [21] J. MASHREGHI, M. PTAK AND W. T. ROSS, *Conjugations of unitary operators, II*, Anal. Math. Phys. **14** (2024), no. 3, 56.
- [22] C. MEHL, *Condensed forms for skew-Hamiltonian/Hamiltonian pencils*, SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl. **21** (1999), no. 2, 454–476.
- [23] F. PIÑERO AND P. SINGH, *The weight spectrum of certain affine Grassmann codes*, Des. Codes Cryptogr. **87** (2019), no. 4, 817–830.
- [24] E. PRODAN, S. R. GARCIA AND M. PUTINAR, *Norm estimates of complex symmetric operators applied to quantum systems*, J. Phys. A **39** (2006), no. 2, 389–400.
- [25] H. RADJAVI AND P. ROSENTHAL, *Invariant subspaces*, Ergeb. Math. Grenzgeb., Band 77 [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas] (1973).
- [26] C. WANG, X. XIE, S. YAN AND S. ZHU, *An interpolation problem for conjugations III*, Banach J. Math. Anal. **16** (2022), no. 4, 61.
- [27] C. WANG, J. ZHAO AND S. ZHU, *Remarks on the structure of  $C$ -normal operators*, Linear Multilinear Algebra **70** (2022), no. 9, 1682–1696.
- [28] S. ZHU, *Approximate unitary equivalence to skew symmetric operators*, Complex Anal. Oper. Theory **8** (2014)0, no. 7, 1565–1580.

- [29] S. ZHU AND C. G. LI, *Complex symmetry of a dense class of operators*, *Integral Equations Operator Theory* **73** (2012), no. 2, 255–272.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, LABO LIABM, FACULTY OF SCIENCES, MOHAMMED FIRST UNIVERSITY, 60000 OUJDA, MOROCCO

*Email address:* z.amara@ump.ac.ma