

# Unconditional convergence and invertibility of Multipliers

D. T. Stoeva<sup>a),b)</sup> and P. Balazs<sup>b)</sup>

<sup>a)</sup> Department of Mathematics,  
University of Architecture, Civil Engineering and Geodesy,  
Blvd Christo Smirnenski 1, 1046 Sofia, Bulgaria

<sup>b)</sup> Acoustics Research Institute,  
Wohllebengasse 12-14, Vienna A-1040, Austria

April 24, 2019

## Abstract

In the present paper invertibility of multipliers is investigated. Sufficient and/or necessary conditions for invertibility are determined. Examples which show that the given assertions cover different classes of multipliers are given. The case when one of the sequences is a Riesz basis is completely characterized. Moreover, necessary and/or sufficient conditions for unconditional convergence of multipliers are given.

Keywords: multiplier, invertibility, unconditional convergence, frame, Riesz basis, Bessel sequence

MSC 2000: 42C15, 47A05, 40A05

---

<sup>1</sup>This work was supported by the WWTF project MULAC ('Frame Multipliers: Theory and Application in Acoustics; MA07-025)

# 1 Introduction

In modern life applications of signal processing can be found in numerous technical items, for example in wireless communication or medical imaging. In these applications, ‘*time-invariant filters*’, i.e. convolution operators, are used very often. In the last decade *time-variant filters* have found more and more applications. A particular way to implement such filters are Gabor multipliers [10] also known as Gabor filters [17]. Such operators find application in psychoacoustics [4], computational auditory scene analysis [20], virtual acoustics [15] and seismic data analysis [16]. In [3] the concept of Bessel multipliers, i.e. operators of the form

$$Mf = \sum_k \lambda_k \langle f, \phi_k \rangle \psi_k, \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{H},$$

with  $(\phi_n)$  and  $(\psi_n)$  being Bessel sequences, were introduced and investigated. For many applications, for example in sound morphing [9], to find the inversion of such operators is of interest. In this paper we investigate the inversion of multipliers.

From a theoretical point of view it is very natural to investigate Bessel and frame multipliers. In [18], R. Schatten provided a detailed study of ideals of compact operators using their singular decomposition. By the spectral theorem, every self-adjoint compact operator on a Hilbert space can be represented as a multiplier using an orthonormal system. Multipliers generalize the frame operators, as every frame operator  $S$  for a frame  $(\phi_n)$  is the multiplier  $M_{(1),(\phi_n),(\phi_n)}$ .

Some properties of the invertibility of multipliers are known. For a frame  $(\phi_n)$  and a positive (resp. negative) semi-normalized sequence  $(m_n)$ , the multiplier  $M_{(m_n),(\phi_n),(\phi_n)}$  is the frame operator  $S$  (resp.  $-S$ ) for the frame  $(\sqrt{|m_n|} \phi_n)$  and thus,  $M_{(m_n),(\phi_n),(\phi_n)}$  is invertible [5]. When  $(\phi_n)$  and  $(\psi_n)$  are Riesz bases and  $(m_n)$  is semi-normalized, then  $M_{(m_n),(\phi_n),(\psi_n)}$  is invertible and  $M_{(m_n),(\phi_n),(\psi_n)}^{-1} = M_{(\frac{1}{m_n}),(\tilde{\psi}_n),(\tilde{\phi}_n)}$ , where  $(\tilde{\phi}_n)$  and  $(\tilde{\psi}_n)$  denote the canonical duals of  $(\phi_n)$  and  $(\psi_n)$ , respectively, see [3]. If  $(\phi_n^d)$  is a dual frame of the frame  $(\phi_n)$ , then  $M_{(1),(\phi_n),(\phi_n^d)}$  is the Identity operator and therefore, invertible. If  $m \in c_0$  and both  $(\phi_n)$  and  $(\psi_n)$  are Bessel sequences, then the multiplier  $M_{(m_n),(\phi_n),(\psi_n)}$  is never invertible on an infinite dimensional Hilbert space, because it is a compact operator [3, Theorem 6.1].

In the present paper we investigate invertibility of multipliers in more details. In Section 2 we specify notation and state the needed results for the main part of

the paper. In Section 3 unconditional convergence of multipliers is considered; sufficient and/or necessary conditions are determined. Section 4 concerns the question for invertibility of multipliers  $M_{(m_n),(\phi_n),(\psi_n)}$ . Different cases for  $(\phi_n)$  and  $(\psi_n)$  are considered - non-Bessel, Bessel sequences, overcomplete frames, Riesz bases. Sufficient and/or necessary conditions for invertibility of  $M_{(m_n),(\phi_n),(\psi_n)}$  are given. In the cases of invertibility, expression for  $M_{(m_n),(\phi_n),(\psi_n)}^{-1}$  is determined. The last section of the paper contains examples, showing the exactness of the bounds in Propositions 4.5 - 4.9 as well as that Propositions 4.7, 4.8 and 4.9 are independent of each other.

For certain cases of multipliers we provide examples and counter-examples. For some of them we refer to the table [19]. We have chosen this approach to shorten the paper.

## 2 Notation and preliminary results

Throughout the paper  $\mathcal{H}$  denotes a Hilbert space and  $(e_n)$  denotes an orthonormal basis of  $\mathcal{H}$ . The notion *operator* is used for linear mappings. The Identity operator on  $\mathcal{H}$  is denoted by  $I_{\mathcal{H}}$ . The operator  $G : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is called *invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$*  if there exists bounded operator  $G^{-1} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  such that  $GG^{-1} = G^{-1}G = I_{\mathcal{H}}$ . Throughout the paper, we work with a fixed infinite, but countable index set  $J$  and without loss of generality  $\mathbb{N}$  is used as an index set, also implicitly.

The notation  $\Phi$  (resp.  $\Psi$ ) is used to denote the sequence  $(\phi_n)$  (resp.  $(\psi_n)$ ) with elements from  $\mathcal{H}$ ;  $\Phi - \Psi$  denotes the sequence  $(\phi_n - \psi_n)$ ;  $m$  denotes a real scalar sequence  $(m_n)$ ;  $m\Phi$  denotes the sequence  $(m_n\phi_n)$ . Recall that  $m$  is called *semi-normalized* (in short, *SN*) if there exist constants  $a, b$  such that  $0 < a \leq |m_n| \leq b < \infty, \forall n$ .

Recall that  $\Phi$  is called a *Bessel sequence* (in short, *Bessel*) for  $\mathcal{H}$  with bound  $B_{\Phi}$  if  $B_{\Phi} > 0$  and  $\sum |\langle h, \phi_n \rangle|^2 \leq B_{\Phi} \|h\|^2$  for every  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ . A Bessel sequence  $\Phi$  is called a *frame for  $\mathcal{H}$  with bounds  $A_{\Phi}, B_{\Phi}$* , if  $A_{\Phi} > 0$ ,  $B_{\Phi}$  is a Bessel bound for  $\Phi$  and  $A_{\Phi} \|h\|^2 \leq \sum |\langle h, \phi_n \rangle|^2$  for every  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ ;  $A_{\Phi}^{opt}$  and  $B_{\Phi}^{opt}$  denote the optimal frame bounds for  $\Phi$ . The sequence  $\Phi$  is called a Riesz basis for  $\mathcal{H}$  with bounds  $A_{\Phi}, B_{\Phi}$  if  $A_{\Phi} > 0$  and  $A_{\Phi} \|(c_n)\|_2 \leq \|\sum c_n \phi_n\| \leq B_{\Phi} \|(c_n)\|_2, \forall (c_n) \in \ell^2$ . Every Riesz basis for  $\mathcal{H}$  with bounds  $A, B$  is a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$  with bounds  $A, B$ . The sequence  $\Phi$  is called an *unbounded frame for  $\mathcal{H}$*  [2] if there exists  $B > 0$  such that  $0 < \sum |\langle f, \phi_n \rangle|^2 \leq B \|f\|^2$  for every  $f \in \mathcal{H}, f \neq 0$ .

For a given sequence  $\Phi$ , the mapping  $U_\Phi : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \ell^2$  given by  $U_\Phi f = (\langle f, \phi_n \rangle)$  is called *the analysis operator for  $\Phi$*  and the mapping  $T_\Phi$  given by  $T_\Phi(c_n) = \sum c_n \phi_n$  is called *the synthesis operator for  $\Phi$* . Let  $\Phi$  be a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$ . The operator  $S_\Phi : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  given by  $S_\Phi h = \sum \langle h, \phi_n \rangle \phi_n$  is called *the frame operator for  $\Phi$* . The sequence  $(\phi_n^d)$  is called a dual frame of  $\Phi$  if it is a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $h = \sum \langle h, \phi_n^d \rangle \phi_n = \sum \langle h, \phi_n \rangle \phi_n^d, \forall h \in \mathcal{H}$ . The sequence  $\tilde{\Phi} = (S_\Phi^{-1} \phi_n)$  is a dual frame of  $\Phi$ , called *the canonical dual of  $\Phi$* . Recall the following statements.

**Proposition 2.1**

- (a) [8, p.52 and p.102]  $\Phi$  is a Bessel sequence (resp. frame) for  $\mathcal{H}$  with Bessel bound  $B_\Phi$  if and only if the operator  $T_\Phi : (c_n) \rightarrow \sum c_n \phi_n$  is well defined from  $\ell^2$  into (resp. onto)  $\mathcal{H}$  and bounded with  $\|T_\Phi\| \leq \sqrt{B_\Phi}$ .
- (b) [8, p.103] If  $\Phi$  is a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$ , then  $U_\Phi$  is bounded and injective with closed range  $\mathcal{R}(U_\Phi)$ . Thus,  $U_\Phi$  has a bounded inverse  $U_\Phi^{-1} : \mathcal{R}(U_\Phi) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ . Moreover,  $T_\Phi|_{\mathcal{R}(U_\Phi)} : \mathcal{R}(U_\Phi) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is bijective.
- (c) [12, Prop. 5.1.5] If  $\Phi$  is a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$ , then  $\mathcal{R}(U_\Phi) = \ell^2$  if and only if  $\Phi$  is a Riesz basis for  $\mathcal{H}$ .
- (d) [14, Prop. 12.10] If  $\Phi$  is a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$  with bounds  $A_\Phi, B_\Phi$ , then  $S_\Phi$  is invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$ ,  $A_\Phi \|f\| \leq \|S_\Phi f\| \leq B_\Phi \|f\|$  and  $\frac{1}{B_\Phi} \|f\| \leq \|S_\Phi^{-1} f\| \leq \frac{1}{A_\Phi} \|f\|, \forall f \in \mathcal{H}$ . Moreover,  $\|S_\Phi\| = B_\Phi^{opt}$  and  $\|S_\Phi^{-1}\| = 1/A_\Phi^{opt}$ , [8, Prop. 5.4.4].

Let  $\Phi$  be a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$  with bounds  $A_\Phi, B_\Phi$ . By the above, the canonical dual frame of  $\Phi$  has bounds  $\frac{1}{B_\Phi}, \frac{1}{A_\Phi}$ . If  $\Phi^d$  is any dual frame of  $\Phi$ , then  $\frac{1}{B_\Phi}$  is a lower frame bound for  $\Phi^d$  (see the proof of [6, Proposition 3.4]). Thus, all the dual frames of a given frame have a common lower bound. However, in general they do not need to have a common upper bound - consider for example the frame  $(e_1, e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, \dots)$  and its dual  $(ke_1, e_1 - ke_1, e_2, e - 3, e_4, \dots)$ , where  $k$  can be arbitrary large number.

If  $\sup_n \|\phi_n\| < \infty$  (resp.  $\inf_n \|\phi_n\| > 0$ ), the sequence  $\Phi$  will be called *norm-bounded above*, in short *NBA* (resp. *norm-bounded below*, in short *NBB*). If  $(\|\phi_n\|)$  is semi-normalized, then  $\Phi$  is called  $\|\cdot\|$ -*semi-normalized* (in short,  $\|\cdot\|$ -SN). Recall that if  $\Phi$  is a Bessel sequence for  $\mathcal{H}$  with bound  $B_\Phi$ , then  $\|\phi_n\| \leq \sqrt{B_\Phi}, \forall n$ , and clearly,  $\Phi$  is not needed to be *NBB*. Note that even a frame  $\Phi$  is not needed to be *NBB*. Take for example the frame  $(\frac{1}{2}e_1, e_2, \frac{1}{2^2}e_1, e_3, \frac{1}{2^3}e_1, e_4, \dots)$ . Typical

examples for  $\|\cdot\|$ -SN frames are Gabor and wavelet frames, [12]. Any Riesz basis  $\Phi$  is  $\|\cdot\|$ -SN, because  $\sqrt{A_\Phi} \leq \|\phi_n\| \leq \sqrt{B_\Phi}, \forall n$ . A frame which is  $\|\cdot\|$ -SN does not need to be a Riesz basis, consider for example the sequence  $(e_1, e_1, e_2, e_3, \dots)$ . In [5] weighted frames  $m\Phi$  are considered. Below we give more details about the relationship between a sequence  $\Phi$  and the weighted sequence  $m\Phi$ .

**Proposition 2.2**

- (i) *If  $\Phi$  is a Bessel sequence for  $\mathcal{H}$  (resp. Bessel sequence for  $\mathcal{H}$  which is not a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$ ) and  $m \in \ell^\infty$ , then  $m\Phi$  is a Bessel sequence for  $\mathcal{H}$  (resp. Bessel sequence for  $\mathcal{H}$  which is not a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$ ).*
- (ii) *If  $\Phi$  is an unbounded frame for  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $m \in \ell^\infty$ ,  $m_n \neq 0, \forall n$ , then  $m\Phi$  is an unbounded frame for  $\mathcal{H}$ .*
- (iii) *If  $m$  is SN, then  $\Phi$  is a Riesz basis (resp. overcomplete frame, Bessel sequence) for  $\mathcal{H}$  if and only if  $m\Phi$  is a Riesz basis (resp. overcomplete frame, Bessel sequence) for  $\mathcal{H}$ .*
- (iv) *If  $\Phi$  is  $\|\cdot\|$ -SN, then  $m\Phi$  is  $\|\cdot\|$ -SN if and only if  $m$  is SN. As a consequence, if  $\Phi$  is a Riesz basis for  $\mathcal{H}$ , then  $m\Phi$  is a Riesz basis for  $\mathcal{H}$  if and only if  $m$  is SN.*
- (v) *If  $\Phi$  is not a Riesz basis for  $\mathcal{H}$ , then  $m\Phi$  can be a Riesz basis for  $\mathcal{H}$  only in the following cases:*
  - *$\Phi$  is non-NBB Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$  which is not a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $m$  is NBB but not in  $\ell^\infty$ ;*
  - *$\Phi$  is non-NBA non-Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $m$  is non-NBB with  $m_n \neq 0, \forall n$ .*

**Proof:** (i)-(iv) are trivial.

(v) 1. Let  $\Phi$  be non-Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ . Assume that  $m\Phi$  is a Riesz basis for  $\mathcal{H}$  with lower bound  $A_{m\Phi}$ . Then:

- $m$  must be non-NBB with  $m_n \neq 0, \forall n$ .

Indeed, if  $m$  is NBB, then  $m\Phi$  being Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$  implies that  $\Phi$  is Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ , which contradicts to the case under consideration. Since a Riesz basis can not contain zero elements,  $m_n$  must be non-zero for every  $n$ .

- $\Phi$  must be non- $NBA$ .

Indeed, if  $\Phi$  is  $NBA$  with bound  $b$ , then  $\sqrt{A_{m\Phi}} \leq \|m_n\phi_n\| \leq b|m_n|$ ,  $\forall n$ , which implies that  $m$  is  $NBB$ , but this contradicts to the conclusion above.

Now assume that  $\Phi$  is non- $NBA$  non-Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $m$  is non- $NBB$  with  $m_n \neq 0$ ,  $\forall n$ . Then there are cases when  $m\Phi$  is a Riesz basis for  $\mathcal{H}$  (for example, take  $\Phi = (ne_n)$ ,  $m = (\frac{1}{n}) \in \ell^\infty$  or take  $\Phi = (e_1, \frac{1}{2}e_2, 3e_3, \frac{1}{4}e_4, 5e_5, \dots)$ ,  $m = (1, 2, \frac{1}{3}, 4, \frac{1}{5}, \dots) \notin \ell^\infty$ ) and there exist cases when  $m\Phi$  is not a Riesz basis for  $\mathcal{H}$  (for example, take the same sequences as above but without their first elements).

2. Let  $\Phi$  be an overcomplete frame for  $\mathcal{H}$ . Recall, a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$  is a Riesz basis for  $\mathcal{H}$  if and only if it has a biorthogonal sequence in  $\mathcal{H}$ , see [8, Theorem 6.1.1]. Assume that  $m\Phi$  is a Riesz basis for  $\mathcal{H}$ . This implies that  $m_n \neq 0$ ,  $\forall n$ , and thus,  $\Phi$  has a biorthogonal sequence in  $\mathcal{H}$ , which contradicts to  $\Phi$  being an overcomplete frame.

3. Let  $\Phi$  be Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$  with bound  $B_\Phi$ , which is not a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$ . Assume that  $m\Phi$  is a Riesz basis for  $\mathcal{H}$  with bounds  $A_{m\Phi}$ ,  $B_{m\Phi}$ . Then:

- $m$  must be  $NBB$ .

Indeed, in this case  $\sqrt{A_{m\Phi}} \leq \|m_n\phi_n\| \leq |m_n| \sqrt{B_\Phi}$ ,  $\forall n$ .

- $m$  must be not in  $\ell^\infty$ .

Indeed, if  $m \in \ell^\infty$ , then  $A_{m\Phi}\|f\|^2 \leq \|m\|_\infty^2 \sum |\langle f, \phi_n \rangle|^2$ ,  $\forall f \in \mathcal{H}$ , which contradicts to the fact that  $\Phi$  does not satisfy the lower frame condition.

- $\Phi$  must be non- $NBB$ .

Indeed, if  $\Phi$  is  $NBB$ , then  $|m_n| \inf_n \|\phi_n\| \leq \|m_n\phi_n\| \leq \sqrt{B_{m\Phi}}$ , which implies that  $m \in \ell^\infty$ , but this contradicts to the conclusion above.

Now assume that  $\Phi$  is non- $NBB$  Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ , which is not a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$ , and  $m$  is  $NBB$  but not  $NBA$ . There are cases when  $m\Phi$  is a Riesz basis for  $\mathcal{H}$  (for example, take  $\Phi = (\frac{1}{n}e_n)$ ,  $m = (n)$ ) and there exist cases when  $m\Phi$  is not a Riesz basis for  $\mathcal{H}$  (for example, take  $\Phi = (\frac{1}{n^2}e_n)$ ,  $m = (n)$ ).  $\square$

As one can see in Proposition 2.2(iii), the weighted sequence  $m\Phi$  with semi-normalized weight  $m$  has the same type as the sequence  $\Phi$ . This is not the case when  $m$  is not semi-normalized. For example, if  $m \notin \ell^\infty$ , the frame property of  $\Phi$  can be destroyed - consider the frame  $\Phi = (\frac{1}{2}e_1, e_2, \frac{1}{2^2}e_1, e_3, \frac{1}{2^3}e_1, e_4, \dots)$  and the weight  $m = (2, 1, 2^2, 1, 2^3, 1, \dots)$ , which give the non-Bessel sequence  $m\Phi$ . Moreover, one can obtain frame  $m\Phi$  starting from a non-Bessel sequence  $\Phi$  -

consider for example  $\Phi = (e_1, e_2, e_1, e_3, e_1, e_4, \dots)$  and  $m = (\frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{1}{2^2}, 1, \frac{1}{2^3}, 1, \dots)$ .

## Multipliers

For any  $\Phi, \Psi$  and any  $m$  (called *weight* or *symbol*), the operator  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$ , given by

$$M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}f = \sum m_n \langle f, \psi_n \rangle \phi_n, \quad f \in \mathcal{H},$$

is called a *multiplier*. Depending on  $m, \Phi, \Psi$ , the corresponding multiplier might not be well defined. The following assertion gives sufficient condition for the well-definedness of multipliers.

**Proposition 2.3** [3, Theorems 3.2.3 and 5.5.1] *Let  $m \in \ell^\infty$  and let  $\Phi, \Psi$  be Bessel sequences for  $\mathcal{H}$  with bounds  $B_\phi, B_\psi$ , respectively. Then the multiplier  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  is well defined from  $\mathcal{H}$  into  $\mathcal{H}$  and it is bounded with  $\|M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}\| \leq \sqrt{B_\phi B_\psi} \|m\|_\infty$ . Furthermore, the series  $\sum m_n \langle f, \psi_n \rangle \phi_n$  converges unconditionally for every  $f \in \mathcal{H}$ .*

Note that the above assertion gives only sufficient condition. Multipliers can be unconditionally convergent and bounded even in case  $m \notin \ell^\infty$  (for example,  $M_{(n^2), (\frac{1}{n}e_n), (\frac{1}{n}e_n)} = I_{\mathcal{H}}$ ) or in case at least one of the sequences is not Bessel (for example,  $M_{(1), (\frac{1}{n}e_n), (ne_n)} = I_{\mathcal{H}}$ ). The question for unconditional convergence of multipliers is investigated deeper in Section 3. We will use the following known results:

### Proposition 2.4

- (i) [14, p.75]  $(\phi_n)$  is Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$  if and only if  $(\langle f, \phi_n \rangle) \in \ell^2$  for every  $f \in \mathcal{H}$ .
- (ii) [14, p.92] If  $(\phi_n)$  is a Riesz basis for  $\mathcal{H}$ , then
 
$$\sum c_n \phi_n \text{ converges unconditionally in } \mathcal{H} \Leftrightarrow \sum c_n \phi_n \text{ converges in } \mathcal{H} \Leftrightarrow (c_n) \in \ell^2.$$
- (iii) [14, p.32] (Orlicz's Theorem) If  $(x_n)$  is a sequence with elements from  $\mathcal{H}$ , then
 
$$\sum x_n \text{ converges unconditionally in } \mathcal{H} \Rightarrow \sum \|x_n\|^2 < \infty.$$

It is well known that if  $(\phi_n)$  is a Bessel sequence for  $\mathcal{H}$ , then  $\sum c_n \phi_n$  converges unconditionally in  $\mathcal{H}$  for every  $(c_n) \in \ell^2$ , e.g. [14, p.83]. If in addition  $(\phi_n)$  is *NBB*, then an equivalence can be stated:

**Lemma 2.5** *Let  $(\phi_n)$  be a NBB Bessel sequence for  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then*

$$\sum c_n \phi_n \text{ converges unconditionally in } \mathcal{H} \Leftrightarrow (c_n) \in \ell^2.$$

**Proof:** In case  $(\phi_n)$  is a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$ , the assertion is proved in [14, Prop. 12.17]. The proof in [14] uses only validity of the upper frame condition, so the property is shown for Bessel sequences.  $\square$

Note that if the condition “norm-bounded below” is omitted, then the conclusion of the above lemma does not hold in general, because  $\sum c_n \phi_n$  might converge unconditionally for some  $(c_n) \notin \ell^\infty$ , see [14, Ex. 12.16].

The main aim of our paper is to investigate invertibility of multipliers. We will use the following criterion for invertibility of operators:

**Proposition 2.6** *Let  $F : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  be invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$ . Suppose that  $G : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is a bounded operator and  $\|Gh - Fh\| \leq \nu \|h\|$ ,  $\forall h \in \mathcal{H}$ , where  $\nu \in [0, \frac{1}{\|F^{-1}\|})$ . Then*

$$(i) \ G \text{ is invertible on } \mathcal{H} \text{ and } G^{-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} [F^{-1}(F - G)]^k F^{-1};$$

$$(ii) \ \frac{1}{1+\nu\|F^{-1}\|} \frac{1}{\|F\|} \|h\| \leq \|G^{-1}h\| \leq \frac{1}{1/\|F^{-1}\|-\nu} \|h\|, \ \forall h \in \mathcal{H}.$$

**Proof:** (i) is proved in [11, p.70]. For (ii), observe that  $\|Gh - Fh\| \leq \nu \|F^{-1}\| \|Fh\|$  and apply [7, Theorem 1] with  $\lambda_1 = \nu \|F^{-1}\| < 1$  and  $\lambda_2 = 0$ .  $\square$

### 3 Unconditional convergence of multipliers

As one can see in Proposition 2.3, Bessel multipliers are unconditionally convergent in case  $m \in \ell^\infty$ . Now we are interested in converse assertions.

**Lemma 3.1** *Let  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  be unconditionally convergent.*

- (i) *Then  $(|m_n| \cdot \|\phi_n\| \psi_n)$  is a Bessel sequence for  $\mathcal{H}$ . As a consequence, the sequence  $(|m_n| \cdot \|\phi_n\| \cdot \|\psi_n\|)$  is bounded.*



- (ii) If  $\Phi$  (resp.  $m\Phi$ ) is NBB, then  $m\Psi$  (resp.  $\Psi$ ) is a Bessel sequence for  $\mathcal{H}$ .
- (iii) If both  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  are NBB, then  $m \in \ell^\infty$ .

**Proof:** (i) By Orlicz's Theorem (see Prop. 2.4), we have that  $(|m_n \langle f, \psi_n \rangle| \cdot \|\phi_n\|) \in \ell^2$  for every  $f \in \mathcal{H}$ . Therefore,  $(\langle f, |m_n| \cdot \|\phi_n\| \psi_n \rangle) \in \ell^2$  for every  $f \in \mathcal{H}$ . Now Proposition 2.4 implies that  $(|m_n| \cdot \|\phi_n\| \psi_n)$  is a Bessel sequence for  $\mathcal{H}$ .

(ii) and (iii) follow easily from (i).  $\square$

**Corollary 3.2** *Let both multipliers  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  and  $M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}$  be unconditionally convergent in  $\mathcal{H}$ . If  $\Phi$ ,  $\Psi$  and  $m$  are NBB, then  $m \in \ell^\infty$  and both  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  are Bessel sequences for  $\mathcal{H}$ .*

Using Lemma 3.1 and Proposition 2.4, it is easy to show the following:

**Corollary 3.3** *If  $\Psi$  is a non-Bessel sequence for  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $m\Phi$  is NBB, then  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  can not be unconditionally convergent in  $\mathcal{H}$ . As a consequence, if  $\Psi$  is non-Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $m\Phi$  is a Riesz basis for  $\mathcal{H}$ , then  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  is not well defined.*

**Remark 3.4** *Note that if  $\Psi$  is non-Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $m\Phi$  is NBB non-Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ , then  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  can be conditionally convergent and invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$ , although  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  can not be unconditionally convergent in  $\mathcal{H}$  by Corollary 3.3. Consider for example the non-Bessel sequences*

$$\Phi = (e_1, e_2, e_2, -e_2, e_3, e_3, -e_3, e_3, -e_3, e_4, e_4, -e_4, e_4, -e_4, e_4, -e_4, \dots),$$

$$\Psi = (e_1, e_2, e_2, e_2, e_3, e_3, e_3, e_3, e_3, e_4, e_4, e_4, e_4, e_4, e_4, e_4, \dots),$$

for which  $M_{(1),\Phi,\Psi} = M_{(1),\Psi,\Phi} = I_{\mathcal{H}}$ .

**Remark 3.5** *Note that if  $\Psi$  is non-Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $m\Phi$  is non-NBB, then  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  can be unconditionally convergent and invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$ . Consider for example the non-Bessel sequences*

$$\Phi = (\tfrac{1}{2} e_1, 2 e_2, \tfrac{1}{2^2} e_1, 3 e_3, \tfrac{1}{2^3} e_1, 4 e_4, \dots),$$

$$\Psi = (e_1, \tfrac{1}{2} e_2, e_1, \tfrac{1}{3} e_3, e_1, \tfrac{1}{4} e_4, \dots),$$

for which  $M_{(1),\Phi,\Psi} = M_{(1),\Psi,\Phi} = I_{\mathcal{H}}$  with unconditional convergence in  $\mathcal{H}$ , because  $M_{(1),\Phi,\Psi} = M_{(1),\Psi,\Phi} = M_{(1),\Theta,\Theta}$ , where

$$\Theta = \left( \sqrt{\tfrac{1}{2}} e_1, e_2, \sqrt{\tfrac{1}{2^2}} e_1, e_3, \sqrt{\tfrac{1}{2^3}} e_1, e_4, \dots \right) \text{ is a Bessel sequence for } \mathcal{H}.$$

In certain cases one can determine conditions, which are sufficient and/or necessary for unconditional convergence of multipliers:

**Lemma 3.6**

(i) *Let  $\Phi$  be a NBB Bessel sequence for  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then*

*$M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  is unconditionally convergent in  $\mathcal{H} \Leftrightarrow m\Psi$  is Bessel for  $\mathcal{H} \Leftrightarrow M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  is unconditionally convergent in  $\mathcal{H}$  and bounded.*

(ii) *Let  $\Phi$  be a Riesz basis for  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then*

*$M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  is well defined  $\Leftrightarrow M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  is unconditionally convergent in  $\mathcal{H}$  and bounded  $\Leftrightarrow m\Psi$  is Bessel for  $\mathcal{H} \Leftrightarrow M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}$  is well defined  $\Leftrightarrow M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}$  is unconditionally convergent in  $\mathcal{H}$  and bounded.*

(iii) *Let  $\Phi$  be a Riesz basis for  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\Psi$  be NBB. Then*

*$M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  (or  $M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}$ ) is well defined  $\Rightarrow m \in \ell^\infty$ . The converse does not hold in general.*

**Proof:** (i) By Lemma 2.5,  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  is unconditionally convergent in  $\mathcal{H}$  if and only if  $(\langle h, m_n \psi_n \rangle) \in \ell^2$ ,  $\forall h \in \mathcal{H}$ , which by Proposition 2.4(i) is equivalent to  $m\Psi$  being a Bessel sequence for  $\mathcal{H}$ . When  $m\Psi$  is Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ , then Proposition 2.3 implies the boundedness of  $M_{(1),\Phi,m\Psi}$  and this concludes the proof of (i).

(ii) Since  $\Phi$  is a Riesz basis for  $\mathcal{H}$ ,  $\sum c_n \phi_n$  converges in  $\mathcal{H}$  if and only if  $\sum c_n \phi_n$  converges unconditionally in  $\mathcal{H}$  (see Proposition 2.4). The first two equivalences now follow from (i), because Riesz bases are NBB Bessel sequences.

For the third equivalence, consider  $M_{m,\Psi,\Phi} f = \sum \langle h, \phi_n \rangle m_n \psi_n$ ,  $f \in \mathcal{H}$ . The sequence  $m\Psi$  is Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$  if and only if  $\sum c_n m_n \psi_n$  converges for every  $(c_n) \in \ell^2$ , which holds if and only if  $\sum \langle f, \phi_n \rangle m_n \psi_n$  converges for every  $f \in \mathcal{H}$ , because  $\ell^2 = \{(\langle f, \phi_n \rangle) : f \in \mathcal{H}\}$ .

For the last equivalence, the implication ( $\Leftarrow$ ) is obvious. For the other implication, use that  $m\Psi$  must be Bessel from what is already proved and apply Proposition 2.3 to  $M_{(1),m\Psi,\Phi}$ .

(iii) Assume that  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  is well defined, or equivalently, by (ii), that  $M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}$  is well defined. Let  $a_\Psi > 0$  denote a lower bound for  $(\|\psi_n\|)$ . By (ii),  $m\Psi$  is Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then  $a_\Psi |m_n| \leq \|m_n \psi_n\| \leq \sqrt{B_{m\Psi}}$ , which implies that  $m$  belongs to  $\ell^\infty$ . For the converse, consider the multiplier  $M_{(\frac{1}{n}), (e_n), (n^2 e_n)}$ , which is not well defined.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.7** *If in Lemma 3.6 it is moreover assumed that  $m$  is NBB (resp. SN), then each of the equivalent assertions in Lemma 3.6(i), (ii) implies (resp. is equivalent to)  $\Psi$  being a Bessel sequence for  $\mathcal{H}$ .*

**Remark 3.8** *If  $\Phi$  is Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ , which is non-NBB, then the conclusion of Lemma 3.6(i) might fail. Consider  $\Phi = (\frac{1}{2}e_1, e_2, \frac{1}{2^2}e_1, e_3, \frac{1}{2^3}e_1, e_4, \dots)$ , which is Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ , and  $\Psi = (e_1, e_2, e_1, e_3, e_1, e_4, \dots)$ , which is non-Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ . We have that  $M_{(1),\Phi,\Psi} = M_{(1),\Psi,\Phi} = I_{\mathcal{H}}$  with unconditional convergence, because  $M_{(1),\Phi,\Psi} = M_{(1),\Psi,\Phi} = M_{(1),\Theta,\Theta}$ , where  $\Theta = (\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}e_1, e_2, \sqrt{\frac{1}{2^2}}e_1, e_3, \sqrt{\frac{1}{2^3}}e_1, e_4, \dots)$  is Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ .*

## 4 Invertibility of Multipliers

First note that having zero elements at “appropriate places” of  $\Phi$ ,  $\Psi$  and  $m$ , one can get any desired multiplier, for example the invertible Identity operator and the Zero operator:

### Example 4.1 (ZERO-example)

Let  $\Phi = (*, 0, *, 0, *, 0, \dots)$ ,  $\Psi = (0, *, 0, *, 0, *, \dots)$ , where the stars denote arbitrary elements of the space (not necessarily the same). For any weight  $m$ , we have  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi} = M_{m,\Psi,\Phi} = 0$  and thus, both multipliers are non-invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$ .

Note that in this example the sequences  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  can be any kind, except Riesz basis - they can be non-Bessel, Bessel, overcomplete frames.

**Example 4.2 (IDENTITY-example)** Let  $\Phi = (*, e_1, 0, *, e_2, 0, *, e_3, 0, \dots)$ ,  $\Psi = (0, e_1, *, 0, e_2, *, 0, e_3, *, \dots)$ ,  $m = (*, 1, *, *, 1, *, *, 1, *, \dots)$ . Then  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi} = M_{m,\Psi,\Phi} = I_{\mathcal{H}}$  and thus, both multipliers are invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$ .

Since the zero elements in the sequences  $m, \Phi, \Psi$ , do not have an influence on the values of the corresponding multiplier  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$ , we can consider new index set removing the zeros. Let  $J_0 = J \setminus \{i : m_i = 0 \text{ or } \phi_n = 0 \text{ or } \psi_n = 0\}$ . Then  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi} = M_{(m_n)_{n \in J_0}, (\phi_n)_{n \in J_0}, (\psi_n)_{n \in J_0}}$ . Note that if  $J_0$  is empty or finite and  $\mathcal{H}$  is infinite dimensional, then  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  can not be surjective and thus, it can not be invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$ . That is why only infinite  $J_0$  is of interest for the present paper.

Without loss of generality, from now on we consider only sequences  $m, \Phi, \Psi$ , which do not contain zero elements, and  $\mathbb{N}$  is the index set.

Observe that if  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  is invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$ , then  $\Phi$  must be complete in  $\mathcal{H}$ . Indeed, in the case of invertibility every  $g \in \mathcal{H}$  can be written as  $g = M_{m,\Phi,\Psi} M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}^{-1} g = \sum m_n \langle M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}^{-1} g, \psi_n \rangle \phi_n \in \overline{\text{span}}(\phi_n)$ .

#### 4.1 Multipliers for non-Bessel sequences

First note that it is possible to have an invertible unconditionally convergent multiplier even in case both the sequences  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  are non-Bessel. Consider the trivial example  $M_{\frac{1}{n^2}, ne_n, ne_n} = I_{\mathcal{H}}$ . Moreover, this is possible to happen even in cases with  $m = (1)$ , see the sequences in Remark 3.5.

Having in mind Corollary 3.3, in the cases when  $\Psi$  is non-Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$  considering unconditionally convergent multiplier  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  is only possible if  $m\Phi$  is non- $NBB$  non-Bessel or non- $NBB$  Bessel (in particular, could be a frame, but not a Riesz basis) - for any of these cases invertible and non-invertible multipliers exist, see [19].

#### 4.2 Sufficient and/or necessary conditions for invertibility of Bessel Multipliers

If the multiplier  $M_{(1),\Phi,\Psi}$  is well defined and one of the sequence  $\Psi$  and  $\Phi$  is Bessel, then the other one does not need to be Bessel. For example, consider the frame  $\Phi = (\frac{1}{2}e_1, e_2, \frac{1}{2^2}e_1, e_3, \frac{1}{2^3}e_1, e_4, \dots)$  and the sequence  $\Psi = (e_1, e_2, e_1, e_3, e_1, e_4, \dots)$  which is non-Bessel; in this case  $M_{(1),\Phi,\Psi} = M_{(1),\Psi,\Phi} = I_{\mathcal{H}}$ . Below we observe that if one of the sequences is Bessel, invertibility of  $M_{(1),\Phi,\Psi}$  implies that the other one must satisfy the lower frame condition.

**Theorem 4.3** *Let  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  be well defined and invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$ .*

- (i) *If  $\Psi$  (resp.  $\Phi$ ) is a Bessel sequence for  $\mathcal{H}$  with bound  $B$ , then  $m\Phi$  (resp.  $m\Psi$ ) satisfies the lower frame condition for  $\mathcal{H}$  with bound  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{B} \|M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}^{-1}\|}$ .*
- (ii) *If  $\Psi$  (resp.  $\Phi$ ) and  $m\Phi$  (resp.  $m\Psi$ ) are Bessel sequences for  $\mathcal{H}$ , then they are frames for  $\mathcal{H}$ .*

- (iii) If  $\Psi$  (resp.  $\Phi$ ) is a Bessel sequence for  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $m \in \ell^\infty$ , then  $\Phi$  (resp.  $\Psi$ ) satisfies the lower frame condition for  $\mathcal{H}$ .
- (iv) If  $\Psi$  and  $\Phi$  are Bessel sequences for  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $m \in \ell^\infty$ , then  $\Psi$  and  $\Phi$  are frames for  $\mathcal{H}$ ;  $m\Phi$  and  $m\Psi$  are also frames for  $\mathcal{H}$ .

**Proof:** (i) For shortness of writing, the multiplier  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  will be denoted by  $M$ . The proof will be done in two steps.

First step:  $m = (1)$ .

Assume that  $\Psi$  is a Bessel sequence for  $\mathcal{H}$  with bound  $B_\Psi$ . For those  $g \in \mathcal{H}$ , for which  $\sum |\langle g, \phi_n \rangle|^2 = \infty$  or  $g = 0$ , clearly the lower frame condition holds. Let now  $g \in \mathcal{H}$  be such that  $\sum |\langle g, \phi_n \rangle|^2 < \infty$  and  $g \neq 0$ . For every  $f \in \mathcal{H}$ ,

$$\left| \sum_{n=j+1}^k \langle \langle f, \psi_n \rangle \phi_n, g \rangle \right| \leq \left( \sum_{n=j+1}^k |\langle f, \psi_n \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left( \sum_{n=j+1}^k |\langle \phi_n, g \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2} \rightarrow 0$$

as  $j, k \rightarrow \infty$ , which implies that the series  $\sum_{n=1}^\infty \langle \langle f, \psi_n \rangle \phi_n, g \rangle$  converges in  $\mathcal{H}$ . Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle Mf, g \rangle| &= \left| \sum \langle \langle f, \psi_n \rangle \phi_n, g \rangle \right| \\ &\leq \left( \sum |\langle f, \psi_n \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left( \sum |\langle \phi_n, g \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq \\ &\leq \sqrt{B_\psi} \|f\| \left( \sum |\langle \phi_n, g \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

For  $f = M^{-1}g$ , it follows that

$$\|g\|^2 \leq \sqrt{B_\psi} \|M^{-1}\| \|g\| \left( \sum |\langle \phi_n, g \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

Therefore,  $\Phi$  satisfies the lower frame condition with bound  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{B_\psi} \|M^{-1}\|}$ .

Assume now that  $\Phi$  is a Bessel sequence for  $\mathcal{H}$  with bound  $B_\Phi$ . If  $f \in \mathcal{H}$  is such that  $\sum |\langle f, \psi_n \rangle|^2 = \infty$  or  $f = 0$ , then clearly the lower frame condition holds. Let now  $f \in \mathcal{H}$  be such that  $\sum |\langle f, \psi_n \rangle|^2 < \infty$  and  $f \neq 0$ . With similar calculations as above, for every  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ , the series  $\sum_{n=1}^\infty \langle \langle f, \psi_n \rangle \phi_n, h \rangle$  converges in  $\mathcal{H}$  and

$$|\langle Mf, h \rangle| = \left| \sum \langle \langle f, \psi_n \rangle \phi_n, h \rangle \right| \leq \left( \sum |\langle f, \psi_n \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2} \sqrt{B_\phi} \|h\|.$$

For  $h = Mf \neq 0$ , it follows that  $\|Mf\|^2 \leq (\sum |\langle f, \psi_n \rangle|^2)^{1/2} \sqrt{B_\phi} \|Mf\|$ . Therefore,

$$\left(\sum |\langle f, \psi_n \rangle|^2\right)^{1/2} \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{B_\phi}} \|Mf\| \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{B_\phi} \|M^{-1}\|} \|f\|.$$

Thus,  $\Psi$  satisfies the lower frame condition with bound  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{B_\phi} \|M^{-1}\|}$ .

Second step: general  $m$ .

Apply the first step to the multiplier  $M_{(1),m\Phi,\Psi}$  (resp.  $M_{(1),\Phi,m\Psi}$ ).

(ii) and (iii) follow easily from (i).

(iv) Let  $\Psi$  and  $\Phi$  be Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $m \in \ell^\infty$ . Then  $m\Phi$  and  $m\Psi$  are also Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ . The rest follows from (ii).  $\square$

Note that the assertion (i) in Theorem 4.3 generalizes [6, Prop. 3.4], which concerns the case  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi} = I_{\mathcal{H}}$ .

By Theorem 4.3(iv), a Bessel multiplier  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  with  $m \in \ell^\infty$  can be invertible only if the Bessel sequences  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  are frames. Note that the boundedness of  $m$  is essential for this statement - if  $m \notin \ell^\infty$ , then a Bessel multiplier  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  can be invertible in cases when the Bessel sequences  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  are not frames, examples are given in [19].

#### 4.2.1 The synthesis sequence $\Phi$ is Bessel

Let  $\Phi$  be *NBB* Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ , which is not a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$ . By Lemma 3.6(i), unconditional convergence of  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  in  $\mathcal{H}$  requires  $m\Psi$  to be Bessel, but in this case Theorem 4.3 implies that  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  can never be invertible.

Let  $\Phi$  be non-*NBB* Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ , which is not a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$ . By Theorem 4.3, if  $m\Psi$  is (at least) Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ , then the multiplier  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  can never be invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$ . If  $m\Psi$  is non-Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ , then both cases (invertible multiplier and non-invertible multiplier) are possible - for example,  $M_{(1),(\frac{1}{n}e_n),(ne_n)} = I_{\mathcal{H}}$  is invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$  with unconditional convergence and  $M_{(1),(\frac{1}{n^2}e_n),(ne_n)}$  is unconditionally convergent but not invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$ , see Example 5.1.

### 4.2.2 The synthesis sequence $\Phi$ is a frame

If  $\Phi$  is NBB frame for  $\mathcal{H}$ , then unconditional convergence and invertibility of  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  require  $m\Psi$  to be a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$  (see Lemma 3.6 and Theorem 4.3). In the other direction, when  $m\Psi$  is a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$ , both invertibility and non-invertibility of multipliers is possible - examples with overcomplete frames are given in Example 5.2; the Riesz basis case is completely characterized in Section 4.2.3. More examples with consideration of  $m$  - SN,  $m \in \ell^\infty$ ,  $m \notin \ell^\infty$ , can be found in [19].

We continue with sufficient conditions for invertibility of  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$ .

**Proposition 4.4** *Let  $\Phi$  be a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$ ,  $G : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  be a bounded bijective operator and  $\psi_n = G\phi_n$ ,  $\forall n$ , i.e.  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  are equivalent frames<sup>1</sup>. Let  $m$  be positive (resp. negative) semi-normalized. Then  $\Psi$  is a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$ , the frame multiplier  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  is invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$  and*

$$M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}^{-1} = \begin{cases} (G^{-1})^* S_{(\sqrt{m_n} \phi_n)}^{-1}, & \text{when } m_n > 0, \forall n, \\ -(G^{-1})^* S_{(\sqrt{|m_n|} \phi_n)}^{-1}, & \text{when } m_n < 0, \forall n. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

**Proof:** By [8, Proposition 5.3.1],  $\Psi$  is a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$ . For every  $f \in \mathcal{H}$  we have  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}f = \sum m_n \langle G^*f, \phi_n \rangle \phi_n = M_{m,\Phi,\Phi}G^*f$ . By [5],  $M_{m,\Phi,\Phi}$  is invertible and

$$M_{m,\Phi,\Phi}^{-1} = \begin{cases} S_{(\sqrt{m_n} \phi_n)}^{-1}, & \text{when } m_n > 0, \forall n, \\ -S_{(\sqrt{|m_n|} \phi_n)}^{-1}, & \text{when } m_n < 0, \forall n. \end{cases}$$

Therefore,  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi} = M_{m,\Phi,\Phi}G^*$  is invertible and Equation (1) holds.  $\square$

Note that the above proposition covers the case when  $\Psi$  is the canonical dual of  $\Phi$  and do not cover any other dual of  $\Phi$ , because if  $\Psi = (G\phi_n)$  is a dual frame of  $\Phi$  for some bounded operator  $G$ , then  $G$  must coincide with  $S_\phi^{-1}$  and thus,  $\Psi$  must be the canonical dual of  $\Phi$ , see [13, pp.19-20]. For other duals the following statement can be used.

**Proposition 4.5** *Let  $\Phi$  be a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$  and let  $\Phi^d = (\phi_n^d)$  be a dual frame of  $\Phi$ . Let  $0 \leq \lambda < \frac{1}{\sqrt{B_\Phi B_{\Phi^d}}} (\leq 1)$  and let  $(m_n)$  be such that  $1 - \lambda \leq m_n \leq 1 + \lambda$ ,*

---

<sup>1</sup>For a treatise of equivalent frames see [1]

$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then  $M_{m,\Phi,\Phi^d}$  and  $M_{m,\Phi^d,\Phi}$  are invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$ ,

$$\frac{1}{1 + \lambda\sqrt{B_\Phi B_{\Phi^d}}} \|h\| \leq \|M_{m,\Phi,\Phi^d}^{-1} h\| \leq \frac{1}{1 - \lambda\sqrt{B_\Phi B_{\Phi^d}}} \|h\|, \quad \forall h \in \mathcal{H}, \quad (2)$$

and the same inequalities hold for  $\|M_{m,\Phi^d,\Phi}^{-1} h\|$ . Moreover,

$$M_{m,\Phi,\Phi^d}^{-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (M_{(1-m_n),\Phi,\Phi^d})^k \quad \text{and} \quad M_{m,\Phi^d,\Phi}^{-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (M_{(1-m_n),\Phi^d,\Phi})^k.$$

**Proof:** The case  $\lambda = 0$  is trivial - in this case  $M_{m,\Phi,\Phi^d} = M_{m,\Phi^d,\Phi} = M_{(1),\Phi,\Phi^d} = I_{\mathcal{H}}$ . Now consider the case  $\lambda > 0$ . First note that  $B_\Phi B_{\Phi^d} \geq 1$ . Indeed, for every  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  one has  $\|h\| = \|T_{\Phi^d} U_\Phi h\| \leq \|T_{\Phi^d}\| \|U_\Phi\| \|h\| \leq \sqrt{B_\Phi B_{\Phi^d}} \|h\|$  and thus, for  $h \neq 0$ , one can conclude that  $B_\Phi B_{\Phi^d} \geq 1$ . Hence,  $\lambda < 1$  and  $m$  is positive. By the assumptions,  $(m_n - 1) \in \ell^\infty$ . For every  $f \in \mathcal{H}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|M_{m_n,\Phi,\Phi^d} f - f\| &= \left\| \sum m_n \langle f, \phi_n^d \rangle \phi_n - \sum \langle f, \phi_n^d \rangle \phi_n \right\| = \|M_{(m_n-1),\Phi,\Phi^d} f\| \\ &\leq \lambda \sqrt{B_\Phi B_{\Phi^d}} \|f\|. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\lambda \sqrt{B_\Phi B_{\Phi^d}} < 1$ , Proposition 2.6 with  $F = I_{\mathcal{H}}$  implies that the multiplier  $M_{m,\Phi,\Phi^d}$  is invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$ , (2) holds and

$$M_{m,\Phi,\Phi^d}^{-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (I_{\mathcal{H}} - M_{m,\Phi,\Phi^d})^k = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (M_{(1-m_n),\Phi,\Phi^d})^k.$$

Since  $\Phi$  is a dual of  $\Phi^d$ , the conclusions for  $M_{m,\Phi^d,\Phi}$  follow from what is already proved.  $\square$

Let  $\Phi$  be a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$  and let  $m$  be positive semi-normalized. By Proposition 4.4, the multiplier  $M_{m,\Phi,\tilde{\Phi}}$  is invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $M_{m,\Phi,\tilde{\Phi}}^{-1} = (S_\Phi)^* S_{(\sqrt{m_n}\phi_n)}^{-1}$ . As a consequence of Proposition 4.5, for certain positive weights  $m$  the inverse  $M_{m,\Phi,\tilde{\Phi}}^{-1}$  can be expressed simpler via the use of  $M_{m,\Phi,\tilde{\Phi}}$ :

**Corollary 4.6** *Let  $\Phi$  be a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\tilde{\Phi}$  be the canonical dual of  $\Phi$ . Let  $0 \leq \lambda < \sqrt{\frac{A_\Phi}{B_\Phi}} (\leq 1)$  and  $(m_n)$  be such that  $1 - \lambda \leq m_n \leq 1 + \lambda$ ,  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then  $M_{m,\Phi,\tilde{\Phi}}$  and  $M_{m,\tilde{\Phi},\Phi}$  are invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$ ,*

$$\frac{1}{1 + \lambda\sqrt{B_\Phi/A_\Phi}} \|h\| \leq \|M_{m,\Phi,\tilde{\Phi}}^{-1} h\| \leq \frac{1}{1 - \lambda\sqrt{B_\Phi/A_\Phi}} \|h\|, \quad \forall h \in \mathcal{H},$$



and the same inequalities hold for  $\|M_{m,\tilde{\Phi},\Phi}^{-1}h\|$ . Moreover,

$$M_{m,\Phi,\tilde{\Phi}}^{-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (M_{(1-m_n),\Phi,\tilde{\Phi}})^k \text{ and } M_{m,\tilde{\Phi},\Phi}^{-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (M_{(1-m_n),\tilde{\Phi},\Phi})^k.$$

**Proof:** The assertion follows from Proposition 4.5, because  $\tilde{\Phi}$  has bounds  $\frac{1}{B_{\Phi}}, \frac{1}{A_{\Phi}}$ .  $\square$

Note that the bound for  $\lambda$  in Corollary 4.6 (resp. Proposition 4.5) is sharp - if the assumptions hold with  $\lambda = \sqrt{\frac{A_{\Phi}}{B_{\Phi}}}$  (resp.  $\lambda = \sqrt{B_{\Phi}B_{\Phi^d}}$ ), then the multiplier might be non-invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$ , see Example 5.3.

For the next assertion, we will use the property that when  $(f_n)$  and  $(h_n)$  are Bessel sequences, then  $(f_n - h_n)$  is a Bessel sequence with optimal bound  $B_{(f_n-h_n)}^{opt} \leq (\sqrt{B_{(f_n)}} + \sqrt{B_{(h_n)}})^2$ . Recall that if  $\Phi$  is a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $m$  is positive (resp. negative) semi-normalized, then  $M_{m,\Phi,\Phi}$  is invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$ , see [5]. Below we generalize this statement allowing different sequences  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  in the multiplier.

**Proposition 4.7** *Let  $\Phi$  be a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$ . Assume that  $\Psi - \Phi$  is a Bessel sequence for  $\mathcal{H}$  with bound  $B_{\Psi-\Phi} < \frac{A_{\Phi}^2}{B_{\Phi}}$ . For every positive (or negative) semi-normalized sequence  $m$ , satisfying*

$$0 < a \leq |m_n| \leq b, \forall n, \text{ and } \frac{b}{a} < \frac{A_{\Phi}}{\sqrt{B_{\Psi-\Phi}B_{\Phi}}}, \quad (3)$$

*it follows that  $\Psi$  is a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$ , the multipliers  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  and  $M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}$  are invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$ ,*

$$\frac{1}{bB_{\Phi} + b\sqrt{B_{\Phi}B_{\Psi-\Phi}}} \|h\| \leq \|M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}^{-1}h\| \leq \frac{1}{aA_{\Phi} - b\sqrt{B_{\Phi}B_{\Psi-\Phi}}} \|h\|$$

and the same inequalities hold for  $\|M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}^{-1}h\|$ . Moreover,

$$M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}^{-1} = \begin{cases} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} [S_{(\sqrt{m_n}\phi_n)}^{-1} (S_{(\sqrt{m_n}\phi_n)} - M_{m,\Phi,\Psi})]^k S_{(\sqrt{m_n}\phi_n)}^{-1}, & \text{if } m_n > 0, \forall n, \\ -\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} [S_{(\sqrt{|m_n|}\phi_n)}^{-1} (S_{(\sqrt{|m_n|}\phi_n)} + M_{m,\Phi,\Psi})]^k S_{(\sqrt{|m_n|}\phi_n)}^{-1}, & \text{if } m_n < 0, \forall n. \end{cases}$$

$$M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}^{-1} = \begin{cases} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} [S_{(\sqrt{m_n}\phi_n)}^{-1} (S_{(\sqrt{m_n}\phi_n)} - M_{m,\Psi,\Phi})]^k S_{(\sqrt{m_n}\phi_n)}^{-1}, & \text{if } m_n > 0, \forall n, \\ -\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} [S_{(\sqrt{|m_n|}\phi_n)}^{-1} (S_{(\sqrt{|m_n|}\phi_n)} + M_{m,\Psi,\Phi})]^k S_{(\sqrt{|m_n|}\phi_n)}^{-1}, & \text{if } m_n < 0, \forall n. \end{cases}$$

**Proof:** Assume that  $m$  is positive.

(i) First note that we need  $B_{\Psi-\Phi} < \frac{A_\Phi^2}{B_\Phi}$  in order to be able to fulfill (3). Assume now that (3) holds and note that  $(\sqrt{m_n}\phi_n)$  is a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$  with lower bound  $aA_\Phi$  and upper bound  $bB_\Phi$  (see [5]), and thus  $\|S_{(\sqrt{m_n}\phi_n)}^{-1}\| \leq \frac{1}{aA_\Phi}$ , see Proposition 2.1(d). Since  $\Phi$  is a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $B_{\Psi-\Phi} \leq \frac{A_\Phi^2}{B_\Phi} \leq A_\Phi$ , it follows from [8, Lemma 15.1.5] that  $\Psi$  is also a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$ . Therefore, the multiplier  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  is well defined and bounded. For every  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ ,

$$\|M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}h - S_{(\sqrt{m_n}\phi_n)}h\| = \|M_{m,\Phi,\Psi-\Phi}h\| \leq b \cdot \sqrt{B_{\Psi-\Phi}B_\Phi}\|h\|.$$

By the assumptions,  $b\sqrt{B_{\Phi-\Psi}B_\Phi} < aA_\Phi \leq \frac{1}{\|S_{(\sqrt{m_n}\phi_n)}^{-1}\|}$  and thus, Proposition 2.6 implies the invertibility of  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  and the representation for  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}^{-1}$ . Moreover, for every  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}^{-1}h\| &\geq \frac{1}{\|M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}\|}\|h\| \geq \frac{1}{b \cdot \sqrt{B_\Phi}\sqrt{B_\Psi^{opt}}}\|h\| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{b \cdot \sqrt{B_\Phi}(\sqrt{B_\Phi} + \sqrt{B_{\Psi-\Phi}})}\|h\| = \frac{1}{b(B_\Phi + \sqrt{B_\Phi B_{\Psi-\Phi}})}\|h\|. \end{aligned}$$

Note that Proposition 2.6 also gives a lower bound for  $\|M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}^{-1}h\|$ , namely,  $\frac{aA_\Phi}{bB_\Phi} \frac{1}{aA_\Phi + b \cdot \sqrt{B_{\Phi-\Psi}B_\Phi}}\|h\|$ , but the above bound  $\frac{1}{b(B_\Phi + \sqrt{B_\Phi B_{\Psi-\Phi}})}$  is better.

An analogous proof can be used for the invertibility of  $M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}$  and the conclusions for  $M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}^{-1}$ .

If  $m$  is negative, apply what is already proved to the multiplier  $M_{-m,\Phi,\Psi}$ .  $\square$

Note that the bound for  $b/a$  in (3) is sharp. If  $\frac{\sup_n |m_n|}{\inf_n |m_n|} = \frac{A_\Phi}{\sqrt{B_{\Psi-\Phi}B_\Phi}}$ , the multiplier  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  can be non-invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$ , see Example 5.4 with  $m = (1)$  and  $k \in [0, 2]$ .

**Proposition 4.8** *Let  $\Phi$  be a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$ . Assume that*

$$\mathcal{P}_1: \exists \mu \in [0, \frac{A_\Phi^2}{B_\Phi}) \text{ such that } \sum |\langle f, m_n \psi_n - \phi_n \rangle|^2 \leq \mu \|f\|^2, \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{H}.$$

*Then  $m\Psi$  is a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$ , the multipliers  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  and  $M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}$  are invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$ ,*

$$\frac{1}{B_\Phi + \sqrt{\mu B_\Phi}}\|h\| \leq \|M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}^{-1}h\| \leq \frac{1}{A_\Phi - \sqrt{\mu B_\Phi}}\|h\|, \quad \forall h \in \mathcal{H}, \quad (4)$$

and the same inequalities hold for  $\|M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}^{-1}h\|$ . Moreover,

$$M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}^{-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} [S_{\Phi}^{-1}(S_{\Phi} - M_{m,\Phi,\Psi})]^k S_{\Phi}^{-1} \text{ and } M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}^{-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} [S_{\Phi}^{-1}(S_{\Phi} - M_{m,\Psi,\Phi})]^k S_{\Phi}^{-1}. \quad (5)$$

As a consequence, if  $m$  is semi-normalized, then  $\Psi$  is also a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$  (see Proposition 2.2(iii)).

**Proof:** If  $\mathcal{P}_1$  holds with  $\mu = 0$ , then  $m\Psi = \Phi$  and thus,  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi} = M_{m,\Psi,\Phi} = S_{\Phi}$ . Now apply Proposition 2.1(d).

Let  $\mathcal{P}_1$  hold with  $\mu \neq 0$ . Apply Proposition 4.7 to the multipliers  $M_{(1),\Phi,m\Psi}$  and  $M_{(1),m\Psi,\Phi}$ .  $\square$

Note that  $\mathcal{P}_1$  is equivalent to the following two conditions:

- $\exists \nu \in [0, \frac{A_{\Phi}}{\sqrt{B_{\Phi}}})$  such that  
 $\|\sum c_n(m_n\psi_n - \phi_n)\| \leq \nu\|c\|_2$  for all finite scalar sequences  $(c_n)$  (and hence for all  $(c_n) \in \ell^2$ );
- $\exists \mu \in [0, \frac{A_{\Phi}^2}{B_{\Phi}})$  such that  
 $\sum |\langle f, m_n\psi_n - \phi_n \rangle|^2 \leq \mu\|f\|^2$ , for all  $f$  in a dense subset of  $\mathcal{H}$ .

Indeed, the case  $\mathcal{P}_1$  &  $(\mu = 0)$  is trivial; for the case  $\mathcal{P}_1$  &  $(\mu \neq 0)$  see Proposition 2.1(a) and [8, Lemma 3.2.6].

The bound  $\mu < \frac{A_{\Phi}^2}{B_{\Phi}}$  in Proposition 4.8 is sharp - if  $\mu \geq \frac{A_{\Phi}^2}{B_{\Phi}}$ , then the multiplier might be non-invertible (see Example 5.4). The multiplier might be invertible for any value of  $\mu$  (see Example 5.5).

Although Proposition 4.8 is proved based on Proposition 4.7, the two propositions cover different classes of sequences  $\Phi, \Psi, m$ . Example 5.7 shows a case when Proposition 4.8 applies, but Proposition 4.7 does not apply. For a case where Proposition 4.7 can be used, but Proposition 4.8 can not be used, see Example 5.10.

By Proposition 4.8, when  $m\Psi$  is a perturbation of  $\Phi$ , the inverse operator  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}^{-1}$  is given by (5). Simpler representation for  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}^{-1}$  can be obtained if  $m\Psi$  is a perturbation of a dual frame of  $\Phi$ :

**Proposition 4.9** *Let  $\Phi$  be a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$ . Assume that*

$$\mathcal{P}_2: \exists \mu \in [0, \frac{1}{B_\Phi}) \text{ such that } \sum |\langle f, m_n \psi_n - \phi_n^d \rangle|^2 \leq \mu \|f\|^2, \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{H},$$

*for some dual frame  $\Phi^d = (\phi_n^d)$  of  $\Phi$ . Then  $m\Psi$  is a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$ , the bounded multipliers  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  and  $M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}$  are invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$ ,*

$$\frac{1}{1 + \sqrt{\mu B_\Phi}} \|h\| \leq \|M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}^{-1} h\| \leq \frac{1}{1 - \sqrt{\mu B_\Phi}} \|h\|, \quad \forall h \in \mathcal{H},$$

*and the same inequalities hold for  $\|M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}^{-1} h\|$ . Moreover,*

$$M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}^{-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (I_{\mathcal{H}} - M_{m,\Phi,\Psi})^k \text{ and } M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}^{-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (I_{\mathcal{H}} - M_{m,\Psi,\Phi})^k.$$

*As a consequence, if  $m$  is semi-normalized, then  $\Psi$  is also a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$  (see Proposition 2.2(iii)).*

**Proof:** Since  $\Phi^d$  is a dual frame of  $\Phi$ , the number  $\frac{1}{B_\Phi}$  is a lower bound for  $\Phi^d$  (see p.4). Since  $\mu < A_{\Phi^d}$ , it follows from [8, Corollary 15.1.1] that  $m\Psi$  is a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$ . Therefore,  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi} = M_{(1),\Phi,m\Psi}$  is well defined and bounded. For every  $f \in \mathcal{H}$ ,

$$\|M_{m,\Phi,\Psi} f - f\| = \|M_{(1),(m_n \psi_n - \phi_n^d),(\phi_n)} f\| \leq \sqrt{\mu B_\Phi} \|f\|$$

and similarly,  $\|M_{m,\Psi,\Phi} f - f\| \leq \sqrt{\mu B_\Phi} \|f\|$ . Since  $\mu B_\Phi \in [0, 1)$ , one can apply Proposition 2.6 and this concludes the proof.  $\square$

Similar to the case with  $\mathcal{P}_1$ , one can list conditions equivalent to  $\mathcal{P}_2$ .

The bound  $\mu < \frac{1}{B_\Phi}$  in Proposition 4.9 is sharp - if  $\mu \geq \frac{1}{B_\Phi}$ , then the multiplier might be non-invertible (see Example 5.4). Note that the multiplier might be invertible for any value of  $\mu$  (see Example 5.5).

Note that Propositions 4.8 and 4.9 do not cover the same classes of sequences. For a case when Proposition 4.8 applies and Proposition 4.9 does not apply see Example 5.6; for a case when Proposition 4.9 applies and Proposition 4.8 does not apply see Example 5.8. Let  $\Phi$  be a Parseval frame, i.e. a tight frame with  $A = B = 1$ . In this case the frame is self-dual and both Propositions 4.8 and 4.9 can be applied.

Propositions 4.7 and 4.9 are not included one into other also. Example 5.11 (resp. 5.9) shows a case when Proposition 4.7 applies (resp. does not apply), but Proposition 4.9 does not apply (resp. applies).

### 4.2.3 One of the sequences $\Phi$ and $\Psi$ is a Riesz basis

For two Riesz bases and semi-normalized symbol the multipliers are always invertible [3]. What can be said about the case, when only one of the sequences has the Riesz property and  $m$  is not necessarily semi-normalized? The answer is given in the following assertion.

**Theorem 4.10** *Let  $\Phi$  be a Riesz basis for  $\mathcal{H}$ .*

- (a) *Let  $m$  be SN.*
  - (a1) *If  $\Psi$  is a non-Bessel sequence for  $\mathcal{H}$ , then both  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  and  $M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}$  are not well defined.*
  - (a2) *If  $\Psi$  is a Bessel sequence for  $\mathcal{H}$ , then  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  (resp.  $M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}$ ) is invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$  if and only if  $\Psi$  is a Riesz basis for  $\mathcal{H}$ . In the case of invertibility,  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}^{-1} = M_{(\frac{1}{mn}),\tilde{\Psi},\tilde{\Phi}}$ .*
- (b) *Let  $m \in \ell^\infty$  and  $m$  be non-NBB.*
  - (b1) *If  $\Psi$  is NBA non-Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ , then  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  (resp.  $M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}$ ) can either be well defined or not, but can never be invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$ .*
  - (b2) *If  $\Psi$  is non-NBA non-Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ , then for  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  and  $M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}$  all feasible combinations of invertibility and well-definedness are possible, i.e. they can be invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$ , can be well defined non-invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$ , can be not well defined.*
  - (b3) *If  $\Psi$  is Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ , then  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  (resp.  $M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}$ ) is well defined, but not invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$ .*
- (c) *Let  $m$  be NBB and  $m \notin \ell^\infty$ .*
  - (c1) *If  $\Psi$  is non-Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$  or NBB, then both  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  and  $M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}$  are not well defined.*

- (c2) *Let  $\Psi$  be non-NBB Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ , which is not a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then for  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  and  $M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}$  all feasible combinations of invertibility and well-definedness are possible.*
- (c3) *Let  $\Psi$  be a non-NBB frame for  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  (resp.  $M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}$ ) can either be well defined or not, but can never be invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$ .*
- (d) *Let  $m$  be non-NBB and  $m \notin \ell^\infty$ .*
  - (d1) *If  $\Psi$  is NBB, then both  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  and  $M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}$  are not well defined.*
  - (d2) *If  $\Psi$  is non-NBB non-NBA non-Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ , then for  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  (resp.  $M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}$ ) all feasible combinations of invertibility and well-definedness are possible.*
  - (d3) *If  $\Psi$  is non-NBB Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$  or NBA non-NBB non-Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ , then  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  (resp.  $M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}$ ) can either be well defined or not, but can never be invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$ .*

**Proof:** (a1) follows from Lemma 3.6(ii), because in the case when  $m$  is  $SN$ , the sequence  $m\Psi$  is Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$  if and only if  $\Psi$  is Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ .

(a2) If  $\Psi$  is Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ , which is not a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$ , then Theorem 4.3(iv) implies that both  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  and  $M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}$  are not invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$ .

Let now  $\Psi$  be an overcomplete frame for  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then  $m\Psi$  is also an overcomplete frame for  $\mathcal{H}$ , which implies that  $\mathcal{R}(U_{m\Psi}) \neq \ell^2$ . Since  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi} = T_\Phi U_{m\Psi}$  and  $T_\Phi$  is bijective, it follows that  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  is not surjective. Since  $T_{m\Psi}$  is not injective, the operator  $T_{m\Psi} U_\Phi = M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}$  is not injective.

When  $\Psi$  is a Riesz basis for  $\mathcal{H}$ , the invertibility of  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  and the representation for the inverse are proved in [3].

(b1) As an example of well defined multiplier consider the sequences  $\Phi = (e_n)$ ,  $\Psi = (e_1, e_2, e_1, e_3, e_1, e_4, \dots)$ ,  $m = (\frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{1}{2^2}, 1, \frac{1}{2^3}, 1, \dots)$ . Since  $m\Psi$  is Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ , both  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  and  $M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}$  are well defined (see Lemma 3.6(ii)). Now consider the sequences  $\Phi = (e_n)$ ,  $\Psi = (e_1, e_2, e_1, e_3, e_1, e_4, \dots)$ ,  $m = (1, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{1}{3}, 1, \frac{1}{4}, \dots)$  - in this case both  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  and  $M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}$  are not well defined, because  $m\Psi$  is not Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ .

Now assume that  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  (resp.  $M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}$ ) is well defined. By (a),  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi} = M_{(1),\Phi,m\Psi}$  (resp.  $M_{m,\Psi,\Phi} = M_{(1),m\Psi,\Phi}$ ) is invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$  if and only if  $m\Psi$  is a Riesz basis for  $\mathcal{H}$ . By Proposition 2.2(v), the sequence  $m\Psi$  can not be a Riesz basis for  $\mathcal{H}$  under the assumptions of (b1).

(b2) As an example of invertible multipliers on  $\mathcal{H}$ , consider  $M_{(1/n), (e_n), (ne_n)} = M_{(1/n), (ne_n), (e_n)} = I_{\mathcal{H}}$ . As an example for well-defined non-invertible multipliers, take  $M_{(1/n^2), (e_n), (ne_n)} = M_{(1/n^2), (ne_n), (e_n)}$ , see Example 5.1. For a case with multipliers, which are not well defined, consider  $M_{(\frac{1}{n}), (e_n), (n^2 e_n)}$  and  $M_{(\frac{1}{n}), (n^2 e_n), (e_n)}$ .

(b3) By (a), the multiplier  $M_{(1), \Phi, m\Psi}$  (resp.  $M_{(1), m\Psi, \Phi}$ ) is invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$  if and only if  $m\Psi$  is a Riesz basis for  $\mathcal{H}$ . By Proposition 2.2(iv),(v), the sequence  $m\Psi$  can never be a Riesz basis for  $\mathcal{H}$  under the assumptions of (b3).

(c1) By Lemma 3.6(ii) and Corollary 3.7, well-definedness of  $M_{m, \Phi, \Psi}$  (resp.  $M_{m, \Psi, \Phi}$ ) requires  $\Psi$  to be Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ .

If  $\Psi$  is *NBB*, the conclusion follows from Lemma 3.6(iii).

(c2) For a case with invertible multipliers look at  $M_{(n), (e_n), (\frac{1}{n} e_n)} = M_{(n), (\frac{1}{n} e_n), (e_n)} = I_{\mathcal{H}}$ . As an example of well defined non-invertible multipliers, take  $M_{(n), (e_n), (\frac{1}{n^2} e_n)} = M_{(n), (\frac{1}{n^2} e_n), (e_n)}$ , see Example 5.1. The multipliers  $M_{(n^2), (e_n), (\frac{1}{n} e_n)} = M_{(n^2), (\frac{1}{n} e_n), (e_n)}$  are not well defined.

(c3) Consider  $\Phi = (e_n)$  and the sequence  $\Psi = (\frac{1}{2}e_1, e_2, \frac{1}{2^2}e_1, e_3, \frac{1}{2^3}e_1, e_4, \dots)$ , which is non-*NBB* frame for  $\mathcal{H}$ . For  $m = (\sqrt{2}, 1, \sqrt{2^2}, 1, \sqrt{2^3}, 1, \dots)$ , the sequence  $m\Psi$  is Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ , which implies that both  $M_{m, \Phi, \Psi}$  and  $M_{m, \Psi, \Phi}$  are well defined (see Lemma 3.6(ii)). For  $m = (2, 1, 2^2, 1, 2^3, 1, \dots)$ , the sequence  $m\Psi$  is not Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ , which implies that both  $M_{m, \Phi, \Psi}$  and  $M_{m, \Psi, \Phi}$  are not well defined (see Lemma 3.6(ii)).

Now assume that  $M_{m, \Phi, \Psi}$  (resp.  $M_{m, \Psi, \Phi}$ ) is well defined. The non-invertibility of  $M_{m, \Phi, \Psi}$  (resp.  $M_{m, \Psi, \Phi}$ ) can be shown in an analogue way as in (b3).

(d1) follows from Lemma 3.6(iii).

(d2) Consider  $\Phi = (e_n)$  and the sequence  $\Psi = (e_1, \frac{1}{2^2}e_2, 3e_3, \frac{1}{4^2}e_4, 5e_5, \dots)$ , which is non-*NBB* non-*NBA* non-Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ . For  $m = (1, 2^2, \frac{1}{3}, 4^2, \frac{1}{5}, \dots)$ , we have  $M_{m, \Phi, \Psi} = M_{m, \Psi, \Phi} = I_{\mathcal{H}}$ . For  $m = (1, 2, \frac{1}{3^2}, 4, \frac{1}{5^2}, \dots)$ , both multipliers  $M_{m, \Phi, \Psi}$  and  $M_{m, \Psi, \Phi}$  coincide with the non-invertible operator used in Example 5.1. For  $m = (1, 2^3, \frac{1}{3}, 4^3, \frac{1}{5}, \dots)$ , the sequence  $m\Psi$  is not Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ , which implies that both  $M_{m, \Phi, \Psi}$  and  $M_{m, \Psi, \Phi}$  are not well defined (see Lemma 3.6(ii)).

(d3) Examples for the case “ $\Psi$  - non-NBB Bessel”:

Let  $\Phi = (e_n)$ ,  $\Psi = (e_1, \frac{1}{2}e_2, \frac{1}{3}e_3, \dots)$ . For  $m = (1, 2^2, \frac{1}{3}, 4^2, \frac{1}{5}, \dots)$ ,  $m\Psi$  is not Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$  and thus, both  $M_{m, \Phi, \Psi}$  and  $M_{m, \Psi, \Phi}$  are not well defined (see Lemma 3.6(ii)). For  $m = (1, 2, \frac{1}{3}, 4, \frac{1}{5}, \dots)$ ,  $m\Psi$  is Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$  and thus, both  $M_{m, \Phi, \Psi}$

and  $M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}$  are well defined (see Lemma 3.6(ii)).

Examples for the case “ $\Psi$  - NBA non-NBB non-Bessel”:

Let  $\Phi = (e_n)$ ,  $\Psi = (e_1, \frac{1}{2}e_2, e_1, \frac{1}{3}e_3, e_1, \frac{1}{4}e_4 \dots)$ . For  $m = (\frac{1}{2}, 2, \frac{1}{2^2}, 3, \frac{1}{2^3}, 4, \dots)$ , the sequence  $m\Psi$  is Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$  and thus, both  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  and  $M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}$  are well defined. For  $m = (\frac{1}{2}, 2^2, \frac{1}{2^2}, 3^2, \frac{1}{2^3}, 4^2, \dots)$ ,  $m\Psi$  is non-Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$  and thus, both  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  and  $M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}$  are not well defined.

By Proposition 2.2(v), the sequence  $m\Psi$  can never be a Riesz basis for  $\mathcal{H}$  under the assumptions of (d3), which implies that both  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  and  $M_{m,\Psi,\Phi}$  can not be invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$  in this case.  $\square$

As a consequence of the above detail assertion, we can summarize the possibilities for invertibility as follows:

**Corollary 4.11** *Let  $\Phi$  be a Riesz basis for  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  is invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$  if and only if  $m\Psi$  is a Riesz basis for  $\mathcal{H}$ . This may happen only in the following cases:*

- $\Psi$  is a Riesz basis for  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $m$  is SN;
- $\Psi$  is non-NBB Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ , which is not a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$ , and  $m$  is NBB, but not in  $\ell^\infty$ ;
- $\Psi$  is non-NBA non-Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ ,  $m$  is non-NBB and  $m \in \ell^\infty$ ;
- $\Psi$  is non-NBA non-NBB non-Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ ,  $m$  is non-NBB and  $m \notin \ell^\infty$ ;

In the case of invertibility,  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}^{-1} = M_{(1),\widetilde{m\Psi},\widetilde{\Phi}}$ .

As a consequence of Proposition 2.3, Lemma 3.6(iii) and Theorem 4.10, the following equivalences hold:

**Corollary 4.12** *Let  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  be Riesz bases for  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  is well defined (resp. invertible) on  $\mathcal{H}$  if and only if  $m \in \ell^\infty$  (resp.  $m$  is SN).*

## 5 Examples

In this section we list some examples, which we refer to throughout the paper.



**Example 5.1** The operator  $M : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  given by  $Mf = \sum \frac{1}{n} \langle f, e_n \rangle e_n$  is injective, but not surjective - for example, the element  $\sum \frac{1}{n} e_n \in \mathcal{H}$  does not belong to the range of  $M$ .

**Example 5.2** Invertible multiplier of two overcomplete frames:

$\Phi = (e_1, e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, \dots)$ ,  $\Psi = (\frac{1}{2}e_1, \frac{1}{2}e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, \dots)$ ,  $M_{(1),\Phi,\Psi} = I_{\mathcal{H}}$  with unconditional convergence.

Non-invertible multiplier of two overcomplete frames:

$\Phi = (e_1, e_1, e_2, e_2, e_3, e_3, \dots)$ ,  $\Psi = (e_1, e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, \dots)$ ,  $M_{(1),\Phi,\Psi}$  is unconditionally convergent, but not injective.

## 5.1 Examples for the sharpness of the bounds:

The bound for  $\lambda$  in Proposition 4.5 is sharp:

**Example 5.3** Let  $\Phi = (e_n)$ ,  $m = (\frac{1}{n})$ . The smallest possibility for  $\lambda$  satisfying  $|m_n - 1| \leq \lambda$  is 1 and  $1 = 1/\sqrt{B_{\Phi}B_{\tilde{\Phi}}} = \sqrt{\frac{A_{\Phi}}{B_{\Phi}}}$ . The multiplier  $M_{m,\Phi,\tilde{\Phi}}$  is injective, but not surjective, see Example 5.1.

The bound for  $\mu$  in Proposition 4.8 (resp. 4.9) is sharp. If  $\mathcal{P}_1$  (resp.  $\mathcal{P}_2$ ) holds with  $\mu \geq A_{\Phi}^2/B_{\Phi}$  (resp.  $\mu \geq 1/B_{\Phi}$ ), then the multiplier  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  might be non-invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$ :

**Example 5.4** Let  $\Phi = (e_n)$  and  $m\Psi = (ke_1, \frac{1}{2}e_2, \frac{1}{3}e_3, \frac{1}{4}e_4, \dots)$  for some number  $k$ . The unique dual frame of  $\Phi$  is  $\Phi^d = (e_n)$ . The multiplier  $M_{(1),\Phi,m\Psi}$  is non-invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$  by Theorem 4.3(iv), because  $\Phi$  is a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $m\Psi$  is Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$ , which is not a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$ .

The sequence  $m\Psi - \Phi = m\Psi - \Phi^d$  satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum |\langle h, m_n \psi_n - \phi_n \rangle|^2 &= |k - 1|^2 |\langle h, e_1 \rangle|^2 + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \left( \frac{1}{n} - 1 \right)^2 |\langle h, e_n \rangle|^2 \\ &\leq |k - 1|^2 |\langle h, e_1 \rangle|^2 + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} |\langle h, e_n \rangle|^2, \quad \forall h \in \mathcal{H}. \end{aligned}$$

If  $|k - 1|^2 \leq 1$ , then

$$\sum |\langle h, m_n \psi_n - \phi_n \rangle|^2 \leq |\langle h, e_1 \rangle|^2 + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} |\langle h, e_i \rangle|^2 = \|h\|^2, \quad \forall h \in \mathcal{H},$$

$$\text{and } \sum |\langle e_i, m_n \psi_n - \phi_n \rangle|^2 = \left(\frac{1}{i} - 1\right)^2 \|e_i\|^2, \quad \forall i = 2, 3, 4, \dots,$$

which implies that  $m\Psi - \Phi$  is Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$  with optimal bound equal to 1.

If  $|k - 1|^2 > 1$ , then

$$\sum |\langle h, m_n \psi_n - \phi_n \rangle|^2 \leq |k - 1|^2 \|h\|^2, \quad \forall h \in \mathcal{H}$$

$$\text{and } \sum |\langle e_1, m_n \psi_n - \phi_n \rangle|^2 = |k - 1|^2 \|e_1\|^2,$$

which implies that  $m\Psi - \Phi$  is Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$  with optimal bound equal to  $|k - 1|^2$ . Therefore,

$$B_{m\Psi - \Phi}^{\text{opt}} = \begin{cases} |k - 1|^2 > 1 = 1/B_{\Phi} = A_{\Phi}^2/B_{\Phi}, & \text{when } |k - 1| > 1, \\ 1 = 1/B_{\Phi} = A_{\Phi}^2/B_{\Phi}, & \text{when } |k - 1| \leq 1, \end{cases}$$

which shows that the example fulfills  $\mathcal{P}_1$  (resp.  $\mathcal{P}_2$ ) with any  $\mu \geq A_{\Phi}^2/B_{\Phi}$  (resp.  $\mu \geq 1/B_{\Phi}$ ).

Note that the multiplier  $M_{m, \Phi, \Psi}$  can be invertible with any value of  $\mu$  in  $\mathcal{P}_1$  (resp.  $\mathcal{P}_2$ ):

**Example 5.5** Let  $\Phi = (e_n)$ ,  $m\Psi = (ke_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, \dots)$ , where  $k \neq 0$ . The unique dual frame of  $\Phi$  is  $\Phi^d = (e_n)$ . The sequence  $m\Psi - \Phi = m\Psi - \Phi^d$  is Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$  with optimal bound  $\mu = |k - 1|^2$ . The multiplier  $M_{m, \Phi, \Psi}$  is invertible on  $\mathcal{H}$ .

## 5.2 Independence of conditions for invertibility of multipliers

Proposition 4.8 applies, Proposition 4.9 does not apply:

**Example 5.6** Let  $\Phi = (e_1, e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, \dots)$ . Clearly,  $\Phi$  is a frame for  $\mathcal{H}$  with  $A_\Phi^{opt} = 1$ ,  $B_\Phi^{opt} = 2$ . Take  $m_n\psi_n = (k+1)\phi_n$ ,  $\forall n$ , where  $k \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ . The sequence  $m\Psi - \Phi = (k\phi_n)$  is Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$  with optimal bound  $B_{m\Psi-\Phi}^{opt} = k^2 B_\Phi^{opt} = 2k^2 < \frac{1}{2} = \frac{(A_\Phi^{opt})^2}{B_\Phi^{opt}}$ . Thus, Proposition 4.8 implies the invertibility of  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$ .

Now observe that the sequences  $(h, e_1 - h, e_2, e_3, e_4, \dots)$ ,  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ , are precisely all the dual frames of  $\Phi$ . Let  $\Phi^d = (\phi_1^d, e_1 - \phi_1^d, e_2, e_3, e_4, \dots)$  be an arbitrary chosen dual frame of  $\Phi$  and denote  $\langle e_1, \phi_1^d \rangle = x + iy$ . Consider the sequence

$$(m_n\psi_n - \phi_n^d) = ((k+1)e_1 - \phi_1^d, ke_1 + \phi_1^d, ke_2, ke_3, ke_4, \dots)$$

and observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum |\langle e_1, m_n\psi_n - \phi_n^d \rangle|^2 &= |\langle e_1, (k+1)e_1 - \phi_1^d \rangle|^2 + |\langle e_1, ke_1 + \phi_1^d \rangle|^2 \\ &= |k+1-x-iy|^2 + |k+x+iy|^2 \\ &= (2k^2 + 2x^2 + 2k - 2x + 2y^2 + 1) \|e_1\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Assume that  $m\Psi - \Phi^d$  is Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$  with bound  $B_{m\Psi-\Phi^d} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ . Applying the Bessel inequality to the element  $e_1$  we obtain that  $2k^2 + 2x^2 + 2k - 2x + 2y^2 + 1 \leq \frac{1}{2}$ . However, the last inequality can not hold for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}, y \in \mathbb{R}$ , because  $D_x = -4y^2 - 4k^2 - 4k < 0$ . Therefore,  $m\Psi - \Phi^d$  can not be Bessel with bound  $B_{m\Psi-\Phi^d} < \frac{1}{B_\Phi}$ , because  $\frac{1}{B_\Phi} \leq \frac{1}{B_\Phi^{opt}} = \frac{1}{2}$ . Thus, the invertibility of  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  can not be concluded from Proposition 4.9.

**Proposition 4.8 applies, Proposition 4.7 does not apply:**

**Example 5.7** Let  $\Phi = (e_1, e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, \dots)$ ,  $m = (1, -1, 1, 1, 1, \dots)$ ,  $\Psi = ((k+1)\phi_1, -(k+1)\phi_2, (k+1)\phi_3, (k+1)\phi_4, (k+1)\phi_5, \dots)$ , where  $k \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ . By Example 5.6, the invertibility of  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  follows from Proposition 4.8. Since  $m$  is neither positive, nor negative, Proposition 4.7 does not apply.

**Proposition 4.9 applies, Proposition 4.8 does not apply:**

**Example 5.8** Consider the frame  $\Phi = (e_1, e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, \dots)$  with  $A_\Phi^{opt} = 1$ ,  $B_\Phi^{opt} = 2$  and the sequence  $m\Psi = (e_2, e_1 - e_2, e_2, e_3, e_4, \dots)$ , which is a dual frame of  $\Phi$ . Clearly, Proposition 4.9 can be applied with  $\Phi^d = m\Psi$  with any  $\mu < \frac{1}{B_\Phi}$ .

Now consider the sequence  $m\Psi - \Phi$ . For the element  $e_2$  we have

$$\sum |\langle e_2, m_n \psi_n - \phi_n \rangle|^2 = |\langle e_2, e_2 - e_1 \rangle|^2 + |\langle e_2, e_2 \rangle|^2 = 2\|e_2\|^2.$$

Therefore, the sequence  $m\Psi - \Phi$  can not be Bessel with bound  $\mu < \frac{A_\Phi^2}{B_\Phi}$ , because  $\frac{A_\Phi^2}{B_\Phi} \leq \frac{(A_\Phi^{opt})^2}{B_\Phi^{opt}} < 2$ . Thus, Proposition 4.8 can not be used to imply the invertibility of  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$ .

**Proposition 4.9** applies, **Proposition 4.7** does not apply:

**Example 5.9** Consider  $\Phi = (e_1, e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, \dots)$ ,  $m = (1, -1, 1, 1, 1, 1, \dots)$  and  $\Psi = (e_2, e_2 - e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, \dots)$ . By Example 5.8, the invertibility of  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  follows from Proposition 4.9. Since  $m$  is neither positive, nor negative, Proposition 4.7 does not apply.

**Proposition 4.7** applies, **Proposition 4.8** does not apply:

**Example 5.10** Consider the frame  $\Phi = (e_1, e_1, e_2, e_2, e_3, e_3, e_4, e_4, \dots)$  with bounds  $A_\Phi^{opt} = B_\Phi^{opt} = 2$  and the frame  $\Psi = (e_1, \frac{1}{2}e_1, e_2, e_2, e_3, e_3, e_4, e_4, \dots)$ . The sequence  $\Psi - \Phi = (0, -\frac{1}{2}e_1, 0, 0, 0, 0, \dots)$  is Bessel with  $B_{\Psi-\Phi}^{opt} = \frac{1}{4} < 2 = \frac{(A_\Phi^{opt})^2}{B_\Phi^{opt}}$ . Take  $m = (4)$ . Then  $\frac{\sup |m_n|}{\inf |m_n|} = 1 < 2\sqrt{2} = \frac{A_\Phi^{opt}}{\sqrt{B_{\Psi-\Phi}^{opt} B_\Phi^{opt}}}$ . Now the invertibility of  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$  can be concluded by Proposition 4.7. Since the sequence  $m\Psi - \Phi = (3e_1, e_1, 3e_2, 3e_2, 3e_3, 3e_3, 3e_4, 3e_4, \dots)$  is Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$  with bound  $B_{m\Psi-\Phi}^{opt} = 18 > \frac{(A_\Phi^{opt})^2}{B_\Phi^{opt}}$ , Proposition 4.8 can not be applied.

**Proposition 4.7** applies, **Proposition 4.9** does not apply:

**Example 5.11** Let  $\Phi = (e_1, e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, \dots)$ ,  $m = (1)$ ,  $\Psi = ((k+1)\phi_n)$ , where  $k \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ . By Example 5.6, Proposition 4.9 can not be applied. Again by Example 5.6, the sequence  $\Psi - \Phi = (k\phi_n)$  is Bessel for  $\mathcal{H}$  with optimal bound  $B_{\Psi-\Phi}^{opt} = k^2 B_\Phi^{opt} < \frac{(A_\Phi^{opt})^2}{B_\Phi^{opt}}$ . Moreover,  $\frac{\sup_n |m_n|}{\inf_n |m_n|} = 1 < \frac{1}{2k} = \frac{A_\Phi^{opt}}{\sqrt{B_{\Psi-\Phi}^{opt} B_\Phi^{opt}}}$ . Thus, Proposition 4.7 implies the invertibility of  $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$ .

**Acknowledgements** The authors are thankful to the MULAC-team for the fruitful discussions and valuable comments, in particular to H. Feichtinger, F. Jaillet and D. Bayer. The second author is grateful for the hospitality of the Acoustics Research Institute and the support from the MULAC-project.

## References

- [1] S. T. Ali, Jean Pierre Antoine, and J. P. Gazeau. Continuous frames in Hilbert space. *Annals of Physics*, 222(1):1–37, February 1993.
- [2] Jean-Pierre Antoine and Peter Balazs. Resynthesis with unbounded frames. in preparation.
- [3] P. Balazs. Basic definition and properties of Bessel multipliers. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 325(1):571–585, January 2007.
- [4] P. Balazs, B. Laback, G. Eckel, and W. A. Deutsch. Time-frequency sparsity by removing perceptually irrelevant components using a simple model of simultaneous masking. *IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech and Language Processing*, 18(1):34–49, 2010.
- [5] Peter Balazs, Jean-Pierre Antoine, and Anna Grybos. Weighted and controlled frames: Mutual relationship and first numerical properties. *International Journal of Wavelets, Multiresolution and Information Processing*, to appear.
- [6] P. Casazza, O. Christensen, S. Li, and A. Lindner. On Riesz-Fischer sequences and lower frame bounds. *Z. Anal. Anwend.*, 21(2):305–314, 2002.
- [7] Peter G. Casazza and Ole Christensen. Perturbation of operators and applications to frame theory. *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.*, 3(5):543–557, 1997.
- [8] O. Christensen. *An Introduction To Frames And Riesz Bases*. Birkhäuser, 2003.
- [9] Ph. Depalle, R. Kronland-Martinet, and B. Torr  sani. Time-frequency multipliers for sound synthesis. In *Proceedings of the Wavelet XII conference, SPIE annual Symposium, San Diego*, August 2007.

- [10] H. G. Feichtinger and K. Nowak. *A first survey of Gabor multipliers*, chapter 5, pages 99–128. Birkhäuser Boston, 2003.
- [11] I. Gohberg, S. Goldberg, and M. Kaashoek. *Basic Classes of Linear Operators*. Birkhäuser, 2003.
- [12] K. Gröchenig. *Foundations of Time-Frequency Analysis*. Birkhäuser Boston, 2001.
- [13] Deguang Han and David R. Larson. Frames, Bases and Group Representations. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 697:1–94, 2000.
- [14] Christopher Heil. A Basis Theory Primer. Technical report, 1998.
- [15] P. Majdak, P. Balazs, and B. Laback. Multiple exponential sweep method for fast measurement of head related transferfunctions. *Journal of the Audio Engineering Society*, 55(7/8):623–637, July/August 2007.
- [16] Gary F. Margrave, Peter C. Gibson, Jeff P. Grossman, David C. Henley, Victor Iliescu, and Michael P. Lamoureux. The Gabor transform, pseudodifferential operators, and seismic deconvolution. *Integrated Computer-Aided Engineering*, 12(1):43–55, 2005.
- [17] G. Matz and F. Hlawatsch. *Linear Time-Frequency Filters: On-line Algorithms and Applications*, chapter 6 in 'Application in Time-Frequency Signal Processing', pages 205–271. eds. A. Papandreou-Suppappola, Boca Raton (FL): CRC Press, 2002.
- [18] R. Schatten. *Norm Ideals of Completely Continuous Operators*. Springer Berlin, 1960.
- [19] D. T. Stoeva and P. Balazs. Table of examples for the invertibility of multipliers. 2009.
- [20] DeLiang Wang and Guy J. Brown. *Computational Auditory Scene Analysis: Principles, Algorithms, and Applications*. Wiley-IEEE Press, 2006.