

Some aspects of semi-harmonious quasi-projection pairs

Xiaoyi Tian^a, Qingxiang Xu^a, Chunhong Fu^b

^a*Department of Mathematics, Shanghai Normal University, Shanghai 200234, PR China*

^b*Health School Attached to Shanghai University of Medicine & Health Sciences, Shanghai 200237, PR China*

Abstract

A term called the quasi-projection pair (P, Q) was introduced recently by the authors, where P is a projection and Q is an idempotent on a Hilbert C^* -module H satisfying $Q^* = (2P - I)Q(2P - I)$, in which Q^* is the adjoint operator of the idempotent Q and I is the identity operator on H . Some fundamental issues on quasi-projection pairs, such as the block matrix representations for quasi-projection pairs and the C^* -morphisms associated with quasi-projection pairs, are worthwhile to be investigated. This paper aims to make some preparations. One object called the semi-harmonious quasi-projection pair is introduced in the general setting of the adjointable operators on Hilbert C^* -modules. Some related operator theories on the common similarity of operators and a norm equation associated with the Friedrichs angle are dealt with.

Keywords: Hilbert C^* -module; projection; idempotent; polar decomposition; orthogonal complementarity.

2000 MSC: 46L08; 47A05

1. Introduction and preliminaries

Let H be a (right) Hilbert module over a C^* -algebra \mathfrak{A} , and $\mathcal{L}(H)$ be the set of all adjointable operators on H . For each $T \in \mathcal{L}(H)$, let $\mathcal{R}(T)$ and $\mathcal{N}(T)$ denote the range and the null space of T , respectively. An operator $Q \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ is called an idempotent if $Q^2 = Q$. If furthermore Q is self-adjoint, then Q is referred to be a projection. One fundamental issue concerning idempotents and projections is the characterization of the distances from all

Email addresses: tianxytian@163.com (Xiaoyi Tian), qingxiang_xu@126.com (Qingxiang Xu), fchlixue@163.com (Chunhong Fu)

the projections to an idempotent Q , and some recent results on this issue can be found in [11, 12, 13, 15, 16]. For each idempotent $Q \in \mathcal{L}(H)$, a specific projection $m(Q)$ called the matched projection of Q is introduced recently in [12]. It is proved in [16, Theorems 2.3, Corollary 2.5 and Remark 2.2] that

$$\|m(Q) - Q\| \leq \|P - Q\| \leq \|I - m(Q) - Q\|$$

for every projection $P \in \mathcal{L}(H)$, where I denotes the identity operator on H . This shows that the distance away from $m(Q)$ to Q (resp. from $I - m(Q)$ to Q) takes the minimum value (resp. the maximum value) among all the distances from projections to Q . The same is also true in the case that H is a finite-dimensional Hilbert space and all the matrices are endowed with the Frobenius norm [13, Theorems 3.2 and 4.2]. Inspired by the relationship between $m(Q)$ and Q , another term called the quasi-projection pair (P, Q) is also introduced recently in [12], where $P \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ is a projection satisfying

$$Q^* = (2P - I)Q(2P - I), \tag{1.1}$$

in which Q^* denotes the adjoint operator of the idempotent Q . In particular, $(m(Q), Q)$ is a quasi-projection pair, which is called the matched pair of Q .

Hilbert C^* -modules are the natural generalizations of Hilbert spaces by allowing the inner product to take values in certain C^* -algebra instead of the complex field [6, 9, 10]. It is known that a closed submodule of a Hilbert C^* -module may fail to be orthogonally complemented. Due to this dissimilarity between the Hilbert space and the Hilbert C^* -module, an adjointable operator on a Hilbert C^* -module may have no polar decomposition (see e.g. [7, Example 3.15]). So, some additional demanding is usually needed in dealing with a pair of projections on a general Hilbert C^* -module. Motivated by two norm equations used to characterize the Friedrichs angle [2], the term of the semi-harmonious pair (P, Q) of projections is introduced in the sense that $\overline{\mathcal{R}(P + Q)}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{R}(2I - P - Q)}$ are both orthogonally complemented [4, Definition 1.1]. It is notable that such a semi-harmonious condition plays a crucial role in the study of the C^* -isomorphisms associated with two projections on a Hilbert C^* -module [4, Theorems 3.1 and 3.2].

Although a quasi-projection pair (P, Q) is composed of one projection and one idempotent rather than two projections, due to the restriction (1.1) it can be expected to obtain some results similar to the case of two projections mentioned above. The key to achieving this goal is to clarify the exact meaning of the semi-harmony for a quasi-projection pair separately, which is fulfilled in this paper; see Definitions 2.2 for the details.

A study of semi-harmonious quasi-projection pairs is carried out in Section 2. To get a deeper understanding of semi-harmonious quasi-projection pairs, six operators and four closed submodules are defined at the beginning of this section for each quasi-projection pair. With the notations for these operators and submodules, three featured results are obtained for each quasi-projection pair. As a result, we prove that each semi-harmonious quasi-projection pair (P, Q) can ensure that H_1 and H_4 defined by (2.4) are orthogonally complemented in H .

The common similarity and the unitary equivalence of operators are dealt with in Section 3 in the setting of semi-harmonious quasi-projection pairs. For each semi-harmonious quasi-projection pair, an operator with non-zero parameters is defined by (3.12), and it is proved in Theorem 3.3 that such an operator is invertible and is in fact a common solution of (3.1) and (3.2). Employing (3.1) and (3.2) yields the modified equation (3.20), which leads obviously to equation (3.23). It is shown in Theorem 3.4 that for each semi-harmonious quasi-projection pair, equation (3.20) has a solution of unitary operator with the form (3.22). Meanwhile, a counterexample is constructed in Theorem 3.5 to show that when the underlying quasi-projection pair fails to be semi-harmonious, equation (3.23) may have no solution of invertible operator. A norm equation associated with the Friedrichs angle is dealt with in Section 4 in the general setting of quasi-projection pairs. Under the weakest condition, the validity of equation (4.3) is verified in Theorem 4.4.

We recall briefly some basic knowledge about adjointable operators on Hilbert C^* -modules. For more details, the reader is referred to [6, 9, 10]. Hilbert C^* -modules are generalizations of Hilbert spaces by allowing the inner product to take values in a C^* -algebra rather than in the complex field. Given Hilbert C^* -modules H and K over a C^* -algebra \mathfrak{A} , let $\mathcal{L}(H, K)$ denote the set of all adjointable operators from H to K , with the abbreviation $\mathcal{L}(H)$ whenever $H = K$. Let $\mathcal{L}(H)_{\text{sa}}$ (resp. $\mathcal{L}(H)_+$) denote the set of all self-adjoint (resp. positive) elements in the C^* -algebra $\mathcal{L}(H)$. In the special case that H is a Hilbert space, we use the notation $\mathbb{B}(H)$ instead of $\mathcal{L}(H)$.

Unless otherwise specified, throughout the rest of this paper \mathbb{C} is the complex field, \mathfrak{A} is a C^* -algebra, E , H and K are Hilbert \mathfrak{A} -modules. For every C^* -algebra \mathfrak{B} , $M_n(\mathfrak{B})$ denotes the $n \times n$ matrix algebra over \mathfrak{B} . Specifically, $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ stands for the set of all $n \times n$ complex matrices. The identity matrix and the zero matrix in $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ are denoted by I_n and 0_n , respectively.

It is known that every adjointable operator $A \in \mathcal{L}(H, K)$ is a bounded linear operator, which is also \mathfrak{A} -linear in the sense that

$$A(xa) = A(x)a, \quad \forall x \in H, a \in \mathfrak{A}.$$

Let $\mathcal{R}(A)$, $\mathcal{N}(A)$ and A^* denote the range, the null space and the adjoint operator of A , respectively. In the case that $A \in \mathcal{L}(H)_+$, the notation $A \geq 0$ is also used to indicate that A is a positive operator on H .

Given a unital C^* -algebra \mathfrak{B} , its unit is denoted by $I_{\mathfrak{B}}$. When V is a Hilbert module over a C^* -algebra \mathfrak{C} , the unit of $\mathcal{L}(V)$ will be denoted simply by I_V rather than $I_{\mathcal{L}(V)}$. In most cases of this paper, the Hilbert C^* -module under consideration is represented by H , so the symbol I_H is furthermore simplified to be I . In other words, the Italic letter I is reserved for the identity operator on the Hilbert C^* -module H .

A projection $P \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ is said to be proper if $P \neq I$ and $P \neq 0$, and a closed submodule M of H is referred to be orthogonally complemented in H if $H = M + M^\perp$, where

$$M^\perp = \{x \in H : \langle x, y \rangle = 0 \text{ for every } y \in M\}.$$

In this case, the projection from H onto M is denoted by P_M . If both H_1 and H_2 are submodules of a Hilbert \mathfrak{A} -module H such that $H_1 \cap H_2 = \{0\}$, then we set

$$H_1 \dot{+} H_2 = \{h_1 + h_2 : h_i \in H_i, i = 1, 2\}.$$

For each $T \in \mathcal{L}(H, K)$, the notation $|T|$ is used to denote the square root of T^*T . Hence, $|T^*| = (TT^*)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. From [7, Lemma 3.9] we know that there exists at most a partial isometry $U \in \mathcal{L}(H, K)$ satisfying

$$T = U|T| \quad \text{with} \quad U^*U = P_{\overline{\mathcal{R}(T^*)}}. \quad (1.2)$$

If such a partial isometry U exists, then the representation (1.2) is called the polar decomposition of T [7, Definition 3.10]. As shown in [7, Example 3.15], an adjointable operator on a Hilbert C^* -module may fail to have the polar decomposition. The following lemma gives a characterization of the existence of the polar decomposition.

Lemma 1.1. [7, Lemma 3.6 and Theorem 3.8] *For every $T \in \mathcal{L}(H, K)$, the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) T has the polar decomposition;
- (ii) T^* has the polar decomposition;
- (iii) $\overline{\mathcal{R}(T)}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{R}(T^*)}$ are orthogonally complemented in K and H , respectively.

If (i)–(iii) are satisfied, and the polar decomposition of T is given by (1.2), then the polar decomposition of T^* is represented by

$$T^* = U^*|T^*| \quad \text{with} \quad UU^* = P_{\overline{\mathcal{R}(T)}}.$$

Remark 1.1. Suppose that $T \in \mathcal{L}(H, K)$ has the polar decomposition represented by (1.2). For simplicity, henceforth we just say that T has the polar decomposition $T = U|T|$.

Next, we give some characterizations of quasi-projection pairs, which is introduced recently in [12] as follows.

Definition 1.1. [12, Definition 1.2] An ordered pair (P, Q) is called a quasi-projection pair on H if $P \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ is a projection, while $Q \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ is an idempotent such that

$$\begin{aligned} PQ^*P &= PQP, & PQ^*(I - P) &= -PQ(I - P), \\ (I - P)Q^*(I - P) &= (I - P)Q(I - P). \end{aligned} \quad (1.3)$$

Lemma 1.2. [12, Theorem 1.4] Suppose that $P \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ is a projection and $Q \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ is an idempotent. If one element in

$$\Sigma := \{(A, B) : A \in \{P, I - P\}, B \in \{Q, Q^*, I - Q, I - Q^*\}\}$$

is a quasi-projection pair, then all the remaining elements in Σ are quasi-projection pairs.

Lemma 1.3. [12, Theorem 1.5] Suppose that $P \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ is a projection and $Q \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ is an idempotent. Then the following statements are equivalent:

- (i) (P, Q) is a quasi-projection pair;
- (ii) $Q^* = (2P - I)Q(2P - I)$;
- (iii) $|Q^*| = (2P - I)|Q|(2P - I)$.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Sections 2 are devoted to the study of semi-harmonious quasi-projection pairs. Some related operator theories on the common similarity of operators and a norm equation associated with the Friedrichs angle are dealt with in Sections 3 and 4, respectively.

2. Semi-harmonious quasi-projection pairs

In this section, we will introduce and study semi-harmonious quasi-projection pairs. It is helpful to specify some frequently used symbols for those operators and submodules associated with two idempotents. On the whole, we will introduce six operators and four submodules as follows.

Definition 2.1. Given idempotents $P, Q \in \mathcal{L}(H)$, let

$$T_1 = P(I - Q), \quad T_2 = (I - P)Q, \quad (2.1)$$

$$T_3 = PQ(I - P), \quad T_4 = (I - P)QP, \quad (2.2)$$

$$\widetilde{T}_1 = T_1(2P - I), \quad \widetilde{T}_2 = -T_2(2P - I), \quad (2.3)$$

and let

$$H_1 = \mathcal{R}(P) \cap \mathcal{R}(Q), \quad H_4 = \mathcal{N}(P) \cap \mathcal{N}(Q), \quad (2.4)$$

$$H_2 = \mathcal{R}(P) \cap \mathcal{N}(Q), \quad H_3 = \mathcal{N}(P) \cap \mathcal{R}(Q). \quad (2.5)$$

We begin with a characterization of the adjoint operators as follows.

Lemma 2.1. *Given a quasi-projection pair (P, Q) on H , let T_i ($1 \leq i \leq 4$) and \widetilde{T}_i ($1 \leq i \leq 2$) be defined by (2.1)–(2.3). Then*

$$T_1^* = (2P - I)(I - Q)P, \quad \widetilde{T}_1^* = (I - Q)P, \quad (2.6)$$

$$T_2^* = -(2P - I)Q(I - P), \quad \widetilde{T}_2^* = Q(I - P), \quad (2.7)$$

Proof. Since P is a projection, we know that $2P - I$ is a self-adjoint unitary (symmetry). Hence, by Lemma 1.3(ii) we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_2^* &= (2P - I)Q(2P - I) \cdot (I - P) = -(2P - I)Q(I - P), \\ \widetilde{T}_2^* &= -(2P - I)\widetilde{T}_2^* = Q(I - P). \end{aligned}$$

This gives the verification of (2.7). In view of Lemma 1.2, the rest equalities can be obtained by a simple replacement of (P, Q) with $(I - P, I - Q)$. \square

Next, we provide three featured results for every quasi-projection pair.

Lemma 2.2. *For every quasi-projection pair (P, Q) on H , $T_1 + T_2$ is self-adjoint, where T_1 and T_2 are defined by (2.1).*

Proof. From (2.6) and (2.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (T_1 + T_2)^* &= (2P - I)[(I - Q)P - Q(I - P)] = P - 2PQ + Q \\ &= P(I - Q) + (I - P)Q = T_1 + T_2. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Lemma 2.3. *For every quasi-projection pair (P, Q) on H , we have*

$$|T_i| \cdot |T_j^*|^2 = |T_i|^2 \cdot |T_j^*|, \quad i, j = 1, 2,$$

where T_1 and T_2 are defined by (2.1).

Proof. Given an arbitrary operator $T \in \mathcal{L}(H)$, it is clear that $|T^*|^2 \cdot T = T \cdot |T|^2$, which leads to

$$p(|T^*|^2) \cdot T = T \cdot p(|T|^2)$$

for every polynomial p . Hence,

$$|T^*| \cdot T = T \cdot |T| \tag{2.8}$$

by the functional calculus of elements in a commutative C^* -algebra, since the function $t \rightarrow \sqrt{t}$ can be approximated uniformly by a sequence of polynomials on any compact subset of $[0, +\infty)$. Also, from [7, Proposition 2.9] and [7, Lemma 3.3] we can obtain

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}(|T^*|)} = \overline{\mathcal{R}(T)}, \quad \mathcal{N}(|T|) = \mathcal{N}(T). \tag{2.9}$$

In virtue of (2.9) and (2.8), we see that for any $T, S \in \mathcal{L}(H)$,

$$\begin{aligned} |T| \cdot |S^*|^2 = |T|^2 \cdot |S^*| &\iff |T|(|S^*| - |T|)|S^*| = 0 \\ &\iff |T|(|S^*| - |T|)S = 0 \\ &\iff T(|S^*| - |T|)S = 0 \\ &\iff T \cdot |S^*| \cdot S = T \cdot |T| \cdot S \\ &\iff T \cdot |S^*| \cdot S = |T^*| \cdot T \cdot S. \end{aligned}$$

So, our aim here is to prove that

$$T_i \cdot |T_j^*| \cdot T_j = |T_i^*| \cdot T_i \cdot T_j \quad (i, j = 1, 2). \tag{2.10}$$

First, we consider the case that $i = j = 1$. From (2.1), we have

$$T_1 P = P(I - Q)P,$$

which is self-adjoint according to (1.3). Utilizing the expression of T_1^* given in (2.6) yields

$$T_1 T_1^* = P(I - Q) \cdot (2P - I)(I - Q)P = 2(T_1 P)^2 - T_1 P.$$

Hence,

$$T_1 P \cdot T_1 T_1^* = 2(T_1 P)^3 - (T_1 P)^2.$$

As $T_1 P = (T_1 P)^*$, this shows that

$$T_1 P \cdot T_1 T_1^* = (T_1 P \cdot T_1 T_1^*)^* = T_1 T_1^* \cdot T_1 P.$$

Similar reasoning in the derivation of (2.8) gives

$$T_1 P \cdot |T_1^*| = |T_1^*| \cdot T_1 P,$$

which can be simplified as

$$T_1 \cdot |T_1^*| = |T_1^*| \cdot T_1 P, \quad (2.11)$$

since P is a projection, and by (2.9) and (2.1) $\overline{\mathcal{R}(|T_1^*|)} = \overline{\mathcal{R}(T_1)} \subseteq \mathcal{R}(P)$. It follows that

$$T_1 \cdot |T_1^*| \cdot T_1 = |T_1^*| \cdot T_1 P \cdot T_1 = |T_1^*| \cdot T_1^2$$

by post-multiplying T_1 on both sides of (2.11). So, the validity of (2.10) is verified in the case considered as above.

Next, we show that (2.10) is true in the case that $i = 1$ and $j = 2$. A simple calculation gives

$$T_1(I - P) = -PQ(I - P), \quad T_1 P Q = -T_1 T_2. \quad (2.12)$$

From (2.6) and the observation $T_1 Q = 0$, we have

$$T_1 T_1^* = T_1 \cdot (2P - I)(I - Q)P = T_1 \cdot (P - 2PQP).$$

Combining the above expression for $T_1 T_1^*$ with (2.12) and Lemma 1.3(ii) yields

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 T_1^* \cdot T_1(I - P) &= -T_1(P - 2PQP) \cdot PQ(I - P) \\ &= -T_1 P Q \cdot (I - 2P)Q(I - P) \\ &= T_1 T_2 \cdot Q^*(I - P). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$T_1 T_1^* \cdot T_1(I - P) = T_1 T_2 T_2^*,$$

which means that

$$T_1 T_1^* \cdot T_1(I - P) = T_1(I - P) \cdot T_2 T_2^*,$$

since $(I - P)T_2 = T_2$. Consequently,

$$|T_1^*| \cdot T_1(I - P) = T_1(I - P) \cdot |T_2^*|,$$

which leads by the observation $\overline{\mathcal{R}(|T_2^*|)} = \overline{\mathcal{R}(T_2)} \subseteq \mathcal{R}(I - P)$ to

$$|T_1^*| \cdot T_1(I - P) = T_1 \cdot |T_2^*|.$$

Therefore,

$$T_1 \cdot |T_2^*| \cdot T_2 = |T_1^*| \cdot T_1(I - P) \cdot T_2 = |T_1^*| \cdot T_1 \cdot T_2.$$

So, the desired conclusion follows.

Finally, we may replace (P, Q) with $(I - P, I - Q)$ to get (2.10) in the remaining two cases. \square

Lemma 2.4. *For every quasi-projection pair (P, Q) on H , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} H_1 &= \mathcal{R}(P) \cap \mathcal{R}(Q^*), & H_4 &= \mathcal{N}(P) \cap \mathcal{N}(Q^*), \\ H_2 &= \mathcal{R}(P) \cap \mathcal{N}(Q^*), & H_3 &= \mathcal{N}(P) \cap \mathcal{R}(Q^*), \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

where H_i ($1 \leq i \leq 4$) are defined by (2.4)–(2.5).

Proof. Let $x \in \mathcal{R}(P)$. It is obvious that $(2P - I)x = x$. If furthermore $x \in \mathcal{R}(Q)$, then $Qx = x$ and from Lemma 1.3(ii) we have

$$Q^*x = (2P - I)Q(2P - I)x = x.$$

It follows that $H_1 \subseteq \mathcal{R}(P) \cap \mathcal{R}(Q^*)$. Since $2P - I$ is a symmetry, similar reasoning gives $\mathcal{R}(P) \cap \mathcal{R}(Q^*) \subseteq H_1$. This completes the verification of the first equation in (2.13).

Replacing (P, Q) with $(I - P, I - Q)$, $(P, I - Q)$ and $(I - P, Q)$ respectively, the remaining three equations can be derived immediately. \square

As shown in [7, Example 3.15], an adjointable operator on a Hilbert C^* -module may have no polar decomposition. This leads us to make a definition as follows.

Definition 2.2. Let (P, Q) be a quasi-projection pair. If T_1 and T_2 defined by (2.1) both have the polar decompositions, then (P, Q) is said to be semi-harmonious.

Suppose that (P, Q) is a quasi-projection pair on H . Let H_1 and H_4 be defined by (2.4). In Theorem 2.6, we will prove that each semi-harmonious quasi-projection pair can ensure that H_1 and H_4 are orthogonally complemented in H . For this, we need a useful lemma as follows.

Lemma 2.5. *For every idempotents $P, Q \in \mathcal{L}(H)$, let H_1 be defined by (2.4). Then we have $\mathcal{N}[(I - Q)P] = H_1 + \mathcal{R}(I - P)$.*

Proof. A proof given in [3, Lemma 2.1] for two projections is also valid in the case that $P, Q \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ are idempotents. \square

Theorem 2.6. *Suppose that (P, Q) is a semi-harmonious quasi-projection pair on H . Let $T_1, T_2, \widetilde{T}_1, \widetilde{T}_2, H_1$ and H_4 be defined by (2.1), (2.3) and (2.4), respectively. Then $H_1, H_4, \overline{\mathcal{R}(\widetilde{T}_1^*)}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{R}(\widetilde{T}_2^*)}$ are orthogonally complemented in H such that*

$$P = P_{\overline{\mathcal{R}(T_1)}} + P_{H_1}, \quad P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)} = P_{\overline{\mathcal{R}(\widetilde{T}_2^*)}} + P_{H_1}, \quad (2.14)$$

$$I - P = P_{\overline{\mathcal{R}(T_2)}} + P_{H_4}, \quad P_{\mathcal{N}(Q)} = P_{\overline{\mathcal{R}(\widetilde{T}_1^*)}} + P_{H_4}. \quad (2.15)$$

Proof. In view of Definition 2.2 and Lemma 1.1, by the complementarity of $\overline{\mathcal{R}(T_1)}$ in H , we have $H = \overline{\mathcal{R}(T_1)} + \mathcal{N}(T_1^*)$. From the first equation in (2.6) together with the invertibility of $2P - I$ and Lemma 2.5, it can be deduced that

$$\mathcal{N}(T_1^*) = \mathcal{N}[(I - Q)P] = H_1 + \mathcal{R}(I - P).$$

Hence,

$$\mathcal{R}(P) + \mathcal{R}(I - P) = H = \overline{\mathcal{R}(T_1)} + H_1 + \mathcal{R}(I - P), \quad (2.16)$$

which is combined with Lemmas 1.2 and 2.4 to get the complementarity of H_1 and

$$\mathcal{R}(P) = \overline{\mathcal{R}(T_1)} + H_1.$$

Consequently, the first equation in (2.14) is valid. Since $\widetilde{T}_2^* = Q(I - P)$ (see (2.7)), we have $\overline{\mathcal{R}(\widetilde{T}_2^*)} + H_1 \subseteq \mathcal{R}(Q)$. On the other hand, each $x \in H$ can be decomposed as $x = x_1 + x_2 + x_3$ for some $x_1 \in \overline{\mathcal{R}(T_1)}$, $x_2 \in H_1$ and $x_3 \in \mathcal{R}(I - P)$, which gives

$$Qx = Qx_1 + x_2 + Qx_3. \quad (2.17)$$

Note that $Q\mathcal{R}(I - P) = \mathcal{R}(Q(I - P)) = \mathcal{R}(\widetilde{T}_2^*)$ and

$$QT_1 = -Q(I - P)(I - Q) = -\widetilde{T}_2^*(I - Q),$$

so by (2.17) we have

$$\mathcal{R}(Q) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{R}(\widetilde{T}_2^*)} + H_1 \subseteq \mathcal{R}(Q).$$

Hence,

$$\mathcal{R}(Q) = \overline{\mathcal{R}(\widetilde{T}_2^*)} + H_1.$$

Therefore, $\overline{\mathcal{R}(\widetilde{T}_2^*)}$ is orthogonally complemented in H such that the second equation in (2.14) is satisfied.

Replacement $\overline{\mathcal{R}(T_1)}$ and Q with $I - P$ and $I - Q$ respectively, we can conclude that H_4 and $\overline{\mathcal{R}(\widetilde{T}_1^*)}$ are both orthogonally complemented in H such that (2.15) is satisfied. \square

3. Common similarity and unitary equivalence of operators

Inspired by [4, Section 3], in this section we consider mainly the common solvability of the following two operator equations

$$W(Q - P_{H_1})W^{-1} = I - P - P_{H_4}, \quad (3.1)$$

$$W(P - P_{H_1})W^{-1} = I - Q - P_{H_4}, \quad (3.2)$$

where (P, Q) is a known quasi-projection pair on H such that H_1 and H_4 defined by (2.4) are both orthogonally complemented in H , while $W \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ is an unknown invertible operator.

When (P, Q) is semi-harmonious, a concrete invertible operator W will be constructed in Theorem 3.3 such that (3.1) and (3.2) are both satisfied. To achieve this main result of this section, we need a couple of lemmas.

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose that (P, Q) is a semi-harmonious quasi-projection pair on H . Let T_1, T_2, H_1 and H_4 be defined by (2.1) and (2.4) respectively, and let $T_i = V_i|T_i|$ ($i = 1, 2$) be the polar decompositions. Then*

$$P_{H_1}(P - P_{H_1}) = (I - Q - P_{H_4})P_{H_1} = 0, \quad (3.3)$$

$$P_{H_4}(P - P_{H_1}) = (I - Q - P_{H_4})P_{H_4} = 0. \quad (3.4)$$

Furthermore, for every $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ the following statements are equivalent:

- (i) $(\lambda_1 V_1 - \lambda_2 V_2)(P - P_{H_1}) = (I - Q - P_{H_4})(\lambda_1 V_1 - \lambda_2 V_2)$;
- (ii) $\lambda_i V_i T_j = \lambda_j T_i V_j$ for $i, j = 1, 2$.

Proof. By Theorem 2.6 P_{H_1} and P_{H_4} (henceforth denoted simply by P_1 and P_4) are existent. Evidently, (3.3) and (3.4) can be derived directly from (2.4). So, it remains to prove the equivalence of (i) and (ii).

From (2.14) and (2.15), we have

$$P - P_1 = P_{\overline{\mathcal{R}(T_1)}} = V_1 V_1^*, \quad (3.5)$$

$$(I - P) - P_4 = P_{\overline{\mathcal{R}(T_2)}} = V_2 V_2^*. \quad (3.6)$$

Observe that

$$\mathcal{R}(V_1) = \overline{\mathcal{R}(T_1)} \subseteq \mathcal{R}(P), \quad \mathcal{R}(V_2) = \overline{\mathcal{R}(T_2)} \subseteq \mathcal{N}(P),$$

so by (3.5) and (3.6) we can get

$$\begin{aligned} V_2^* V_1 &= V_2^* (V_2 V_2^* V_1 V_1^*) V_1 = V_2^* \cdot 0 \cdot V_1 = 0, \\ P_1 V_1 &= P_1 V_2 = 0, \quad P_4 V_1 = P_4 V_2 = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which yield

$$V_1^*V_2 = 0, \quad V_1^*P_1 = V_2^*P_1 = 0, \quad V_1^*P_4 = V_2^*P_4 = 0 \quad (3.7)$$

by taking $*$ -operation. Also, from the definitions of P_1 , P_4 , T_1 and T_2 it is clear that

$$T_1P_1 = T_2P_1 = T_1P_4 = T_2P_4 = T_1Q = T_2(I - Q) = 0,$$

which implies that

$$V_1P_1 = V_2P_1 = V_1P_4 = V_2P_4 = V_1Q = V_2(I - Q) = 0, \quad (3.8)$$

since it is true that $\mathcal{N}(V_i) = \mathcal{N}(T_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$. It follows that

$$V_1 = PV_1(I - Q), \quad V_2 = (I - P)V_2Q. \quad (3.9)$$

Given $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{C}$, let

$$A = (\lambda_1V_1 - \lambda_2V_2)(P - P_1), \quad B = (I - Q - P_4)(\lambda_1V_1 - \lambda_2V_2).$$

Then by (3.5)–(3.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned} A &= (\lambda_1V_1 - \lambda_2V_2)P = \lambda_1PV_1(I - Q)P - \lambda_2(I - P)V_2QP, \\ B &= [(P + V_2V_2^*) - Q](\lambda_1V_1 - \lambda_2V_2) = (P - Q)(\lambda_1V_1 - \lambda_2V_2) - \lambda_2V_2 \\ &= \lambda_1V_1 - Q(\lambda_1V_1 - \lambda_2V_2) - \lambda_2V_2 = (I - Q)(\lambda_1V_1 - \lambda_2V_2) \\ &= (I - Q)[\lambda_1PV_1(I - Q) - \lambda_2(I - P)V_2Q]. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$P(A - B)Q = \lambda_1V_1(I - Q)PQ + \lambda_2P(I - Q)V_2 = -\lambda_1V_1T_2 + \lambda_2T_1V_2.$$

Therefore,

$$P(A - B)Q = 0 \iff \lambda_1V_1T_2 = \lambda_2T_1V_2.$$

Similarly, it can be verified that

$$\begin{aligned} P(A - B)(I - Q) &= 0 \iff \lambda_1V_1T_1 = \lambda_1T_1V_1, \\ (I - P)(A - B)Q &= 0 \iff \lambda_2V_2T_2 = \lambda_2T_2V_2, \\ (I - P)(A - B)(I - Q) &= 0 \iff \lambda_2V_2T_1 = \lambda_1T_2V_1. \end{aligned}$$

This shows the equivalence of items (i) and (ii). \square

Lemma 3.2. *Under the notations and conditions of Lemma 3.1, the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) $(V_1 + V_2)(T_1 + T_2) = (T_1 + T_2)(V_1 + V_2)$;
- (ii) $V_i T_j = T_i V_j$ for $i, j = 1, 2$;
- (iii) $|T_i| \cdot |T_j^*|^2 = |T_i|^2 \cdot |T_j^*|$ for $i, j = 1, 2$.

Proof. (i) \iff (ii). Let $A = (V_1 + V_2)(T_1 + T_2)$ and $B = (T_1 + T_2)(V_1 + V_2)$. By (3.9) and (2.1), we have

$$(I - P)V_1 = PV_2 = V_1Q = V_2(I - Q) = 0, \quad (3.10)$$

$$(I - P)T_1 = PT_2 = T_1Q = T_2(I - Q) = 0. \quad (3.11)$$

So, the equation $V_1 T_2 = T_1 V_2$ turns out to be $PAQ = PBQ$. Similarly, the other three equations in (ii) can be rephrased as $XAY = XBY$ for all the cases that $X \in \{P, I - P\}$ and $Y \in \{Q, I - Q\}$ satisfying $(X, Y) \neq (P, Q)$. Hence, the equivalence of (i) and (ii) is derived.

(ii) \iff (iii). In virtue of $\mathcal{R}(V_j) = \overline{\mathcal{R}(|T_j^*|)}$ and $\mathcal{N}(V_i) = \mathcal{N}(|T_i|)$ for $i, j = 1, 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} V_i T_j - T_i V_j = 0 &\iff V_i(|T_j^*| - |T_i|)V_j = 0 \\ &\iff V_i(|T_j^*| - |T_i|)|T_j^*| = 0 \\ &\iff |T_i|(|T_j^*| - |T_i|)|T_j^*| = 0. \end{aligned}$$

This shows the equivalence of (ii) and (iii). \square

Remark 3.1. By Lemma 2.3, we know that Lemma 3.2(iii) is always true for every quasi-projection pair (P, Q) . However, when (P, Q) is not semi-harmonious, the operators T_1 and T_2 defined by (2.1) may have no polar decompositions. In such case, items (i) and (ii) in Lemma 3.2 are meaningless.

Recall that an element $A \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ is called an EP operator if $\mathcal{R}(A) = \mathcal{R}(A^*)$. If A is Moore-Penrose invertible (equivalently, $\mathcal{R}(A)$ is closed in H [14, Theorem 2.2]), then this can be characterized as $AA^\dagger = A^\dagger A$, since AA^\dagger and $A^\dagger A$ are projections whose ranges are equal to $\mathcal{R}(A)$ and $\mathcal{R}(A^*)$ respectively, where A^\dagger denotes the Moore-Penrose inverse of A . It is notable that an EP operator needs not to be self-adjoint. When (P, Q) is a semi-harmonious quasi-projection pair, let V_1 and V_2 be defined as above. In the next theorem, we will show that $V_1 - V_2$ is an EP operator, which plays a crucial role in the verification of the invertibility of the operator W constructed as (3.12).

Theorem 3.3. *Suppose that (P, Q) is a semi-harmonious quasi-projection pair on H . Let T_1, T_2, H_1 and H_4 be defined by (2.1) and (2.4) respectively, and let $T_i = V_i|T_i|$ ($i = 1, 2$) be the polar decompositions. Then $V_1 + V_2$ is self-adjoint, and the operator $W \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ given by*

$$W = \lambda_1(V_1 - V_2) + \lambda_2 P_{H_1} + \lambda_3 P_{H_4} \quad (3.12)$$

is a common solution of (3.1) and (3.2), where λ_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) are arbitrary in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$.

Proof. By Theorem 2.6, P_{H_1} and P_{H_4} (simplified as P_1 and P_4) are existent. From Lemmas 3.1, 3.2 and 2.3, we have

$$(\lambda_1 V_1 - \lambda_1 V_2)(P - P_1) = (I - Q - P_4)(\lambda_1 V_1 - \lambda_1 V_2),$$

which is combined with (3.3), (3.4) and (3.12) to get

$$W(P - P_1) = (I - Q - P_4)W.$$

Observe that $V_2^* V_1 = 0$ (see the proof of Lemma 3.1), so from (3.6), (3.12), (3.7), (2.13), (3.10) and (3.8) we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (I - P - P_4)W &= V_2 V_2^* W = -\lambda_1 V_2, \\ W(Q - P_1) &= \lambda_1(V_1 - V_2)(Q - P_1) = -\lambda_1 V_2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$W(Q - P_1) = (I - P - P_4)W.$$

So, it remains only to prove that W is invertible and $V_1 + V_2$ is self-adjoint.

Firstly, we prove that $V_1 - V_2$ is an EP operator. By (3.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 &= P(T_1 \pm T_2), & T_2 &= (I - P)(T_2 \pm T_1), \\ T_1^* &= (I - Q^*)(T_1^* \pm T_2^*), & T_2^* &= Q^*(T_2^* \pm T_1^*), \end{aligned}$$

which lead obviously to

$$\mathcal{N}(T_1) \cap \mathcal{N}(T_2) = \mathcal{N}(T_1 \pm T_2), \quad \mathcal{N}(T_1^* \pm T_2^*) = \mathcal{N}(T_1^*) \cap \mathcal{N}(T_2^*).$$

As $T_1 + T_2$ is self-adjoint (see Lemma 2.2), this gives

$$\mathcal{N}(T_1) \cap \mathcal{N}(T_2) = \mathcal{N}(T_1 + T_2) = \mathcal{N}[(T_1 + T_2)^*] = \mathcal{N}(T_1^*) \cap \mathcal{N}(T_2^*).$$

Hence

$$\mathcal{N}(V_1) \cap \mathcal{N}(V_2) = \mathcal{N}(V_1^*) \cap \mathcal{N}(V_2^*).$$

The same method employed as above shows that

$$\mathcal{N}(V_1 \pm V_2) = \mathcal{N}(V_1) \cap \mathcal{N}(V_2) = \mathcal{N}(V_1^*) \cap \mathcal{N}(V_2^*) = \mathcal{N}[(V_1 \pm V_2)^*]. \quad (3.13)$$

Moreover, it is clear that $\mathcal{R}(\lambda_1 V_1 + \lambda_2 V_2) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{R}(V_1)} + \mathcal{R}(V_2)$ for every $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$. On the other hand, since $\mathcal{R}(V_1^*) = \overline{\mathcal{R}(T_1^*)} \subseteq \mathcal{R}(I - Q^*)$, we see that $(I - Q^*)V_1^* = V_1^*$ and $Q^*V_1^* = 0$. Taking $*$ -operation we have $V_1(I - Q) = V_1$ and $V_1Q = 0$. Similarly, we obtain $V_2Q = V_2$ and $V_2(I - Q) = 0$. Hence, for every $x, y \in H$ we have

$$V_1x + V_2y = (\lambda_1 V_1 + \lambda_2 V_2) \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_1} (I - Q)x + \frac{1}{\lambda_2} Qy \right) \in \mathcal{R}(\lambda_1 V_1 + \lambda_2 V_2).$$

Therefore,

$$\mathcal{R}(\lambda_1 V_1 + \lambda_2 V_2) = \mathcal{R}(V_1) + \mathcal{R}(V_2), \quad \forall \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}. \quad (3.14)$$

Combining the observation $V_1V_1^* \perp V_2V_2^*$ with (3.5) and (3.6) yields

$$\mathcal{R}(V_1) + \mathcal{R}(V_2) = \mathcal{R}(V_1V_1^*) + \mathcal{R}(V_2V_2^*) = \mathcal{R}(V_1V_1^* + V_2V_2^*) = \mathcal{R}(\tilde{P}),$$

where \tilde{P} is a projection on H given by

$$\tilde{P} = I - P_1 - P_4. \quad (3.15)$$

Specifically, if we let $\lambda_1 = 1$ and $\lambda_2 = -1$, then it gives

$$\mathcal{R}(V_1 - V_2) = \mathcal{R}(\tilde{P}),$$

and thus $\mathcal{R}(V_1 - V_2)$ is closed in H , so $V_1 - V_2$ is Moore-Penrose invertible such that

$$(V_1 - V_2)(V_1 - V_2)^\dagger = \tilde{P}. \quad (3.16)$$

It follows from (3.16) and (3.13) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}(\tilde{P}) &= \mathcal{N}[(V_1 - V_2)^\dagger] = \mathcal{N}[(V_1 - V_2)^*] = \mathcal{N}(V_1 - V_2) \\ &= \mathcal{N} \left[(V_1 - V_2)^\dagger (V_1 - V_2) \right], \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$(V_1 - V_2)^\dagger (V_1 - V_2) = \tilde{P}. \quad (3.17)$$

Hence, by (3.16) and (3.17) $V_1 - V_2$ is an EP operator.

Secondly, we prove that $W^{-1} = \widetilde{W}$, where

$$\widetilde{W} = \frac{1}{\lambda_1} (V_1 - V_2)^\dagger + \frac{1}{\lambda_2} P_1 + \frac{1}{\lambda_3} P_4.$$

Indeed, by (3.15) we have $\tilde{P}P_1 = P_1\tilde{P} = 0$, which is combined with (3.16) and (3.17) to get

$$\begin{aligned}(V_1 - V_2)^\dagger P_1 &= (V_1 - V_2)^\dagger \left[(V_1 - V_2)(V_1 - V_2)^\dagger \right] P_1 = (V_1 - V_2)^\dagger (\tilde{P}P_1) = 0, \\ P_1(V_1 - V_2)^\dagger &= P_1 \left[(V_1 - V_2)^\dagger (V_1 - V_2) \right] (V_1 - V_2)^\dagger = (P_1\tilde{P})(V_1 - V_2)^\dagger = 0.\end{aligned}$$

The same is true if P_1 is replaced by P_4 . That is,

$$(V_1 - V_2)^\dagger P_4 = P_4(V_1 - V_2)^\dagger = 0.$$

With the derivations as above and the various equations given in the proof of Lemma 3.1, it is easily seen that $W\tilde{W} = \tilde{W}W = I$.

Finally, we prove that $V_1 + V_2$ is self-adjoint. To this end, we show that

$$(V_1 + V_2)^*\tilde{P} = (V_1 + V_2)\tilde{P}, \quad (V_1 + V_2)^*(I - \tilde{P}) = (V_1 + V_2)(I - \tilde{P}), \quad (3.18)$$

where \tilde{P} is given by (3.15). By (3.16) and (3.17), we have

$$\mathcal{N}(\tilde{P}) = \mathcal{N}(V_1 - V_2) = \mathcal{N}[(V_1 - V_2)^*],$$

which is combined with (3.13) to get

$$\mathcal{R}(I - \tilde{P}) = \mathcal{N}(\tilde{P}) = \mathcal{N}(V_1 + V_2) = \mathcal{N}[(V_1 + V_2)]^*.$$

Therefore, the second equation in (3.18) is satisfied.

Following the line in the derivation of (3.14), we have $\overline{\mathcal{R}(T_1 + T_2)} = \overline{\mathcal{R}(T_1)} + \overline{\mathcal{R}(T_2)}$. Hence, $\mathcal{R}(\tilde{P}) = \mathcal{R}(V_1) + \mathcal{R}(V_2) = \overline{\mathcal{R}(T_1)} + \overline{\mathcal{R}(T_2)} = \overline{\mathcal{R}(T_1 + T_2)}$, the first equation in (3.18) can therefore be changed into

$$(V_1 + V_2)^*(T_1 + T_2) = (V_1 + V_2)(T_1 + T_2),$$

which can be rephrased furthermore as

$$(V_1 + V_2)^*(T_1 + T_2) = (T_1 + T_2)(V_1 + V_2) \quad (3.19)$$

by using (i) \iff (iii) in Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 2.3. As observed before, we have $V_2^*V_1 = 0$, which gives $V_2^*T_1 = 0$ since $\mathcal{R}(T_1)$ is contained in $\mathcal{R}(V_1)$. Similarly, $V_1^*T_2 = 0$. As a result,

$$(V_1 + V_2)^*(T_1 + T_2) = V_1^*T_1 + V_2^*T_2 = |T_1| + |T_2|,$$

which leads to (3.19) by taking $*$ -operation, since both $|T_1| + |T_2|$ and $T_1 + T_2$ are self-adjoint. \square

Let $Q \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ be an idempotent. It is well-known that $\|Q\| > 1$ whenever Q is not a projection. Under the condition of Theorem 3.3 and suppose furthermore that Q is not a projection, $I - Q - P_4$ is an idempotent which is not a projection, so

$$\|I - Q - P_{H_4}\| > 1 \geq \|P - P_{H_1}\| = \|U(P - P_{H_1})U^*\|$$

for any unitary operator U . Therefore, the operator W constructed in Theorem 3.3 is merely an invertible operator, which generally fails to be a unitary operator. Employing (3.1) and (3.2) yields

$$W(P - P_{H_1})(Q - P_{H_1})W^{-1} = (I - Q - P_{H_4})(I - P - P_{H_4}). \quad (3.20)$$

Our next theorem indicates that the operator W in the above modified equation can in fact be replaced by a unitary operator.

Theorem 3.4. *Under the condition and the notations of Theorem 3.3, we have*

$$U(P - P_{H_1})(Q - P_{H_1})U^* = (I - Q - P_{H_4})(I - P - P_{H_4}), \quad (3.21)$$

where U is a unitary operator defined by

$$U = \lambda_1 [V_1(2P - I) - V_2] + \lambda_2 P_1 + \lambda_3 P_4, \quad (3.22)$$

in which $\lambda_i (i = 1, 2, 3)$ are arbitrary in the unit circle of \mathbb{C} .

Proof. As before, denote P_{H_1} and P_{H_4} simply by P_1 and P_4 , respectively. Suppose that $|\lambda_i| = 1$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. First, we prove that the operator U defined by (3.22) is a unitary. Let \widetilde{T}_1 be defined by (2.3) and let

$$\widetilde{V}_1 = V_1(2P - I).$$

Since $2P - I$ is a symmetry, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{V}_1 \widetilde{V}_1^* &= V_1(2P - I)(2P - I)V_1^* = V_1 V_1^* = P_{\overline{\mathcal{R}(T_1)}} = P_{\overline{\mathcal{R}(\widetilde{T}_1)}}, \\ |\widetilde{T}_1^*|^2 &= T_1(2P - I)(2P - I)T_1^* = T_1 T_1^* = |T_1^*|^2, \end{aligned}$$

and thus $|\widetilde{T}_1^*| = |T_1^*|$. Also, it is clear that

$$\widetilde{T}_1^* = (2P - I)T_1^* = (2P - I)V_1^*|T_1^*| = \widetilde{V}_1^*|\widetilde{T}_1^*|.$$

So, $\widetilde{T}_1^* = \widetilde{V}_1^* |\widetilde{T}_1^*|$ is the polar decomposition. In addition, by (2.1), (2.3) and Lemma 1.3(ii) we have

$$T_2 \widetilde{T}_1^* = (I - P) \cdot (2P - I)Q^*(I - Q^*) \cdot P = 0,$$

which gives $V_2 \widetilde{V}_1^* = 0$, since $\overline{\mathcal{R}(\widetilde{T}_1^*)} = \mathcal{R}(\widetilde{V}_1^*)$ and $\mathcal{N}(T_2) = \mathcal{N}(V_2)$. Hence, $V_2^* V_2 \perp \widetilde{V}_1^* \widetilde{V}_1$. Moreover, by (2.15), (3.5) and (3.6) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{V}_1^* \widetilde{V}_1 &= P_{\overline{\mathcal{R}(\widetilde{T}_1^*)}} = P_{\mathcal{N}(Q)} - P_4, \\ \widetilde{V}_1 \widetilde{V}_1^* + V_2 V_2^* &= V_1 V_1^* + V_2 V_2^* = I - P_1 - P_4. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} UU^* &= \widetilde{V}_1 \widetilde{V}_1^* + V_2 V_2^* + P_1 + P_4 = I, \\ U^*U &= \widetilde{V}_1^* \widetilde{V}_1 + V_2^* V_2 + P_1 + P_4 = P_{\mathcal{N}(Q)} + V_2^* V_2 + P_1. \end{aligned}$$

So, U^*U is a summation of three mutually orthogonal projections. Thus, in order to get $U^*U = I$ it is sufficient to verify the triviality of the common null space of these projections. It is routine to make such a verification. For, if $x \in H$ satisfies

$$T_2 x = 0, \quad P_1 x = 0, \quad P_{\mathcal{N}(Q)} x = 0,$$

then $Qx = PQx \in H_1$, so $Qx = P_1 Qx = P_1 x = 0$, and therefore $x = P_{\mathcal{N}(Q)} x = 0$.

Next, we check the validity of

$$X(P - P_1)(Q - P_1) = (I - Q - P_4)(I - P - P_4)X. \quad (3.23)$$

in the case that $X = U$. From (3.20) we see that W is a solution of the above equation. If $X = V_1(P - I)$, then both sides of (3.23) are equal to zero. So, $V_1(P - I)$ is another solution. This finishes the verification of (3.23) for $X = U$, since by (3.12) and (3.22) we have $U = W + 2\lambda_1 V_1(P - I)$. \square

Some new phenomena may happen if a quasi-projection pair fails to be semi-harmonious. In fact, we have a theorem as follows.

Theorem 3.5. *There exists a quasi-projection pair (P, Q) on certain Hilbert C^* -module H such that H_1 and H_4 defined by (2.4) satisfy $H_1 = \{0\}$ and $H_4 = \{0\}$, whereas (3.23) has no solution of invertible operator.*

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{B} = C(\Omega)$ with $\Omega = [0, 1]$ and \mathfrak{J} be the ideal of \mathfrak{B} given by

$$\mathfrak{J} = \{f \in \mathfrak{B} : f(0) = 0\}.$$

Let \mathfrak{A} be the unital C^* -subalgebra of $M_2(\mathfrak{B})$ defined by

$$\mathfrak{A} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} b_{11} & b_{12} \\ b_{21} & b_{22} \end{pmatrix} : b_{11}, b_{22} \in \mathfrak{B}; b_{12}, b_{21} \in \mathfrak{J} \right\}.$$

As before, \mathfrak{A} serves as a Hilbert module over itself. Let $P, Q \in \mathfrak{A}$ be defined by

$$P(t) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad Q(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \sec^2(t) & -\sec(t)\tan(t) \\ \sec(t)\tan(t) & -\tan^2(t) \end{pmatrix}$$

for each $t \in \Omega$. Suppose that $x \in H_4$ is determined by $x(t) = (x_{ij}(t))_{1 \leq i, j \leq 2}$ for each $t \in \Omega$. Then

$$P(t)x(t) \equiv 0, \quad Q(t)x(t) \equiv 0 \quad (t \in \Omega),$$

which clearly lead to $x_{i,j}(t) \equiv 0$ for all $i, j = 1, 2$, since $\sec(t) \neq 0$ for every $t \in \Omega$ and $\tan(t) = 0$ only if $t = 0$, and all the functions considered are continuous on Ω . This shows that $H_4 = \{0\}$. Similarly, $H_1 = \mathcal{N}(I - P) \cap \mathcal{N}(I - Q) = \{0\}$. Therefore, (3.23) is simplified as

$$WPQ = (I - Q)(I - P)W. \quad (3.24)$$

Now, suppose that $W \in \mathfrak{A}$ is determined by $W(t) = (W_{ij}(t))_{1 \leq i, j \leq 2}$ and is a solution of (3.24). Substituting $t = 0$ into (3.24) yields

$$\begin{pmatrix} W_{11}(0) & W_{12}(0) \\ W_{21}(0) & W_{22}(0) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} W_{11}(0) & W_{12}(0) \\ W_{21}(0) & W_{22}(0) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence, $W_{11}(0) = W_{22}(0) = 0$. In addition, since W_{12} and W_{21} are taken in \mathfrak{J} which requires $W_{12}(0) = W_{21}(0) = 0$. As a result, $W(0)$ is the zero matrix in $M_2(\mathbb{C})$, which clearly implies the non-invertibility of W in \mathfrak{A} . \square

As an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.5, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 3.6. *There exists a quasi-projection pair (P, Q) on certain Hilbert C^* -module H such that H_1 and H_4 defined by (2.4) satisfy $H_1 = \{0\}$ and $H_4 = \{0\}$, whereas (3.1) and (3.2) have no common solution of invertible operator.*

4. A norm equation associated with the Friedrichs angle

Let M and N be closed subspaces of a Hilbert space. The Friedrichs angle [2], denoted by $\alpha(M, N)$, is the unique angle in $[0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$ whose cosine is equal to $c(M, N)$, where

$$c(M, N) = \sup \{ |\langle x, y \rangle| : x \in \widetilde{M}, y \in \widetilde{N}, \|x\| \leq 1, \|y\| \leq 1 \},$$

in which $\widetilde{M} = M \cap (M \cap N)^\perp$ and $\widetilde{N} = N \cap (M \cap N)^\perp$. It is known [1, Lemma 10] that

$$c(M, N) = \|P_M P_N - P_{M \cap N}\|, \quad (4.1)$$

which is invariant in the sense that

$$c(M, N) = c(M^\perp, N^\perp). \quad (4.2)$$

Inspired by (4.1) and (4.2), the following lemma is obtained in [8] for two projections on a general Hilbert C^* -module.

Lemma 4.1. [8, Theorem 5.12] *Let $P, Q \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ be projections such that H_1 and H_4 defined by (2.4) are orthogonally complemented in H . Then*

$$\|PQ - P_{H_1}\| = \|(I - P)(I - Q) - P_{H_4}\|. \quad (4.3)$$

The characteristics of the above lemma is mainly reflected in its weakest condition, since for each $i \in \{1, 4\}$, P_{H_i} exists if and only if H_i is orthogonally complementary in H . It is interesting to investigate the validity of (4.3) in the new setting of quasi-projection pairs on a general Hilbert C^* -module. To give the positive answer under the above weakest condition, we need a couple of lemmas, which are provided as follows.

Lemma 4.2. *Equation (4.3) is valid for every semi-harmonious quasi-projection pair (P, Q) on H , where H_1 and H_4 are defined by (2.4).*

Proof. Let (P, Q) be an arbitrary quasi-projection pair on H . From Lemma 1.3(ii), we obtain

$$[Q(I - P)]^* = (I - P) \cdot (2P - I)Q(2P - I) = (I - P)Q(I - 2P).$$

Replacing Q with $I - Q$ gives

$$[(I - Q)(I - P)]^* = (I - P)(I - Q)(I - 2P). \quad (4.4)$$

Now, suppose that H_1 and H_4 defined by (2.4) are both orthogonally complemented in H . Let P_{H_1} and P_{H_4} be denoted simply by P_1 and P_4 , respectively. By (4.4) and the observation $P_4^* = P_4 = P_4(I - 2P)$, we have

$$[(I - Q)(I - P) - P_4]^* = [(I - P)(I - Q) - P_4](I - 2P).$$

Since $I - 2P$ is a unitary, this shows that

$$\|(I - Q)(I - P) - P_4\|^* = \|(I - P)(I - Q) - P_4\|. \quad (4.5)$$

Suppose furthermore that (P, Q) is semi-harmonious. Then a simple use of (3.21) gives

$$\|PQ - P_1\| = \|(I - Q)(I - P) - P_4\| = \|[I - Q)(I - P) - P_4]^*\|.$$

The equation above together with (4.5) yields the desired conclusion. \square

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose that (P, Q) is a quasi-projection pair on H such that H_1 defined by (2.4) is orthogonally complemented in H . Let X be a Hilbert space and $\pi : \mathcal{L}(H) \rightarrow \mathbb{B}(X)$ be a unital C^* -morphism. Then*

$$\|\pi(P)\pi(Q) - \pi(P_{H_1})\| = \max\{\alpha, \|P_M - \pi(P_{H_1})\|\}, \quad (4.6)$$

$$\|\pi(P)\pi(P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}) - \pi(P_{H_1})\| = \max\{\beta, \|P_M - \pi(P_{H_1})\|\}, \quad (4.7)$$

where M , α and β are given respectively by

$$M = \mathcal{R}(\pi(P)) \cap \mathcal{R}(\pi(Q)), \quad \alpha = \|\pi(P)\pi(Q) - P_M\|, \quad (4.8)$$

$$\beta = \|\pi(P)\pi(P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}) - P_M\|.$$

Proof. Let P_{H_1} be denoted simply by P_1 , and let

$$S_1 = \pi(P)\pi(Q) - P_M, \quad S_2 = P_M - \pi(P_1). \quad (4.9)$$

It is clear that $PP_1 = QP_1 = P_1$, so $\pi(P)\pi(P_1) = \pi(Q)\pi(P_1) = \pi(P_1)$, which implies that $\pi(P_1) \leq P_M$, hence S_2 is a projection and $S_1S_2 = 0$. It follows that

$$S_2S_1^* = S_2^*S_1^* = (S_1S_2)^* = 0.$$

Since $(\pi(P), \pi(Q))$ is also a quasi-projection pair, by (2.13) we have

$$\begin{aligned} M &= \mathcal{R}(\pi(P)) \cap \mathcal{R}(\pi(Q)^*) = \mathcal{R}(\pi(P)) \cap \mathcal{R}(\pi(Q^*)), \\ N &:= \mathcal{N}(\pi(P)) \cap \mathcal{N}(\pi(Q)) = \mathcal{N}(\pi(P)) \cap \mathcal{N}(\pi(Q)^*). \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

As $\pi(Q)^*$ is an idempotent and $M \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\pi(Q)^*)$, it gives $\pi(Q)^*P_M = P_M$. By (2.13) $H_1 \subseteq \mathcal{R}(Q^*)$, so

$$\pi(Q)^*\pi(P_1) = \pi(Q^*P_1) = \pi(P_1).$$

Therefore, it can be derived from (4.9) that $S_1^*S_2 = 0$, which yields $S_2S_1 = (S_1^*S_2)^* = 0$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} S_1S_1^* \geq 0, \quad S_2 \geq 0, \quad S_1S_2 = S_2S_1^* = 0, \quad S_1S_1^* \cdot S_2 = S_2 \cdot S_1S_1^* = 0, \\ (S_1 + S_2)(S_1 + S_2)^* = (S_1 + S_2)(S_1^* + S_2) = S_1S_1^* + S_2. \end{aligned}$$

Since S_2 is a projection, we have $\|S_2\| = \|S_2\|^2$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_1 + S_2\|^2 &= \|(S_1 + S_2)(S_1 + S_2)^*\| = \max\{\|S_1S_1^*\|, \|S_2\|\} \\ &= \max\{\|S_1\|^2, \|S_2\|^2\}. \end{aligned}$$

This shows the validity of (4.6).

Following the same line as in the derivation of (4.6), we see that (4.7) is also true whenever $P_M \leq \pi(P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)})$. So, it needs only to prove this latter inequality. It is known that $P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)} = Q(Q + Q^* - I)^{-1}$ (see e.g. [5, Theorem 1.3]). Since π is a unital C^* -morphism, we have

$$\pi(P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}) = \pi(Q)[\pi(Q) + \pi(Q)^* - I]^{-1} = P_{\mathcal{R}[\pi(Q)]}, \quad (4.11)$$

which leads obviously to $P_M \leq \pi(P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)})$. \square

Now, we are in the position to provide the main result of this section.

Theorem 4.4. *Let (P, Q) be a quasi-projection pair on H such that H_1 and H_4 defined by (2.4) are orthogonally complemented in H . Then (4.3) is satisfied.*

Proof. We begin with the following simple observation:

$$b \leq a \text{ and } \max\{b, c\} = \max\{b, d\} \implies \max\{a, c\} = \max\{a, d\}. \quad (4.12)$$

Indeed, utilizing $b \leq a$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \max\{a, c\} &= \max\{a, b, c\} = \max\{a, \max\{b, c\}\} = \max\{a, \max\{b, d\}\} \\ &= \max\{a, b, d\} = \max\{a, d\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let X be a Hilbert space and $\pi : \mathcal{L}(H) \rightarrow \mathbb{B}(X)$ be a faithful unital C^* -morphism. Denote P_{H_1} and P_{H_4} by P_1 and P_4 , respectively. For

simplicity, we use the same notation I for the identity operators I_H and I_X . Since $(\pi(P), \pi(Q))$ is a quasi-projection pair on a Hilbert space, it is semi-harmonious. Therefore, a direct use of Lemma 4.2 yields

$$\begin{aligned} a &:= \|\pi(P)\pi(Q) - P_M\| = \|[I - \pi(P)][I - \pi(Q)] - P_N\| \\ &= \|\pi(I - P)\pi(I - Q) - P_N\|, \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

where M and N are defined by (4.8) and (4.10), respectively. So, a simple use of Lemma 4.3 for quasi-projection pairs (P, Q) and $(I - P, I - Q)$ gives

$$\|\pi(P)\pi(Q) - \pi(P_1)\| = \max\{a, c\}, \quad (4.14)$$

$$\|\pi(I - P)\pi(I - Q) - \pi(P_4)\| = \max\{a, d\}, \quad (4.15)$$

where a is given by (4.13) and

$$c = \|P_M - \pi(P_1)\|, \quad d = \|P_N - \pi(P_4)\|.$$

Note that $\pi(P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)})$ is a projection whose range equals $\mathcal{R}(\pi(Q))$ (see (4.11)), so it is clear that

$$[\pi(P)\pi(Q) - P_M]\pi(P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}) = \pi(P)\pi(P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}) - P_M.$$

Hence

$$b := \|\pi(P)\pi(P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}) - P_M\| \leq a \cdot \|\pi(P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)})\| \leq a.$$

Now, we turn to prove that $\max\{b, c\} = \max\{b, d\}$. It is obvious that

$$\mathcal{R}(P) \cap \mathcal{R}(P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}) = H_1, \quad \mathcal{N}(P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}) = \mathcal{R}(Q)^\perp = \mathcal{N}(Q^*).$$

So, from (2.13) we can obtain

$$\mathcal{N}(P) \cap \mathcal{N}(P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}) = H_4.$$

Moreover, due to (4.11) and (4.10) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(\pi(P)) \cap \mathcal{R}(\pi(P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)})) &= \mathcal{R}(\pi(P)) \cap \mathcal{R}(\pi(Q)) = M, \\ \mathcal{N}(\pi(P)) \cap \mathcal{N}(\pi(P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)})) &= \mathcal{N}(\pi(P)) \cap \mathcal{N}(\pi(Q)^*) = N. \end{aligned}$$

Replacing (P, Q) in Lemma 4.1 with $(P, P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)})$ and $(\pi(P), \pi(P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}))$ respectively yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|PP_{\mathcal{R}(Q)} - P_1\| &= \|(I - P)(I - P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}) - P_4\|, \\ b &= \|(I - \pi(P))(I - \pi(P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)})) - P_N\|. \end{aligned}$$

We may combine Lemma 4.3 with the above two equations to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\max\{b, c\} &= \|\pi(PP_{\mathcal{R}(Q)} - P_1)\| = \|\pi[(I - P)(I - P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)}) - P_4]\| \\ &= \|[I - \pi(P)][I - \pi(P_{\mathcal{R}(Q)})] - \pi(P_4)\| = \max\{b, d\}.\end{aligned}$$

It follows from (4.12) that $\max\{a, c\} = \max\{a, d\}$. Hence, (4.3) can be derived from (4.14) and (4.15) together with the faithfulness of π . \square

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Data availability

No data was used for the research described in the article.

References

- [1] F. Deutsch, The angle between subspaces of a Hilbert space, *Approximation theory, wavelets and applications* (Maratea, 1994), 107–130, NATO Adv. Sci. Inst. Ser. C Math. Phys. Sci., 454, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 1995.
- [2] K. Friedrichs, On certain inequalities and characteristic value problems for analytic functions and for functions of two variables, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 41 (1937), no. 3, 321–364.
- [3] C. Fu, Q. Xu and G. Yan, Characterizations of the harmonious pairs of projections on a Hilbert C^* -module, *Linear Multilinear Algebra* 70 (2022), no. 21, 6312–6320.
- [4] C. Fu, Q. Xu and G. Yan, C^* -isomorphisms associated with two projections on a Hilbert C^* -module, *Chin. Ann. Math. Ser. B* 44 (2023), no. 3, 325–344.
- [5] J. J. Koliha, Range projections of idempotents in C^* -algebras, *Demonstratio Math.* 34 (2001), no. 1, 91–103.
- [6] E. C. Lance, *Hilbert C^* -modules—A toolkit for operator algebraists*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.

- [7] N. Liu, W. Luo and Q. Xu, The polar decomposition for adjointable operators on Hilbert C^* -modules and centered operators, *Adv. Oper. Theory* 3 (2018), no. 4, 855–867.
- [8] W. Luo, M. S. Moslehian and Q. Xu, Halmos’ two projections theorem for Hilbert C^* -module operators and the Friedrichs angle of two closed submodules, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 577 (2019), 134–158.
- [9] V. M. Manuilov and E. V. Troitsky, *Hilbert C^* -modules*, Translated from the 2001 Russian original by the authors, *Translations of Mathematical Monographs*, 226, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2005.
- [10] W. L. Paschke, Inner product modules over B^* -algebras, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 182 (1973), 443–468.
- [11] X. Tian, Q. Xu and C. Fu, Quasi-projection pairs on C^* -modules, [arXiv.2305.12984v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.12984v1).
- [12] X. Tian, Q. Xu and C. Fu, The matched projections of idempotents on Hilbert C^* -modules, *J. Operator Theory*, to appear. [arXiv.2305.12984v3](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.12984v3).
- [13] X. Tian, Q. Xu and C. Fu, The Frobenius distances from projections to an idempotent matrix, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 688 (2024), 21–43.
- [14] Q. Xu and L. Sheng, Positive semi-definite matrices of adjointable operators on Hilbert C^* -modules, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 428 (2008), no. 4, 992–1000.
- [15] X. Zhang, X. Tian and Q. Xu, The maximum operator distance from an idempotent to the set of projections, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 692 (2024), 62–70.
- [16] X. Zhang, X. Tian and Q. Xu, The operator distances from projections to an idempotent, [arXiv:2404.03433](https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.03433).