

SEPARATED PAIRS OF SUBMODULES IN HILBERT C^* -MODULES

R. ESKANDARI¹, W. LUO², M. S. MOSLEHIAN³, Q. XU⁴ and H. ZHANG⁵

ABSTRACT. We introduce the notion of the separated pair of closed submodules in the setting of Hilbert C^* -modules. We demonstrate that even in the case of Hilbert spaces this concept has several nice characterizations enriching the theory of separated pairs of subspaces in Hilbert spaces. Let \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} be orthogonally complemented closed submodules of a Hilbert C^* -module \mathcal{E} . We establish that $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ is a separated pair in \mathcal{E} if and only if there are idempotents Π_1 and Π_2 such that $\Pi_1\Pi_2 = \Pi_2\Pi_1 = 0$ and $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1) = \mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{N}(\Pi_2) = \mathcal{K}$. We show that $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1 + \lambda\Pi_2)$ is closed for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ if and only if $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)$ is closed.

We use the localization of Hilbert C^* -modules to define the angle between closed submodules. We prove that if $(\mathcal{H}^\perp, \mathcal{K}^\perp)$ is concordant, then $(\mathcal{H}^{\perp\perp}, \mathcal{K}^{\perp\perp})$ is a separated pair if the cosine of this angle is less than one. We also present some surprising examples to illustrate our results.

1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout this paper, \mathcal{A} denotes a C^* -algebra. We denote by $S(\mathcal{A})$ and $PS(\mathcal{A})$ the set of states and the set of pure states on \mathcal{A} , respectively. We assume that \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{F} are Hilbert C^* -modules over \mathcal{A} . The set of all adjointable operators from \mathcal{E} into \mathcal{F} is represented by $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$, with the abbreviation $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$ if $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{F}$. When we deal with a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , we denote $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ by $\mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$. The identity of an algebra is denoted by I . We signify by $\mathcal{R}(T)$ and $\mathcal{N}(T)$ the range and nullity of an operator T , respectively. For more information about Hilbert C^* -modules and their geometry, see [11, 16, 19].

A submodule $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{E}$ is called *orthogonally complemented* in \mathcal{E} if $\mathcal{M} \oplus \mathcal{M}^\perp = \mathcal{E}$, where $\mathcal{M}^\perp = \{x \in \mathcal{E} : \langle x, y \rangle = 0, \text{ for all } y \in \mathcal{M}\}$. In this case \mathcal{M} is closed, and we use the notation $P_{\mathcal{M}}$ to denote the projection from \mathcal{E} onto \mathcal{M} . Unlike Hilbert spaces, a closed submodule is not necessarily orthogonally complemented. If $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ has closed range, then $\mathcal{R}(T)$ and $\mathcal{N}(T)$ are orthogonally complemented; see [16, Theorem 3.2].

In the framework of Hilbert spaces, given a bounded linear idempotent Π , let P and Q be the projections onto the range $\mathcal{R}(\Pi)$ and the null space $\mathcal{N}(\Pi)$ of Π ,

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 46L08, 46C05, 47A05, 47A30.

Key words and phrases. Separated pair; idempotent; Hilbert C^* -module; angle.

respectively. One research field is concerned with the relationships between Π , P , and Q , and some interesting results can be found in the literature; see [2, 4].

A subspace \mathcal{M} of Hilbert space \mathcal{E} is said to be an *operator range* if there is a bounded linear operator A such that $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{R}(A)$. The set \mathcal{L} of all operator ranges constitutes a lattice with respect to the vector addition and the set intersection. It is known that an operator range $\mathcal{R}(A)$ is complemented in the lattice \mathcal{L} (in the sense that there is an operator range $\mathcal{R}(B)$ such that $\mathcal{R}(A) \cap \mathcal{R}(B) = 0$ and $\mathcal{R}(A) + \mathcal{R}(B)$ is closed) if and only if $\mathcal{R}(A)$ is closed; see [10, Theorem 2.3]. In [8, Proposition 3.7], the nonclosedness of the sum of two disjoint operator ranges is studied.

It is clear that for any idempotent $\Pi \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$,

$$\mathcal{R}(\Pi) \cap \mathcal{R}(I - \Pi) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R}(\Pi) + \mathcal{R}(I - \Pi) = \mathcal{E}. \quad (1.1)$$

Motivated by this, we give the following key concept.

Definition 1.1. Let \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} be closed submodules of \mathcal{E} . Then we say that $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ is a *separated pair* if

$$\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{H} + \mathcal{K} \text{ is orthogonally complemented in } \mathcal{E}. \quad (1.2)$$

Lemma 1.2. (see [18, Proposition 4.6], [17, Remark 5.8], and [25, Theorem 1]) *Let $P, Q \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$ be projections. Then the following statements are all equivalent:*

- (i) $\mathcal{R}(P + Q)$ is closed in \mathcal{E} ;
- (ii) $\mathcal{R}(P) + \mathcal{R}(Q)$ is closed in \mathcal{E} ;
- (iii) $\mathcal{R}(I - P) + \mathcal{R}(I - Q)$ is closed in \mathcal{E} ;
- (iv) $\mathcal{R}(2I - P - Q)$ is closed in \mathcal{E} ;
- (v) For every complex numbers λ_1 and λ_2 , $\mathcal{R}(\lambda_1 P + \lambda_2 Q)$ is closed in \mathcal{E} .

In each case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(P) + \mathcal{R}(Q) &= \mathcal{R}(P + Q), \\ \mathcal{R}(I - P) + \mathcal{R}(I - Q) &= \mathcal{R}(2I - P - Q). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 1.3. Let \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} be orthogonally complemented closed submodules and let P and Q be projections onto \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} , respectively. It follows from [17, Lemma 2.3] that $\overline{\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{K}} = \overline{\mathcal{R}(P + Q)}$. Therefore, [16, Theorem 3.2] and Lemma 1.2 entail that for orthogonally complemented closed submodules (1.2) is equivalent to

$$\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{H} + \mathcal{K} \text{ is closed in } \mathcal{E}.$$

Note that for every idempotent Π on \mathcal{E} , the pair $(\mathcal{R}(\Pi), \mathcal{R}(I - \Pi))$ is always separated.

Our investigation of the separated pairs is also motivated by the Dixmier angle. Let \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} be two orthogonally complemented closed submodules of a Hilbert C^* -module \mathcal{E} . The *Dixmier angle (minimum angle)*, denoted by $\alpha_0(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$, is the unique angle in $[0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$ whose cosine is equal to $c_0(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$, where

$$c_0(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K}) = \sup \{ \|\langle x, y \rangle\| : x \in \mathcal{H}, y \in \mathcal{K}, \|x\| \leq 1, \|y\| \leq 1 \}. \quad (1.3)$$

As in the Hilbert space case (see [7, Lemma 2.10]), it can be shown that

$$c_0(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K}) = \|P_{\mathcal{H}}P_{\mathcal{K}}\|. \quad (1.4)$$

Hence, $\|P_{\mathcal{H}}P_{\mathcal{K}}\| < 1$ if and only if $\alpha_0(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K}) > 0$ and this occurs if and only if $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ is a separated pair as the following characterization of such separated pairs of submodules shows.

Lemma 1.4. [17, Lemma 5.10] *Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert module over the C^* -algebra \mathfrak{A} , and let $P, Q \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be projections. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) $\|PQ\| < 1$;
- (ii) $\mathcal{R}(P) \cap \mathcal{R}(Q) = 0$ and $\mathcal{R}(P) + \mathcal{R}(Q)$ is closed;
- (iii) $\mathcal{R}(I - P) + \mathcal{R}(I - Q) = \mathcal{H}$.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we focus on the study of a separated pair of orthogonally complemented closed submodules in terms of the associated idempotents. Our first result is Theorem 2.1, where two natural idempotents are constructed when a separated pair is given. The key point of this construction is the verification of the adjointability of these two idempotents. As an application, the Moore-Penrose invertibility of certain operators associated with a separated pair is clarified. Specifically, a generalization of [2, Theorem 3.8] is obtained; see Proposition 2.4 for the details. We also present an example showing that there is a separated pair $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ and idempotents Π_1, Π_2 with $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1) = \mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_2) = \mathcal{K}$ such that $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)$ is not closed. An alternative description of the idempotents constructed in the proof of Theorem 2.1 is given.

In Section 3, we generalize the Dixmier and Friedrichs angle between two closed submodules. Let \mathcal{E} be a Hilbert C^* -module over a C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} , and let \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} be closed submodules of \mathcal{E} . Denote by $S(\mathcal{A})$ the set of all states on \mathcal{A} . Following the constructions presented in [22], we associate to each $f \in S(\mathcal{A})$ a Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_f . The term of the concordant pair was introduced recently in [20, Definition 1.1] under the restriction that \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} are both orthogonally complemented in \mathcal{E} . In our Definition 3.4, such a restriction of orthogonal complementarity is no longer employed. A necessary and sufficient condition is provided in Theorem 3.5 under which the pair $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ is concordant. At the end of this section, the cosine of the Dixmier and Friedrichs angle between \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} is investigated. Finally, a sufficient

condition of the separated pair is provided in the last theorem of this section; see Theorem 3.14.

2. SEPARATED PAIR OF ORTHOGONALLY COMPLEMENTED SUBMODULES AND IDEMPOTENTS

We start this section with the following theorem in which we give some equivalent conditions to ensure that a pair of orthogonally complemented closed submodules is separated.

Theorem 2.1. *Let \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} be orthogonally complemented closed submodules of \mathcal{E} . The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ is a separated pair.
- (ii) There are idempotents Π_1 and Π_2 in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$ such that $\Pi_1\Pi_2 = \Pi_2\Pi_1 = 0$, $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1) = \mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_2) = \mathcal{K}$.
- (iii) There is an idempotent $\Pi \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$ such that $\mathcal{R}(\Pi) = \mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{N}(\Pi)$.

Proof. (i) \implies (ii). Suppose that $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ is separated. Define $\Pi_i : \mathcal{H} + \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ ($i = 1, 2$) by

$$\Pi_1(x + y) = x, \quad \Pi_2(x + y) = y \quad (x \in \mathcal{H}, y \in \mathcal{K}). \quad (2.1)$$

Since $\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K} = 0$, it is observed that Π_i ($i = 1, 2$) are well-defined. A simple use of the closed graph theorem shows that Π_1 and Π_2 are both bounded.

Let Π_1 be extended to a bounded linear operator on \mathcal{E} (denoted still by Π_1) by putting $\Pi_1 z = 0$ for all $z \in (\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{K})^\perp$. Then

$$\Pi_1^2(x + y + z) = \Pi_1(x) = x = \Pi_1(x + y + z),$$

where $x \in \mathcal{H}, y \in \mathcal{K}$ and $z \in (\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{K})^\perp$. This shows that $\Pi_1^2 = \Pi_1$, $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1) = \mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{N}(\Pi_1)$.

Next, we show that $\Pi_1 \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$. For this, we prove that \mathcal{E} is the direct sum of \mathcal{H}^\perp and $\mathcal{K}^\perp \cap (\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{K})$

Indeed, since $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ is separated, by Lemma 1.4 we have $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{H}^\perp + \mathcal{K}^\perp$. So, for every $x \in \mathcal{E}$, there exist $x_1 \in \mathcal{H}^\perp$ and $x_2 \in \mathcal{K}^\perp$ such that $x = x_1 + x_2$. Let $x_2 = z + z'$, where $z \in \mathcal{H} + \mathcal{K}$ and $z' \in (\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{K})^\perp$. Then $z = x_2 - z' \in \mathcal{K}^\perp + (\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{K})^\perp = \mathcal{K}^\perp$, hence $z \in \mathcal{K}^\perp \cap (\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{K})$. It follows that

$$x = x_1 + x_2 = (x_1 + z') + z \in \mathcal{H}^\perp + [\mathcal{K}^\perp \cap (\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{K})].$$

Hence,

$$\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{H}^\perp + [\mathcal{K}^\perp \cap (\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{K})].$$

Furthermore, it is easy to verify

$$\mathcal{H}^\perp \cap [\mathcal{K}^\perp \cap (\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{K})] = 0.$$

Now, we define unambiguously an operator $D : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ by

$$D(x + y) = y$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{H}^\perp$ and $y \in \mathcal{K}^\perp \cap (\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{K})$. For every such x and y , together with $h \in \mathcal{H}$, $k \in \mathcal{K}$ and $z \in (\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{K})^\perp$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Pi_1(h + k + z), x + y \rangle &= \langle h, x + y \rangle = \langle h, y \rangle = \langle h + k + z, y \rangle \\ &= \langle h + k + z, D(x + y) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\Pi_1 \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$ and $\Pi_1^* = D$.

The operator Π_2 , defined by (2.1), can be extended to an idempotent in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$ such that $\Pi_1\Pi_2 = \Pi_2\Pi_1 = 0$, $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1) = \mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_2) = \mathcal{K}$.

(ii) \implies (iii) It can be derived immediately if we put $\Pi = \Pi_1$.

(iii) \implies (i). Let $\Pi \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$ be an idempotent satisfying $\mathcal{R}(\Pi) = \mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{N}(\Pi)$. Then $\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K} = 0$, since

$$\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\Pi) \cap \mathcal{N}(\Pi) = 0.$$

Now let $\{x_n\}$ and $\{y_n\}$ be sequences in \mathcal{E} such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\Pi x_n + P_{\mathcal{K}} y_n) = z. \quad (2.2)$$

Then

$$\Pi x_n = \Pi(\Pi x_n + P_{\mathcal{K}} y_n) \rightarrow \Pi z. \quad (2.3)$$

Employing (2.2) and (2.3), we see that there is $y \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{\mathcal{K}} y_n = P_{\mathcal{K}} y$. Hence, $z = \Pi z + P_{\mathcal{K}} y$. This shows that $\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{K}$ is closed. Thus $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ is a separated pair. \square

Corollary 2.2. *Let \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} be orthogonally complemented closed submodules of \mathcal{E} . The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ is a separated pair.
- (ii) There exist constants $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 > 0$ such that

$$|x + y| \geq \alpha_1|x| \text{ and } |x + y| \geq \alpha_2|y| \quad (x \in \mathcal{H}, y \in \mathcal{K}).$$

- (iii) There exist constants $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 > 0$ such that

$$\|x + y\| \geq \alpha_1\|x\| \text{ and } \|x + y\| \geq \alpha_2\|y\| \quad (x \in \mathcal{H}, y \in \mathcal{K}). \quad (2.4)$$

Proof. (i) \implies (ii). For $i = 1, 2$, let Π_i be as in the proof of the preceding theorem, and let $\alpha_i = \|\Pi_i\|$. From (2.1), we see that for every $x \in \mathcal{H}$ and $y \in \mathcal{K}$,

$$\langle x, x \rangle = \langle \Pi_1(x + y), \Pi_1(x + y) \rangle = \langle \Pi_1^* \Pi_1(x + y), x + y \rangle \leq \alpha_1^2 \langle x + y, x + y \rangle.$$

Hence,

$$|x| = \langle x, x \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \alpha_1 \langle x + y, x + y \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} = \alpha_1 |x + y|.$$

Similarly, $|y| \leq \alpha_2 |x + y|$.

(ii) \implies (iii). It follows from

$$a, b \in \mathcal{A}, a \geq b > 0 \Rightarrow \|a\| \geq \|b\|.$$

(iii) \implies (i). Suppose that (2.4) is valid. It is easy to see that $\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{K}$ is closed and $\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K} = 0$. Hence by Remark 1.3, $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ is separated. \square

Given two arbitrary idempotents Π_1 and Π_2 on a Hilbert space, it is shown in [9] that the invertibility of the linear combination $\lambda_1\Pi_1 + \lambda_2\Pi_2$ is independent of the choice of $\lambda_i, i = 1, 2$, if $\lambda_1\lambda_2 \neq 0$ and $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \neq 0$. Such a result can be generalized as follows.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ be a separated pair of orthogonally complemented submodules of \mathcal{E} . Let Π_1 and Π_2 be idempotents in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$ such that $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1) = \mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_2) = \mathcal{K}$. Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (i) $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1 + \lambda\Pi_2)$ is closed in \mathcal{E} for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$;
- (ii) $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1 + \lambda\Pi_2)$ is closed in \mathcal{E} for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$;
- (iii) $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)$ is closed in \mathcal{E} .

Proof. (i) \implies (ii). It is clear.

(ii) \implies (iii). Suppose that $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1 + \lambda\Pi_2)$ is closed for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$. Let $x \in \overline{\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1) + \mathcal{R}(\Pi_2)} = \mathcal{R}(\Pi_1) + \mathcal{R}(\Pi_2)$. Then there exist a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in \mathcal{E} and $z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{E}$ such that

$$x = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)x_n = \Pi_1 z_1 + \Pi_2 z_2. \quad (2.5)$$

Since the pair $(\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1), \mathcal{R}(\Pi_2))$ is separated, it follows from Corollary (2.2) that

$$\|\Pi_1(x_n - z_1) + \Pi_2(x_n - z_2)\| \geq \alpha \|\Pi_2(x_n - z_2)\|$$

for some $\alpha > 0$. Hence

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pi_1 x_n = \Pi_1 z_1, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pi_2 x_n = \Pi_2 z_2, \quad (2.6)$$

which gives

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\Pi_1 + \lambda\Pi_2)x_n = \Pi_1 z_1 + \lambda\Pi_2 z_2.$$

Consequently,

$$\Pi_1 z_1 + \lambda\Pi_2 z_2 = (\Pi_1 + \lambda\Pi_2)z_0 \quad (2.7)$$

for some $z_0 \in \mathcal{R}(\Pi_1)$, since $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1 + \lambda\Pi_2)$ is assumed to be closed. Therefore,

$$\Pi_1(z_1 - z_0) = \Pi_2(\lambda(z_0 - z_2)) \in \mathcal{R}(\Pi_1) \cap \mathcal{R}(\Pi_2) = 0.$$

Substituting $\Pi_1 z_1 = \Pi_1 z_0$ in (2.7) yields $\lambda\Pi_2 z_2 = \lambda\Pi_2 z_0$, which in turn gives $\Pi_2 z_2 = \Pi_2 z_0$, since $\lambda \neq 0$. It follows from (2.5) that $x = (\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)z_0$. This shows the closedness of $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)$.

(iii) \implies (i). The case of $\lambda = 0$ is trivial. Suppose that $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)$ is closed. Let

$\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ be arbitrary. If $x \in \overline{\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1 + \lambda\Pi_2)} \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\Pi_1) + \mathcal{R}(\Pi_2)$, then there exists a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_2)$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\Pi_1 + \lambda\Pi_2)x_n = x = \Pi_1 z_1 + \Pi_2 z_2 \quad (2.8)$$

for some $z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{E}$. Since $(\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1), \mathcal{R}(\Pi_2))$ is separated, by the same as reasoning in getting (2.6), we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pi_1 x_n = \Pi_1 z_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda\Pi_2 x_n = \Pi_2 z_2.$$

As a result,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)x_n = \Pi_1 z_1 + \Pi_2 \left(\frac{z_2}{\lambda}\right) = (\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)z_0$$

for some $z_0 \in \mathcal{E}$. Therefore, $\Pi_1 z_1 = \Pi_1 z_0$ and $\Pi_2 z_2 = \lambda\Pi_2(z_0)$, since $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1) \cap \mathcal{R}(\Pi_2) = 0$. It follows from (2.8) that $x = (\Pi_1 + \lambda\Pi_2)(z_0) \in \mathcal{R}(\Pi_1 + \lambda\Pi_2)$. Hence, $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1 + \lambda\Pi_2)$ is closed. \square

As an application of Theorem 2.3, we introduce the formulas for the Moore–Penrose inverse associated with a separated pair. We recall some basic knowledge about the Moore–Penrose inverse of an operator. Suppose that $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$. The *Moore–Penrose inverse* of T , denoted by T^\dagger , is the unique element $X \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{H})$ satisfying

$$TXT = T, \quad XTX = X, \quad (TX)^* = TX, \quad \text{and} \quad (XT)^* = XT. \quad (2.9)$$

If such an operator T^\dagger exists, then T is said to be *Moore–Penrose invertible*. It is known that T is Moore–Penrose invertible if and only if $\mathcal{R}(T)$ is closed in \mathcal{K} [26, Theorem 2.2], and in this case, we have

$$\mathcal{R}(T^\dagger) = \mathcal{R}(T^*) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{N}(T^\dagger) = \mathcal{N}(T^*). \quad (2.10)$$

In the next result, we give a formula for the Moore–Penrose inverse of operators associated with a separated pair of submodules.

Proposition 2.4. *Let $\Pi_1, \Pi_2 \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$ be idempotents satisfying $\Pi_1\Pi_2 = \Pi_2\Pi_1 = 0$. Then*

$$(\Pi_1 + \lambda\Pi_2)^\dagger = (\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)^\dagger \left(\Pi_1 + \frac{1}{\lambda}\Pi_2 \right) (\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)^\dagger \quad (2.11)$$

for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$.

Proof. Due to $\Pi_1\Pi_2 = \Pi_2\Pi_1 = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)\Pi_1 &= \Pi_1, & (\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)\Pi_2 &= \Pi_2, \\ (\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)^*\Pi_1^* &= \Pi_1^*, & (\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)^*\Pi_2^* &= \Pi_2^*. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1 + \Pi_2) = \mathcal{R}(\Pi_1) + \mathcal{R}(\Pi_2)$ (hence $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)$ is closed), and for $i = 1, 2$,

$$(\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)(\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)^\dagger \Pi_i = \Pi_i \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi_i(\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)^\dagger(\Pi_1 + \Pi_2) = \Pi_i, \quad (2.12)$$

which yield

$$\Pi_i = \Pi_i \cdot \Pi_i = \Pi_i(\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)(\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)^\dagger \Pi_i = \Pi_i(\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)^\dagger \Pi_i.$$

Hence

$$\Pi_1(\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)^\dagger \Pi_1 = \Pi_1, \quad \Pi_2(\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)^\dagger \Pi_2 = \Pi_2. \quad (2.13)$$

It follows from Theorem 2.3 that $(\Pi_1 + \lambda\Pi_2)^\dagger$ exists.

Now let

$$X = (\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)^\dagger \left(\Pi_1 + \frac{1}{\lambda}\Pi_2 \right) (\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)^\dagger.$$

For simplicity, we put

$$\tilde{P} = (\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)(\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)^\dagger, \quad \tilde{Q} = (\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)^\dagger(\Pi_1 + \Pi_2).$$

Then both \tilde{P} and \tilde{Q} are projections. In view of (2.12) and (2.13), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\Pi_1 + \lambda\Pi_2)X &= [(\Pi_1 + \Pi_2) + (\lambda - 1)\Pi_2](\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)^\dagger \\ &\quad \cdot \left[(\Pi_1 + \Pi_2) + \frac{1 - \lambda}{\lambda}\Pi_2 \right] (\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)^\dagger \\ &= \left[\tilde{P} + (\lambda - 1)\Pi_2(\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)^\dagger \right] \left[\tilde{P} + \frac{1 - \lambda}{\lambda}\Pi_2(\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)^\dagger \right] \\ &= \tilde{P} + \left[\lambda - 1 + \frac{1 - \lambda}{\lambda} - \frac{(1 - \lambda)^2}{\lambda} \right] \Pi_2(\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)^\dagger = \tilde{P}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $(\Pi_1 + \lambda\Pi_2)X$ is self-adjoint and

$$(\Pi_1 + \lambda\Pi_2)X(\Pi_1 + \lambda\Pi_2) = \tilde{P}\Pi_1 + \lambda\tilde{P}\Pi_2 = \Pi_1 + \lambda\Pi_2.$$

Similarly,

$$X(\Pi_1 + \lambda\Pi_2) = \tilde{Q},$$

$X(\Pi_1 + \lambda\Pi_2)$ is self-adjoint, and $X(\Pi_1 + \lambda\Pi_2)X = \tilde{Q}X = X$. Thus, the four conditions stated in (2.9) are satisfied for $\Pi_1 + \lambda\Pi_2$ and X . \square

Remark 2.5. The group inverse case of formula (2.11) was stated in [2, Theorem 3.8] under the condition that $\Pi_1 = P_{\mathcal{R}(F)}$ and $\Pi_2 = P_{\mathcal{N}(F)}$, where F is an idempotent on a Hilbert space.

The following example shows that there are idempotents Π_1 and Π_2 such that the pair $(\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1), \mathcal{R}(\Pi_2))$ is separated but $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)$ is not closed.

Example 2.6. Let \mathcal{K} be a separable Hilbert space and let $\{e_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be its usual orthonormal basis. Let U be the unilateral shift given by $Ue_i = e_{i+1}$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Define $T \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{K})$ by

$$Te_i = \frac{2}{i}e_i \quad (i \geq 1).$$

Put $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{K} \oplus \mathcal{K}$ and set

$$\Pi_1 = \begin{pmatrix} I & -T \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Pi_2 = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ U & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

A simple computation shows that both Π_1 and Π_2 are idempotents in $\mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1) \cap \mathcal{R}(\Pi_2) = 0$. Note that $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1) = \overline{\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1)} = \overline{\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1\Pi_1^*)} = \mathcal{K} \oplus 0$ and that $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_2) = \overline{\{x \oplus Ux : x \in \mathcal{K}\}}$, so we have

$$\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1) + \mathcal{R}(\Pi_2) = \mathcal{K} \oplus \mathcal{R}(U),$$

which is obviously closed in \mathcal{H} . Thus, $(\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1), \mathcal{R}(\Pi_2))$ is a separated pair of subspaces in \mathcal{H} .

We claim that $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)$ is not closed. To see this, let

$$x_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{i}e_i, \quad y_n = \sum_{i=1}^n e_i$$

for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$(\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)(x_n \oplus y_n) = 0 \oplus Ux_n \rightarrow 0 \oplus \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i}e_{i+1} := 0 \oplus \xi.$$

We claim that $0 \oplus \xi \notin \mathcal{R}(\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)$. In fact, if there exist $x = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \alpha_i e_i, y = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \beta_i e_i \in \mathcal{K}$ such that $(\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)(x \oplus y) = 0 \oplus \xi$, then

$$2x - Ty = 0, \quad Ux = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \alpha_i e_{i+1} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i}e_{i+1}.$$

It follows that $\alpha_i = \frac{1}{i}$ and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{2\beta_i}{i}e_i = Ty = 2x = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{2}{i}e_i.$$

Hence $\beta_i = 1$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, which is a contradiction since $\|y\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |\beta_i|^2 < \infty$. Thus, $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1 + \Pi_2)$ is not closed.

The following example shows that the separated condition in Theorem 2.3 is necessary.

Example 2.7. Let $\mathcal{A} = C[0, 1]$ be the C^* -algebra of all continuous complex-valued functions on $[0, 1]$. Let $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{A} \oplus \mathcal{A}$. Let $g \in \mathcal{A}$ be defined by $g(\lambda) = \lambda$ for all $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. Let T and S be an idempotent operators in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$ defined as follows:

$$T \begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ f_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ gf_1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad S \begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ f_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ -gf_1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is easy to verify that $\mathcal{R}(S) \cap \mathcal{R}(T) = \{0\}$. If we define $f_n \in \mathcal{A}$ by

$$f_n(\lambda) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\lambda}, & \frac{1}{n} \leq \lambda \leq 1, \\ n, & \lambda \leq \frac{1}{n}, \end{cases}$$

then $(T-S) \begin{pmatrix} f_n \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = T \begin{pmatrix} f_n \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + S \begin{pmatrix} -f_n \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ tends to $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix} \notin \mathcal{R}(T) + \mathcal{R}(S) \supseteq \mathcal{R}(T-S)$. This shows that $(\mathcal{R}(T), \mathcal{R}(S))$ is not a separated pair of submodules and $\mathcal{R}(T-S)$ is not closed. It is easy to see that $\mathcal{R}(T+S) = \mathcal{A} \oplus 0$.

Let $\Pi \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$ be an idempotent, and let P and Q be projections from \mathcal{E} onto $\mathcal{R}(\Pi)$ and $\mathcal{N}(\Pi)$, respectively. By Lemma 1.4 we have $\|PQ\| < 1$, and it is shown in [15, Theorem 1.3] that

$$\Pi = (I - PQ)^{-1}P(I - PQ).$$

Inspired by the above observation, we give an alternative description of the idempotents Π_1 and Π_2 constructed in the proof of Theorem 2.1.

Lemma 2.8. *Let $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ be a separated pair of orthogonally complemented closed submodules of \mathcal{E} . Let*

$$\Pi_{P,Q} = (I - PQ)^{-1}P(I - PQ) \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi_{Q,P} = (I - QP)^{-1}Q(I - QP), \quad (2.14)$$

where P and Q are the projections from \mathcal{E} on \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} , respectively. Then $\Pi_{P,Q}$ and $\Pi_{Q,P}$ are idempotents such that

$$\mathcal{R}(\Pi_{P,Q}) = \mathcal{R}(P), \quad \mathcal{N}(\Pi_{P,Q}) = \mathcal{R}(Q) + \mathcal{N}(P) \cap \mathcal{N}(Q), \quad (2.15)$$

$$\mathcal{R}(\Pi_{Q,P}) = \mathcal{R}(Q), \quad \mathcal{N}(\Pi_{Q,P}) = \mathcal{R}(P) + \mathcal{N}(P) \cap \mathcal{N}(Q). \quad (2.16)$$

Proof. It follows from Lemma 1.4 that

$$\|QP\| = \|PQ\| < 1,$$

so $I - PQ$ and $I - QP$ are both invertible. Evidently, both $\Pi_{P,Q}$ and $\Pi_{Q,P}$ are idempotents.

It is obvious that $(I - PQ)^{-1}P = P(I - QP)^{-1}$, which gives $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_{P,Q}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(P)$. Also, by (2.14), we have

$$\Pi_{P,Q}P = (I - PQ)^{-1}(P - PQP) = (I - PQ)^{-1}(I - PQ)P = P, \quad (2.17)$$

and therefore $\mathcal{R}(P) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\Pi_{P,Q})$. This shows that $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_{P,Q}) = \mathcal{R}(P)$.

The idempotent $\Pi_{P,Q}$ can be rewritten as

$$\Pi_{P,Q} = (I - PQ)^{-1}P(I - Q),$$

which gives $\mathcal{R}(Q) \subseteq \mathcal{N}(\Pi_{P,Q})$. Furthermore, the equation above indicates that for every $u \in \mathcal{N}(Q)$, we have $u \in \mathcal{N}(\Pi_{P,Q})$ if and only if $u \in \mathcal{N}(P)$. This completes the proof of the second equality in (2.15). Clearly, the equations in (2.16) can be derived directly from (2.15) by exchanging P with Q . \square

Lemma 2.9. [24, Lemma 3.1] *Let $\Pi_1, \Pi_2 \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$ be idempotents. If $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_2) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\Pi_1)$ and $\mathcal{N}(\Pi_2) \subseteq \mathcal{N}(\Pi_1)$, then $\Pi_1 = \Pi_2$.*

Theorem 2.10. *Suppose that $P, Q \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$ are projections such that $(\mathcal{R}(P), \mathcal{R}(Q))$ is separated. Let Π_1 and Π_2 be idempotents such that $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_1) = \mathcal{R}(P)$ and $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_2) = \mathcal{R}(Q)$, respectively. Let \tilde{P} be the projection from \mathcal{E} onto $\mathcal{R}(P) + \mathcal{R}(Q)$. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) $\Pi_1 + \Pi_2 = \tilde{P}$;
- (ii) $\Pi_{P,Q} = \Pi_1$ and $\Pi_{Q,P} = \Pi_2$.

Proof. Note that by (2.15), we have $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_{P,Q}) = \mathcal{R}(P) = \mathcal{R}(\Pi_1)$ and

$$\mathcal{N}(\Pi_{P,Q}) = \mathcal{R}(\Pi_2) + \mathcal{N}(P) \cap \mathcal{N}(Q).$$

Therefore, by Lemma 2.9, we observe that $\Pi_{P,Q} = \Pi_1$ if and only if

$$\mathcal{N}(\Pi_1) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\Pi_2) + \mathcal{N}(P) \cap \mathcal{N}(Q). \quad (2.18)$$

In a similar way, we conclude that $\Pi_{Q,P} = \Pi_2$ if and only if

$$\mathcal{N}(\Pi_2) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\Pi_1) + \mathcal{N}(P) \cap \mathcal{N}(Q). \quad (2.19)$$

(i) \implies (ii). Suppose that $\Pi_1 + \Pi_2 = \tilde{P}$. Then we have

$$\mathcal{N}(\Pi_1) = \mathcal{N}(\tilde{P} - \Pi_2) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\Pi_2) + \mathcal{N}(P) \cap \mathcal{N}(Q),$$

$$\mathcal{N}(\Pi_2) = \mathcal{N}(\tilde{P} - \Pi_1) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\Pi_1) + \mathcal{N}(P) \cap \mathcal{N}(Q),$$

which indicate the validity of (2.18) and (2.19), and therefore, we have $\Pi_{P,Q} = \Pi_1$ and $\Pi_{Q,P} = \Pi_2$.

(ii) \implies (i). We show that $\Pi_{P,Q} + \Pi_{Q,P} = \tilde{P}$. As a matter of fact, by a straightforward calculation as in (2.17), we have

$$\Pi_{P,Q}P = P, \quad \Pi_{Q,P}Q = Q, \quad \Pi_{P,Q}Q = 0 = \Pi_{Q,P}P.$$

Thus

$$(\Pi_{P,Q} + \Pi_{Q,P})(Px + Qy) = Px + Qy \quad (2.20)$$

for each $x, y \in \mathcal{E}$. Moreover,

$$(\Pi_{P,Q} + \Pi_{Q,P})z = 0, \quad (z \in \mathcal{N}(P) \cap \mathcal{N}(Q)). \quad (2.21)$$

Since $\mathcal{R}(P) + \mathcal{R}(Q)$ is orthogonally complemented, employing (2.20) and (2.21) we get the desired result. \square

3. CONCORDANT PAIRS OF CLOSED SUBMODULES IN TERMS OF THE STATES

For a positive linear functional f on \mathcal{A} , we set

$$\mathcal{N}_f = \{x \in \mathcal{E} : f(\langle x, x \rangle) = 0\}.$$

It follows from the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality that

$$\mathcal{N}_f = \{x \in \mathcal{E} : f(\langle y, x \rangle) = f(\langle x, y \rangle) = 0, \text{ for all } y \in \mathcal{E}\}.$$

Therefore, \mathcal{N}_f is a closed subspace of \mathcal{E} , and the quotient space $\mathcal{E}/\mathcal{N}_f$ is a pre-Hilbert space equipped with the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_f$ defined by

$$\langle x + \mathcal{N}_f, y + \mathcal{N}_f \rangle_f = f(\langle x, y \rangle).$$

Let \mathcal{E}_f be the completion of $\mathcal{E}/\mathcal{N}_f$. Let $\iota_f : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_f$ be the natural map, that is, $\iota_f(x) = x + \mathcal{N}_f$. If \mathcal{H} is a closed submodule of \mathcal{E} , then we consider \mathcal{H}_f as the closure of $\iota_f(\mathcal{H}) = \{x + \mathcal{N}_f : x \in \mathcal{H}\}$. That is, $\mathcal{H}_f = \overline{\{x + \mathcal{N}_f : x \in \mathcal{H}\}}$, see [22] for more information. We have the following Theorem.

Theorem 3.1. [13, Theorem 3.1] *Let $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{E}$ be a closed convex subset of the Hilbert C^* -module \mathcal{E} over \mathcal{A} . For each vector $x_0 \in \mathcal{E} \setminus \mathcal{L}$ there exists a state f on \mathcal{A} such that $\iota_f(x_0)$ is not in the closure of $\iota_f(\mathcal{L})$. In particular, there exists a state f such that $\iota_f(\mathcal{L})$ is not dense in \mathcal{E}_f and thus, when \mathcal{L} is a submodule, $\iota_f(\mathcal{L})^\perp \neq 0$.*

The above theorem, [23, Corollary 1.17] and the paragraph after [20, Proposition 1.6], point out the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *Let \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} be closed submodules of \mathcal{E} . Then $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{K}$ if and only if $\mathcal{H}_f = \mathcal{K}_f$ for each $f \in \mathbf{S}(\mathcal{A})$, if and only if $\mathcal{H}_f = \mathcal{K}_f$ for each $f \in \mathbf{PS}(\mathcal{A})$.*

Employing Theorem 3.1 and [14, Theorem 2.1] to get equivalences for orthogonally complemented submodules, see also [20, Proposition 1.6].

Proposition 3.3. *Let \mathcal{H} be a closed submodule of \mathcal{E} . Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) \mathcal{H} is orthogonally complemented in \mathcal{E} .
- (ii) $(\mathcal{H}_f)^\perp = (\mathcal{H}^\perp)_f$ for each $f \in \mathbf{S}(\mathcal{A})$.
- (iii) $(\mathcal{H}_f)^\perp = (\mathcal{H}^\perp)_f$ for each $f \in \mathbf{PS}(\mathcal{A})$.

Definition 3.4. The pair $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ of closed submodules of \mathcal{E} is said to be *concordant* if $\overline{\mathcal{H}^\perp + \mathcal{K}^\perp}$ is orthogonally complemented in \mathcal{E} , that is, \mathcal{E} can be decomposed orthogonally as

$$\mathcal{E} = (\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K}) \oplus \overline{\mathcal{H}^\perp + \mathcal{K}^\perp}. \quad (3.1)$$

Theorem 3.5. Let \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} be closed submodules of \mathcal{E} . Then the following statements are equivalent:

- (i) The pair $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ is concordant.
- (ii) For every $f \in S(\mathcal{A})$,

$$(\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K})_f = ((\mathcal{H}^\perp)_f)^\perp \cap ((\mathcal{K}^\perp)_f)^\perp. \quad (3.2)$$

- (iii) For every $f \in PS(\mathcal{A})$,

$$(\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K})_f = ((\mathcal{H}^\perp)_f)^\perp \cap ((\mathcal{K}^\perp)_f)^\perp. \quad (3.3)$$

Proof. (i) \implies (ii). Suppose that $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ is concordant. Given $f \in S(\mathcal{A})$, let $X \subseteq \mathcal{E}/\mathcal{N}_f$, $Y \subseteq \mathcal{E}$ and $Z \subseteq \mathcal{E}_f$ be defined respectively by

$$X = \{x + \mathcal{N}_f : x \in \mathcal{H}^\perp + \mathcal{K}^\perp\}, \quad Y = \overline{\mathcal{H}^\perp + \mathcal{K}^\perp}, \quad Z = ((\mathcal{H}^\perp)_f)^\perp \cap ((\mathcal{K}^\perp)_f)^\perp.$$

It is clear that

$$Y^\perp = \mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K}, \quad Y_f = \overline{X} \quad \text{and} \quad X^\perp = Z. \quad (3.4)$$

Making a use of Theorem 3.3 to Y , we get

$$(\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K})_f = (Y^\perp)_f = (Y_f)^\perp = \overline{X}^\perp = X^\perp = Z$$

in the Hilbert space \mathcal{E}_f . This shows the validity of (3.2).

(ii) \implies (iii). It is clear.

(iii) \implies (i). Given $f \in PS(\mathcal{A})$, let X , Y and Z be defined as above. Then

$$[(\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K})_f]^\perp = Z^\perp = \overline{X} = Y_f \subseteq [(\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K})^\perp]_f \subseteq [(\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K})_f]^\perp, \quad (3.5)$$

which gives

$$[(\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K})_f]^\perp = [(\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K})^\perp]_f.$$

From Theorem 3.3 we conclude that $\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K}$ is orthogonally complemented in \mathcal{E} . Furthermore, from (3.5) we obtain

$$Y_f = [(\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K})^\perp]_f, \quad (f \in PS(\mathcal{A})),$$

whence, by Lemma 3.2, $Y = (\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K})^\perp$. \square

It is remarkable if the pair $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ of closed submodules of \mathcal{E} is concordant, then (3.2) gives

$$\mathcal{H}_f \cap \mathcal{K}_f \subseteq ((\mathcal{H}^\perp)_f)^\perp \cap ((\mathcal{K}^\perp)_f)^\perp = (\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K})_f \subseteq \mathcal{H}_f \cap \mathcal{K}_f.$$

This is a corollary as follows:

Corollary 3.6. *Let the pair $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ of closed submodules of \mathcal{E} be concordant. Then*

$$(\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K})_f = \mathcal{H}_f \cap \mathcal{K}_f \quad (f \in S(\mathcal{A})).$$

The following example shows that the reverse of Corollary 3.6 is not valid.

Example 3.7. Let $\mathcal{A} = C[0, 1]$ and $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{A}$. Let \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} be closed submodules of \mathcal{E} defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{H} = \{\tau \in \mathcal{A} : \tau(0) = 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{K} = \{\tau \in \mathcal{A} : \tau(1) = 0\}.$$

Then

$$\mathcal{H}^\perp = \mathcal{K}^\perp = \{0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K} = \{\tau \in \mathcal{A} : \tau(0) = \tau(1) = 0\}.$$

Hence $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ is not concordant. Let f be an arbitrary pure state on \mathcal{A} . Then there exists $t_0 \in [0, 1]$ such that $f(\tau) = \tau(t_0)$ for all $\tau \in \mathcal{A}$. It is easy to check that $(\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K})_f = \mathcal{H}_f \cap \mathcal{K}_f$.

Let \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} be closed submodules of \mathcal{E} . As in the Hilbert space case, we define the cosine of the Friedrichs angle between \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} by

$$c(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K}) = \sup\{\|\langle x, y \rangle\| : \|x\| = \|y\| = 1, x \in \mathcal{H} \cap (\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K})^\perp, y \in \mathcal{K} \cap (\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K})^\perp\} \quad (3.6)$$

Let \mathcal{H} , \mathcal{K} , and $\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K}$ be orthogonally complemented in \mathcal{E} . Then in [17], $c(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ is formulated by

$$c(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K}) = \|P_{\mathcal{H}} P_{\mathcal{K}} (I - P_{\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K}})\| = \|P_{\mathcal{H}} P_{\mathcal{K}} - P_{\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K}}\|. \quad (3.7)$$

Definition 3.8. Let \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} be closed submodules of \mathcal{E} . We define the *cosine of the local Friedrichs angle* between \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} by

$$\alpha(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K}) := \sup_{f \in S(\mathcal{A})} c(\mathcal{H}_f, \mathcal{K}_f).$$

Also, we define the *cosine of the local Dixmier angle* between \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} by

$$\alpha_0(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K}) := \sup_{f \in S(\mathcal{A})} c_0(\mathcal{H}_f, \mathcal{K}_f).$$

Remark 3.9. Let \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} be orthogonally complemented submodules of \mathcal{E} such that $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ is concordant. It follows from [20, Corollary 3.4] that

$$\alpha(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K}) = c(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K}),$$

Theorem 3.10. *Let \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} be closed submodules of \mathcal{E} such that $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ is concordant and let $\overline{\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{K}}$ be an orthogonally complemented submodule. Then*

$$\alpha(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K}) = \alpha(\mathcal{H}^\perp, \mathcal{K}^\perp),$$

Proof. Since $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ is concordant, Theorems 3.5 and Corollary 3.6 ensure that

$$((\mathcal{H}^\perp)_f)^\perp \cap ((\mathcal{K}^\perp)_f)^\perp = (\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K})_f = \mathcal{H}_f \cap \mathcal{K}_f, \quad (f \in \mathbb{S}(\mathcal{A})).$$

It follows from [7, Lemma 10, Theorem 16] that for every $f \in \mathbb{S}(\mathcal{A})$,

$$\begin{aligned} c((\mathcal{H}^\perp)_f, (\mathcal{K}^\perp)_f) &= c((\mathcal{H}^\perp)_f^\perp, (\mathcal{K}^\perp)_f^\perp) \\ &= \|P_{(\mathcal{H}^\perp)_f^\perp} P_{(\mathcal{K}^\perp)_f^\perp} - P_{(\mathcal{H}^\perp)_f^\perp \cap (\mathcal{K}^\perp)_f^\perp}\| \\ &= \|P_{(\mathcal{H}^\perp)_f^\perp} P_{(\mathcal{K}^\perp)_f^\perp} - P_{\mathcal{H}_f \cap \mathcal{K}_f}\| \\ &= \|P_{(\mathcal{H}^\perp)_f^\perp} P_{(\mathcal{K}^\perp)_f^\perp} P_{(\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K})_f^\perp}\| \\ &\geq \|P_{\mathcal{H}_f} P_{(\mathcal{K}^\perp)_f^\perp} P_{(\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K})_f^\perp}\| \quad (\text{since } P_{(\mathcal{H}^\perp)_f^\perp} \geq P_{\mathcal{H}_f}) \\ &= \|P_{\mathcal{H}_f} P_{(\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K})_f^\perp} P_{(\mathcal{K}^\perp)_f^\perp}\| \\ &\geq \|P_{\mathcal{H}_f} P_{(\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K})_f^\perp} P_{\mathcal{K}_f}\| = \|P_{\mathcal{H}_f} P_{\mathcal{K}_f} P_{(\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K})_f^\perp}\| = c(\mathcal{H}_f, \mathcal{K}_f), \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$c((\mathcal{H}^\perp)_f, (\mathcal{K}^\perp)_f) \geq c(\mathcal{H}_f, \mathcal{K}_f) \quad (f \in \mathbb{S}(\mathcal{A})). \quad (3.8)$$

Therefore,

$$\alpha(\mathcal{H}^\perp, \mathcal{K}^\perp) \geq \alpha(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K}). \quad (3.9)$$

Since $\overline{(\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{K})} \oplus (\mathcal{H}^\perp \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp) = \mathcal{E}$, we have $\overline{(\mathcal{H}^{\perp\perp} + \mathcal{K}^{\perp\perp})} \oplus (\mathcal{H}^\perp \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp) = \mathcal{E}$. This entails that $(\mathcal{H}^\perp, \mathcal{K}^\perp)$ is concordant. Hence,

$$(\mathcal{H}^\perp)_f \cap (\mathcal{K}^\perp)_f = (\mathcal{H}^\perp \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp)_f = ((\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{K})^\perp)_f = ((\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{K})_f)^\perp = \mathcal{H}_f^\perp \cap \mathcal{K}_f^\perp, \quad (3.10)$$

for each state f on \mathcal{A} . Now, if we set $H_f = (\mathcal{H}^\perp)_f \cap ((\mathcal{H}^\perp)_f \cap (\mathcal{K}^\perp)_f)^\perp$, then we have

$$H_f \subseteq (\mathcal{H}_f)^\perp \cap ((\mathcal{H}^\perp)_f \cap (\mathcal{K}^\perp)_f)^\perp := H'_f.$$

By the same reasoning, $K_f \subseteq K'_f$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} c((\mathcal{H}^\perp)_f, (\mathcal{K}^\perp)_f) &= \sup\{\|\langle \tilde{u}, \tilde{v} \rangle\|; \tilde{u} \in H_f, \|\tilde{u}\| \leq 1, \tilde{v} \in K_f, \|\tilde{v}\| \leq 1\} \\ &\leq \sup\{\|\langle \tilde{u}, \tilde{v} \rangle\|; \tilde{u} \in H'_f, \|\tilde{u}\| \leq 1, \tilde{v} \in K'_f, \|\tilde{v}\| \leq 1\} \\ &= c(\mathcal{H}_f^\perp, \mathcal{K}_f^\perp) \quad (\text{by (3.10)}) \\ &= c(\mathcal{H}_f, \mathcal{K}_f) \end{aligned}$$

Thus $c(\mathcal{H}_f, \mathcal{K}_f) = c((\mathcal{H}^\perp)_f, (\mathcal{K}^\perp)_f)$, and hence, $\alpha(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K}) = \alpha(\mathcal{H}^\perp, \mathcal{K}^\perp)$ \square

We use the following lemma in the next theorem.

Lemma 3.11. [7, Lemma 5, Lemma 9] *Let \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} be closed subspaces of a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) $P_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $P_{\mathcal{N}}$ commute.
- (ii) $P_{\mathcal{M}}P_{\mathcal{N}} = P_{\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{N}}$.

- (iii) $P_{\mathcal{M}^\perp}$ and $P_{\mathcal{N}^\perp}$ commute.
- (iv) $P_{\mathcal{M}^\perp}$ and $P_{\mathcal{N}}$ commute.
- (v) $P_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $P_{\mathcal{N}^\perp}$ commute.
- (vi) $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{N}) + (\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{N}^\perp)$.

Theorem 3.12. *Let \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} be closed submodules of \mathcal{E} such that $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ and $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K}^\perp)$ are concordant and let $\overline{\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{K}}$ be an orthogonally complemented submodule. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) $\alpha(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K}) = 0$.
- (ii) $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K}) + (\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp)$.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii). Let $f \in S(\mathcal{A})$. Since $\overline{\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{K}}$ is orthogonally complemented, we have $\mathcal{E} = \overline{(\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{K})} \oplus (\mathcal{H}^\perp \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp)$. Hence,

$$\mathcal{E}_f = \overline{(\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{K})}_f \oplus (\mathcal{H}^\perp \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp)_f \subseteq \overline{(\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{K})}_f + [(\mathcal{H}_f)^\perp \cap (\mathcal{K}_f)^\perp].$$

It is clear that $\overline{(\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{K})}_f$ is orthogonal to $(\mathcal{H}_f)^\perp \cap (\mathcal{K}_f)^\perp$, hence

$$(\mathcal{H}^\perp \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp)_f = (\mathcal{H}_f)^\perp \cap (\mathcal{K}_f)^\perp. \quad (3.11)$$

It follows from Theorem 3.5 and Corollary 3.6 that $\overline{(\mathcal{H}^\perp)_f + (\mathcal{K}^\perp)_f} = (\mathcal{H}_f)^\perp + (\mathcal{K}_f)^\perp$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} P_{(\mathcal{H}_f)^\perp} + P_{(\mathcal{K}_f)^\perp} - P_{(\mathcal{H}^\perp \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp)_f} &= P_{(\mathcal{H}_f)^\perp} + P_{(\mathcal{K}_f)^\perp} - P_{(\mathcal{H}_f)^\perp \cap (\mathcal{K}_f)^\perp} \quad (\text{by (3.11)}) \\ &= P_{(\mathcal{H}_f)^\perp + (\mathcal{K}_f)^\perp} \\ &= P_{\overline{(\mathcal{H}^\perp)_f + (\mathcal{K}^\perp)_f}} \end{aligned}$$

By multiplying the both sides of above equality from left and right with $P_{(\mathcal{H}^\perp)_f}$ and $P_{(\mathcal{K}^\perp)_f}$, respectively, we get

$$P_{(\mathcal{H}^\perp)_f} P_{(\mathcal{K}^\perp)_f} - P_{(\mathcal{H}^\perp \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp)_f} = 0 \quad (3.12)$$

From (3.12) and [7, Lemma 5] we get $P_{(\mathcal{K}^\perp)_f} P_{(\mathcal{H}^\perp)_f} = P_{(\mathcal{H}^\perp)_f} P_{(\mathcal{K}^\perp)_f}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_f &\subseteq (\mathcal{H}^\perp)_f^\perp \\ &= [(\mathcal{H}^\perp)_f^\perp \cap (\mathcal{K}^\perp)_f^\perp] + [(\mathcal{H}^\perp)_f^\perp \cap (\mathcal{K}^\perp)_f] \quad (\text{by Lemma 3.11}) \\ &\subseteq (\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K})_f + (\mathcal{H}^\perp)_f^\perp \cap (\mathcal{K}^{\perp\perp})_f^\perp \\ &= (\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K})_f + (\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp)_f \\ &= ((\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K}) + (\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp))_f \\ &\subseteq \mathcal{H}_f \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Lemma 3.2, we conclude that $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K}) + (\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp)$.
(ii) \Rightarrow (i). Let $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})$ be arbitrary. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}_f &= (\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K})_f + (\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K}^\perp)_f \\ &\subseteq (\mathcal{H}_f \cap \mathcal{K}_f) + (\mathcal{H}_f \cap (\mathcal{K}_f)^\perp) \\ &\subseteq \mathcal{H}_f.\end{aligned}$$

This shows that $P_{\mathcal{H}_f}$ and $P_{\mathcal{K}_f}$ commute. So $c(\mathcal{H}_f, \mathcal{K}_f) = 0$. Since f is arbitrary, we conclude that $\alpha(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K}) = 0$. \square

The following example shows that $\alpha(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ is different from $c(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ if \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} are closed submodules (not orthogonally complemented) in \mathcal{E} such that $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ is concordant.

Example 3.13. Let $X = [-2, -1] \cup [0, 1]$. Let $\mathcal{A} = C(X)$ and let $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{A}$. Let

$$\mathcal{H} = \{\tau \in \mathcal{E} : \tau|_{[0, \frac{2}{3}]} = 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{K} = \{\tau \in \mathcal{E} : \tau|_{[\frac{1}{3}, 1]} = 0\}.$$

Then

$$\mathcal{H}^\perp = \{\tau \in \mathcal{E} : \tau|_{[-2, -1] \cup [\frac{2}{3}, 1]} = 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{K}^\perp = \{\tau \in \mathcal{E} : \tau|_{[-2, -1] \cup [0, \frac{1}{3}]} = 0\}.$$

Note that

$$\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K} = \{\tau \in \mathcal{E} : \tau|_{[0, 1]} = 0\}. \quad (3.13)$$

This implies that $(\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K}) + (\mathcal{H}^\perp + \mathcal{K}^\perp) = \mathcal{E}$. Hence, $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ is a concordant pair of closed submodules of \mathcal{E} . Let f be a state on \mathcal{A} . Since $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ is a concordant pair, by Proposition 3.3, Corollary 3.6, and (3.13), we have

$$(\mathcal{H}_f \cap \mathcal{K}_f)^\perp = [(\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K})_f]^\perp = [(\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{N})^\perp]_f = \overline{\{\tau + \mathcal{N}_f; \tau \in \mathcal{A}, \tau|_{[-2, -1]} = 0\}}.$$

If we set $H_f = \mathcal{H}_f \cap (\mathcal{H}_f \cap \mathcal{K}_f)^\perp$ and $K_f = \mathcal{K}_f \cap (\mathcal{H}_f \cap \mathcal{K}_f)^\perp$, then by employing (3.6) in the Hilbert space case, we get

$$\begin{aligned}c(\mathcal{H}_f, \mathcal{K}_f) &= \sup\{|f\langle \tau, \sigma \rangle|; \tau + \mathcal{N}_f \in H_f, \sigma + \mathcal{N}_f \in K_f\} \\ &= \sup\{|f(\tau\bar{\sigma})|; \tau + \mathcal{N}_f \in H_f, \sigma + \mathcal{N}_f \in K_f\} = 0.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\alpha(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K}) = 0$. Note that $c(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K}) = 1$.

Theorem 3.14. Let \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} be closed submodules of \mathcal{E} such that $(\mathcal{H}^\perp, \mathcal{K}^\perp)$ is concordant. Then $(\mathcal{H}^{\perp\perp}, \mathcal{K}^{\perp\perp})$ is a separated pair if $\alpha_0(\mathcal{H}^{\perp\perp}, \mathcal{K}^{\perp\perp}) < 1$.

Proof. Suppose that $\alpha_0 := \alpha_0(\mathcal{H}^{\perp\perp}, \mathcal{K}^{\perp\perp}) < 1$. Then for each $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})$ we have

$$|f\langle x, y \rangle| \leq \alpha_0 f\langle x, x \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} f\langle y, y \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (x \in \mathcal{H}, y \in \mathcal{K}). \quad (3.14)$$

There is a state $f_0 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})$ such that $f_0\langle x, x \rangle = \|x\|^2$. By (3.14), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|x + y\|^2 &\geq f_0\langle x + y, x + y \rangle = f_0\langle x, x \rangle + f_0\langle y, y \rangle + 2\operatorname{Re}f_0\langle x, y \rangle \\ &\geq \|x\|^2 + f_0\langle y, y \rangle - 2|f_0\langle x, y \rangle| \\ &\geq \|x\|^2 + f_0\langle y, y \rangle - 2\alpha_0 f_0\langle x, x \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} f_0\langle y, y \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= (\|x\| - f_0\langle y, y \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}})^2 + 2(1 - \alpha_0)\|x\|f_0\langle y, y \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (3.15) \end{aligned}$$

for each $x \in \mathcal{H}^{\perp\perp}$ and $y \in \mathcal{K}^{\perp\perp}$. Let $\lim_n(x_n + y_n) = z$, where $x_n \in \mathcal{H}^{\perp\perp}$ and $y_n \in \mathcal{K}^{\perp\perp}$. It follows from (3.15) that $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence and so there is a $x \in \mathcal{H}^{\perp\perp}$ such that $\lim_n x_n = x$. Hence, there is a $y \in \mathcal{K}^{\perp\perp}$ such that $\lim_n y_n = y$. So $z = x + y$. This shows that $\mathcal{H}^{\perp\perp} + \mathcal{K}^{\perp\perp}$ is closed. Since $(\mathcal{H}^{\perp}, \mathcal{K}^{\perp})$ is concordant, we conclude that $\mathcal{H}^{\perp\perp} + \mathcal{K}^{\perp\perp}$ is an orthogonally complemented submodule.

Due to $(\mathcal{H}^{\perp}, \mathcal{K}^{\perp})$ is concordant and $\alpha_0 < 1$ we have $c_0((\mathcal{H}^{\perp\perp})_f, (\mathcal{K}^{\perp\perp})_f) < 1$, which, by [7, Theorem 12], yields that

$$(\mathcal{H}^{\perp\perp} \cap \mathcal{K}^{\perp\perp})_f = (\mathcal{H}^{\perp\perp})_f \cap (\mathcal{K}^{\perp\perp})_f = \{0\}, \quad (f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})).$$

Hence, $\mathcal{H}^{\perp\perp} \cap \mathcal{K}^{\perp\perp} = \{0\}$. □

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author states that there is no conflict of interest. Data sharing is not applicable to this paper as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

FUNDING

The fourth author is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (11971136), and the fifth author is supported by the Youth Backbone Teacher Training Program of Henan Province (2017GGJS140).

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Afriat, *Orthogonal and oblique projectors and the characteristics of pairs of vector spaces*, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **53** (1957), 800–816.
- [2] T. Ando, *Unbounded or bounded idempotent operators in Hilbert space*, Linear Algebra Appl. **438** (2013), no. 10, 3769–3775.
- [3] J. Antezana, G. Corach, and D. Stojanoff, *Bilateral shorted operators and parallel sums*, Linear Algebra Appl. **414** (2006), no. 2-3, 570–588.
- [4] A. Böttcher and I. M. Spitkovsky, *A gentle guide to the basics of two projections theory*, Linear Algebra Appl. **432** (2010), no. 6, 1412–1459.

- [5] N. Castro-González and J. Y. Vélez-Cerrada, *On the perturbation of the group generalized inverse for a class of bounded operators in Banach spaces*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **341** (2008), 1213–1223.
- [6] C. Deng and H. Du, *Common complements of two subspaces and an answer to Groß's question*, Acta Math. Sinica (Chinese Series) **49** (2006), no. 5, 1099–1112.
- [7] 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.
- [8] J. Dixmier, *Étude sur les variétés et les opérateurs de Julia, avec quelques applications*, (French) Bull. Soc. Math. France **77** (1949), 11–101.
- [9] H. Du, X. Yao, and C. Deng, *Invertibility of linear combinations of two idempotents*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **134** (2006), no. 5, 1451–1457.
- [10] P. A. Fillmore and J. P. Williams, *Operator ranges*, Advances in Math. **7** (1971), 254–281.
- [11] M. Frank, *Geometrical aspects of Hilbert C^* -modules*, Positivity **3**(1999), 215–243.
- [12] P. Halmos, *Two subspaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **144** (1969), 381–389.
- [13] J. Kaad and M. Lesch, *A local global principle for regular operators in Hilbert C^* -modules*, J. Funct. Anal. **262** (2012), no. 10, 4540–4569.
- [14] J. Kaad and M. Lesch, *Corrigendum to "A local global principle for regular operators in Hilbert C^* -modules, J. Funct. Anal. **262** (2012), no. 10, 4540–4569"*, J. Funct. Anal. **272** (2017) 4403–4406.
- [15] J. J. Koliha, *Range projections of idempotents in C^* -algebras*, Demonstratio Math. **34** (2001), no. 1, 91–103.
- [16] E. C. Lance, *Hilbert C^* -modules: A toolkit for operator algebraists*, Cambridge University Press, Oxford, 1995.
- [17] 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.
- [18] W. Luo, C. Song, and Q. Xu, *The parallel sum for adjointable operators on Hilbert C^* -modules*, (Chinese) Acta Math. Sinica (Chin. Ser.) **62** (2019), no. 4, 541–552.
- [19] V. M. Manuilov and E. V. Troitsky, *Hilbert C^* -modules*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs. 226, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2005.
- [20] B. Mesland and A. Rennie, *The Friedrichs angle and alternating projections in Hilbert C^* -modules*, J. Math Anal. Appl. **516** (2022) 126474.
- [21] G. J. Murphy, *C^* -algebras and operator theory*, Academic Press, London, 1990.
- [22] W. L. Paschke, *Inner product modules over B^* -algebras*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **182** (1972), 443–468.
- [23] F. Pierrot, *Opérateurs réguliers dans les C^* -modules et structure des C^* -algèbres de groupes de Lie semisimples complexes simplement connexes*, J. Lie theory, **16** (2006), 651–689.
- [24] M. Qin, Q. Xu, and A. Zamani, *Weighted Moore–Penrose inverses of adjointable operators on indefinite inner-product spaces*, J. Korean Math. Soc. **57** (2020), no. 3, 691–706.
- [25] Y. Tan, Q. Xu, and G. Yan, *Weighted Moore–Penrose inverses of products and differences of weighted projections on indefinite inner-product spaces*, Adv. Oper. Theory **5** (2020), no. 3, 796–815.
- [26] 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.

¹DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS EDUCATION, FARHANGIAN UNIVERSITY, P.O. Box 14665-889, TEHRAN, IRAN.

Email address: Rasoul.eskandari@cfu.ac.ir; eskandarirasoul@yahoo.com

²DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS AND MATHEMATICS, SHANGHAI LIXIN UNIVERSITY OF ACCOUNTING AND FINANCE, SHANGHAI 201209, PR CHINA

Email address: luoweipig1@163.com

³DEPARTMENT OF PURE MATHEMATICS, CENTER OF EXCELLENCE IN ANALYSIS ON ALGEBRAIC STRUCTURES (CEAAS), FERDOWSI UNIVERSITY OF MASHHAD, P. O. Box 1159, MASHHAD 91775, IRAN.

Email address: moslehian@um.ac.ir; moslehian@yahoo.com

⁴DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SHANGHAI NORMAL UNIVERSITY, SHANGHAI 200234, PR CHINA

Email address: qingxiang_xu@126.com

⁴SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, SHANGQIU NORMAL UNIVERSITY, SHANGQIU 476000, PR CHINA.

Email address: csqam@163.com