

ON THE SIMILARITY OF BOUNDARY TRIPLES FOR DUAL PAIRS

RYTIS JURŠĖNAS

ABSTRACT. The Weyl family of a dual pair $A \subseteq B^c$ of operators in a Krein space determines a minimal boundary triple uniquely up to similarity; if $A = B$, a necessary and sufficient condition in order that the similarity should be unitary is given.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let A, B be closed linear relations in a complex separable Krein space \mathcal{H} . The pair (A, B) is a dual pair (dp) if $A \subseteq B^c$ (the adjoint, [4, Definition 2.6.7]); in [5, 29] a dp is an adjoint pair of closed densely defined operators in a Hilbert space. Adapted from [18] to the Krein space setting is a boundary triple (bt) $\Pi = (\mathcal{G}_0 \oplus \mathcal{G}_1, \Gamma^B, \Gamma^A)$; as Γ^A (Γ^B) is uniquely determined by Γ^B (Γ^A), $\Pi \equiv (\mathcal{G}, \Gamma^B)$, $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_0 \oplus \mathcal{G}_1$. A bt for a dp exists always¹. To avoid repetition we refer instead to [5, 18] and a list of sources therein for motive and applications.

The problem we address here is whether the Weyl family $\lambda \mapsto M_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda) = \Gamma^B(\lambda I)$ on a suitable subset of the complex plane determines Π uniquely. If $A = B$ has equal defect numbers and Π is an ordinary boundary triple (obt), $\Pi_\Gamma = (\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$, the Hilbert space solution is found essentially in [11, 12, 23]: The Weyl family $\lambda \mapsto M_\Gamma(\lambda) = \Gamma(\lambda I)$ on $\mathbb{C}_* = \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$ determines a minimal obt Π_Γ uniquely up to unitary equivalence. Related statements in a Pontryagin space exist too, [14, 19, 20].

For dp's it is known that M_{Γ^B} determines Π up to so-called weak similarity². We prove that the weak similarity can be replaced by the similarity in its usual sense. Although now the spectral properties are preserved, it is nonetheless of general interest to explore whether the similarity can be chosen unitary, just like for obt's. If $A = B$ this is indeed so iff the boundary operators Γ^B and $\Gamma^{B'}$ in bt's $\Pi = (\mathcal{G}, \Gamma^B)$ and $\Pi' = (\mathcal{G}, \Gamma^{B'})$ for dp's (A, A) and (A', A') in Krein spaces \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{H}' satisfy the condition: $(\Gamma^B)^{-1}\Gamma^{B'}$ is a unitary relation $\mathcal{H}'_\Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_\Gamma$; in Krein spaces $\mathcal{H}_\Gamma, \mathcal{H}'_\Gamma$ an indefinite metric is as defined in [4, Section 2.1]. An equivalent characterization is that $(\Gamma^B)^{-1}\Gamma^{B'} = (\Gamma^A)^{-1}\Gamma^{A'}$; see Sections 2–4 for details.

Date: March 27, 2025.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 46C20, 47B50, 47A56.

Key words and phrases. Dual (adjoint) pair of linear relations, boundary triple, Weyl family.

¹We do not have an access to an original proof (for linear relations in a Hilbert space) in M.M. Malamud and V.I. Mogilevskii, Krein type formula for canonical resolvents of dual pairs of linear relations. *Methods Funct. Anal. Topology* (4) 8 (2002) 72–100. We give a simple proof though.

²An original proof in M.M. Malamud, V.I. Mogilevskii, On Weyl functions and Q -functions of dual pairs of linear relations, *Dop. Akad. Nauk Ukr.* (1999), no.4, 32–37, is again inaccessible to us; but see [17] for the definition of weak similarity, which is due to [2]. The sources, however, are not critical for our presentation.

As an exercise, the results on unitarity in [1, 18] fall within the general criterion. As an application, in Section 6 we answer the question raised in [18, Remark 3.16] and we show in Section 5 that the Weyl function of a simple π -symmetric operator A ([3]) of class (L) ([22]) determines a D -boundary triple up to unitary equivalence; a D -bt for A^* in a Π_0 -space was originally defined in [25], see also [26, 27].

The main idea in our approach is to associate with a dp (A, B) a block diagonal linear relation $T = \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix}$, which is closed symmetric in a suitable Krein space. Although an off-diagonal analogue is also used *e.g.* in [29], here we go on further in determining the correspondence between a bt Π for (A, B) and an obt Π_Γ for T^c .

2. MINIMAL ORDINARY BOUNDARY TRIPLE

Standard sources for the Hilbert space (linear) relations and the Krein (J -)spaces are [4, 7, 15]. Assuming that the reader is familiar with the theory of boundary value spaces, well established definitions are not detailed.

Notation is as in [4]. Particularly, if T is a relation in a Krein space $(\mathcal{H}, [\cdot, \cdot])$, the points of regular type ($\lambda \in r(T)$) as well as other spectral points are defined as in [4, Section 2.6]. We use $r_0(T)$ for the set of $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\mathcal{R}_{T-\xi I}$ is a subspace (closed lineal) in \mathcal{H} for both $\xi = \lambda$ and $\xi = \bar{\lambda}$. The kernel $\text{Ker}_\lambda T = \text{Ker}(T - \lambda I)$.

Let T be a closed symmetric relation in \mathcal{H} with equal nonzero defect numbers. Let $\Pi_\Gamma = (\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ be an obt for T^c ; *i.e.* Γ is a unitary surjective operator $\mathcal{H}_\Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_\Gamma$, $\mathcal{D}_\Gamma = T^c$. As usual $\Gamma_0 = \pi_0 \Gamma$ ($\pi_0: \mathcal{G}_\Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$, $\begin{pmatrix} l \\ h \end{pmatrix} \mapsto l$), $T_0 = \text{Ker } \Gamma_0$, and the Weyl family $\lambda \mapsto M_\Gamma(\lambda) = \Gamma(\lambda I)$ on \mathbb{C} , where the domain restriction $\Gamma|_{\lambda I} = \Gamma|_{\lambda I \cap \mathcal{D}_\Gamma}$, with similar interpretation throughout. Let

$$r(T, T_0) = r(T_0) \cap r_0(T) \cap \sigma_p(T^c) \cap \sigma_r(T).$$

Remark 2.1. Let $\lambda \in r(T_0) \cap r_0(T)$. A real $\lambda \in \sigma_p(T^c)$. For a non-real $\lambda \in \sigma_p(T^c)$ (resp. $\lambda \in \sigma_r(T)$ or equivalently $\bar{\lambda} \in \sigma_p(T^c)$) it suffices that $\text{Ker}_\lambda J T^c \notin \mathcal{A}^-$ (resp. $\text{Ker}_{\bar{\lambda}} J T^c \notin \mathcal{A}^-$) [4, Section 1.8], *e.g.* that $\text{Ker}_\lambda J T^c$ (resp. $\text{Ker}_{\bar{\lambda}} J T^c$) be positive in \mathcal{H} , as is the case if $T \in (L)$ and $|\text{Im } \lambda|$ is sufficiently large. In the Hilbert space context $r(T, T_0)$ is just $\rho(T_0)$.

Definition 2.2. $\{\mathcal{U}, M\}$ is a holomorphic element if \mathcal{U} is an open subset in the complex plane and M is a closed relation holomorphic on \mathcal{U} .

A holomorphic closed relation is as defined in [9]. $M_\Gamma(\lambda) = M_\Gamma(\bar{\lambda})^*$ for $\lambda \in r_0(T)$ ($\lambda \in r(T_0) \cap r_0(T)$) is a closed relation in \mathcal{G} (a closed operator from $\mathcal{B}(\Gamma_0(\lambda I), \mathcal{G})$).

Definition 2.3. An obt $\Pi_\Gamma \equiv \{\mathcal{U}, \Pi_\Gamma\}$ for T^c is minimal if $\{\mathcal{U}, M_\Gamma\}$ and $\{\mathcal{U}^*, M_\Gamma\}$ ($\mathcal{U}^* = \{\lambda | \bar{\lambda} \in \mathcal{U}\}$) are holomorphic elements for some open subset $\mathcal{U} \subseteq r(T, T_0)$, and $C\text{Lin}\{\text{Ker}_\lambda T^c | \lambda \in \mathcal{U}\} = \mathcal{H}$.

Remark 2.4. Essentially we drop the assumption that $\rho(T_0) (\subseteq r(T_0) \cap r_0(T))$ is nonempty; note that $I + (\lambda - \bar{\lambda})(T_0 - \lambda I)^{-1}$ ($\lambda \in \rho(T_0)$) maps $\text{Ker}_{\bar{\lambda}} T^c$ bijectively onto $\text{Ker}_\lambda T^c$.

Remark 2.5. In a Π_κ -space: M_Γ is realized minimally [14, 19] if $C\text{Lin}\{\text{Ker}_\lambda T^c | \lambda \in \rho(T_0)\} = \Pi_\kappa$; a boundary operator Γ is minimal [6] if $C\text{Lin}\{\text{Ker}_\lambda T^c | \lambda \in r(T)\} = \Pi_\kappa$; Π_Γ is minimal for a simple π -symmetric $T \in (L)$ for some \mathcal{U} (Proposition 5.6).

Remark 2.6. T with minimal Π_Γ is an operator without eigenvalues: If $x_\mu \in \text{Ker}_\mu T$, $\mu \in \sigma_p(T)$, $x_\lambda \in \text{Ker}_\lambda T^c$, $\lambda \in r(T, T_0)$, then $(\lambda - \mu)[x_\mu, x_\lambda] = 0$ by $T \subset T^c$, and then $\lambda \neq \mu$ implies $x_\mu = 0$ by the minimality of Π_Γ .

3. UNITARY EQUIVALENCE OF MINIMAL ORDINARY BOUNDARY TRIPLES

As in [20, 21], a relation $T \in (P)$ in \mathcal{H} if the lineal $\mathcal{D}_T + \mathcal{R}_T$ is dense in \mathcal{H} .

$T \in (P)$ iff $\text{Ker}_\lambda T^c \cap \text{Ker}_\mu T^c = \{0\}$ for some and then all $\lambda, \mu \in \sigma_p(T^c)$, $\lambda \neq \mu$.

On this account a closed symmetric operator T in \mathcal{H} with minimal Π_Γ is necessarily of class (P) .

In what follows T is a closed symmetric relation in \mathcal{H} with equal nonzero defect numbers, $\Pi_\Gamma = (\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ is an obt for T^c with Weyl family M_Γ , and T' is (possibly) another closed symmetric relation in (possibly) another Krein space \mathcal{H}' , and $\Pi_{\Gamma'} = (\mathcal{G}', \Gamma')$ is an obt for T'^c with Weyl family $M_{\Gamma'}$. (All objects associated with T' are indicated by the primes and are supposed to be defined similarly to those associated with T , with the same interpretation elsewhere.)

Definition 3.1. The holomorphic elements $\{\mathcal{U}, M\}$ and $\{\mathcal{U}', M'\}$ are continuations of each other, $\{\mathcal{U}, M\} \leftrightarrow \{\mathcal{U}', M'\}$, if $M = M'$ (\neq const.) on each connected component in $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{U}'$.

Theorem 3.2. Let $\{\mathcal{U}, \Pi_\Gamma\}$, $\{\mathcal{U}', \Pi_{\Gamma'}\}$ be minimal obt's for T^c , T'^c respectively. If $\{\mathcal{U}, M_\Gamma\} \leftrightarrow \{\mathcal{U}', M_{\Gamma'}\}$ then $\Pi_{\Gamma'}$ is unitarily equivalent to Π_Γ .

It is standard that $\Pi_{\Gamma'}$ is (U -)unitarily equivalent to Π_Γ if there is $U \in \text{St}_1(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}')$ such that $\Gamma' = \Gamma \tilde{U}^{-1}$, $\tilde{U} = \begin{pmatrix} U & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{U} \end{pmatrix} : \mathcal{H}_\Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{H}'_\Gamma$.

Here $\text{St}_1(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}')$ (or $\text{St}_1(\mathcal{H})$ if $\mathcal{H} \equiv \mathcal{H}'$) is the set of standard unitary operators as defined in [10, Definition 2.5].

To prove the theorem we use three lemmas; obt's need not be minimal.

Lemma 3.3. [20, Theorem 5.8] *The subspaces $T \subseteq \mathcal{H}_\Gamma$ and $T' \subseteq \mathcal{H}'_\Gamma$ are isomorphic iff $\Gamma' = \Gamma V^{-1}$ for some $V \in \text{St}_1(\mathcal{H}_\Gamma, \mathcal{H}'_\Gamma)$.*

Lemma 3.4. [20, Theorem 6.7] *Let T' be U -unitarily equivalent to T . If $M_{\Gamma'} = M_\Gamma$ on a nonempty subset $\Lambda \subseteq r(T) \cap r_0(T)$, then there is $W \in \text{St}_1(\mathcal{H}_\Gamma)$ such that*

- a) $\Pi_{\Gamma'}$ is U -unitarily equivalent to an obt $(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma W^{-1})$ for T^c ;
- b) $W(\lambda I \cap T^c) = \lambda I \cap T^c$, $\lambda \in \Lambda$.

The third lemma is more than enough for our primary purpose. Yet we include it as a generalization of similar results in [8, 17, 24], in hope of its independent interest.

First, some definitions. Let $\mathcal{G}_0, \mathcal{G}_1$ be Hilbert spaces, $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_0 \oplus \mathcal{G}_1$, $\mathcal{G}' = \mathcal{G}_1 \oplus \mathcal{G}_0$. Associated with (arbitrary) relations $\Gamma^B : \mathcal{H}_\Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$, $\Gamma^A : \mathcal{H}_\Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{G}'$ are

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_\#^B &= \{(\hat{y}, \hat{h}) \in \mathcal{H}_\Gamma \times \mathcal{G}' \mid (\forall \hat{x}, \hat{l}) \in \Gamma^B [\hat{x}, \hat{y}]_\Gamma = \langle \hat{l}, Y \hat{h} \rangle_{\mathcal{G}}\}, \\ \Gamma_\#^A &= \{(\hat{x}, \hat{l}) \in \mathcal{H}_\Gamma \times \mathcal{G} \mid (\forall \hat{y}, \hat{h}) \in \Gamma^A [\hat{x}, \hat{y}]_\Gamma = \langle \hat{l}, Y \hat{h} \rangle_{\mathcal{G}}\} \end{aligned}$$

where $Y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -I_0 \\ I_1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} : \mathcal{G}' \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ and I_0 (I_1) is the identity in \mathcal{G}_0 (\mathcal{G}_1).

The adjoint of Γ^B (Γ^A) is given by

$$(\Gamma^B)^c = (Y \Gamma_\#^B)^{-1} \quad ((\Gamma^A)^c = (Y^{-1} \Gamma_\#^A)^{-1})$$

so that $\Gamma_\#^B, \Gamma_\#^A$ are closed relations. Clearly $\Gamma^A \subseteq \Gamma_\#^B$ iff $\Gamma^B \subseteq \Gamma_\#^A$, and one says Γ^B, Γ^A satisfy the Green identity. If Γ^B, Γ^A are subspaces, $\Gamma^A = \Gamma_\#^B$ iff $\Gamma^B = \Gamma_\#^A$.

Definition 3.5. If $\Gamma^A \subseteq \Gamma_\#^B$, $\bar{\mathcal{D}}_{\Gamma^B} = B^c$, $\bar{\mathcal{D}}_{\Gamma^A} = A^c$, then $((\mathcal{G}, \Gamma^B), (\mathcal{G}', \Gamma^A))$ is an isometric boundary pair (ibp) for a dp (A, B) ; and if also $\Gamma^A = \Gamma_\#^B$, $\Gamma^B = \Gamma_\#^A$, then $(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma^B) \equiv ((\mathcal{G}, \Gamma^B), (\mathcal{G}', \Gamma^A))$ is a unitary boundary pair (ubp) for (A, B) .

Because (A, B) is a dp iff such is (B, A) , $((\mathcal{G}, \Gamma^B), (\mathcal{G}', \Gamma^A))$ is an ibp for (A, B) iff such is $((\mathcal{G}', \Gamma^A), (\mathcal{G}, \Gamma^B))$. The associated Weyl families are $M_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda) = \Gamma^B(\lambda I)$ and $M_{\Gamma^A}(\lambda) = \Gamma^A(\lambda I)$, γ -fields are $\gamma_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda) = P(\Gamma_0^B | \lambda I)^{-1}$ and $\gamma_{\Gamma^A}(\lambda) = P(\Gamma_0^A | \lambda I)^{-1}$, all defined for $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. $P: \mathcal{H}_\Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$, $\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \mapsto x$, $\Gamma_0^B = \{(\hat{x}, l_0) | (\exists l_1)(\hat{x}, \begin{pmatrix} l_0 \\ l_1 \end{pmatrix}) \in \Gamma^B\}$, and $\Gamma_0^A = \{(\hat{y}, h_1) | (\exists h_0)(\hat{y}, \begin{pmatrix} h_1 \\ h_0 \end{pmatrix}) \in \Gamma^A\}$.

In agreement with a common definition (see *e.g.* [17, Definition 2.5]) a bt for a dp (A, B) is an ibp $((\mathcal{G}, \Gamma^B), (\mathcal{G}', \Gamma^A))$ such that Γ^B, Γ^A are surjective operators. In order to see that a bt is a ubp (\mathcal{G}, Γ^B) with surjective Γ^B, Γ^A , by [28, Proposition 2.1] one only needs to verify $B \subseteq \text{Ker } \Gamma^A$, $A \subseteq \text{Ker } \Gamma^B$; but the latter follows from the Green identity and surjectivity of Γ^B, Γ^A .

A bt for a dp (A, B) is denoted by $\Pi = (\mathcal{G}, \Gamma^B)$.

Remark 3.6. Similarly one defines an isometric boundary triple, resp. a unitary boundary triple (ubt), for a dp, if Γ^B and Γ^A are assumed to be operators. In this way a bt for a dp is a ubt such that Γ^B, Γ^A have closed ranges.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $((\mathcal{G}, \Gamma^B), (\mathcal{G}', \Gamma^A))$ be an ibp for a dp (A, B) in \mathcal{H} and let*

$$\phi^B(\lambda) = \left\{ \left(y - \lambda x, \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \right) \middle| \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \in A_0 \right\}, \quad A_0 = \text{Ker } \Gamma_0^B,$$

$$\Gamma_{10}^B = P_1[(\Gamma^B)^{-1} | (\{0\} \times \mathcal{G}_1)]^{-1}$$

and $P_1: \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_1$, $\begin{pmatrix} l_0 \\ l_1 \end{pmatrix} \mapsto l_1$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. Then:

- $\gamma_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda) - \gamma_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda_0) = P\phi^B(\lambda)(\lambda - \lambda_0)\gamma_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda_0)$ ($\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{C}$).
- $M_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda) - M_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda_0) = \Gamma_{10}^B\phi^B(\lambda)(\lambda - \lambda_0)\gamma_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda_0)$ ($\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{C}$).
- $\Gamma_{10}^B\phi^B(\lambda) \subseteq \gamma_{\Gamma^A}(\bar{\lambda})^c$, with the equality iff $\mathcal{R}_{A_0 - \lambda I} = \mathcal{D}_{\gamma_{\Gamma^A}(\bar{\lambda})^c}$ and $\text{Ind } M_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda) = \text{Ind } M_{\Gamma^A}(\bar{\lambda})^*$.
- Let $A_\theta = (\Gamma^B)^{-1}(\theta)$; θ is a lineal in \mathcal{G} . Then

$$(A_\theta - \lambda I)^{-1} - (A_0 - \lambda I)^{-1} \subseteq \gamma_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda)(\theta - M_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda))^{-1}\Gamma_{10}^B\phi^B(\lambda)$$

with the equality if $\text{Ker}_\lambda A_0 = \text{Ker}_\lambda \text{Ker } \Gamma^B$.

Proof. For short $\hat{x}_\lambda = \begin{pmatrix} x_\lambda \\ \lambda x_\lambda \end{pmatrix} = (x_\lambda, \lambda x_\lambda)$ if $x_\lambda \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda = \text{Ker}_\lambda \mathcal{D}_{\Gamma^B}$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$.

a) If $(l_0, x) \in \gamma_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda) - \gamma_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda_0)$ then $x = x_\lambda - x_{\lambda_0}$ for some $x_\lambda \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda$, $x_{\lambda_0} \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda_0}$ such that $(\hat{x}_\lambda, l_0) \in \Gamma_0^B$, $(\hat{x}_{\lambda_0}, l_0) \in \Gamma_0^B$; hence $(l_0, \hat{x}) \in \phi^B(\lambda)(\lambda - \lambda_0)\gamma_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda_0)$ for $\hat{x} = (x, y) \in A_0$, $y = \lambda x + (\lambda - \lambda_0)x_{\lambda_0}$.

Conversely, $(l_0, x) \in P\phi^B(\lambda)(\lambda - \lambda_0)\gamma_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda_0)$ implies $(\exists y) (\exists x_{\lambda_0} \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda_0}) (x, y) \in A_0$, $(l_0, x_{\lambda_0}) \in \gamma_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda_0)$, $(\lambda - \lambda_0)x_{\lambda_0} = y - \lambda x$. Because $(x + x_{\lambda_0}, \lambda x + \lambda x_{\lambda_0}) = (x, y) + \hat{x}_{\lambda_0} \in \mathcal{D}_{\Gamma^B}$, one has $x + x_{\lambda_0} = x_\lambda \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda$, so it remains to verify $(l_0, x_\lambda) \in \gamma_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda)$: Because $(\exists l'_0 \in \mathcal{G}_0) (l'_0, x_\lambda) \in \gamma_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda)$, it follows that $l'_0 - l_0 \in \Gamma_0^B(A_0) = \text{Ind } \Gamma_0^B$, so $(\hat{x}_\lambda, l_0) \in \Gamma_0^B$ *i.e.* $(l_0, x_\lambda) \in \gamma_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda)$.

b) $M_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda) - M_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda_0)$ consists of those $(l_0, l_1 - h_1) \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $(\exists x_\lambda \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda) (\exists x_{\lambda_0} \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda_0}) (\hat{x}_\lambda, \begin{pmatrix} l_0 \\ l_1 \end{pmatrix}) \in \Gamma^B$, $(\hat{x}_{\lambda_0}, \begin{pmatrix} l_0 \\ h_1 \end{pmatrix}) \in \Gamma^B$; so $\hat{x} = (x, y) = (x_\lambda - x_{\lambda_0}, \lambda x_\lambda - \lambda_0 x_{\lambda_0}) \in A_0$ and $(\hat{x}, l_1 - h_1) \in \Gamma_{10}^B$. Since $y - \lambda x = (\lambda - \lambda_0)x_{\lambda_0}$, $(l_0, x_{\lambda_0}) \in \gamma_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda_0)$, so $(l_0, y - \lambda x) \in (\lambda - \lambda_0)\gamma_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda_0)$ *i.e.* $(l_0, l_1 - h_1) \in \Gamma_{10}^B\phi^B(\lambda)(\lambda - \lambda_0)\gamma_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda_0)$.

Conversely, $\Gamma_{10}^B\phi^B(\lambda)(\lambda - \lambda_0)\gamma_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda_0)$ consists of those $(l_0, l'_1) \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $(\exists \hat{x} = (x, y) \in A_0) (l_0, \hat{x}) \in \phi^B(\lambda)(\lambda - \lambda_0)\gamma_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda_0)$ and $(\hat{x}, l'_1) \in \Gamma_{10}^B$; hence $(\exists x_{\lambda_0} \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda_0}) (l_0, x_{\lambda_0}) \in \gamma_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda_0)$, $(\lambda - \lambda_0)x_{\lambda_0} = y - \lambda x$. As in a) this shows $x + x_{\lambda_0} = x_\lambda \in$

\mathcal{N}_λ and $(l_0, x_\lambda) \in \gamma_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda)$. Since $(\exists l_1, h_1 \in \mathcal{G}_1) (\hat{x}_\lambda, \binom{l_0}{l_1}) \in \Gamma^B$, $(\hat{x}_{\lambda_0}, \binom{l_0}{h_1}) \in \Gamma^B$, so $(l_0, l_1) \in M_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda)$, $(l_0, h_1) \in M_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda_0)$, $(\hat{x}, l_1 - h_1) \in \Gamma_{10}^B$, and $l'_1 - (l_1 - h_1) \in \text{Ind } \Gamma_{10}^B$; since $\text{Ind } \Gamma_{10}^B (= \text{Ind } \text{Ind } \Gamma^B) \subseteq \Gamma_{10}^B(\lambda I) = \text{Ind } M_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda)$, $(l_0, l'_1) \in M_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda) - M_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda_0)$.

c) Let $[\cdot, \cdot]$ be an indefinite metric in \mathcal{H} and let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_1$ be a Hilbert metric in \mathcal{G}_1 . To see $\Gamma_{10}^B \phi^B(\lambda) \subseteq \gamma_{\Gamma^A}(\bar{\lambda})^c$, i.e. $(\forall (u, l_1) \in \Gamma_{10}^B \phi^B(\lambda)) (\forall (h_1, x_{\bar{\lambda}}) \in \gamma_{\Gamma^A}(\bar{\lambda})) [x_{\bar{\lambda}}, u] = \langle h_1, l_1 \rangle_1$, use $\Gamma^A \subseteq \Gamma_{\#}^B$, $u = y - \lambda x$, $\hat{x} = (x, y) \in A_0$, $(\hat{x}, \binom{l_0}{l_1}) \in \Gamma^B$.

For the inclusion to become the equality apply e.g. [28, Proposition 2.1].

d) $(u, y - x) \in (A_\theta - \lambda I)^{-1} - (A_0 - \lambda I)^{-1}$ implies $(\exists (l_0, l_1) \in \theta) (\exists h_1 \in \mathcal{G}_1) ((\binom{x}{u+\lambda x}, \binom{l_0}{h_1}) \in \Gamma^B, ((\binom{y}{u+\lambda y}, \binom{l_0}{l_1}) \in \Gamma^B$; so $(u, y - x) = (u, x_\lambda) \in \mathcal{R}_{A_0 - \lambda I} \times \mathcal{N}_\lambda$, $(\hat{x}_\lambda, \binom{l_0}{l_1 - h_1}) \in \Gamma^B$, $(u, h_1) \in \Gamma_{10}^B \phi^B(\lambda)$, $(l_0, x_\lambda) \in \gamma_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda)$, $(l_0, l_1 - h_1) \in M_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda)$ i.e. $(h_1, l_0) \in (\theta - M_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda))^{-1}$, so $(u, y - x) \in \gamma_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda)(\theta - M_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda))^{-1} \Gamma_{10}^B \phi^B(\lambda)$.

Conversely, $\gamma_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda)(\theta - M_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda))^{-1} \Gamma_{10}^B \phi^B(\lambda)$ consists of $(y' - \lambda x, x_\lambda) \in \mathcal{R}_{A_0 - \lambda I} \times \mathcal{N}_\lambda$ such that $(\exists (l_0, l_1) \in \theta) (\exists h_1 \in \mathcal{G}_1) ((\binom{x}{y'}, \binom{l_0}{h_1}) \in \Gamma^B, (l_0, l_1 - h_1) \in M_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda), (l_0, x_\lambda) \in \gamma_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda)$. Thus $(\exists y_\lambda \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda) (\exists l'_1 \in \mathcal{G}_1) (\hat{y}_\lambda, \binom{l_0}{l'_1 - h_1}) \in \Gamma^B$, $(\hat{x}_\lambda, \binom{l_0}{l'_1}) \in \Gamma^B$, so $x_\lambda - y_\lambda \in \text{Ker}_\lambda A_0$ and then $(\hat{x}_\lambda, \binom{l_0}{l_1 - h_1}) \in \Gamma^B \hat{\vdash} ((\lambda I \cap A_0) \times \{0\})$. If $\text{Ker}_\lambda A_0 = \text{Ker}_\lambda \text{Ker } \Gamma^B$ then $(\hat{x}_\lambda, \binom{l_0}{l_1 - h_1}) \in \Gamma^B$ and $h_1 + l'_1 - l_1 \in \text{Ind } \text{Ind } \Gamma^B = \text{Ind } \Gamma_{10}^B$. With $y = x + x_\lambda$ and $u = y' - \lambda x$, by $((\binom{y}{u+\lambda y}, \binom{l_0}{h_1 + l'_1}) \in \Gamma^B$ we get $((\binom{y}{u+\lambda y}, \binom{l_0}{l_1}) \in \Gamma^B$, i.e. $(y' - \lambda x, x_\lambda) = (u, y - x) \in (A_\theta - \lambda I)^{-1} - (A_0 - \lambda I)^{-1}$. \square

Corollary 3.8. *Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \sigma_p(A_0)$. Then*

- $(A_\theta - \lambda I)^{-1} | \mathcal{R}_{A_0 - \lambda I} = (A_0 - \lambda I)^{-1} + \gamma_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda)(\theta - M_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda))^{-1} \Gamma_{10}^B \phi^B(\lambda)$ (cf. [13, Theorem 5.8]).
- $\lambda \notin \sigma_p(A_\theta)$ iff $\mathcal{D}_{\theta \cap M_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda)} \subseteq \text{Ind } \Gamma_0^B$.
- If $\lambda \in \rho(A_0)$ then $\lambda \in \rho(A_\theta)$ iff $\mathcal{D}_{\theta \cap M_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda)} \subseteq \text{Ind } \Gamma_0^B$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\Gamma_{10}^B} \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\theta - M_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda)}$.

In the next proposition A_θ, M_{Γ^B} formally are as above, but for arbitrary Γ^B .

Proposition 3.9. [21, Lemma 2.1]

- $A_\theta^c \supseteq (\Gamma_{\#}^B)^{-1}(\theta^*)$; if Γ^B is a closed relation and $\theta, \theta \hat{\vdash} \mathcal{R}_{\Gamma^B}$ are subspaces in \mathcal{G} , the inclusion becomes the equality; and if moreover $\theta^* \hat{\vdash} \mathcal{R}_{\Gamma_{\#}^B}$ is a subspace in \mathcal{G}' , A_θ is a subspace in \mathcal{H}_Γ .
- $M_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda)^* \supseteq \Gamma_{\#}^B(\bar{\lambda} I)$ ($\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$), with the equality if Γ^B is a closed relation and $\mathcal{D}_{\Gamma^B} - \lambda I$ has closed range; if the latter and also $\mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_{\#}^B} - \bar{\lambda} I$ has closed range, then $M_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda)$ is a closed relation.

Remark 3.10. By $\Gamma^B(A_\theta) = (\theta \cap \mathcal{R}_{\Gamma^B}) \hat{\vdash} \text{Ind } \Gamma^B$, in an ibp $((\mathcal{G}, \Gamma^B), (\mathcal{G}', \Gamma^A))$ for a dp (A, B) the set of relations $A^\sim: \text{Ker } \Gamma^B \subseteq A^\sim \subseteq B^c$ is 1-1 with the set of relations $\theta: \text{Ind } \Gamma^B \subseteq \theta \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\Gamma^B}$ via $A^\sim = A_\theta, \theta = \Gamma^B(A^\sim)$.

Proof of Theorem 3.2. By hypothesis $\{\mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{U}', M\}, \{\mathcal{U}^* \cup \mathcal{U}'^*, M_1\}$ are holomorphic elements, where $M(\lambda) = M_\Gamma(\lambda)$ and $M_1(\bar{\lambda}) = M_\Gamma(\bar{\lambda})$ if $\lambda \in \mathcal{U}$, and $M(\lambda) = M_{\Gamma'}(\lambda)$ and $M_1(\bar{\lambda}) = M_{\Gamma'}(\bar{\lambda})$ if $\lambda \in \mathcal{U}'$. By Lemma 3.7 b), c) $\{\mathcal{U}, \lambda \mapsto \gamma_\Gamma(\bar{\lambda}_0)^c \gamma_\Gamma(\lambda)\}, \{\mathcal{U}', \lambda \mapsto \gamma_{\Gamma'}(\bar{\lambda}_0)^c \gamma_{\Gamma'}(\lambda)\}$ are holomorphic elements, for some $\bar{\lambda}_0 \in \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{U}'$, which are continuations of each other via $M_1(\lambda_0) - M(\lambda)$, hence there is a (J, J') -isometric operator $U: \mathcal{L} = \text{Lin}\{\text{Ker}_\lambda T^c \mid \lambda \in \mathcal{U}\} \rightarrow \text{Lin}\{\text{Ker}_\lambda T'^c \mid \lambda \in \mathcal{U}'\}$, which extends to $U \in \text{St}_1(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}')$.

By Lemma 3.7 a) $\gamma_\Gamma(\lambda) - \gamma_\Gamma(\mu) = (\lambda - \mu)(T_0 - \lambda I)^{-1} \gamma_\Gamma(\mu)$ on $\Gamma_0(\lambda I) \cap \Gamma_0(\mu I)$, for $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{U}$. Thus $U(T_0 - \lambda I)^{-1} = (T'_0 - \lambda I')^{-1} U$ on a dense $\text{Lin}\{\text{Ker}_\mu T^c \cap \mathcal{R}_{T_0 - \lambda I} \mid \mu \in \mathcal{U}\}$ in $\mathcal{R}_{T_0 - \lambda I}$, and $T'_0 = \tilde{U}(T_0)$ on $\mathcal{D}_{T'_0} = U(\mathcal{D}_{T_0})$.

By Lemma 3.7 d)

$$(T'_1 - \lambda I')^{-1} - (T'_0 - \lambda I')^{-1} = U[(T_1 - \lambda I)^{-1} - (T_0 - \lambda I)^{-1}]U^{-1}$$

for $\lambda \in \mathcal{U}$. From here follows $T'_1 \supseteq \tilde{U}(T_1)$, so $T'_1 = \tilde{U}(T_1)$, $\mathcal{D}_{T'_1} = U(\mathcal{D}_{T_1})$, by taking the adjoint and using $\tilde{U} \in \text{St}_1(\mathcal{H}_\Gamma, \mathcal{H}'_\Gamma)$. As a result $T' = \tilde{U}(T)$ on $\mathcal{D}_{T'} = U(\mathcal{D}_T)$.

With Lemmas 3.3, 3.4 a) $\Gamma' = \Gamma V^{-1}$, $V = \tilde{U}W \in \text{St}_1(\mathcal{H}_\Gamma, \mathcal{H}'_\Gamma)$, $W = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix} \in \text{St}_1(\mathcal{H}_\Gamma)$.

Consider the operator $K \sum_j x_j = \sum_j (A + \lambda_j B)x_j$ on $\mathcal{L} = \text{Lin}\{x_j \in \text{Ker}_{\lambda_j} T^c\}$. By Lemma 3.4 b) $\text{Ker}_{\lambda_j} T^c = (A + \lambda_j B)(\text{Ker}_{\lambda_j} T^c)$; hence $\mathcal{D}_K = \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{R}_K$. Because

$$(A + \lambda_{j'} B)^c (A + \lambda_j B)x_j = \frac{\lambda_j - \bar{\lambda}_{j'}}{\lambda_j} x_j + \frac{\bar{\lambda}_{j'}}{\lambda_j} (A + \lambda_{j'} B)^c (A + \lambda_j B)x_j$$

for $\lambda_j \neq 0$, the isometric K extends to $K \in \text{St}_1(\mathcal{H})$.

On the other hand, if $x \in \text{Ker}(K - A - \lambda B)$, $\lambda \in r(T, T_0)$, then $(\exists(x_j) \subseteq \mathcal{L})$ $x - \sum_{j=1}^n x_j \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ strongly in \mathcal{H} , so $\sum_j (\lambda - \lambda_j)x_j \in \text{Ker} B$, i.e. $\mathcal{H} = \text{Ker} B$. But then $B = 0$ implies $\text{Ker}(K - A) = \mathcal{H}$, i.e. $A = K$, and moreover $D = K$ and $C = 0$. As a result $W = \tilde{K}$ and $\Pi_{\Gamma'}$ is UK -unitarily equivalent to Π_Γ . \square

4. SIMILARITY OF MINIMAL BOUNDARY TRIPLES FOR DUAL PAIRS

Let $\Pi = (\mathcal{G}, \Gamma^B)$ be a bt for a dp (A, B) in \mathcal{H} . Let (see [16] for block relations)

$$r(A, B, A_0) = r\left(\begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} A_0 & 0 \\ 0 & B_0 \end{pmatrix}\right), \quad B_0 = A_0^c.$$

Definition 4.1. A bt $\Pi \equiv \{\mathcal{U}, \Pi\}$ for a dp (A, B) in \mathcal{H} is minimal if $\{\mathcal{U}^\#, M_{\Gamma^B}\}$, $\{\mathcal{U}^\#, M_{\Gamma^A}\}$ are holomorphic elements for both $\mathcal{U}^\# = \mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{U}^\# = \mathcal{U}^*$, for an open subset $\mathcal{U} \subseteq r(A, B, A_0)$, and if $C\text{Lin}\{\text{Ker}_\lambda A^c \mid \lambda \in \mathcal{U}\} = \mathcal{H} = C\text{Lin}\{\text{Ker}_\lambda B^c \mid \lambda \in \mathcal{U}\}$.

Let (A', B') be a dp of closed relations in a Krein space \mathcal{H}' and let $\Pi' = (\mathcal{G}', \Gamma^{B'})$ be a bt for (A', B') with Weyl family $M_{\Gamma^{B'}}$.

Definition 4.2. Π' is (U -)similar to Π if there is a homeomorphism $U: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}'$ such that $\Gamma^{B'} = \Gamma^B \tilde{U}^{-1}$. If $U \in \text{St}_1(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}')$, Π' is (U -)unitarily equivalent to Π .

Theorem 4.3. Let $\{\mathcal{U}, \Pi\}$ and $\{\mathcal{U}', \Pi'\}$ be minimal bt's for dp's (A, B) in \mathcal{H} and (A', B') in \mathcal{H}' respectively. If $\{\mathcal{U}, M_{\Gamma^B}\} \leftrightarrow \{\mathcal{U}', M_{\Gamma^{B'}}\}$, $\{\mathcal{U}^*, M_{\Gamma^B}\} \leftrightarrow \{\mathcal{U}'^*, M_{\Gamma^{B'}}\}$ then Π' is similar to Π .

If $A = B$ and $A' = B'$, the similarity can be chosen unitary iff

$$(1) \quad (\Gamma^B)^{-1} \Gamma^{B'} = (\Gamma^A)^{-1} \Gamma^{A'}.$$

For $A = B$ and $A' = B'$, (1) is equivalent to $\Gamma^{A'} (\Gamma^{B'})^{-1} = \Gamma^A (\Gamma^B)^{-1}$ by routine computation; less trivial is that (1) holds iff

$$(1') \quad (\Gamma^B)^{-1} \Gamma^{B'}: \mathcal{H}'_\Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_\Gamma \text{ is a unitary relation.}$$

(Take the adjoint and $\Gamma_{\#}^{B'} = \Gamma^{A'}$, $\Gamma_{\#}^B = \Gamma^A$.) Let $E = \Gamma^A (\Gamma^B)^{-1} (= [\Gamma^B (\Gamma^B)^c Y]^{-1})$, a homeomorphism $\mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}'$. From $\Gamma^A = E \Gamma^B$ follows $M_{\Gamma^A}(\lambda) = E(M_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda))$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. Because $M_{\Gamma^A}(\lambda) = M_{\Gamma^B}(\bar{\lambda})^*$ for $\lambda \in r_0(A)$, by (1) $\{\mathcal{U}, M_{\Gamma^B}\} \leftrightarrow \{\mathcal{U}', M_{\Gamma^{B'}}\}$ iff $\{\mathcal{U}^*, M_{\Gamma^B}\} \leftrightarrow \{\mathcal{U}'^*, M_{\Gamma^{B'}}\}$. Hence the corollary.

Corollary 4.4. *Let $\{\mathcal{U}, \Pi\}$ and $\{\mathcal{U}', \Pi'\}$ be minimal bt's for dp 's (A, A) in \mathcal{H} and (A', A') in \mathcal{H}' respectively, such that (1) holds. If $\{\mathcal{U}, M_{\Gamma^B}\} \leftrightarrow \{\mathcal{U}', M_{\Gamma^{B'}}\}$ then Π' is unitarily equivalent to Π .*

Remark 4.5. In the corollary, $\{\mathcal{U}^\#, M_{\Gamma^B}\}$ is a holomorphic element iff (via E) such is $\{\mathcal{U}^\#, M_{\Gamma^A}\}$. That is, if $\{\mathcal{U}, M_{\Gamma^B}\}, \{\mathcal{U}^*, M_{\Gamma^A}\}$ are holomorphic elements (e.g. if $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \rho(A_0)$, see Lemma 3.7), then so are $\{\mathcal{U}^*, M_{\Gamma^B}\}, \{\mathcal{U}, M_{\Gamma^A}\}$, and conversely.

At some point when proving (1) we shall use the notion of a standard operator.

Definition 4.6. [4, Definition 5.2.1] An operator V from a J_1 -space \mathcal{H}_1 to a J_2 -space \mathcal{H}_2 is a standard operator, $V \in \text{St}(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2)$, if V is a closed continuous and continuously invertible (J_1, J_2) -isometric operator.

Remark 4.7. To recall, by [4, Theorem 5.2.2] $V \in \text{St}(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2)$ always has a maximal extension, V^\sim say, from $\text{St}(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2)$, but not necessarily from $\text{St}_1(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2)$; for $V^\sim \in \text{St}_1(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2)$ it is necessary and sufficient that $\nu_+(V) = 0 = \nu_-(V)$ and that there should be $V_1 \in \text{St}(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2)$ which maps $\mathcal{D}_V^{[\perp]1}$ onto $\mathcal{R}_V^{[\perp]2}$ [4, Theorem 5.2.12];

$$\nu_\pm(V) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if there is in } \mathcal{D}_V^{[\perp]1} \text{ or in } \mathcal{R}_V^{[\perp]2} \text{ an infinite-dimensional} \\ & \text{uniformly negative/uniformly positive subspace;} \\ \dim(\mathcal{D}_V^{[\perp]1} \cap \mathcal{L}_1^\mp) + \dim(V\mathcal{D}_2) \cap \mathcal{L}_2^\pm - \dim(\mathcal{R}_V^{[\perp]2} \cap \mathcal{L}_2^\mp) & \\ \text{otherwise} & \end{cases}$$

where $(\mathcal{L}_1^+, \mathcal{L}_1^-)$ is a maximal uniformly definite dual pair in \mathcal{H}_1 , $\mathcal{D}_V = \mathcal{D}_0[+] \mathcal{D}_1[+] \mathcal{D}_2$ is the $(\mathcal{L}_1^+, \mathcal{L}_1^-)$ -decomposition of \mathcal{D}_V ([4, Definition 1.10.3]), and $(\mathcal{L}_2^+, \mathcal{L}_2^-)$ is a maximal uniformly definite dual pair in \mathcal{H}_2 such that $V(\mathcal{D}_V \cap \mathcal{L}_1^\pm) \subseteq \mathcal{L}_2^\pm$. The $\nu_\pm(V)$ are independent of the choice of the $(\mathcal{L}_i^+, \mathcal{L}_i^-)$ ($i = 1, 2$).

Proof of Theorem 4.3. $T = \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix}$ is a closed symmetric relation both in the Krein space $(\mathcal{H}_\Gamma, [\cdot, \cdot]_\Gamma)$ and in the Krein space $(\mathcal{H}_{\hat{\Gamma}}, [\cdot, \cdot]_{\hat{\Gamma}})$ with canonical symmetry $J_{\hat{\Gamma}}(x, y) = (Jy, Jx)$ and indefinite metric $[(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2)]_{\hat{\Gamma}} = [x_1, y_2] + [y_1, x_2]$, where J is a canonical symmetry and $[\cdot, \cdot]$ an indefinite metric in \mathcal{H} .

Consider

$$\Gamma = \left\{ \left(\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ y' \end{pmatrix} \right), \left(\begin{pmatrix} l_0 \\ h_1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} h_0 \\ l_1 \end{pmatrix} \right) \mid \left(\begin{pmatrix} x \\ x' \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} l_0 \\ l_1 \end{pmatrix} \right) \in \Gamma^B; \left(\begin{pmatrix} y \\ y' \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} h_1 \\ h_0 \end{pmatrix} \right) \in \Gamma^A \right\}$$

as a relation from the Krein space $\mathcal{K} = (\mathcal{H}_{\hat{\Gamma}} \oplus \mathcal{H}_{\hat{\Gamma}}, [\cdot, \cdot]_{\mathcal{K}})$ with canonical symmetry $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -iJ_{\hat{\Gamma}} \\ iJ_{\hat{\Gamma}} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and indefinite metric

$$\left[\left(\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ y' \end{pmatrix} \right), \left(\begin{pmatrix} x_* \\ y_* \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} x'_* \\ y'_* \end{pmatrix} \right) \right]_{\mathcal{K}} = -i \left[\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} x'_* \\ y'_* \end{pmatrix} \right]_{\hat{\Gamma}} + i \left[\begin{pmatrix} x' \\ y' \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} x_* \\ y_* \end{pmatrix} \right]_{\hat{\Gamma}}$$

to the Krein space \mathcal{G}_Γ .

It is a simple computational task to verify that in general (i.e. for arbitrary Γ^B, Γ^A) $(\Gamma^c)^{-1}$ is given similar to Γ , but with $\Gamma_\#^A, \Gamma_\#^B$ in place of Γ^B, Γ^A , respectively;

$$\mathcal{D}_\Gamma = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{D}_{\Gamma^B} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{D}_{\Gamma^A} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{Ker } \Gamma = \begin{pmatrix} \text{Ker } \Gamma^B & 0 \\ 0 & \text{Ker } \Gamma^A \end{pmatrix}, \\ \mathcal{R}_\Gamma = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathcal{R}_{\Gamma^A} \\ \mathcal{R}_{\Gamma^B} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{Ind } \Gamma = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \text{Ind } \Gamma^A \\ \text{Ind } \Gamma^B & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

In case of bt's therefore $\Gamma: \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_\Gamma$ is unitary surjective and $\Pi_\Gamma = (\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ is an obt for $T^c = \begin{pmatrix} B^c & 0 \\ 0 & A^c \end{pmatrix}$. The Weyl family M_Γ associated with Π_Γ reads

$$M_\Gamma(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & M_{\Gamma^A}(\lambda) \\ M_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda) & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}$$

and moreover $M_{\Gamma^A}(\lambda) = M_{\Gamma^B}(\bar{\lambda})^*$ if $\lambda \in r_0(A) \cap r_0(B)$.

In parallel one constructs an obt $\Pi_{\Gamma'} = (\mathcal{G}, \Gamma')$ for $T'^c = \begin{pmatrix} B'^c & 0 \\ 0 & A'^c \end{pmatrix}$ with Weyl family $M_{\Gamma'}$. Because $\{\mathcal{U}, \Pi_\Gamma\}, \{\mathcal{U}', \Pi_{\Gamma'}\}$ are minimal obt's for T^c, T'^c respectively, where open subsets $\mathcal{U} \subseteq r(T, T_0), \mathcal{U}' \subseteq r(T', T'_0)$, and self-adjoint relations $T_0 = \begin{pmatrix} A_0 & 0 \\ 0 & B_0 \end{pmatrix} = \text{Ker } \Gamma_0, T'_0 = \begin{pmatrix} A'_0 & 0 \\ 0 & B'_0 \end{pmatrix} = \text{Ker } \Gamma'_0$, and because $\{\mathcal{U}, M_\Gamma\} \leftrightarrow \{\mathcal{U}', M_{\Gamma'}\}$, from Theorem 3.2 follows that $\Pi_{\Gamma'}$ is U -unitarily equivalent to Π_Γ .

Write $U \in \text{St}_1(\mathcal{H}_\Gamma, \mathcal{H}'_\Gamma)$ in matrix form $(U_{ij})_{i,j=1}^2$:

$$\begin{aligned} U_{11}^c U_{22} + U_{21}^c U_{12} &= I, & U_{11} U_{22}^c + U_{12} U_{21}^c &= I', \\ U_{11}^c U_{21} + U_{21}^c U_{11} &= 0, & U_{11} U_{12}^c + U_{12} U_{11}^c &= 0, \\ U_{12}^c U_{22} + U_{22}^c U_{12} &= 0, & U_{21} U_{22}^c + U_{22} U_{21}^c &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then $\Gamma' = \Gamma \tilde{U}^{-1}$ yields: $(\hat{x}, \hat{l}) \in \Gamma^B, (\hat{y}, \hat{h}) \in \Gamma^A$ iff $(\tilde{U}_{11} \hat{x} + \tilde{U}_{12} \hat{y}, \hat{l}) \in \Gamma^{B'}, (\tilde{U}_{21} \hat{x} + \tilde{U}_{22} \hat{y}, \hat{h}) \in \Gamma^{A'}$. Thus $\Gamma^B \subseteq \Gamma^{B'} \tilde{U}_{11}, \tilde{U}_{21}(B^c) \subseteq B'$, and $\Gamma^A \subseteq \Gamma^{A'} \tilde{U}_{22}, \tilde{U}_{12}(A^c) \subseteq A'$.

From $\tilde{U}_{21}(B^c) \subseteq B'$ follows $U_{21}(\text{Ker}_\lambda B^c) \subseteq \text{Ker}_\lambda B'$ ($\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$); i.e. $U_{21} = 0$ by minimality of Π, Π' . Similarly $U_{12} = 0$, so U_{11} and $U_{22} = (U_{11}^c)^{-1}$ are homeomorphisms $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}'$. Then $\Gamma_\#^B \subseteq \Gamma_\#^{B'} \tilde{U}_{22}$ implies $\Gamma^B \supseteq \Gamma^{B'} \tilde{U}_{11}$, and then $\Gamma^B = \Gamma^{B'} \tilde{U}_{11}$ (equivalently $\Gamma^A = \Gamma^{A'} \tilde{U}_{22}$), and this proves that Π' is U_{11} -similar to Π .

Assume $A = B, A' = B'$. We show that a homeomorphism U_{11} can be chosen from $\text{St}_1(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}')$ iff (1) holds. From $\Gamma^{B'} = \Gamma^B \tilde{U}_{11}^{-1}$ and $\Gamma^{A'} = \Gamma^A \tilde{U}_{22}^{-1}$ (with $U_{22} = (U_{11}^c)^{-1}$) follows

$$\begin{aligned} (\Gamma^B)^{-1} \Gamma^{B'} &= (\tilde{U}_{11} | A^c)^{-1} \hat{\vdash} (\{0\} \times A), \\ (\Gamma^A)^{-1} \Gamma^{A'} &= (\tilde{U}_{22} | A^c)^{-1} \hat{\vdash} (\{0\} \times A) \end{aligned}$$

which proves necessity of (1) in order that $U_{11} = U_{22}$ should hold.

Conversely, if (1) then let $V = \tilde{U}_{11} | A^c$. By the above $V = \tilde{U}_{22} | A^c \in \text{St}(\mathcal{H}_\Gamma, \mathcal{H}'_\Gamma)$. If we showed that V admitted an extension from $\text{St}_1(\mathcal{H}_\Gamma, \mathcal{H}'_\Gamma)$, then, because an arbitrary homeomorphism $W: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}'$ obeys $W \in \text{St}_1(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}')$ iff $\tilde{W} \in \text{St}_1(\mathcal{H}_\Gamma, \mathcal{H}'_\Gamma)$ iff $\tilde{W} \in \text{St}_1(\mathcal{H}_\Gamma, \mathcal{H}'_\Gamma)$, we could put $U_{11} \in \text{St}_1(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}')$, which would accomplish our proof of sufficiency.

If $V_1 = \tilde{U}_{22} | A$ then $V_1 = \tilde{U}_{11} | A \in \text{St}(\mathcal{H}_\Gamma, \mathcal{H}'_\Gamma)$ maps $\mathcal{D}_V^{[\pm]} = A$ onto $\mathcal{R}_V^{[\pm]'} = A'$, and therefore it remains to verify $\nu_\pm(V) = 0$.

Because $\mathcal{D}_V = A^c, \mathcal{R}_V = A'^c$, and $A (A')$ is a neutral subspace in $\mathcal{H}_\Gamma (\mathcal{H}'_\Gamma)$, $\nu_\pm(V) = \dim(V(\mathcal{D}_2) \cap \mathcal{L}_2^\pm)$. Without loss of generality put $(\mathcal{L}_1^+, \mathcal{L}_1^-) = (\mathcal{H}_\Gamma^+, \mathcal{H}_\Gamma^-)$, where $\mathcal{H}_\Gamma^\pm = \{(x, \pm i Jx) | x \in \mathcal{H}\}$ are positive/negative subspaces in the canonical decomposition $\mathcal{H}_\Gamma = \mathcal{H}_\Gamma^+ \hat{\vdash} \mathcal{H}_\Gamma^-$; hence $\mathcal{D}_2 = \{0\}$. \square

Remark 4.8. By correspondence $(A, B) \leftrightarrow T$ established in the proof, every dp has a bt: $\dim \text{Ker}_i J_\Gamma T^c = \dim \text{Ker}_{-i} J_\Gamma T^c$ since $\text{Ker}_{\pm i} J_\Gamma T^c = \pm i((JA^c)^{-1} \cap -JB^c)$. By a simple computation, moreover, all boundary value spaces defined in [13] have their analogues for a dp; particularly the pair (\mathcal{G}, Γ) is an ibp for T^c iff $((\mathcal{G}, \Gamma^B), (\mathcal{G}', \Gamma^A))$ is an ibp for a dp (A, B) . With $\Gamma_1 = \pi_1 \Gamma$ ($\pi_1: \mathcal{G}_\Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{G}, \begin{pmatrix} l \\ h \end{pmatrix} \mapsto h$), $\Gamma_1^B = P_1 \Gamma^B (P_1$

as in Lemma 3.7), $\Gamma_1^A = P_1' \Gamma^A$ ($P_1': \mathcal{G}' \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_0, \binom{h_1}{h_0} \mapsto h_0$), $\mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_i} = \mathcal{D}_\Gamma$ ($i = 0, 1$), and

$$T_i = \text{Ker } \Gamma_i = \begin{pmatrix} A_i & 0 \\ 0 & B_i \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_i = \text{Ker } \Gamma_i^B, \quad B_i = \text{Ker } \Gamma_i^A,$$

$$\mathcal{R}_{\Gamma_0} = \mathcal{R}_{\Gamma_0^B} \times \mathcal{R}_{\Gamma_0^A}, \quad \mathcal{R}_{\Gamma_1} = \mathcal{R}_{\Gamma_1^A} \times \mathcal{R}_{\Gamma_1^B},$$

$$\text{Ind } \Gamma_0 = \text{Ind } \Gamma_0^B \times \text{Ind } \Gamma_0^A, \quad \text{Ind } \Gamma_1 = \text{Ind } \Gamma_1^A \times \text{Ind } \Gamma_1^B$$

the following equivalences hold:

- (\mathcal{G}, Γ) is an AB -generalized boundary pair (bp) for T^c (i.e. ibp with T_0 self-adjoint and $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_{\Gamma_0} = \mathcal{G}$) iff $((\mathcal{G}, \Gamma^B), (\mathcal{G}', \Gamma^A))$ is an AB -generalized bp for (A, B) (i.e. ibp with $A_0 = B_0^c, B_0 = A_0^c, \bar{\mathcal{R}}_{\Gamma_0^B} = \mathcal{G}_0, \bar{\mathcal{R}}_{\Gamma_0^A} = \mathcal{G}_1$);
- (\mathcal{G}, Γ) is a q -bt for T^c (i.e. AB -generalized bp with $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_{\Gamma_1} = \mathcal{G}$) iff $((\mathcal{G}, \Gamma^B), (\mathcal{G}', \Gamma^A))$ is a q -bt for (A, B) (i.e. AB -generalized bp with $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_{\Gamma_1^B} = \mathcal{G}_1, \bar{\mathcal{R}}_{\Gamma_1^A} = \mathcal{G}_0$), see [5];
- (\mathcal{G}, Γ) is an ES -generalized bp for T^c (i.e. ubp with T_0 essentially self-adjoint) iff $((\mathcal{G}, \Gamma^B), (\mathcal{G}', \Gamma^A))$ is an ES -generalized bp for (A, B) (i.e. ubp with $A_0 = B_0^c$);
- (\mathcal{G}, Γ) is an S -generalized bp for T^c (i.e. ES -generalized bp with T_0 self-adjoint) iff $((\mathcal{G}, \Gamma^B), (\mathcal{G}', \Gamma^A))$ is an S -generalized bp for (A, B) (i.e. ES -generalized bp with $A_0 = B_0^c$ and $B_0 = A_0^c$);
- (\mathcal{G}, Γ) is a B -generalized bp for T^c (i.e. S -generalized bp with $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_{\Gamma_0} = \mathcal{G}$) iff $((\mathcal{G}, \Gamma^B), (\mathcal{G}', \Gamma^A))$ is a B -generalized bp for (A, B) (i.e. S -generalized bp with $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_{\Gamma_0^B} = \mathcal{G}_0, \bar{\mathcal{R}}_{\Gamma_0^A} = \mathcal{G}_1$).

Example 4.9. By [1, Theorem 6.2] a bounded everywhere defined contraction T in a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} is a qsc-operator if $\mathcal{D}_{T \cap T^*}$ is nontrivial; it is a qsc-extension of a closed symmetric contraction $A = T|_{\mathcal{H} \ominus \mathcal{N}}, \mathcal{N} = \tilde{\mathcal{N}} \supseteq \mathcal{R}_{T^* - T}$. Associated with a qsc-operator T is the Q -function $Q_T(\lambda) = P_{\mathcal{N}}(T - \lambda I)^{-1}|_{\mathcal{N}}, \lambda \in \mathcal{U} = \{\lambda \mid |\lambda| > 1\}$ ($P_{\mathcal{N}}$ is an orthogonal projection in \mathcal{H} onto \mathcal{N}), which is the Weyl function $M_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda)$ of a bt Π for a dp (A, A) , where $\mathcal{G}_0 = \mathcal{G}_1 = \mathcal{N}, \Gamma^B \binom{x}{y} = \binom{P_{\mathcal{N}}(Tx - y)}{P_{\mathcal{N}}x}, \binom{x}{y} \in A^* = T \hat{+} (\{0\} \times \mathcal{N})$, so that $\Gamma^A = \Gamma^B + \binom{T^* - T}{0} P$ (and P is as in Lemma 3.7); T is \mathcal{N} -minimal if $C\text{Lin}\{\text{Ker}_\lambda A^* = (T - \lambda I)^{-1}(\mathcal{N}) \mid \lambda \in \mathcal{U}\} = \mathcal{H}$. In order to see that Q_T on $\mathcal{U} (\subseteq r(A, A, A_0 = T))$ determines an \mathcal{N} -minimal qsc-operator T uniquely up to unitary equivalence, by (1) one only needs to observe that $(T^* - T)x = (T'^* - T')x'$ if $\binom{x'}{y'} \in (\Gamma^B)^{-1} \Gamma^{B'}$, where T' is an \mathcal{N} -minimal qsc-operator in a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}' \supseteq \mathcal{N}$, with $\{\mathcal{U}, Q_T\} \leftrightarrow \{\mathcal{U}', Q_{T'}\}$ and a bt Π' defined similarly.

5. EXAMPLE: D -BOUNDARY TRIPLE IN A Π_κ -SPACE

Definition 5.1. Let A be a closed symmetric relation in a Krein space \mathcal{H} and let the Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{G}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{G}_0$ and $\mathcal{G}_2 = \mathcal{G}_0 \ominus \mathcal{G}_1$. A D -bt for A^c is a bt $\Pi = (\mathcal{G}, \Gamma^B)$ for (A, A) such that $\Gamma^A = E \Gamma^B$, where $E(l_0, l_1) = (E_1 l_0, iE_2 l_0 + l_1)$, $\mathcal{D}_E = \mathcal{G}$, where E_1 (E_2) is an orthogonal projection in \mathcal{G}_0 onto \mathcal{G}_1 (\mathcal{G}_2). A D -bt is minimal if such is a bt Π .

In a D -bt A_0 (B_1) is a maximal J -symmetric relation (cf. [25, Proposition 3.11]) with zero negative defect number; to avoid trivialities A is non-maximal J -symmetric.

Corollary 4.4 for minimal D -bt's generalizes Theorem 3.2; we apply this corollary to symmetric operators in a Π_κ -space, a Pontryagin space with κ negative squares (and indefinite metric $[\cdot, \cdot]$ and induced norm $\|\cdot\|$).

Let A be a closed π -symmetric operator.

Definition 5.2. [21] $A \in (LP)$ if $A \in (P)$ has the (Langer) property (L): There is a canonical decomposition $\Pi_\kappa = \Pi^-[\oplus]\Pi^+$ in which the negative subspace $\Pi^- \subseteq \mathcal{D}_A$.

A π -self-adjoint operator is of class (LP). From [21, Theorem 1.3] follows

Proposition 5.3. *A π -dissipative extension A^\sim of $A \in (LP)$ is an operator, and*

$$\mathbb{C}^- \cap \Gamma_A \subseteq r(A^\sim) \quad (\text{equivalently } \mathbb{C}^- \cap \sigma_p(A^\sim) \subseteq C_A)$$

for some open subset $\Gamma_A = \mathbb{C}_* \setminus C_A \supseteq \{\lambda \mid |\operatorname{Im} \lambda| > t_0 \|AP^-\|\}$, $t_0 \approx 1.84$, where P^- is the canonical projection onto $\Pi^- \subseteq \mathcal{D}_A$. $\Gamma_A = -\Gamma_A = \Gamma_A^*$.

Definition 5.4. $A \in (LP)$ is simple if $C\operatorname{Lin}\{\operatorname{Ker}_\lambda A^c \mid \lambda \in \Gamma_A\} = \Pi_\kappa$, $\Pi^- \subseteq \mathcal{D}_A$.

A simple A is automatically of class (P). The definition agrees with that in [3].

Proposition 5.5. $A \in (L)$ is simple iff $C\operatorname{Lin}\{\operatorname{Ker}_\lambda A^c \mid \lambda \in \mathbb{C}_*\} = \Pi_\kappa$.

Proof. As in [7, Lemma 1.6.11] consider $V = I + (\lambda - \mu)(A^\sim - \lambda I)^{-1}$ for any maximal π -dissipative (maximal π -accumulative) $A^\sim \supseteq A$ and $\lambda, \mu \in \rho(A^\sim)$; in the canonical decomposition $\Pi_\kappa = \Pi^-[\oplus]\Pi^+$, $\Pi^- \subseteq \mathcal{D}_A$, by Proposition 5.3 $\mathbb{C}^- \cap \Gamma_A \subseteq \rho(A^\sim)$ ($\mathbb{C}^+ \cap \Gamma_A \subseteq \rho(A^\sim)$). V maps $\operatorname{Ker}_\mu A^c$ bijectively onto $\operatorname{Ker}_\lambda A^c$, that is $x_\lambda = Vx_\mu \in \operatorname{Ker}_\lambda A^c$ if $x_\mu \in \operatorname{Ker}_\mu A^c$, and conversely.

If $x \in \bigcap_{\lambda \in \Gamma_A} \mathcal{R}_{A-\lambda I}$ then the function $\lambda \mapsto [x_\lambda, x]$ holomorphic on $\mathbb{C}^- \cap \rho(A^\sim)$ ($\mathbb{C}^+ \cap \rho(A^\sim)$) vanishes on $\mathbb{C}^- \cap \Gamma_A$ ($\mathbb{C}^+ \cap \Gamma_A$), so it must vanish on all of $\mathbb{C}^- \cap \rho(A^\sim)$ ($\mathbb{C}^+ \cap \rho(A^\sim)$); that is $C\operatorname{Lin}\{\operatorname{Ker}_\lambda A^c \mid \lambda \in \Gamma_A\} = C\operatorname{Lin}\{\operatorname{Ker}_\lambda A^c \mid \lambda \in \mathbb{C}_* \cap \rho(A^\sim)\}$. Because $\rho(A^\sim)$ contains \mathbb{C}^- (\mathbb{C}^+) with a possible exception of at most κ normal eigenvalues of A^\sim , the assertion follows; A^\sim is an operator by Proposition 5.3. \square

Proposition 5.6. *A D -bt $\{\Gamma_A, \Pi\}$ ($\Pi^- \subseteq \mathcal{D}_A$) of a simple $A \in (L)$ is minimal.*

Proof. By hypothesis A in $\Pi_\kappa = \Pi^-[\oplus]\Pi^+$, $\Pi^- \subseteq \mathcal{D}_A$, is non-maximal symmetric. Then by Proposition 5.3 $\mathbb{C}^- \cap r(A, A, A_0) \supseteq \mathbb{C}^- \cap \Gamma_A \cap r(B_0)$; since B_0 is maximal (π -)dissipative, $\mathbb{C}^- \cap r(A, A, A_0) \supseteq \mathbb{C}^- \cap \Gamma_A$. In the upper half-plane $\mathbb{C}^+ \cap r(A, A, A_0)$ contains $\mathbb{C}^+ \cap \Gamma_A$ with the exception of an at most κ -dimensional subset $\mathbb{C}^+ \cap \Gamma_A \cap \sigma_p(B_0)$: $\mathbb{C}^- \cap \Gamma_A \cap \sigma_p^*(B_0) = \mathbb{C}^- \cap \Gamma_A \cap \sigma_r(A_0)$ and $\#(\mathbb{C}^- \cap \sigma(A_0)) \leq \kappa$.

Because $\mathbb{C}^+ \cap \Gamma_A \subseteq \rho(A_0)$, all four $\{\mathbb{C}^+ \cap \Gamma_A, M_{\Gamma^B}\}$, $\{\mathbb{C}^- \cap \Gamma_A, M_{\Gamma^A}\}$, and then $\{\mathbb{C}^- \cap \Gamma_A, M_{\Gamma^B}\}$, $\{\mathbb{C}^+ \cap \Gamma_A, M_{\Gamma^A}\}$, are holomorphic elements. \square

Corollary 5.7. *On a neighborhood of infinity in \mathbb{C}^+ the Weyl function of a closed simple π -symmetric operator of class (L) determines a D -bt uniquely up to unitary equivalence.*

In a Π_0 -space the Weyl function in [25, 26, 27] is defined on $\mathbb{C}^+ = \rho(A_0)$, in order to have it holomorphic. For $A \in (LP)$ in a Π_κ -space $\rho(A_0)$ is characterized thus.

Proposition 5.8. *Let $A \in (LP)$, $\Pi^- \subseteq \mathcal{D}_A$, and let $A_0 \supseteq A$ be a closed maximal π -symmetric operator with defect numbers $(d_+, 0)$, $d_+ \geq 1$. Then*

$$\mathbb{R} \cap \rho(A_0) = \mathbb{R} \cap r(A_0), \quad \mathbb{C}^+ \cap \rho(A_0) \supseteq \mathbb{C}^+ \cap \Gamma_A, \quad \mathbb{C}^- \cap \rho(A_0) \subseteq \mathbb{C}^- \cap C_A$$

and $\rho(A_0) \cap \rho^*(A_0) = \emptyset$.

Proof. The first two claims follow from $\mathbb{R} \cap \sigma_r(A_0) = \emptyset$ ([4, Corollary 2.2.17]) and Proposition 5.3. For the last two claims it suffices to verify that $\mathcal{R}_{A_0-\lambda I} \neq \Pi_\kappa$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^- \cap \Gamma_A$, as the latter would imply $\mathbb{C}^- \cap \sigma_r(A_0) \supseteq \mathbb{C}^- \cap \Gamma_A$.

If $\mathcal{R}_{A_0-\lambda I} = \Pi_\kappa$ for some and then for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^- \cap \Gamma_A$, then $\mathbb{C}^- \cap \Gamma_A \subseteq \mathbb{C}^- \cap \rho(A_0)$ so $\Gamma_A \subseteq \rho(A_0) \cap \rho^*(A_0)$; as in [7, Theorem 1.5.5(iv)] the latter implies $A_0 = A_0^\circ$. \square

Remark 5.9. In the proposition necessarily $\bar{\mathcal{D}}_{A_0} = \Pi_\kappa$. If $\kappa = 0$ then $C_A = \emptyset$ and then $\mathbb{R} \cap r(A_0) = \emptyset$ (e.g. [29, Proposition 3.3]) and $\rho(A_0) = \mathbb{C}^+$.

6. EXAMPLE: A BOUNDARY TRIPLE DETERMINED BY THE LINEAR FRACTIONAL TRANSFORMATION OF NEVANLINNA FUNCTION

Consider a closed symmetric operator $A \in (P)$ in a Krein space \mathcal{H} with equal nonzero defect numbers. Let $(\mathcal{L}, \dot{\Gamma})$ be an obt for A^c with Weyl family $M_{\dot{\Gamma}}$. Suppose the Hilbert spaces \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{G}_0 are isomorphic and let W be a homeomorphism $\mathcal{L}_\Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$; $\mathcal{G}_1 = \mathcal{G}_0$. Then $\Pi = (\mathcal{G}, \Gamma^B)$, where $\Gamma^B = W\dot{\Gamma}$ and $\Gamma^A = (W^c)^{-1}\dot{\Gamma}$, is a bt for a dp (A, A) with Weyl family $M_{\Gamma^B}(\lambda) = W(M_{\dot{\Gamma}}(\lambda))$; W^c is the adjoint of W , the latter being considered as the operator from the Krein space \mathcal{L}_Γ to the $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -iI_0 \\ iI_0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ -space \mathcal{G} (i.e. the Krein space $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{G}_0)_\Gamma$). It is supposed that Π is minimal.

Let $A' \in (P)$ be a closed symmetric operator in a Krein space \mathcal{H}' with the same defect numbers as those of A ; $(\mathcal{L}', \dot{\Gamma}')$ is an obt for A'^c with Weyl family $M_{\dot{\Gamma}'}$, W' is a homeomorphism $\mathcal{L}'_\Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$. Let $\Pi' = (\mathcal{G}, \Gamma^{B'})$, $\Gamma^{B'} = W'\dot{\Gamma}'$, $\Gamma^{A'} = (W'^c)^{-1}\dot{\Gamma}'$, be a minimal bt for a dp (A', A') with Weyl family $M_{\Gamma^{B'}}(\lambda) = W'(M_{\dot{\Gamma}'}(\lambda))$.

Under these conditions (1') holds iff a homeomorphism $V = W'^{-1}W: \mathcal{L}_\Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{L}'_\Gamma$ is isometric.

We illustrate the necessary and sufficient condition with

$$W = \begin{pmatrix} K^{-1}B & -K^{-1} \\ K^* + CK^{-1}B & -CK^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

(see [18, Remark 3.16]), where $K \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{G}_0, \mathcal{L})$ is bijective, $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{L})$, $C = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{G}_0)$. The operator W' is defined analogously, where the corresponding objects are indicated by the primes. Then

Proposition 6.1. $V \in \text{St}_1(\mathcal{L}_\Gamma, \mathcal{L}'_\Gamma)$ iff

$$(2) \quad \begin{cases} \text{Im}(C' - C) = 0, & \mathcal{R}_{\text{Im} B} \subseteq K(\mathcal{D}_{C \cap C'}), \\ \text{Im} B' = (K'K^{-1})(\text{Im} B)(K'K^{-1})^*. \end{cases}$$

(Note that $C \cap C' = \text{Re} C \cap \text{Re} C'$ if $\text{Im} C = \text{Im} C'$.)

Proof. By definition

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} V_1 & V_2 \\ B'V_1 - K'K^{-1}B & K'K^{-1} + B'V_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$V_1 = (KK'^{-1})^* - V_2B, \quad V_2 = K'^{* -1}(C' - C)K^{-1}$$

and by routine computation $V \in \text{St}_1(\mathcal{L}_\Gamma, \mathcal{L}'_\Gamma)$ iff

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{R}_{\text{Im} B} \subseteq \text{Ker} V_2 & (\text{or equivalently } \mathcal{R}_{V_2^*} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{B \cap B^*}), \\ \mathcal{R}_{\text{Im} B'} \subseteq \text{Ker} V_2^* & (\text{or equivalently } \mathcal{R}_{V_2} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{B' \cap B'^*}), \\ \text{Im}(V_2KK'^{-1}) = 0, & \text{Im} B' = (K'K^{-1})(\text{Im} B)(K'K^{-1})^*; \end{cases}$$

substituting V_2 in the latter system gives (2). □

If Π' is unitarily equivalent to Π , $\dot{\Gamma}'^{-1}(\theta')$ ($\theta' \subseteq \mathcal{L}'_\Gamma$) is unitarily equivalent to $\dot{\Gamma}^{-1}(\theta)$ ($\theta = V^{-1}(\theta')$); for V as in Proposition 6.1 this means

$$\theta' = B' + K'[\text{Re}(C' - C) + K^*(\theta - B)^{-1}K]^{-1}K'^*.$$

In particular

- a) $A_0 = \text{Ker}(\dot{\Gamma}_1 - B\dot{\Gamma}_0)$ (resp. $B_0 = \text{Ker}(\dot{\Gamma}_1 - B^*\dot{\Gamma}_0)$) and $A'_0 = \text{Ker}(\dot{\Gamma}'_1 - B'\dot{\Gamma}'_0)$ (resp. $B'_0 = \text{Ker}(\dot{\Gamma}'_1 - B'^*\dot{\Gamma}'_0)$) are unitarily equivalent, but
b) $\dot{T}_0 = \text{Ker} \dot{\Gamma}_0$ (i.e. $\theta = \{0\} \times \mathcal{L}$) gives $\theta' = B' + K'[\text{Re}(C' - C)]^{-1}K'^*$.
Further simplification is possible in the Hilbert space setting.

Proposition 6.2. *Suppose Π' is similar to Π . If A (A') is considered as a closed symmetric operator in a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} (\mathcal{H}'), then the first two conditions in the system (2) are sufficient in order that the third one should hold.*

Proof. By hypothesis $\Gamma^{B'} = \Gamma^B \tilde{U}_{11}^{-1}$ for a homeomorphism $U_{11}: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}'$, which we are willing to show can be chosen unitary, i.e. $\text{Im } B' = (K'K^{-1})(\text{Im } B)(K'K^{-1})^*$.

Since $\Gamma^B = W'V\dot{\Gamma}$, $\Gamma^{B'} = W'\dot{\Gamma}'$, so $\dot{\Gamma}' = V\dot{\Gamma}\tilde{U}_{11}^{-1}$. Since $\dot{\Gamma}': \mathcal{H}'_\Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{L}'_\Gamma$ is unitary, taking the adjoint and the inverse yields $\dot{\Gamma}' = (V^c)^{-1}\dot{\Gamma}\tilde{U}_{11}^c$; so $VV^c\dot{\Gamma}' = \dot{\Gamma}'H$ or else

$$\begin{pmatrix} I_{\mathcal{L}'} & 0 \\ (VV^c)_{21} & I_{\mathcal{L}'} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \dot{\Gamma}'_0 \\ \dot{\Gamma}'_1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \dot{\Gamma}'_0 H \\ \dot{\Gamma}'_1 H \end{pmatrix}, \quad H = \begin{pmatrix} U_{11}U_{11}^* & 0 \\ 0 & U_{11}U_{11}^* \end{pmatrix}: \mathcal{H}'_\Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{H}'_\Gamma,$$

$$(VV^c)_{21} = 2i[\text{Im } B' - (K'K^{-1})(\text{Im } B)(K'K^{-1})^*].$$

By $\dot{\Gamma}'_0 = \dot{\Gamma}'_0 H$ on A'^* , $(I'_\Gamma - H)(\dot{T}'_0) \subseteq (I'_\Gamma - H)(A'^*) \subseteq \dot{T}'_0$. Since $H^* = H$ and $\dot{T}'_0{}^* = \dot{T}'_0$, $(I'_\Gamma - H)J'_\Gamma(\dot{T}'_0) \subseteq J'_\Gamma(\dot{T}'_0)$; $J'_\Gamma = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -iJ' \\ iJ' & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Since $A'^* = A' \hat{\oplus} \dot{N}' \hat{\oplus} J'_\Gamma(\dot{N}')$, $\dot{N}' = \dot{T}'_0 \cap A'^\perp$, so $(I'_\Gamma - H)J'_\Gamma(\dot{N}') \subseteq J'_\Gamma(\dot{T}'_0) \cap \dot{T}'_0 = \{0\}$ i.e. $\mathcal{R}_{(VV^c)_{21}} = \{0\}$. \square

Remark 6.3. In the proof the decomposition of A'^* is due to [20, Proposition 3.4]. In the Krein space setting H would have $U_{11}U_{11}^c$ on the diagonal, so $H = H^c \neq H^*$ and the invariance of \dot{T}'_0 ($= \text{Ker } \dot{\Gamma}'_0$) under $I'_\Gamma - H$ would not lead in general to the invariance of $\dot{T}'_0{}^\perp = J'_\Gamma(\dot{T}'_0)$ (where now $J'_\Gamma = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -iJ' \\ iJ' & 0 \end{pmatrix}$) under the same operator.

Corollary 6.4. *Let A (A') be a closed simple symmetric operator in a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} (\mathcal{H}') with equal defect numbers, and let $(\mathcal{L}, \dot{\Gamma})$ ($(\mathcal{L}', \dot{\Gamma}')$) be an obt for A^* (A'^*) with Weyl family $M_{\dot{\Gamma}}$ ($M_{\dot{\Gamma}'}$); the Hilbert spaces \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L}' are isomorphic.*

Let $K \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{G}_0, \mathcal{L})$ bijective, $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{L})$, $C = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{G}_0)$, and let $K' \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{G}_0, \mathcal{L}')$ bijective, $B' \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{L}')$, $C' = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{G}_0)$, $\text{Im}(C' - C) = 0$, $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Im } B} \subseteq K(\mathcal{D}_{C' - C})$.

If

$$(3) \quad C + K^*(B - M_{\dot{\Gamma}}(\lambda))^{-1}K = C' + K'^*(B' - M_{\dot{\Gamma}'}(\lambda))^{-1}K'$$

on both nonempty $\mathbb{C}^\pm \cap \rho(A_0) \cap \rho(A'_0)$, then $A_0 = \text{Ker}(\dot{\Gamma}_1 - B\dot{\Gamma}_0)$ and $A'_0 = \text{Ker}(\dot{\Gamma}'_1 - B'\dot{\Gamma}'_0)$ are unitarily equivalent, whereas $\text{Ker } \dot{\Gamma}_0$ and $\text{Ker } \dot{\Gamma}'_0$ are unitarily equivalent iff $C = C'$.

Proof. As the final step a bit $\{\mathcal{U}, \Pi\}$ with an open subset $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathbb{C}_* \cap \rho(A_0) \cap r(B_0) (\subseteq r(A, A, A_0))$ is minimal; put $A^\sim = \dot{T}_0$ in Proposition 5.5. And $\mathbb{C}_* \cap \rho(A_0) \cap \rho(B_0) \neq \emptyset$ if $\mathbb{C}_* \cap \rho(A_0) \neq \emptyset$: For all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_* \cap \rho(A_0)$, $B^* - M_{\dot{\Gamma}}(\lambda) = (B - M_{\dot{\Gamma}}(\lambda))^*(I_{\mathcal{L}} - X(\lambda))$, where $X(\lambda) = 2i(B - M_{\dot{\Gamma}}(\lambda))^*{}^{-1} \text{Im } M_{\dot{\Gamma}}(\lambda) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{L})$ is bijective; since $X(\lambda)$ is also non-constant, there is λ such that either $\|X(\lambda)\| < 1$ or $\|X(\lambda)^{-1}\| < 1$, and in both cases $\lambda \in \rho(B_0)$. \square

Remark 6.5. $\{\mathbb{C}_* \cap \rho(B_0), M_{\Gamma^B}\}$ is a holomorphic element, where the representing pair $\{\Phi(\lambda), \Psi(\lambda)\}$ for the closed relation $M_{\Gamma^B} = E^{-1}(M_{\Gamma^A}(\lambda)) = WW^c(M_{\Gamma^A}(\lambda))$ is $\Phi(\lambda) = (I_0 - LC^*) + LM_{\Gamma^A}(\lambda)$, $\Psi(\lambda) = C - C^* - CLC^* + (I_0 + CL)M_{\Gamma^A}(\lambda)$, where $L = K^{-1}(B - B^*)K^{*-1}$.

Remark 6.6. If $C = C'$ then (3) holds iff $\{\mathbb{C}_* \cap \rho(A_0), M_{\dot{\Gamma}}\} \leftrightarrow \{\mathbb{C}_* \cap \rho(A'_0), M_{\dot{\Gamma}'}\}$ —where $M_{\dot{\Gamma}}(\lambda) = K^*(\operatorname{Re} B - M_{\dot{\Gamma}}(\lambda))^{-1}K$ is the Weyl function associated with the obt $(\mathcal{L}, \dot{\Gamma})$ for A^* , with $\dot{\Gamma}_0 = K^{-1}(\dot{\Gamma}_1 - (\operatorname{Re} B)\dot{\Gamma}_0)$, $\dot{\Gamma}_1 = -K^*\dot{\Gamma}_0$, cf. [18, Lemma 3.10]—so Theorem 3.2 applies after one proves the third condition in (2). In [18, Theorem 3.11] the corollary is originally shown under hypotheses that (3) holds for $C = 0 = C'$ and either a) for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^\pm \cap \rho(A_0) \cap \rho(A'_0)$ or b) for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^+ \cap \rho(A_0) \cap \rho(A'_0)$ if $\operatorname{Ind} \dot{T}_0 \neq \mathcal{H}$, $\operatorname{Ind} \dot{T}'_0 \neq \mathcal{H}'$, and the Nevanlinna functions $M_{\dot{\Gamma}}$, $M_{\dot{\Gamma}'}$ satisfy some rather involved conditions. By Proposition 5.3 actually $\operatorname{Ind} \dot{T}_0 = \{0\} = \operatorname{Ind} \dot{T}'_0$.

Remark 6.7. Unlike $\mathbb{R} \cap r(A_0) \cap r(B_0) = \mathbb{R} \cap \rho(A_0)$, $\mathbb{C}_* \cap r(A_0) \cap r(B_0)$ is in general neither larger nor smaller than $\mathbb{C}_* \cap \rho(A_0)$. The example of both nonempty sets is as follows: For an arbitrary closed relation A_0 in a Krein space, if $\mathbb{C}_* \cap \sigma(A_0)$ is nowhere dense (in \mathbb{C}) then $\mathbb{C}_* \cap r(A_0) \cap r(A_0^c)$ (as well as $\mathbb{C}_* \cap \rho(A_0)$) is nonempty.

Proof. $\mathbb{C}_* \cap \rho(A_0)$ clearly is nonempty. Assume by contradiction $\mathbb{C}_* \cap r(A_0) \cap r(A_0^c) = \emptyset$, i.e. $\mathbb{C}_* \cap r(A_0) \subseteq \mathbb{C} \setminus r(A_0^c)$. Then $\mathbb{C}_* \cap \rho(A_0) \subseteq \sigma(A_0^c)$ so $\sigma^*(A_0) = (\mathbb{C}_* \cap \rho(A_0)) \sqcup (\sigma(A_0) \cap \sigma^*(A_0))$. Because $\sigma(A_0)$ is a closed set while $\mathbb{C}_* \cap \rho(A_0) \equiv \mathbb{C}_* \setminus \sigma_0$ is open, $\sigma_0 \cap \overline{\mathbb{C}_* \setminus \sigma_0} \subseteq \sigma^*(A_0)$ or equivalently $\sigma_0 \cap \partial\sigma_0 \subseteq \sigma_0^*$; $\partial\sigma_0$ is the boundary of σ_0 . If by hypothesis the closure $\bar{\sigma}_0 = \partial\sigma_0$, then $\sigma_0 \subseteq \sigma_0^*$ or equivalently $\mathbb{C}_* \cap \rho(A_0) = \emptyset$. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Yu. Arlinskii, S. Hassi, and H. de Snoo, *Q-functions of quasi-selfadjoint contractions*, Operator Theory and Indefinite Inner Product Spaces, 2005, pp. 23–54.
- [2] D. Arov, *Passive linear stationary dynamical systems*, Sib. Mat. Zhurn. **20** (1979), no. 2, 211–228.
- [3] T. Azizov, B. Čurgus, and A. Dijksma, *Standard symmetric operators in Pontryagin spaces: a generalized von Neumann formula and minimality of boundary coefficients*, J. Func. Anal. **198** (2003), no. 2, 361–412.
- [4] T. Azizov and I. Iokhvidov, *Linear Operators in Spaces with an Indefinite Metric*, John Wiley & Sons. Inc., 1989.
- [5] J. Behrndt, *Boundary value problems for adjoint pairs of operators*, arXiv:2313.08955 (2023).
- [6] J. Behrndt, V. A. Derkach, S. Hassi, and H. de Snoo, *A realization theorem for generalized Nevanlinna families*, Operators and Matrices **5** (2011), no. 4, 679–706.
- [7] J. Behrndt, S. Hassi, and H. de Snoo, *Boundary Value Problems, Weyl Functions, and Differential Operators.*, Vol. 108, Birkhauser, 2020.
- [8] J. Behrndt and M. Langer, *Boundary value problems for elliptic partial differential operators on bounded domains*, J. Func. Anal. **243** (2007), 536–565.
- [9] V. Derkach, *On Weyl function and generalized resolvents of a Hermitian operator in a Krein space*, Integr. Equ. Oper. Theory **23** (1995), no. 4, 387–415.
- [10] V. Derkach, S. Hassi, M. Malamud, and H. de Snoo, *Boundary relations and generalized resolvents of symmetric operators*, Russ. J. Math. Phys. **16** (2009), no. 1, 17–60.
- [11] V. Derkach and M. Malamud, *Generalized Resolvents and the Boundary Value Problems for Hermitian Operators with Gaps*, J. Func. Anal. **95** (1991), no. 1, 1–95.
- [12] ———, *The extension theory of Hermitian operators and the moment problem*, J. Math. Sci. **73** (1995), no. 2, 141–242.
- [13] V. Derkach, S. Hassi, and M. M. Malamud, *Generalized boundary triples, I. Some classes of isometric and unitary boundary pairs and realization problems for subclasses of Nevanlinna functions*, Math. Nachr. **293** (2020), no. 7, 1278–1327.
- [14] S. Hassi, H. de Snoo, and H. Woracek, *Some interpolation problems of Nevanlinna–Pick type. The Krein–Langer method*, Operator Theory: Advances and Applications **106** (1998), 201–216.
- [15] S. Hassi, H. S. V. de Snoo, and F. H. Szafraniec, *Componentwise and Cartesian decompositions of linear relations*, Dissert. Math. **465** (2009), 1–59.
- [16] S. Hassi, J. Labrousse, and H. de Snoo, *Operational calculus for rows, columns, and blocks of linear relations*, Advances in Operator Theory **5** (2020), no. 3, 1193–1228.

- [17] S. Hassi, M. Malamud, and V. Mogilevskii, *Generalized resolvents and boundary triplets for dual pairs of linear relations*, Methods of Funct. Anal. and Topology **11** (2005), no. 2, 170–187.
- [18] ———, *Unitary equivalence of proper extensions of a symmetric operator and the Weyl function*, Integr. Equ. Oper. Theory **77** (2013), no. 4, 449–487.
- [19] S. Hassi and H. Wietsma, *Minimal realizations of generalized Nevanlinna functions*, Opuscula Math. **36** (2016), no. 6, 749–768.
- [20] R. Juršėnas, *On the similarity of boundary triples of symmetric operators in Krein spaces*, Compl. Anal. Oper. Theory **17** (2023), no. 72, 1–39.
- [21] ———, *Locus of non-real eigenvalues of a class of linear relations in a Krein space*, arXiv:2410.16725 (2024).
- [22] H. Langer, *Invariant subspaces for a class of operators in spaces with indefinite metric*, J. Func. Anal. **19** (1975), no. 3, 232–241.
- [23] H. Langer and B. Textorius, *On generalized resolvents and Q -functions of symmetric linear relations (subspaces) in Hilbert space*, Pacific. J. Math. **72** (1977), no. 1, 135–165.
- [24] M. Malamud and V. Mogilevskii, *Generalized resolvents of isometric operators*, Spectral and Evolution Problems. Proceedings of the Thirteenth Crimean Autumn Mathematical School-Symposium, 2003, pp. 82–93.
- [25] V. Mogilevskii, *Boundary triplets and Krein type resolvent formula for symmetric operators with unequal defect numbers*, Methods Func. Anal. Topology **12** (2006), no. 3, 258–280.
- [26] ———, *Boundary triplets and Titchmarsh–Weyl functions of differential operators with arbitrary deficiency indices*, Methods Func. Anal. Topology **15** (2009), no. 3, 280–300.
- [27] ———, *Description of generalized resolvents and characteristic matrices of differential operators in terms of the boundary parameter*, Math. Notes **90** (2011), no. 4, 558–583.
- [28] D. Popovici and Z. Sebestyén, *Factorizations of linear relations*, Advances in Mathematics **233** (2013), 40–55.
- [29] K. Schmüdgen, *Adjoint pairs and unbounded normal operators*, Acta Sci. Math. **88** (2020), 449–467.

VILNIUS UNIVERSITY, INSTITUTE OF THEORETICAL PHYSICS AND ASTRONOMY, SAULĖTEKIO AVE. 3, 10257 VILNIUS, LITHUANIA

Email address: rytis.jursenas@tfai.vu.lt