Integr. equ. oper. theory 99 (9999), 1–18
0378-620X/99000-0, DOI 10.1007/s00020-003-0000

Integral Equations and Operator Theory

Metric properties of projections in semi-Hilbertian spaces

M. Laura Arias, Gustavo Corach and M. Celeste Gonzalez

To our teacher Mischa Cotlar, in memoriam

Abstract. Several results on norms of projections on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ are extended for the operator seminorm defined by a positive semidefinite operator $A \in L(\mathcal{H})^+$.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000). Primary 46C05; Secondary 47A05; Third 47A30.

Keywords. Projections, semi inner products, compatibility, symmetrizable.

1. Introduction

In this paper, $\mathcal{H}$ denotes a Hilbert space, $L(\mathcal{H})$ is the algebra of bounded linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{Q}$ is the subset of $L(\mathcal{H})$ of all projections (i.e. idempotents). Given a closed subspace $\mathcal{S}$ of $\mathcal{H}$, $\mathcal{Q}_\mathcal{S}$ denotes the subset of $\mathcal{Q}$ of all projections with image $\mathcal{S}$. The topology and differential geometry of $\mathcal{Q}$ and $\mathcal{P} = \{P \in \mathcal{Q} : P^* = P\}$ have been studied in detail in many places [3], [13], [9], [15], [29], [30], [32], [37], [38] and [42]. This paper is devoted to the study of several metrical properties of $\mathcal{Q}$ and $\mathcal{Q}_\mathcal{S}$ when an additional seminorm is consider on $\mathcal{H}$. Let $P_\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{Q}_\mathcal{S}$ denote the unique Hermitian projection with image $\mathcal{S}$. The following properties are well known:

- (I) For all $0 \neq Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ it holds $\|Q\| = 1$ if and only if $Q^* = Q$;
- (II) For every non trivial $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ it holds $\|Q\| = \|I - Q\|$;
- (III) Given closed subspaces $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ of $\mathcal{H}$ it holds $\|P_\mathcal{S} - P_\mathcal{T}\| \leq \|Q_\mathcal{S} - Q_\mathcal{T}\|$ for every $Q_\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{Q}_\mathcal{S}$ and $Q_\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{Q}_\mathcal{T}$;
- (IV) For all closed subspaces $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ of $\mathcal{H}$ it holds $\|P_\mathcal{S} - P_\mathcal{T}\| \leq 1$. Equality holds if and only if $P_\mathcal{S}$ and $P_\mathcal{T}$ commute;

The authors were supported in part by UBACYT I030, ANPCYT PICT 03-09521, PIP 2188/00.

(V) For all closed subspaces $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ of $\mathcal{H}$ it holds $\|P_{\mathcal{S}} - P_{\mathcal{T}}\| = \max\{\ \|P_{\mathcal{S}}(I - P_{\mathcal{T}})\|,\ \|P_{\mathcal{T}}(I - P_{\mathcal{S}})\|\ \}$;

(VI) For every $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ it holds $\|Q\| = \dfrac{1}{\sin\theta}$ if $\theta \in [0, \pi/2]$ is the angle such that $\cos\theta = \sup\{|\langle \xi, \eta\rangle| : \xi \in R(Q), \eta \in N(Q) \text{ and } \|\xi\| = \|\eta\| = 1\}$.

Here $R(Q)$ is the image of the projection Q and $N(Q)$ is its nullspace. Proofs of properties (I), (II) and (IV) can be found in textbooks like [8] and [25]. A proof of property (V) can be found in the book by Akhiezer and Glazman [1]. Property (III) is due to T. Kato [[25], Th. 6.35, p. 58] (see also M. Mbektha [[33], 1.10]). Property (VI) is due to V. Ljance [28]. Proofs of it can be found in the monograph of Gokhberg and Krein [22] and in the papers by V. Ptak [35], J. Steinberg [40], D. Buckholtz [6] and I. Ipsen and C. Meyer [24] (for finite dimensional spaces).

The main goal of this paper is to study these properties if we consider an additional seminorm $\|\ .\ \|_A$, defined by a positive semidefinite operator $A \in L(\mathcal{H})$ by $\|\xi\|_A^2 = \langle A\xi, \xi\rangle$, $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$, and we replace the operator norm in formulas (I) to (VI) by the quantity

$$\|T\|_A = \sup\{\|T\xi\|_A :\ \|\xi\|_A = 1\}.$$

Of course, many difficulties arise. For instance, it may happen that $\|T\|_A = +\infty$ for some $T \in L(\mathcal{H})$. Besides, there is no obvious choice for an adjoint operation defined by A. In order to describe our results, we need to introduce a certain relationship between positive operators and closed subspaces called compatibility in the recent literature. We say that a positive semidefinite operator A on $\mathcal{H}$ and a closed subspace $\mathcal{S}$ of $\mathcal{H}$ are **compatible** if there exists a projection $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}}$ such that AQ is Hermitian (or symmetric). This means that $\langle Q\xi, \eta\rangle_A = \langle \xi, Q\eta\rangle_A$ for all $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}$ where $\langle \xi, \eta\rangle_A = \langle A\xi, \eta\rangle$. In this case, it can be proved that $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{S} \dot{+} (A\mathcal{S})^{\perp}$ and the projection $P_{A,\mathcal{S}}$ onto $\mathcal{S}$ with nullspace $(A\mathcal{S})^{\perp} \ominus \mathcal{S} \cap N(A)$ satisfies $AP_{A,\mathcal{S}} = P_{A,\mathcal{S}}^{*}A$. This operator, $P_{A,\mathcal{S}}$, has similar, but not identical, metric properties like the orthogonal projection $P_{\mathcal{S}}$. For example, if the pair $(A, \mathcal{S})$ is compatible then for every $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$ it holds that $\|(I - P_{A,\mathcal{S}})\xi\|_A = d_A(\xi, \mathcal{S}) = \inf\{\|\xi - \eta\|_A :\ \eta \in \mathcal{S}\}$. See [12] for its proof. Under convenient hypothesis of compatibility we are able to prove properties analogous to (I)-(VI) for the operator seminorm $\|\ .\ \|_A$ and a convenient adjoint operation.

The subject of operators which are symmetric under a certain inner product is quite old. Papers by M.G. Krein [26] in 1937 and W. T. Reid [36] in 1951, with references to earlier works, studied many spectral properties of the so-called **symmetrizable** operators. Later, P. Lax [27] and J. Dieudonné [17] studied conditions for the symmetrizability of operators. In more recent times, Z. Sebestyén [39], B.A. Barnes [4], S. Hassi, Z. Sebestyén and H. de Snoo [23] and P. Cojuhari and A. Gheondea [7] have found many interesting results and applications of various notions of symmetrizability.

The contents of the paper are the following. In section 2 we collect some facts about Moore-Penrose pseudoinverses, compatibility between positive operators and closed subspaces, and a brief description of a result by R. G. Douglas [19]

which plays a relevant role in this paper. Douglas theorem (sometimes called **range inclusion theorem**) gives necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence and uniqueness of solution for equations of the type $AX = TA$, with an additional condition on the range of X.
In section 3 we explore the existence of A-adjoints for projections. If a projection Q admits an A-adjoint then we define $Q^\sharp$ as the unique solution of the problem

$$AX = Q^*A, \quad R(X) \subseteq \overline{R(A)}.$$

Properties of $Q^\sharp$ are described.
Sections 4 and 5 contain the main results of the paper, i.e., the extension of properties (I) to (VI) above, as follows

(I') every projection Q such that $AQ = Q^*A \neq 0$ satisfies $\|Q\|_A = 1$;

(II') equality $\|Q\|_A = \|I - Q\|_A$ holds for any projection Q such that $R(Q) \cap \overline{R(A)} \neq \{0\}$ and $R(I-Q) \cap \overline{R(A)} \neq \{0\}$;

(III') if $(A, \mathcal{S})$, $(A, \mathcal{T})$ are compatible pairs then for every $Q_\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{Q}_\mathcal{S}$ and $Q_\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{Q}_\mathcal{T}$ which admit adjoint respect to $\langle \ , \ \rangle_A$ it holds

$$\|P_{A,\mathcal{S}} - P_{A,\mathcal{T}}\|_A \leq \|Q_\mathcal{S} - Q_\mathcal{T}\|_A;$$

(III") if $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_1 + \mathcal{S}_2$ and $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_1 + \mathcal{T}_2$, where $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{T}_1 \subseteq \overline{R(A)}$ and $\mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{T}_2 \subseteq N(A)$ and the pairs $(A, \mathcal{S}_1)$ and $(A, \mathcal{T}_1)$ are compatible then, for every $Q_\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{Q}_\mathcal{S} \cap L^A(\mathcal{H})$ and $Q_\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{Q}_\mathcal{T} \cap L^A(\mathcal{H})$ it holds

$$\|P_{A,\mathcal{S}} - P_{A,\mathcal{T}}\|_A \leq \|Q_\mathcal{S} - Q_\mathcal{T}\|_A,$$

where $L^A(\mathcal{H}) = \{T \in L(\mathcal{H}) : \ \|T\|_A < \infty\}$;

(IV') if A is compatible with the closed subspaces $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ then $\|P_{A,\mathcal{S}} - P_{A,\mathcal{T}}\|_A \leq 1$ and equality holds if $P^\sharp_{A,\mathcal{S}}$ commutes with $P^\sharp_{A,\mathcal{T}}$;

(V') if A is compatible with the closed subspaces $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ then $\|P_{A,\mathcal{S}} - P_{A,\mathcal{T}}\|_A = \max\{ \ \|P_{A,\mathcal{S}}(I - P_{A,\mathcal{T}})\|_A, \ \|P_{A,\mathcal{T}}(I - P_{A,\mathcal{S}})\|_A \ \}$;

(VI') if $(A, \mathcal{S})$ and $(A, \mathcal{T})$ are compatible pairs and $\mathcal{S} \cap \overline{R(A)} \neq \{0\}$ then it holds $\|Q_{\mathcal{S}//\mathcal{T}}\|_A = \dfrac{1}{\sin\theta_A}$, where $\theta_A \in [0, \pi/2]$ is the angle such that $\cos\theta_A = \sup\{|\langle \xi, \eta\rangle_A| : \xi \in \mathcal{S}, \eta \in \mathcal{T}$ and $\|\xi\|_A = \|\eta\|_A = 1\}$.

2. Preliminaries

Throughout $\mathcal{H}$ denotes a complex Hilbert space. $L(\mathcal{H})$ is the space of bounded linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$, $L(\mathcal{H})^+$ denotes the cone of all positive operators of $L(\mathcal{H})$, i.e., $L(\mathcal{H})^+ = \{A \in L(\mathcal{H}) : \langle A\eta, \eta\rangle \geq 0$ for all $\eta \in \mathcal{H}\}$, $Gl(\mathcal{H})$ is the group of invertible operators of $L(\mathcal{H})$ and $Gl(\mathcal{H})^+ = Gl(\mathcal{H}) \cap L(\mathcal{H})^+$. For every $T \in L(\mathcal{H})$, its range is denoted by $R(T)$, its nullspace by $N(T)$ and its adjoint by T^*. $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ are closed subspaces of $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{S} \ominus \mathcal{T} = \mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{T}^\perp$. In this paper, given closed subspaces $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}$ of $\mathcal{H}$, by $L(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})$ we denote the subspace $\{T \in L(\mathcal{H}) : \ T(\mathcal{S}^\perp) = \{0\}$ and $T(\mathcal{S}) \subseteq \mathcal{T}\}$. If $\mathcal{H}$ is decomposed as a direct sum $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{S} \dotplus \mathcal{T}$, where $\mathcal{S}$

and $\mathcal{T}$ are closed subspaces of $\mathcal{H}$, then the unique projection with range $\mathcal{S}$ and nullspace $\mathcal{T}$ is denoted by $Q_{\mathcal{S}//\mathcal{T}}$.

2.1. Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse

Recall that given $T \in L(\mathcal{H})$, the Moore-Penrose inverse of T, denoted by $T^\dagger$, is defined as the unique linear extension of $\tilde{T}^{-1}$ to $\mathcal{D}(T^\dagger) := R(T) + R(T)^\perp$ with $N(T^\dagger) = R(T)^\perp$, where $\tilde{T}$ is the isomorphism $T|_{N(T)^\perp} : N(T)^\perp \longrightarrow R(T)$. It holds that $T^\dagger$ is the unique solution of the four "Moore-Penrose equations":

$$TXT = T, \quad XTX = X, \quad XT = P_{N(T)^\perp} \quad \text{and} \quad TX = P_{\overline{R(T)}}|_{\mathcal{D}(T^\dagger)}.$$

$T^\dagger$ has closed graph and $T^\dagger$ is bounded if and only if $R(T)$ is closed. Proofs of these facts can be found in many places, e.g. the books [34], [5] and [20]. Observe that, since $T^\dagger$ has closed graph, then for every $B \in L(\mathcal{H})$ such that $R(B) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(T^\dagger)$ it holds that $T^\dagger B$ is bounded. In the next proposition we collect without proof some properties of $T^\dagger$ that we will need in this work.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $T \in L(\mathcal{H})$.*
1. *If $T = T^*$ then $(T^\dagger)^* = T^\dagger$.*
2. *If $T \in L(\mathcal{H})^+$ then $T^\dagger = (T^{1/2})^\dagger (T^{1/2})^\dagger$.*

A bounded linear densely defined operator T can be uniquely extended to $L(\mathcal{H})$; its unique extension will be denoted by $\overline{T}$. Clearly, $\|\overline{T}\| = \|T\|$. It can be checked that $\overline{T} = (T^*)^*$. Then, as a consequence, $\overline{T^*} = \overline{T}^* = T^*$ and if $T = R^*R$ then $\overline{T} = \overline{R}^*\overline{R}$.

2.2. A-selfadjoint projections and compatibility

Any $A \in L(\mathcal{H})^+$ defines a positive semidefinite sesquilinear form:

$$\langle \ , \ \rangle_A : \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{C}, \ \langle \xi, \eta \rangle_A = \langle A\xi, \eta \rangle .$$

By $\| \ . \ \|_A$ we denote the seminorm induced by $\langle \ , \ \rangle_A$, i.e., $\|\xi\|_A = \langle \xi, \xi \rangle_A^{1/2}$. Observe that $\|\xi\|_A = 0$ if and only if $\xi \in N(A)$. Then $\| \ . \ \|_A$ is a norm if and only if A is an injective operator. Moreover, $\langle \ , \ \rangle_A$, induces a seminorm on a subset of $L(\mathcal{H})$. Namely, given $T \in L(\mathcal{H})$, if there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that $\|T\omega\|_A \leq c\|\omega\|_A$ for every $\omega \in \overline{R(A)}$ it holds

$$\|T\|_A = \sup_{\substack{\omega \in \overline{R(A)} \\ \omega \neq 0}} \frac{\|T\omega\|_A}{\|\omega\|_A} < \infty.$$

It is straightforward that

$$\|T\|_A = \sup\{ | \langle T\xi, \eta \rangle_A | : \xi, \eta \in \mathcal{H} \text{ and } \|\xi\|_A \leq 1 \ \|\eta\|_A \leq 1 \}.$$

From now on we will denote

$$L^A(\mathcal{H}) = \{T \in L(\mathcal{H}) : \ \|T\|_A < \infty\}.$$

It can be seen that $L^A(\mathcal{H})$ is not a subalgebra of $L(\mathcal{H})$. In [4] it is proved that if $A \in L(\mathcal{H})^+$ is injective then $T \in L^A(\mathcal{H})$ if and only if $A^{1/2}TA^{-1/2}$ is bounded. In the next proposition we extend this result for a not necessary injective operator $A \in L(\mathcal{H})^+$. Before that we state the next theorem of R. G. Douglas (for its proof see [19] or [21]) which will be used frequently during these notes.

Theorem (Douglas). Let $A, B \in L(\mathcal{H})$. The following conditions are equivalent:

1. $R(B) \subseteq R(A)$.
2. There exists a positive number λ such that $BB^* \leq \lambda AA^*$.
3. There exists $C \in L(\mathcal{H})$ such that $AC = B$.

If one of these conditions holds there exists an unique operator $D \in L(\mathcal{H})$ such that $AD = B$ and $R(D) \subseteq \overline{R(A^*)}$. Furthermore, $N(D) = N(B)$. Such D is called the **reduced solution** or **Douglas solution** of $AX = B$.

Note that if the equation $AX = B$ has solution then $A^\dagger B$ is the reduced solution. Indeed, since $R(B) \subseteq R(A) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(A^\dagger)$, $A^\dagger B \in L(\mathcal{H})$. Moreover, $AA^\dagger B = P_{\overline{R(A)}}|_{\mathcal{D}(A^\dagger)} B = B$ and $R(A^\dagger B) \subseteq \overline{R(A)}$.

Proposition 2.2. *Let $A \in L(\mathcal{H})^+$ and $T \in L(\mathcal{H})$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

1. *$T \in L^A(\mathcal{H})$.*
2. *$A^{1/2}T(A^{1/2})^\dagger$ is a bounded linear operator.*
3. *$R(A^{1/2}T^*A^{1/2}) \subseteq R(A)$.*

Moreover, if one of these conditions holds then

$$\|T\|_A = \|A^{1/2}T(A^{1/2})^\dagger\|.$$

Proof. 1⇒2 If $T \in L^A(\mathcal{H})$ then there exists $c > 0$ such that $\|T\omega\|_A \leq c\|\omega\|_A$ for every $\omega \in \overline{R(A)}$. Then, for every $\xi \in \mathcal{D}((A^{1/2})^\dagger)$ it holds that

$$\|A^{1/2}T(A^{1/2})^\dagger\xi\| \quad = \quad \|T(A^{1/2})^\dagger\xi\|_A \leq \|T\|_A\|(A^{1/2})^\dagger\xi\|_A \leq \|T\|_A\|\xi\|.$$

Therefore, $A^{1/2}T(A^{1/2})^\dagger$ is bounded and $\|A^{1/2}T(A^{1/2})^\dagger\| \leq \|T\|_A$.
2⇒1 Let $A^{1/2}T(A^{1/2})^\dagger$ be a bounded linear operator. Then, for every $\xi \in \overline{R(A)}$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|T\xi\|_A &= \|TP_{\overline{R(A)}}\xi\|_A = \|A^{1/2}T(A^{1/2})^\dagger A^{1/2}\xi\| \\ &\leq \|A^{1/2}T(A^{1/2})^\dagger\|\|A^{1/2}\xi\| \\ &= \|A^{1/2}T(A^{1/2})^\dagger\|\|\xi\|_A, \end{aligned}$$

i.e., item 2. holds. Moreover, $\|T\|_A \leq \|A^{1/2}T(A^{1/2})^\dagger\|$.
2⇔3 It is clear that $\|T\xi\|_A \leq c\|\xi\|_A$ for every $\xi \in \overline{R(A)}$ if and only if $\|A^{1/2}T\xi\| \leq c\|A^{1/2}\xi\|$ for every $\xi \in R(A^{1/2})$, i.e. if and only if $\|A^{1/2}TA^{1/2}\eta\| \leq c\|A\eta\|$ for every $\eta \in \mathcal{H}$. Now, by Douglas theorem, this is equivalent to $R(A^{1/2}T^*A^{1/2}) \subseteq R(A)$. □

By Proposition 2.2, if $A \in L(\mathcal{H})^+$ has closed range then $L^A(\mathcal{H}) = L(\mathcal{H})$ because $(A^{1/2})^\dagger$ is bounded. But, as the next example shows, if A has not closed range then $L^A(\mathcal{H}) \subsetneq L(\mathcal{H})$.

Example 1. Let $A \in L(\mathcal{H})^+$ with non closed range and let $\mu \in R(A^{1/2}) \setminus R(A)$. Then, there exists $\eta \in \overline{R(A)} \setminus R(A^{1/2})$ such that $\mu = A^{1/2}\eta$. Now, let $\xi \in R(A^{1/2})$ and $\mathcal{S}$ a closed subspace of $\mathcal{H}$ such that $\mathcal{H} = span\{\xi\} + span\{\eta\} + \mathcal{S}$. Then, define $T : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ by $T\xi = \eta, T\eta = \eta$ and $T(\mathcal{S}) = \{0\}$. Thus, $T \in L(\mathcal{H})$. Moreover, $T \in \mathcal{Q}$. Then, $T^* \in \mathcal{Q}$ but $T^* \notin L^A(\mathcal{H})$. In fact, $\mu = A^{1/2}\eta = A^{1/2}T\xi \in R(A^{1/2}TA^{1/2})$ and $\mu \notin R(A)$. So, $R(A^{1/2}TA^{1/2}) \not\subseteq R(A)$, i.e., $T^* \notin L^A(\mathcal{H})$ by Proposition 2.2.

A bounded linear operator $W \in L(\mathcal{H})$ is called an ***A*-adjoint** of $T \in L(\mathcal{H})$ if

$$\langle T\xi, \eta\rangle_A = \langle \xi, W\eta\rangle_A \quad \text{for every} \quad \xi, \eta \in \mathcal{H},$$

or, which is equivalent, if W satisfies the equation $AW = T^*A$. The operator T is said ***A*-selfadjoint** if $AT = T^*A$. The existence of an A-adjoint operator is not guaranteed. In fact, by Douglas theorem, $T \in L(\mathcal{H})$ admits an A-adjoint operator if and only if $R(T^*A) \subseteq R(A)$. We shall denote by $L_A(\mathcal{H})$ the subalgebra of $L(\mathcal{H})$ consisting of such operators, i.e,

$$L_A(\mathcal{H}) = \{T \in L(\mathcal{H}) : \ R(T^*A) \subseteq R(A)\}.$$

Again, by Douglas theorem, it is easy to see that

$$L_{A^{1/2}}(\mathcal{H}) = \{T \in L(\mathcal{H}) : \ \exists\, c > 0 \ \ \|T\xi\|_A \leq c\|\xi\|_A \ \ \forall\, \xi \in \mathcal{H}\}.$$

The inclusions $L_A(\mathcal{H}) \subseteq L_{A^{1/2}}(\mathcal{H}) \subseteq L^A(\mathcal{H})$ hold. The first of them was proved in Theorem 5.1 of [23], the second one follows from Proposition 2.2. Observe that these inclusions assure that $\|T\|_A$ is finite for every T which admits an A-adjoint. If $T \in L_A(\mathcal{H})$ then there exists a distinguished A-adjoint operator of T, namely, the reduced solution of equation $AX = T^*A$. We denote this operator by $T^\sharp$. Therefore $T^\sharp = A^\dagger T^*A$ and its main properties are

$$AT^\sharp = T^*A, \ \ R(T^\sharp) \subseteq \overline{R(A)} \ \text{ and } \ N(T^\sharp) = N(T^*A).$$

Observe that if W is an A-adjoint of T then $T^\sharp = P_{\overline{R(A)}}W$. In [2] we have studied some properties of the $\sharp$ operation which are relevant for studying A-partial isometries, i.e. operator which behave as partial isometries with respect to $\langle\ ,\ \rangle_A$. We add now a few properties.

Proposition 2.3. *Let $A \in L(\mathcal{H})^+$ and $T \in L_A(\mathcal{H})$. Then*

1. $\|T\|_A = \|T^\sharp\|_A = \|T^\sharp T\|_A^{1/2}$.
2. $\|W\|_A = \|T^\sharp\|_A$ *for every $W \in L(\mathcal{H})$ which is an A-adjoint of T.*
3. *If $W \in L_A(\mathcal{H})$ then* $\|TW\|_A = \|WT\|_A$.
4. $\|T^\sharp\| \leq \|W\|$ *for every $W \in L(\mathcal{H})$ which is an A-adjoint of T. Nevertheless, $T^\sharp$ is not in general the unique A-adjoint of T that realizes the minimal norm.*

Proof.

1. It is easy to check that $\overline{A^{1/2}T(A^{1/2})^\dagger}^* = \overline{A^{1/2}(A^\dagger T^* A)(A^{1/2})^\dagger}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\|T\|_A &= \|A^{1/2}T(A^{1/2})^\dagger\| = \|\overline{A^{1/2}T(A^{1/2})^\dagger}\| = \|\overline{A^{1/2}T(A^{1/2})^\dagger}^*\| \\ &= \|\overline{A^{1/2}(A^\dagger T^* A)(A^{1/2})^\dagger}\| = \|A^{1/2}(A^\dagger T^* A)(A^{1/2})^\dagger\| \\ &= \|A^{1/2}T^\sharp(A^{1/2})^\dagger\| = \|T^\sharp\|_A.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}\|T^\sharp T\|_A &= \|A^{1/2}T^\sharp T(A^{1/2})^\dagger\| = \|A^{1/2}A^\dagger T^* AT(A^{1/2})^\dagger\| \\ &= \|(A^{1/2})^\dagger T^* AT(A^{1/2})^\dagger\| = \|\overline{(A^{1/2})^\dagger T^* AT(A^{1/2})^\dagger}\| \\ &= \|\overline{(A^{1/2}T(A^{1/2})^\dagger)}^* \, \overline{(A^{1/2}T(A^{1/2})^\dagger)}\| = \|\overline{A^{1/2}T(A^{1/2})^\dagger}\|^2 \\ &= \|A^{1/2}T(A^{1/2})^\dagger\|^2 = \|T\|_A^2.\end{aligned}$$

2. If $W \in L(\mathcal{H})$ is an A-adjoint operator of T then $W = T^\sharp + Z$, where Z is a solution of the homogeneous equation $AX = 0$. Then $\|W\|_A = \|A^{1/2}W(A^{1/2})^\dagger\| = \|A^{1/2}(T^\sharp + Z)(A^{1/2})^\dagger\| = \|A^{1/2}T^\sharp(A^{1/2})^\dagger\| = \|T^\sharp\|_A$.
3. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\|TW\|_A &= \|(TW)^\sharp\|_A = \|W^\sharp T^\sharp\|_A = \|A^{1/2}W^\sharp T^\sharp(A^{1/2})^\dagger\| \\ &= \|A^{1/2}W^\sharp(A^{1/2})^\dagger A^{1/2}T^\sharp(A^{1/2})^\dagger\| \\ &= \|A^{1/2}T^\sharp(A^{1/2})^\dagger A^{1/2}W^\sharp(A^{1/2})^\dagger\| \\ &= \|T^\sharp W^\sharp\|_A = \|(WT)^\sharp\|_A \\ &= \|WT\|_A.\end{aligned}$$

4. Let $W \in L(\mathcal{H})$ be an A-adjoint operator of T. Then $W = T^\sharp + Z$, where $AZ = 0$. Let $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$ with $\|\xi\| = 1$. Since $R(T^\sharp) \subseteq \overline{R(A)}$ and $R(Z) \subseteq N(A)$ we get $\|W\xi\|^2 = \|T^\sharp\xi\|^2 + \|Z\xi\|^2$. Then $\|T^\sharp\xi\|^2 \le \|W\xi\|^2$ and so $\|T^\sharp\| \le \|W\|$. Now, let $A = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in M_2(\mathbb{R})^+$ and $T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in M_2(\mathbb{R})$. It is easy to check that T admits A-adjoint operators and that $T^\sharp = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Furthermore, observe that the identity matrix I is an A-adjoint of T, $\|T^\sharp\| = \|I\| = 1$ and $T^\sharp \ne I$. □

Given $A \in L(\mathcal{H})^+$ and a closed subspace $\mathcal{S}$, we denote by $\mathcal{P}(A,\mathcal{S})$ the set of A-selfadjoint projections with fixed range $\mathcal{S}$:

$$\mathcal{P}(A,\mathcal{S}) = \{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\mathcal{S} : \ AQ = Q^*A\}.$$

With a fixed $A \in L(\mathcal{H})^+$ the set $\mathcal{P}(A,\mathcal{S})$ can be empty, or have one element (for example if $A \in Gl(\mathcal{H})^+$) or have infinitely many elements. If $\mathcal{P}(A,\mathcal{S}) \ne \emptyset$ then the pair $(A,\mathcal{S})$ is said to be **compatible**. For a fuller treatment on the theory of compatibility see [10], [11], [13] and [31]. Given $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\mathcal{S}$, Q is A-selfadjoint if and only if $\langle Q\xi, \xi\rangle_A \ge 0$ for all $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$. If the pair $(A,\mathcal{S})$ is compatible, the unique element in $\mathcal{P}(A,\mathcal{S})$ with nullspace $(A\mathcal{S})^\perp \ominus \mathcal{N}$, where $\mathcal{N} = N(A) \cap \mathcal{S}$, is denoted by $P_{A,\mathcal{S}}$. This element has minimal norm in $P(A,\mathcal{S})$. Nevertheless, $P_{A,\mathcal{S}}$ is not in general the unique $Q \in \mathcal{P}(A,\mathcal{S})$ that realizes the minimal norm. See [10] Theorem

3.5 for its proof. The next proposition provides a parametrization of $\mathcal{P}(A,\mathcal{S})$ and it expresses the element $P_{A,\mathcal{S}}$ as the solution of certain Douglas-type equations. For its proof the reader is referred to [11] (section 3), [31] (section 6).

Proposition 2.4. *Let $A \in L(\mathcal{H})^+$ such that the pair $(A,\mathcal{S})$ is compatible and $\mathcal{N} = N(A)\cap\mathcal{S}$. If Q is the reduced solution of the equation $(P_{\mathcal{S}}AP_{\mathcal{S}})X = P_{\mathcal{S}}A$ then*

1. *$Q = P_{A,\mathcal{S}\ominus\mathcal{N}}$.*
2. *$P_{A,\mathcal{S}} = P_{A,\mathcal{S}\ominus\mathcal{N}} + P_{\mathcal{N}}$.*
3. *$\mathcal{P}(A,\mathcal{S})$ is an affine manifold that can be parametrized as $\mathcal{P}(A,\mathcal{S}) = P_{A,\mathcal{S}} + L(\mathcal{S}^{\perp},\mathcal{N})$. In particular, if $\mathcal{N} = \{0\}$ then $\mathcal{P}(A,\mathcal{S}) = \{P_{A,\mathcal{S}}\}$.*

3. The A-adjoint operation $\sharp$ on projections

In this paper, we are mainly interested in how the A-adjoint operation $\sharp$ acts on A-adjointable projections. We first notice that there is no obvious notion of self-adjointness: an operator T such that $AT = T^*A$ could be named A-Hermitian, but also an operator $T \in L_A(\mathcal{H})$ such that $T^\sharp = T$. We discuss this problem focusing in the set of projections. For this, we consider the following subsets of $\mathcal{Q}$:

$$\mathcal{W} = \{Q \in \mathcal{Q} \cap L_A(\mathcal{H}) : \; Q^\sharp = Q\}$$

$$\mathcal{X} = \{Q \in \mathcal{Q} \cap L_A(\mathcal{H}) : \; AQ = Q^*A\}$$

$$\mathcal{Y} = \{Q \in \mathcal{Q} \cap L_A(\mathcal{H}) : \; (Q^\sharp)^2 = Q^\sharp\}$$

$$\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Q} \cap L_A(\mathcal{H}).$$

Proposition 3.1. *The next inclusions hold: $\mathcal{W} \subsetneq \mathcal{X} \subsetneq \mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{Z}$.*

Proof. Let $Q \in \mathcal{W}$ then $Q^\sharp = Q$. Thus, $Q^*A = AQ^\sharp = AQ$ and so $Q \in \mathcal{X}$. On the other hand, consider $A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^+$ and $Q = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Then it is easy to check that $Q \in \mathcal{X}$, but $Q \notin \mathcal{W}$. It is immediate that $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{Z}$. In order to see that this is a strict inclusion consider $A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^+$ and $Q = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Since A is invertible then $R(Q^*A) \subseteq R(A)$, i.e., $Q \in \mathcal{Z}$, but $Q \notin \mathcal{X}$. Finally, let $Q \in \mathcal{Z}$, i.e, $Q^2 = Q$ and there exists $Q^\sharp$. Let us show that that $(Q^\sharp)^2 = Q^\sharp$. Indeed, $(Q^\sharp)^2 = A^\dagger Q^*AA^\dagger Q^*A = A^\dagger Q^* P_{\overline{R(A)}}|_{\mathcal{D}(A^\dagger)}Q^*A = A^\dagger (Q^*)^2 A = A^\dagger Q^* A = Q^\sharp$. i.e., $Q \in \mathcal{Y}$. The other inclusion is trivial. □

Proposition 3.2. *If $Q \in \mathcal{P}(A,\mathcal{S})$ then:*

1. *$Q^\sharp = Q^\sharp Q = P_{\overline{R(A)}}Q = P_{\overline{R(A)}}P_{A,\mathcal{S}}$ is a projection.*
2. *$I - Q^\sharp \in \mathcal{P}(A, N(P_{\mathcal{S}}A))$.*

Proof.
1. It is sufficient to prove that $Q^\sharp Q$ is the reduced solution of the equation $AX = Q^*A$. In fact, $AQ^\sharp Q = Q^*AQ = (Q^*)^2A = Q^*A$ and $R(Q^\sharp Q) \subseteq R(Q^\sharp) \subseteq \overline{R(A)}$. Therefore, $Q^\sharp Q = Q^\sharp$. In order to see that $Q^\sharp = P_{\overline{R(A)}}P_{A,\mathcal{S}}$, observe that, by Proposition 2.4, we get $Q = P_{A,\mathcal{S}} + Z$, where $Z \in L(\mathcal{S}^\perp, \mathcal{N})$. Therefore, $Q^\sharp = A^\dagger Q^*A = P_{\overline{R(A)}}Q = P_{\overline{R(A)}}(P_{A,\mathcal{S}} + Z) = P_{\overline{R(A)}}P_{A,\mathcal{S}}$.
2. If $Q \in \mathcal{P}(A, \mathcal{S})$ then $Q^\sharp$ is also an A-selfadjoint projection. On the other hand, $R(I-Q^\sharp) = N(Q^\sharp) = N(Q^*A) = R(AQ)^\perp = R(AP_\mathcal{S})^\perp = N(P_\mathcal{S}A)$. Then $I-Q^\sharp \in \mathcal{P}(A, N(P_\mathcal{S}A))$. □

Remarks 3.3. Considering the subsets defined before, it is clear that if the pair $(A, \mathcal{S})$ is compatible then $\mathcal{P}(A, \mathcal{S}) \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. On the other hand, $\mathcal{P}(A, \mathcal{S}) \cap \mathcal{W} \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \overline{R(A)}$ and the pair $(A, \mathcal{S})$ is compatible. In fact, if there exists $Q \in \mathcal{P}(A, \mathcal{S}) \cap \mathcal{W}$ then $Q^\sharp = Q$ and so $\mathcal{S} = R(Q) = R(Q^\sharp) \subseteq \overline{R(A)}$. Conversely, if $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \overline{R(A)}$ and $(A, \mathcal{S})$ is compatible then $P^\sharp_{A,\mathcal{S}} = P_{\overline{R(A)}}P_{A,\mathcal{S}} = P_{A,\mathcal{S}}$, i.e. $P_{A,\mathcal{S}} \in \mathcal{P}(A, \mathcal{S}) \cap \mathcal{W}$.

4. Identities on the seminorm of projections

In this section we generalize several identities on the norm of projections when the seminorm induced by $A \in L(\mathcal{H})^+$ is considered. We start by establishing an useful relationship between orthogonal projections and A-selfadjoint projections.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $A \in L(\mathcal{H})^+$ and $Q \in L(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\mathcal{S} = R(Q)$ is a closed subspace of $\overline{R(A)}$.*

1. *If $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\mathcal{S} \cap L^A(\mathcal{H})$ then $\overline{A^{1/2}Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger}$ is a projection.*
2. *The following conditions are equivalent:*
   (a) *$Q \in \mathcal{P}(A, \mathcal{S})$.*
   (b) *$Q \in L_A(\mathcal{H})$ and $\overline{A^{1/2}Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger}$ is an orthogonal projection.*

   If one of these conditions holds then $\|Q\|_A = \|\overline{A^{1/2}Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger}\| = 1$.

Proof.
1. Since $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \overline{R(A)}$ then $A^{1/2}Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger$ is a projection. Futhermore, as $Q \in L^A(\mathcal{H})$, by Proposition 2.2, it holds that $A^{1/2}Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger$ is bounded. Therefore $\overline{A^{1/2}Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger}$ is a projection of $L(\mathcal{H})$.
2. Let $Q \in \mathcal{P}(A, \mathcal{S})$. By item 1. it holds that $\overline{A^{1/2}Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger}$ is a projection. In order to see that $(\overline{A^{1/2}Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger})^* = \overline{A^{1/2}Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger}$, observe that $(\overline{A^{1/2}Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger})^* = (A^{1/2}Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger)^* \supset (A^{1/2})^\dagger Q^*A^{1/2}$. Furthermore, since $\mathcal{D}((A^{1/2})^\dagger Q^*A^{1/2}) = \mathcal{H}$, we obtain that $(\overline{A^{1/2}Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger})^* = (A^{1/2})^\dagger Q^*A^{1/2} = \overline{(A^{1/2})^\dagger Q^*A^{1/2}|_{\mathcal{D}((A^{1/2})^\dagger)}} = \overline{A^{1/2}Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger}$ where the last equality holds since $AQ = Q^*A$.
Conversely, let $\overline{A^{1/2}Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger}$ be an orthogonal projection. First, it is shown that that Q is a projection. Since, $\overline{A^{1/2}Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger}$ is a projection, then $A^{1/2}Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger$

is also a projection. Thus, $A^{1/2}Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger = (A^{1/2}Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger)^2 = A^{1/2}Q^2(A^{1/2})^\dagger$. Then, $Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger = Q^2(A^{1/2})^\dagger$, i.e., $(Q^2-Q)(A^{1/2})^\dagger = 0$. Hence, $\overline{R(A)} \subseteq N(Q^2-Q)$, or which is the same $R((Q^*)^2-Q^*) \subseteq N(A)$. Thus, $R(((Q^*)^2-Q^*)A) \subseteq N(A)$. On the other hand, since $R(Q^*A) \subseteq R(A)$, it is easy to prove that $R((Q^*)^2A) \subseteq R(A)$. So, $R(((Q^*)^2 - Q^*)A) \subseteq R(A)$.Then, $((Q^*)^2 - Q^*)A = 0$, i.e., $AQ^2 = AQ$ and so $Q^2 = Q$. It only remains to show that Q is A-selfadjoint. Now, as $\overline{A^{1/2}Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger}$ is selfadjoint, it holds $\overline{A^{1/2}Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger} = (\overline{A^{1/2}Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger})^* = (A^{1/2}Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger)^* = (A^{1/2})^\dagger Q^* A^{1/2}$. Hence, $A^{1/2}Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger = (A^{1/2})^\dagger Q^* A^{1/2}|_{\mathcal{D}((A^{1/2})^\dagger)}$ and as a consequence, $AQP_{\overline{R(A)}} = P_{\overline{R(A)}}|_{\mathcal{D}((A^{1/2})^\dagger)} Q^*A = Q^*A$. Now, taking adjoints we get $Q^*A = AQ$. Hence $Q \in \mathcal{P}(A, \mathcal{S})$.
The equality $\|Q\|_A = \|\overline{A^{1/2}Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger}\|$ follows by Proposition 2.2. $\square$

For the seminorm $\| \ \|_A$, it is not true, in general, that $1 \leq \|Q\|_A$ for every $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\mathcal{S}$. See example 2 below.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $A \in L(\mathcal{H})^+$. If $\mathcal{S} \cap \overline{R(A)} \neq \{0\}$ then $1 \leq \|Q\|_A$ for every $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\mathcal{S}$.*

Proof. If $Q \notin L^A(\mathcal{H})$ then the assertion is trivial. Now, suppose $Q \in L^A(\mathcal{H})$. Let $0 \neq \xi \in \mathcal{S} \cap \overline{R(A)}$ and $\eta = A^{1/2}\xi$. Then, we get $\dfrac{\|A^{1/2}Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger \eta\|}{\|\eta\|} = \dfrac{\|A^{1/2}Q\xi\|}{\|A^{1/2}\xi\|} = \dfrac{\|A^{1/2}\xi\|}{\|A^{1/2}\xi\|} = 1$. Therefore, $\|Q\|_A = \|A^{1/2}Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger\| \geq 1$. $\square$

In what follows, given A in $L(\mathcal{H})^+$ we shall say that a projection Q is **non-trivial for** A if $AQ \neq 0$. Note that if $Q \in \mathcal{P}(A, \mathcal{S})$ then $\|Q\|_A$ is finite. Moreover, in the next proposition we show that if $Q \in \mathcal{P}(A, \mathcal{S})$ is non-trivial for A then $\|Q\|_A = 1$.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $A \in L(\mathcal{H})^+$. If $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\mathcal{S}$ is non-trivial for A then the following conditions are equivalent:*

1. *$Q \in \mathcal{P}(A, \mathcal{S})$ (i.e. Q is A-selfadjoint).*
2. *$\|Q\|_A = 1$ and $Q \in L_A(\mathcal{H})$.*

Proof.
$1 \Rightarrow 2$. If $Q \in \mathcal{P}(A, \mathcal{S})$ then, by Proposition 3.2, $Q^\sharp Q$ is a projection. In addition, $R(Q^\sharp Q) \subseteq \overline{R(A)}$. Then applying Proposition 4.1 we deduce that $\overline{A^{1/2}Q^\sharp Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger}$ is an orthogonal projection. Moreover, since Q is non-trivial, $R(Q) \not\subseteq N(A)$ and so $\overline{A^{1/2}Q^\sharp Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger} \neq 0$. Thus, applying Proposition 2.3, $\|Q\|_A^2 = \|Q^\sharp Q\|_A = \|A^{1/2}Q^\sharp Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger\|^2 = \|\overline{A^{1/2}Q^\sharp Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger}\|^2 = 1$.
$2 \Rightarrow 1$. As $R(Q^*A) \subseteq R(A)$ then $Q^\sharp$ is a projection whose range is contained in $\overline{R(A)}$. Then, $(A^{1/2}Q^\sharp(A^{1/2})^\dagger)^2 = A^{1/2}Q^\sharp(A^{1/2})^\dagger$ and so $\overline{A^{1/2}Q^\sharp(A^{1/2})^\dagger}$ is a projection. In addition, as $1 = \|Q\|_A = \|Q^\sharp\|_A = \|\overline{A^{1/2}Q^\sharp(A^{1/2})^\dagger}\|$, it follows that $\overline{A^{1/2}Q^\sharp(A^{1/2})^\dagger}$ is an orthogonal projection. On the other hand, since $Q^\sharp = A^\dagger Q^* A$ we get that $\overline{A^{1/2}Q^\sharp(A^{1/2})^\dagger} = \overline{(A^{1/2})^\dagger Q^* A^{1/2}}|_{\mathcal{D}((A^{1/2})^\dagger)}$ is an orthogonal

projection. Hence, it holds $\overline{(A^{1/2})^\dagger Q^* A^{1/2}|_{\mathcal{D}((A^{1/2})^\dagger)}} = (\overline{(A^{1/2})^\dagger Q^* A^{1/2}|_{\mathcal{D}((A^{1/2})^\dagger)}})^*$ and $((A^{1/2})^\dagger Q^* A^{1/2}|_{\mathcal{D}((A^{1/2})^\dagger)})^* \supset A^{1/2}Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger$. As a consequence, we have that $\overline{(A^{1/2})^\dagger Q^* A^{1/2}|_{\mathcal{D}((A^{1/2})^\dagger)}} = \overline{A^{1/2}Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger}$ and so $\overline{A^{1/2}Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger}$ is an orthogonal projection. Thus $\overline{A^{1/2}Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger} = (A^{1/2}Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger)^* \supset (A^{1/2})^\dagger Q^* A^{1/2}$. Moreover, since $\mathcal{D}((A^{1/2})^\dagger Q^* A^{1/2}) = \mathcal{H}$ then $\overline{A^{1/2}Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger} = (A^{1/2})^\dagger Q^* A^{1/2}$. In particular, $A^{1/2}Q(A^{1/2})^\dagger = (A^{1/2})^\dagger Q^* A^{1/2}|_{\mathcal{D}((A^{1/2})^\dagger)}$. So $AQ(A^{1/2})^\dagger = Q^* A^{1/2}|_{\mathcal{D}((A^{1/2})^\dagger)}$ and then $AQ = Q^*A$. Thus $Q \in \mathcal{P}(A, \mathcal{S})$.

□

Corollary 4.4. *Let $A \in L(\mathcal{H})^+$ and $(A, \mathcal{S})$ be a compatible pair. If $\mathcal{S} \cap \overline{R(A)} \neq \{0\}$ then, for every $Q_\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{Q}_\mathcal{S}$ it holds*

$$\|P_{A,\mathcal{S}}\|_A \leq \|Q_\mathcal{S}\|_A. \tag{4.1}$$

Proof. Note that $\|P_{A,\mathcal{S}}\|_A = 1$. Therefore, the assertion follows from Proposition 4.2. □

In [[25], Th. 6.35, p. 58] T. Kato proved that $\|P_\mathcal{S} - P_\mathcal{T}\| \leq \|Q_1 - Q_2\|$ for every $Q_1 \in \mathcal{Q}_\mathcal{S}$ and $Q_2 \in \mathcal{Q}_\mathcal{T}$ (see also M. Mbekhta [[33], 1.10]) . We shall generalize this property for A-selfadjoint projections and the seminorm induced by $A \in L(\mathcal{H})^+$ in three different manners. In Proposition 4.5 the inequality is proved for every $Q_\mathcal{S}$, $Q_\mathcal{T} \in L_A(\mathcal{H})$. In order to obtain this inequality for every $Q_\mathcal{S}$, $Q_\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{Q}$ new hypotheses on the subspaces $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ are required (Proposition 4.6, Corollary 4.7). The proof of the next proposition follows the same lines that the proof of [33], Proposition 1.10.

Proposition 4.5. *Let $A \in L(\mathcal{H})^+$ and $(A, \mathcal{S})$, $(A, \mathcal{T})$ be compatible pairs. Then, for every $Q_\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{Q}_\mathcal{S} \cap L_A(\mathcal{H})$ and $Q_\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{Q}_\mathcal{T} \cap L_A(\mathcal{H})$ it holds*

$$\|P_{A,\mathcal{S}} - P_{A,\mathcal{T}}\|_A \leq \|Q_\mathcal{S} - Q_\mathcal{T}\|_A.$$

Proof. First observe that $Q_\mathcal{S} P_{A,\mathcal{S}} = P_{A,\mathcal{S}}$, $P_{A,\mathcal{S}} Q_\mathcal{S} = Q_\mathcal{S}$, $Q_\mathcal{T} P_{A,\mathcal{T}} = P_{A,\mathcal{T}}$ and $P_{A,\mathcal{T}} Q_\mathcal{T} = Q_\mathcal{T}$. From this it holds that

$$(I - Q_\mathcal{S})(P_{A,\mathcal{S}} - P_{A,\mathcal{T}}) = (Q_\mathcal{S} - Q_\mathcal{T})P_{A,\mathcal{T}},$$

$$(P_{A,\mathcal{S}} - P_{A,\mathcal{T}})Q_\mathcal{S} = (I - P_{A,\mathcal{T}})(Q_\mathcal{S} - Q_\mathcal{T})$$

and as consequence $((P_{A,\mathcal{S}} - P_{A,\mathcal{T}})Q_\mathcal{S})^\sharp = ((I - P_{A,\mathcal{T}})(Q_\mathcal{S} - Q_\mathcal{T}))^\sharp$. On the other hand, simple computations show that $((I - P_{A,\mathcal{T}})(Q_\mathcal{S} - Q_\mathcal{T}))^\sharp = (Q_\mathcal{S}^\sharp - Q_\mathcal{T}^\sharp)(I - P_{A,\mathcal{T}})$ and $((P_{A,\mathcal{S}} - P_{A,\mathcal{T}})Q_\mathcal{S})^\sharp = Q_\mathcal{S}^\sharp(P_{A,\mathcal{S}} - P_{A,\mathcal{T}})$.
Now, if $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$, then it is easy to check that

$$\|\xi\|_A^2 + \|(Q_\mathcal{S} - Q_\mathcal{S}^\sharp)\xi\|_A^2 = \|(I - Q_\mathcal{S})\xi\|_A^2 + \|Q_\mathcal{S}^\sharp \xi\|_A^2.$$

Therefore, if $\eta \in \overline{R(A)}$ and we define $\xi = (P_{A,\mathcal{S}} - P_{A,\mathcal{T}})\eta$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(P_{A,\mathcal{S}} - P_{A,\mathcal{T}})\eta\|_A^2 &\leq \|(P_{A,\mathcal{S}} - P_{A,\mathcal{T}})\eta\|_A^2 + \|(Q_{\mathcal{S}} - Q_{\mathcal{S}}^{\sharp})(P_{A,\mathcal{S}} - P_{A,\mathcal{T}})\eta\|_A^2 \\
&= \|(I - Q_{\mathcal{S}})(P_{A,\mathcal{S}} - P_{A,\mathcal{T}})\eta\|_A^2 + \|Q_{\mathcal{S}}^{\sharp}(P_{A,\mathcal{S}} - P_{A,\mathcal{T}})\eta\|_A^2 \\
&= \|(Q_{\mathcal{S}} - Q_{\mathcal{T}})P_{A,\mathcal{T}}\eta\|_A^2 + \|(Q_{\mathcal{S}}^{\sharp} - Q_{\mathcal{T}}^{\sharp})(I - P_{A,\mathcal{T}})\eta\|_A^2 \\
&\leq \|Q_{\mathcal{S}} - Q_{\mathcal{T}}\|_A^2(\|P_{A,\mathcal{T}}\eta\|_A^2 + \|(I - P_{A,\mathcal{T}})\eta\|_A^2) \\
&= \|Q_{\mathcal{S}} - Q_{\mathcal{T}}\|_A^2\|\eta\|_A^2.
\end{aligned}$$

So, $\|P_{A,\mathcal{S}} - P_{A,\mathcal{T}}\|_A \leq \|Q_{\mathcal{S}} - Q_{\mathcal{T}}\|_A$. □

Proposition 4.6. *Let $A \in L(\mathcal{H})^+$ and $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T} \subseteq \overline{R(A)}$. If the pairs $(A, \mathcal{S})$ and $(A, \mathcal{T})$ are compatible then, for every $Q_{\mathcal{S}} \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}} \cap L^A(\mathcal{H})$ and $Q_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{T}} \cap L^A(\mathcal{H})$ it holds*

$$\|P_{A,\mathcal{S}} - P_{A,\mathcal{T}}\|_A \leq \|Q_{\mathcal{S}} - Q_{\mathcal{T}}\|_A. \tag{4.2}$$

Proof. Since the subspaces $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T} \subseteq \overline{R(A)}$, it holds that $Q_1 = A^{1/2}Q_{\mathcal{S}}(A^{1/2})^\dagger$ and $Q_2 = A^{1/2}Q_{\mathcal{T}}(A^{1/2})^\dagger$ are projections with the same range as $A^{1/2}P_{A,\mathcal{S}}(A^{1/2})^\dagger$ and $A^{1/2}P_{A,\mathcal{T}}(A^{1/2})^\dagger$, respectively. On the other hand, by Proposition 4.1, it holds that $\overline{A^{1/2}P_{A,\mathcal{S}}(A^{1/2})^\dagger}$ and $\overline{A^{1/2}P_{A,\mathcal{T}}(A^{1/2})^\dagger}$ are orthogonal projections. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|P_{A,\mathcal{S}} - P_{A,\mathcal{T}}\|_A &= \|A^{1/2}(P_{A,\mathcal{S}} - P_{A,\mathcal{T}})(A^{1/2})^\dagger\| \\
&= \|\overline{A^{1/2}P_{A,\mathcal{S}}(A^{1/2})^\dagger} - \overline{A^{1/2}P_{A,\mathcal{T}}(A^{1/2})^\dagger}\| \\
&\leq \|\overline{A^{1/2}Q_{\mathcal{S}}(A^{1/2})^\dagger} - \overline{A^{1/2}Q_{\mathcal{T}}(A^{1/2})^\dagger}\| \\
&= \|A^{1/2}Q_{\mathcal{S}}(A^{1/2})^\dagger - A^{1/2}Q_{\mathcal{T}}(A^{1/2})^\dagger\| \\
&= \|Q_{\mathcal{S}} - Q_{\mathcal{T}}\|_A
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality holds by [[25], p. 58]. □

Corollary 4.7. *Let $A \in L(\mathcal{H})^+$ and $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ such that $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_1 + \mathcal{S}_2$ and $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_1 + \mathcal{T}_2$, where $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{T}_1 \subseteq \overline{R(A)}$ and $\mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{T}_2 \subseteq N(A)$. If the pairs $(A, \mathcal{S}_1)$ and $(A, \mathcal{T}_1)$ are compatible then, for every $Q_{\mathcal{S}} \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}} \cap L^A(\mathcal{H})$ and $Q_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{T}} \cap L^A(\mathcal{H})$ it holds*

$$\|P_{A,\mathcal{S}} - P_{A,\mathcal{T}}\|_A \leq \|Q_{\mathcal{S}} - Q_{\mathcal{T}}\|_A.$$

Proof. Observe that $\mathcal{S}_1$ and $\mathcal{S}_2$ are orthogonal subspaces then every projection $Q_{\mathcal{S}}$ can be decomposed as $Q_{\mathcal{S}_1} + Q_{\mathcal{S}_2}$ where $Q_{\mathcal{S}_1} = P_{\mathcal{S}_1}Q_{\mathcal{S}}$ and $Q_{\mathcal{S}_2} = P_{\mathcal{S}_2}Q_{\mathcal{S}}$. Furthermore, since $\mathcal{S}_2 \subseteq N(A)$ then $P_{A,\mathcal{S}} = P_{A,\mathcal{S}_1} + P_{\mathcal{S}_2}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|P_{A,\mathcal{S}} - P_{A,\mathcal{T}}\|_A &= \|A^{1/2}(P_{A,\mathcal{S}_1} - P_{A,\mathcal{T}_1})(A^{1/2})^\dagger\| \\
&= \|\overline{A^{1/2}P_{A,\mathcal{S}_1}(A^{1/2})^\dagger} - \overline{A^{1/2}P_{A,\mathcal{T}_1}(A^{1/2})^\dagger}\| \\
&\leq \|\overline{A^{1/2}Q_{\mathcal{S}_1}(A^{1/2})^\dagger} - \overline{A^{1/2}Q_{\mathcal{T}_1}(A^{1/2})^\dagger}\| \\
&= \|A^{1/2}Q_{\mathcal{S}_1}(A^{1/2})^\dagger - A^{1/2}Q_{\mathcal{T}_1}(A^{1/2})^\dagger\| \\
&= \|A^{1/2}(Q_{\mathcal{S}_1} + Q_{\mathcal{S}_2})(A^{1/2})^\dagger - A^{1/2}(Q_{\mathcal{T}_1} + Q_{\mathcal{T}_2})(A^{1/2})^\dagger\| \\
&= \|Q_{\mathcal{S}} - Q_{\mathcal{T}}\|_A
\end{aligned}$$

□

As the next example shows, a naive extension of Kato's theorem is false. Our results 4.5, 4.6 and 4.7 offer different additional hypothesis which guarantee the conclusion.

Example 2. Consider $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{R}^2$, $\mathcal{S} = span\{(1,1)\}$, $\mathcal{T} = span\{(-1,2)\}$ and $A = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 1/2 \end{pmatrix} \in L(\mathbb{R}^2)^+$. Therefore $R(A) = span\{(2,1)\}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ does not satisfy the condition of Corollary 4.7. Moreover, $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{T}} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} -\xi & -1/2(\xi+1) \\ 2\xi & \xi+1 \end{pmatrix}, \xi \in \mathbb{R} \right\}$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1/2(1+\xi) & 1/2(1-\xi) \\ 1/2(1+\xi) & 1/2(1-\xi) \end{pmatrix}, \xi \in \mathbb{R} \right\}$. It is easy to check that $P_{A,\mathcal{S}} = \begin{pmatrix} 2/3 & 1/3 \\ 2/3 & 1/3 \end{pmatrix}$ and $P_{A,\mathcal{T}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1/5 & -2/5 \\ -2/5 & 4/5 \end{pmatrix}$. Now, if we take $Q_{\mathcal{S}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ and $Q_{\mathcal{T}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1/2 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ then $Q_{\mathcal{S}}$ does not admit an A-adjoint operator, $\|P_{A,\mathcal{S}} - P_{A,\mathcal{T}}\|_A = 1$ and $\|Q_{\mathcal{S}}\|_A = \|Q_{\mathcal{S}} - Q_{\mathcal{T}}\|_A = 0.6$.

The following lemma shows that in Corollary 4.4, Proposition 4.5, Corollary 4.7 and Proposition 4.10, the elements $P_{A,\mathcal{S}}$ and $P_{A,\mathcal{T}}$ can be replaced for any element of $\mathcal{P}(A,\mathcal{S})$ and $P(A,\mathcal{T})$ respectively.

Lemma 4.8. *Let $A \in L(\mathcal{H})^+$. If $(A,\mathcal{S})$ and $(A,\mathcal{T})$ are compatible pairs then*

$$\|Q_1 - Q_2\|_A = \|P_{A,\mathcal{S}} - P_{A,\mathcal{T}}\|_A$$

for every $Q_1 \in \mathcal{P}(A,\mathcal{S})$ and $Q_2 \in \mathcal{P}(A,\mathcal{T})$.

Proof. By Propositions 2.3 and 3.2 it holds that $\|Q_1 - Q_2\|_A = \|Q_1^\sharp - Q_2^\sharp\|_A = \|P_{\overline{R(A)}}P_{A,\mathcal{S}} - P_{\overline{R(A)}}P_{A,\mathcal{T}}\|_A = \|P_{A,\mathcal{S}} - P_{A,\mathcal{T}}\|_A$. □

Given a non trivial projection Q in $L(\mathcal{H})$, i.e., one which is different from 0 and I, it holds $\|Q\| = \|I - Q\|$. In [41] different proofs of this fact are collected. In the next proposition we generalize this identity for the seminorm induced by $A \in L(\mathcal{H})^+$. The proof we present is similar to the one due to Krainer presented in [41].

Proposition 4.9. *Let $A \in L(\mathcal{H})^+$. Therefore, for every $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}}$ such that $R(Q) \cap \overline{R(A)} \neq \{0\}$ and $R(I-Q) \cap \overline{R(A)} \neq \{0\}$ it holds*

$$\|Q\|_A = \|I - Q\|_A.$$

Proof. Observe that by Proposition 4.2, the conditions $R(Q) \cap \overline{R(A)} \neq \{0\}$ and $R(I-Q) \cap \overline{R(A)} \neq \{0\}$ imply that $\|Q\|_A \geq 1$ and $\|I - Q\|_A \geq 1$. Let $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $\|\xi\|_A = 1$. Define $\eta = Q\xi$ and $\mu = (I-Q)\xi$. Then $\xi = \eta + \mu$. Let us show that $\|Q\xi\|_A \leq \|I - Q\|_A$. If $\eta \in N(A)$ then $\|Q\xi\|_A = 0$ and so the inequality holds. If $\mu \in N(A)$ then $\|Q\xi\|_A = 1$ and so the inequality holds. Consider $\eta, \mu \notin N(A)$ and define $\omega = \tilde{\eta} + \tilde{\mu}$ where $\tilde{\eta} = \frac{\|\mu\|_A}{\|\eta\|_A}\eta$ and $\tilde{\mu} = \frac{\|\eta\|_A}{\|\mu\|_A}\mu$. Then $\|\omega\|_A^2 = \|\tilde{\eta}\|_A^2 + \|\tilde{\mu}\|_A^2 + 2Re\,\langle\tilde{\eta},\tilde{\mu}\rangle_A = \|\eta\|_A^2 + \|\mu\|_A^2 + 2Re\,\langle\eta,\mu\rangle_A = \|\xi\|_A^2 = 1$. Therefore, $\|Q\xi\|_A = \|\eta\|_A = \|\tilde{\mu}\|_A = \|(I-Q)\omega\|_A \leq \|I - Q\|_A$. Thus, $\|Q\|_A \leq \|I - Q\|_A$. The other inequality holds by symmetry. □

The conditions $R(Q)\cap\overline{R(A)}\neq\{0\}$ and $R(I-Q)\cap\overline{R(A)}\neq\{0\}$ in the above Proposition are necessary. Indeed, if $Q=P_{N(A)}$ then $I-Q=P_{\overline{R(A)}}$ and so $\|Q\|_A=0$ and $\|I-Q\|_A=1$.
In [1] § 34, properties (IV) and (V) enunciated in the introduction are proved. They where first proved by M. G. Krein, M. A. Krasnoselski and B. Sz.-Nagy. We extend now these facts for A-selfadjoint projections and the operator seminorm induced by A, with convenient compatibility hypothesis.

Proposition 4.10. *Let $A\in L(\mathcal{H})^+$ such that the pairs $(A,\mathcal{S})$ and $(A,\mathcal{T})$ are compatible. Then:*

(a) $\|P_{A,\mathcal{S}}-P_{A,\mathcal{T}}\|_A\leq 1$;
(b) *If $P^\sharp_{A,\mathcal{S}}$ and $P^\sharp_{A,\mathcal{T}}$ commute then* $\|P_{A,\mathcal{S}}-P_{A,\mathcal{T}}\|_A=1$;
(c) $\|P_{A,\mathcal{S}}-P_{A,\mathcal{T}}\|_A=\mathit{max}\,\{\,\|P_{A,\mathcal{S}}(I-P_{A,\mathcal{T}})\|_A,\ \|P_{A,\mathcal{T}}(I-P_{A,\mathcal{S}})\|_A\,\}$.

Proof. By Proposition 3.1, the element $P^\sharp_{A,\mathcal{S}}$ is an A-selfadjoint projection. Furthermore, $R(P^\sharp_{A,\mathcal{S}})\subseteq\overline{R(A)}$. Therefore, by Proposition 4.1, we get that $P_1=\overline{A^{1/2}P^\sharp_{A,\mathcal{S}}(A^{1/2})^\dagger}$ is an orthogonal projection. Analogously, $P_2=\overline{A^{1/2}P^\sharp_{A,\mathcal{T}}(A^{1/2})^\dagger}$ is an orthogonal projection. By the above remarks,

$$\begin{aligned}\|P_{A,\mathcal{S}}-P_{A,\mathcal{T}}\|_A &= \|P^\sharp_{A,\mathcal{S}}-P^\sharp_{A,\mathcal{T}}\|_A\\ &= \|A^{1/2}(P^\sharp_{A,\mathcal{S}}-P^\sharp_{A,\mathcal{T}})(A^{1/2})^\dagger\|\\ &= \|\overline{A^{1/2}P^\sharp_{A,\mathcal{S}}(A^{1/2})^\dagger}-\overline{A^{1/2}P^\sharp_{A,\mathcal{T}}(A^{1/2})^\dagger}\|\\ &= \|P_1-P_2\|\end{aligned}$$

and so, by (IV), $\|P_{A,\mathcal{S}}-P_{A,\mathcal{T}}\|_A\leq 1$; this proves (a).
It is easy to check that if $P^\sharp_{A,\mathcal{S}}$ and $P^\sharp_{A\mathcal{T}}$ commute then P_1 and P_2 commute. Therefore, applying (IV), $\|P_{A,\mathcal{S}}-P_{A,\mathcal{T}}\|_A=\|P_1-P_2\|=1$, which proves (b).
For the proof of (c) observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\|P_{A,\mathcal{S}}(I-P_{A,\mathcal{T}})\|_A &= \|(I-P_{A,\mathcal{T}})^\sharp P^\sharp_{A,\mathcal{S}}\|_A=\|(P_{\overline{R(A)}}-P^\sharp_{A,\mathcal{T}})P^\sharp_{A,\mathcal{S}}\|_A\\ &= \|(I-P^\sharp_{A,\mathcal{T}})P^\sharp_{A,\mathcal{S}}\|_A=\|A^{1/2}(I-P^\sharp_{A,\mathcal{T}})P^\sharp_{A,\mathcal{S}}(A^{1/2})^\dagger\|\\ &= \|\overline{A^{1/2}(I-P^\sharp_{A,\mathcal{T}})P^\sharp_{A,\mathcal{S}}(A^{1/2})^\dagger}\|=\|(I-P_2)P_1\|\\ &= \|P_1(I-P_2)\|.\end{aligned}$$

Analogously, $\|P_{A,\mathcal{T}}(I-P_{A,\mathcal{S}})\|_A=\|P_2(I-P_1)\|$. On the other hand, $\|P_{A,\mathcal{S}}-P_{A,\mathcal{T}}\|_A=\|P_1-P_2\|$, by the proof of (b). Then the assertion follows applying (V). □

5. Angles and seminorm of projections

In [28], V. Ljance proved that if $\mathcal{H}$ is decomposed as $\mathcal{H}=\mathcal{S}\dotplus\mathcal{T}$ then the norm of the projection $Q_{\mathcal{S}//\mathcal{T}}$ equals $1/\sin\theta$, where $\theta\in[0,\pi/2]$ is the angle between

the subspaces $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ introduced by Dixmier in [18]. Proof of this theorem can be found in the papers by Ptak [35], Steinberg [40], Buckholtz [6] and Ipsen and Meyer [24] (for finite dimensional spaces).
As a final result, we extend Ljance's theorem for the A-seminorm, with a convenient definition of angle between subspaces depending on the semi-inner product $\langle\ ,\ \rangle_A$. First, recall that given two closed subspaces $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ of $\mathcal{H}$ the Dixmier's angle between them is the angle $\theta(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{T}) \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$ whose cosine is defined by

$$\cos\theta(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{T}) = \sup\{|\langle\xi,\eta\rangle| : \xi \in \mathcal{S}, \eta \in \mathcal{T} \text{ and } \|\xi\| \leq 1\ \|\eta\| \leq 1\}.$$

Note that, even though if $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ are not closed subspaces then the angle between them can be also defined as above. Moreover, it holds $\cos\theta(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{T}) = \cos\theta(\overline{\mathcal{S}},\overline{\mathcal{T}})$. It is well known that $\cos\theta(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{T}) = \|P_{\mathcal{S}}P_{\mathcal{T}}\|$ (see [16]).

Definition 5.1. Let $A \in L(\mathcal{H})^+$. The ***A*-angle** between two closed subspaces $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ is the angle $\theta_A(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{T}) \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$ whose cosine is defined by

$$\cos\theta_A(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{T}) = \sup\{|\langle\xi,\eta\rangle_A| : \xi \in \mathcal{S}, \eta \in \mathcal{T} \text{ and } \|\xi\|_A \leq 1\ \|\eta\|_A \leq 1\}.$$

Observe that $0 \leq \cos\theta_A(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{T}) \leq 1$. Furthermore, it holds that $\cos\theta_A(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{T}) = \cos\theta(A^{1/2}(\mathcal{S}), A^{1/2}(\mathcal{T}))$.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $A \in L(\mathcal{H})^+$. If $(A,\mathcal{S})$ and $(A,\mathcal{T})$ are compatible pairs then $\cos\theta_A(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{T}) = \|P_{A,\mathcal{S}}P_{A,\mathcal{T}}\|_A$.*

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
\cos\theta_A(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{T}) &= \sup\{|\langle\xi,\eta\rangle_A| : \xi \in \mathcal{S}, \eta \in \mathcal{T} \text{ and } \|\xi\|_A \leq 1\ \|\eta\|_A \leq 1\}\\
&= \sup\{|\langle P_{A,\mathcal{S}}\xi, P_{A,\mathcal{T}}\eta\rangle_A| : \xi,\eta \in \mathcal{H} \text{ and } \|\xi\|_A \leq 1\ \|\eta\|_A \leq 1\}\\
&= \sup\{|\langle\xi, P_{A,\mathcal{S}}P_{A,\mathcal{T}}\eta\rangle_A| : \xi,\eta \in \mathcal{H} \text{ and } \|\xi\|_A \leq q\ \|\eta\|_A \leq 1\}\\
&= \|P_{A,\mathcal{S}}P_{A,\mathcal{T}}\|_A.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 5.3. *Let $A \in L(\mathcal{H})^+$ and $\mathcal{S},\mathcal{T}$ closed subspaces of $\mathcal{H}$ such that $\mathcal{S} \dot{+} \mathcal{T} = \mathcal{H}$. If $(A,\mathcal{S})$ and $(A,\mathcal{T})$ are compatible pairs and $\mathcal{S} \cap \overline{R(A)} \neq \{0\}$ then for $Q = Q_{\mathcal{S}//\mathcal{T}}$ it holds*

$$\|Q\|_A = (1 - \|P_{A,\mathcal{T}}P_{A,\mathcal{S}}\|_A^2)^{-1/2}.$$

Proof. Let $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$. Then $\xi = P_{A,\mathcal{T}}\xi + (I - P_{A,\mathcal{T}})\xi$, so $Q\xi = Q(I - P_{A,\mathcal{T}})\xi$ and $\|(I - P_{A,\mathcal{T}})\xi\|_A \leq \|\xi\|_A$. Therefore, as $R(I - P_{A,\mathcal{T}}) = N(P_{A,\mathcal{T}}) = \mathcal{T}^{\perp_A} \ominus \mathcal{N}$, where $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{T} \cap N(A)$ then $\|Q\|_A = \|Q|_{\mathcal{T}^{\perp_A}\ominus\mathcal{N}}\|_A$. Now, consider $\xi \in (\mathcal{T}^{\perp_A} \ominus \mathcal{N}) \cap \overline{R(A)}$. Thus $P_{A,\mathcal{T}}Q\xi = P_{A,\mathcal{T}}\xi + P_{A,\mathcal{T}}(Q\xi - \xi) = Q\xi - \xi$ and as a consequence $\|Q\xi\|_A^2 = \|\xi\|_A^2 + \|Q\xi - \xi\|_A^2 = \|\xi\|_A^2 + \|P_{A,\mathcal{T}}P_{A,\mathcal{S}}Q\xi\|_A^2$. Note that, without loss of generality, we can consider $Q\xi \in \overline{R(A)}$. Then we get that $1 = \dfrac{\|\xi\|_A^2}{\|Q\xi\|_A^2} + \dfrac{\|P_{A,\mathcal{T}}P_{A,\mathcal{S}}Q\xi\|_A^2}{\|Q\xi\|_A^2}$ and from this

$$\left(1 - \frac{\|P_{A,\mathcal{T}}P_{A,\mathcal{S}}Q\xi\|_A^2}{\|Q\xi\|_A^2}\right)^{-1/2} = \frac{\|Q\xi\|_A}{\|\xi\|_A}.$$

Now, since $\|Q\|_A = \|Q|_{\mathcal{T}^{\perp_A}\ominus\mathcal{N}}\|_A$ and $\|P_{A,\mathcal{T}}P_{A,\mathcal{S}}\|_A = \|P_{A,\mathcal{T}}P_{A,\mathcal{S}}|_{\mathcal{S}}\|_A$ the assertion follows. $\square$

Corollary 5.4. *Let $A \in L(\mathcal{H})^+$ and $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}$ closed subspaces of $\mathcal{H}$ such that $\mathcal{S}\dot{+}\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{H}$. If $(A, \mathcal{S})$ and $(A, \mathcal{T})$ are compatible pairs and $\mathcal{S}\cap\overline{R(A)} \neq \{0\}$ then for every $Q_{\mathcal{S}//\mathcal{T}}$ it holds*

$$\|Q_{\mathcal{S}//\mathcal{T}}\|_A = \frac{1}{\sin\theta_A(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{S})}.$$

The following example shows that the condition $\mathcal{S} \cap \overline{R(A)} \neq \{0\}$ in Proposition 5.3 is not superfluous.

Example 3. Let $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{R}^2$, $A = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 1/2 \end{pmatrix} \in L(\mathbb{R}^2)^+$ and $Q = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. Then $\mathcal{S} = R(Q) = span\{(1, 1)\}$ and $\mathcal{T} = N(Q) = span\{(1, 0)\}$. Furthermore, $P_{A,\mathcal{T}} = \begin{pmatrix} 2/3 & 1/3 \\ 2/3 & 1/3 \end{pmatrix}$ and $P_{A,\mathcal{S}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1/2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Now, $\|P_{A,\mathcal{T}}P_{A,\mathcal{S}}\|_A = 1$ and $\|Q\|_A = 0.6$.

Acknowledgment

We thank the referee for a careful reading, and many useful comments which greatly improved the final form of the paper.

References

[1] N.I.Akhiezer and I.M.Glazman, *Theory of linear operators in Hilbert space.* Vol.1, Ungar, New York, 1961.

[2] M.L. Arias, G. Corach and M. C. Gonzalez, *Partial isometries in semi-Hilbertian spaces.* Linear Algebra Appl. 428 (2008), 1460-1475.

[3] B. Aupetit, E. Jr Makai, M. Mbekhta and J. Zemánek, *The connected components of the idempotents in the Calkin algebra, and their liftings, Operator theory and Banach algebras.* (Rabat, 1999), Theta, Bucharest, (2003), 23–30.

[4] B. A. Barnes, *The spectral properties of certain linear operators and their extensions.* Proc. Am. Math. Soc. 128 (2000), 1371–1375.

[5] A. Ben-Israel and T. N. E.Greville, *Generalized inverses. Theory and applications.* 2nd Edition, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003.

[6] D. Buckholtz, *Hilbert space idempotents and involutions.* Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 128 (2000), no. 5, 1415-1418.

[7] P. Cojuhari and A. Gheondea, *On lifting of operators to Hilbert spaces induced by positive seladjoint operators.* J. Math. Anal. Appl. 304 (2005), 584–598.

[8] J.B. Conway, *A course in functional analysis.* Springer-Verlag, New York, 1985.

[9] G. Corach, H. Porta, L. Recht, *Differential geometry of systems of projections in Banach algebras.*Pacific Journal of Mathematics 143 (1990), 209-228.

[10] G. Corach, A. Maestripieri and D. Stojanoff, *Schur complements and oblique projections.* Acta Sci. Math 67 (2001), 439–459.

[11] G. Corach, A. Maestripieri and D. Stojanoff, *Generalized Schur complements and oblique projections.* Linear Algebra and its Applications 341 (2002), 259–272.

[12] G. Corach, A. L. Maestripieri, D. Stojanoff, *Oblique projections and abstract splines.* Journal of Aproximation Theory, 117, 2 (2002), 189-206

[13] G. Corach, A. Maestripieri and D. Stojanoff, *A classification of projectors.* Topological algebras, their applications and related topics, Banach Center Publications 67, Polish Acad. Sci., Warsaw, (2005), 145–160.

[14] G. Corach, A. Maestripieri, D.Stojanoff, *Projections in operator ranges.* Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 134 (2006), n^o 3, 765-778.

[15] G. Corach, H. Porta, L. Recht, *The geometry of spaces of projections in C^*-algebras.* Advances in Mathematics 101 (1993), 59-77.

[16] F. Deutsch, *The angle between subspaces in Hilbert space.* in Approximation theory, wavelets and applications, S. P. Singh, editor, Kluwer (1995), 107-130.

[17] J. Dieudonné, *Quasi-hermitian operators.* Proc. Inter. Symp. Linear Algebra, Jerusalem (1961), 115–122.

[18] J. Dixmier, *Étude sur less variétés et le opératerus de Julia avec quelques applications.* Bull. Soc. Math. France, 77 (1949) 11-101.

[19] R. G. Douglas, *On majorization, factorization and range inclusion of operators in Hilbert spaces.* Proc. Am. Math. Soc. 17 (1966) 413–416.

[20] H. W. Engl, M. Hanke and A. Neubauer, *Regularization of Inverse Problems.* Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1996.

[21] P. A. Fillmore and J. P. Williams, *On operator ranges.* Advances in Mathemathics 7 (1971), 254–281.

[22] I.C. Gohberg and M.G. Krein, *Introduction to the theory of linear nonselfadjoint operators.* Translated from the Russian by A. Feinstein. Translations of Mathematical Monographs, Vol. 18 American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I. 1969

[23] S. Hassi, Z. Sebestyén and H. S. V. De Snoo, *On the nonnegative of operator products.* Acta Math. Hungar. 109 (2005), 1–14.

[24] I. Ipsen and C. Meyer, *The angle between complementary subspaces.* Amer. Math. Monthly 102 (1995), n^o 10, 904-911

[25] T. Kato, *Perturbation theory of linear operators.*, Springer, New York, (First edition), 1966.

[26] M. G. Krein, *Compact linear operators on functional spaces with two norms.* Integr. equ. oper. theory 30 (1998), 140-162 (translation from the Ukranian of a paper published in 1937).

[27] P. D. Lax, *Symmetrizable linear transformations.*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 7 (1954), 633–647.

[28] V. È. Ljance, *Certain properties of idempotent operators.* (Russian) Teoret. Prikl. Mat. Vyp. 1 1958 16-22.

[29] S. Maeda, *On arcs in the space of projections of a C^*-algebra.* Math Japon. 21 (1976), n^o 4, 371–374.

[30] S. Maeda, *Probability measures on projections in von Neumann algebras.* Rev. Math. Phys. 1 (1989), n^o 2-3, 235–290.

[31] A. Maestripieri, F. Martinez Perías, *Decomposition of selfadjoint projections in Krein spaces.* Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) 72 (2006), n° 3-4, 611-638.

[32] E. Jr. Makai and J. Zemánek, *On polynomial connections between projections.* Linear Algebra Appl. 126 (1989), 91–94.

[33] M. Mbektha, *Résolvant généralisé et théorie spectrale.* Journal of Operator Theory 21 (1989), 69–105.

[34] M. Z. Nashed, *Inner, outer, and generalized inverses in Banach and Hilbert spaces.* Numer. Funct. Anal. Optim. 9 (1987), 261–325.

[35] V. Pták, *Extremal operators and oblique projections.* Casopis P est. Mat. 110 (1985), no. 4, 343-350, 413.

[36] W. T. Reid, *Symmetrizable completely continuous linear transformations in Hilbert space.* Duke Math. J. 18 (1951). 41–56

[37] C. E. Rickart, *General theory of Banach algebras.* van Nostrand, Princeton, N.J.-Toronto-London-New York 1960.

[38] T. Sakaue, M. O'uchi and S. Maeda, *Connected components of projections of a C^*-algebra.* Math. Japon. 29 (1984),427–431.

[39] Z. Sebestyén, *On ranges of adjoint operators in Hilbert space.* Acta Sci. Math. 46 (1983), 295–298.

[40] J. Steinberg, *Oblique projections in Hilbert spaces.* Integral Equations Operator Theory 38 (2000), no. 1, 81–119

[41] D. Szyld, *The many proofs of an identity on the Norm of oblique projections.* Numerical Algorithms 42 (2006), 309–323.

[42] J. Zemánek, *Idempotents in Banach algebras.* Bull. London Math. Soc. 11 (1979), 177–183.

M. Laura Arias, Gustavo Corach and M. Celeste Gonzalez
Instituto Argentino de Matemática
Saavedra 15 3er. Piso
(1083) Buenos Aires
Argentina
e-mail: ml_arias@uolsinectis.com.ar
e-mail: gcorach@fi.uba.ar
e-mail: celegonzalez@gmail.com