

AN EXTENSION TO FUGLEDE-PUTNAM'S THEOREM AND ORTHOGONALITY

A. BACHIR

Department of Mathematics, King Khalid University, Abha, Saudi Arabia

Copyright © 2014 A. Bachir. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Abstract. An asymmetric Fuglede-Putnam's theorem for w-hyponormal operators and (p,k)-quasihyponormal operator is proved. As a consequence of this result, we obtain that the range of the generalized derivation induced by the above classes of operators is orthogonal to its kernel.

Keywords: Fuglede-Putnam theorem; w-hyponormal operator; (p,k)-quasihyponormal operator; derivation.

2010 AMS Subject Classification: 47B47, 47A30, 47B20.

1. Introduction

For complex Hilbert spaces \mathscr{H} and \mathscr{K} , $B(\mathscr{H}), B(\mathscr{K})$ and $B(\mathscr{H}, \mathscr{K})$ denote the set of all bounded linear operators on \mathscr{H} , the set of all bounded linear operators on \mathscr{K} and the set of all bounded linear transformations from \mathscr{H} to \mathscr{K} respectively. A bounded operator $A \in B(\mathscr{H})$ is called normal if $A^*A = AA^*$. According to [10] a bounded operator $A \in B(\mathscr{H})$ is called (p,k)-quasihyponormal if

$$A^{*k}(A^*A) - (AA^*)A^k \ge 0, \ 0$$

If p = 1, k = 1 and p = k = 1, then A is k-quasihyponormal, p-quasihyponormal and quasihyponormal respectively.

Received January 11, 2014

A. BACHIR

If $\{N\}$, $\{HN\}$, $\{Q(p)\}$, and $\{Q(p,k)\}$ denote the classes of normal, hyponormal, *p*-quasihyponormal and (p,k)-quasihyponormal operators. These classes are related by proper inclusion

$$\{N\} \subseteq \{HN\} \subseteq \{Q(p)\} \subseteq \{Q(p,k)\}.$$

Also *A* is called *p*-hyponormal [1, 5, 7, 8, 16, 17], if $(A^*A)^p \ge (AA^*)^p$ for some 0 ,semi-hyponormal if <math>p = 1/2, log-hyponormal [14] if *A* is invertible operator and satisfies $\log(A^*A) \ge \log(AA^*)$, and *w*-hyponormal if $|\widetilde{A}| \ge |A| \ge |(\widetilde{A})^*|$, where $\widetilde{A} = |A|^{\frac{1}{2}}U|A|^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is the Aluthge transformation. It was shown in [2] and [3] that the class of *w*-hyponormal operators contains both the *p*-hyponormal and log-hyponormal operators. Let *p*-*H* and *w*-*H* denote the class of *p*-hyponormal and *w*-hyponormal operators respectively. We have

$$\{N\} \subset \{HN\} \subset \{p-H\} \subset \{w-H\}.$$

These classes are interesting and have similar properties to those of hyponormal operators.

The familiar Fuglede-Putnam's theorem asserts that if $A \in B(\mathscr{H})$ and $B \in B(\mathscr{H})$ are normal operators and AX = XB for some operators $X \in B(\mathscr{H}, \mathscr{H})$, then $A^*X = XB^*$ [12]. Many authors have extended this theorem for several classes of operators. H.I. Kim [11] proved that Fuglede-Putnam's theorem holds for injective (p,k)-quasihyponormal and p-hyponormal operators.

Let $A \in B(\mathcal{H})$, $B \in B(\mathcal{H})$. We say that the pair (A, B) satisfies the Fuglede-Putnam's theorem if AX = XB for some $X \in B(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H})$ implies $A^*X = XB^*$.

The organization of this paper is as follows, in Section 2, we recall some well known results which will be used in the sequel. In Section 3, our aim is to extend the Fuglede-Putnam theorem [12], we prove that if either

- (1) A is injective (p.k)-quasihyponormal and B^* is w-hyponormal such that ker $B^* \subset \ker B$ or
- (2) A is *w*-hyponormal such that ker $A^* \subset$ kerA and B^* is (p,k)-quasihyponormal, then the pair (A,B) satisfies the Fuglede-Putnam's theorem.

Let $A, B \in L(\mathcal{H})$, we define the generalized derivation $\delta_{A,B}$ induced by A and B by

$$\delta_{A,B}(X) = AX - XB$$
, for all $X \in B(\mathscr{H})$.

Definition 1.1 [4] Given subspaces \mathscr{M} and \mathscr{N} of a Banach space \mathscr{V} with norm $\|\cdot\|$. \mathscr{M} is said to be orthogonal to \mathscr{N} if $\|m+n\| \ge \|n\|$ for all $m \in \mathscr{M}$ and $n \in \mathscr{N}$.

Anderson and Foias [4] proved that if *A* and *B* are normal, *S* is an operator such that AS = SB, then

$$\| \delta_{A,B}(X) - S \| \geq \| S \|$$
, for all $X \in B(\mathscr{H})$,

where $\|\cdot\|$ is the usual operator norm. Hence the range of $\delta_{A,B}$ is orthogonal to the null space of $\delta_{A,B}$. The orthogonality here is understood to be in the sense of definition [4].

2. Preliminaries

We begin by the following known results which will be used in the sequel.

Definition 2.1. [1] Let $A \in B(\mathcal{H})$ and A = U|A| be the polar decomposition of A, the Aluthge transformation of A is $\widetilde{A} = |A|^{\frac{1}{2}}U|A|^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

Theorem 2.2. [9] An operator $A \in B(\mathcal{H})$ is *w*-hyponormal if and only if

$$(|A^*|^{\frac{1}{2}}|A||A^*|^{\frac{1}{2}})^{\frac{1}{2}} \ge |A^*|$$

Lemma 2.3. [17] Let $A \in B(\mathcal{H})$ be p-hyponormal operator and $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{H}$ be an invariant subspace for A, then the restriction of A to \mathcal{M} is p-hyponormal.

Lemma 2.4. [15] Let $A \in B(\mathcal{H})$ be (p,k)-quasihyponormal operator and $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{H}$ be an invariant subspace for A, then the restriction of A to \mathcal{M} is (p,k)-quasihyponormal operator.

Lemma 2.5. [10] Let $A \in B(\mathcal{H})$ be (p,k)-quasihyponormal operator and $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{H}$ be an invariant subspace for A. If $A|_M$ is an injective normal operator, then \mathcal{M} reduces A.

Lemma 2.6. ([6], [12]) Let $A \in B(\mathcal{H})$ be w-hyponormal and $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{H}$ be an invariant subspace for A, then the restriction of A to \mathcal{M} is w-hyponormal.

Lemma 2.7. [16] Let $A \in B(\mathcal{H})$ be w-hyponormal operator, then its Aluthge transform

 $\widetilde{A} = |A|^{\frac{1}{2}} U|A|^{\frac{1}{2}}$

is semi-hyponormal.

Theorem 2.8. [11] Let $A \in B(\mathcal{H})$ be an injective (p,k)-quasihyponormal and $B^* \in B(\mathcal{H})$ be p-hyponormal on Hilbert spaces \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} respectively. If $C \in B(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H})$ and AC = CB, then $A^*C = CB^*$.

Theorem 2.9. [14]*Let* $A \in B(\mathcal{H})$ *and* $B \in B(\mathcal{H})$ *. Then the following assertions are equivalent*

- (1) The pair (A, B) satisfy Fuglede-Putnam's theorem.
- (2) If AX = XB for some $X \in B(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{H})$, then $\overline{R(X)}$ reduces A, $\ker(X)^{\perp}$ reduces B, and $A \mid_{\overline{R(X)}}, B \mid_{(\ker X)^{\perp}}$ are normal operators.

3. Main results

Our goal is to investigate the orthogonality of $R(\delta_{A,B})$ (the range of $\delta_{A,B}$) and ker($\delta_{A,B}$) (the kernel of $\delta_{A,B}$) for some operators. We prove that $R(\delta_{A,B})$ is orthogonal to ker($\delta_{A,B}$) when either

- (i) A is an injective (p,k)-hyponormal operator and B* is w-hyponormal such that ker B* ⊂ ker B or
- (ii) A is w-hyponormal such that ker $A \subset \text{ker}A^*$ and B^* is an injective (p,k)-hyponormal operator.

Theorem 3.1 Let $A \in B(\mathcal{H})$ be is an injective (p,k)-hyponormal operator and $B^* \in B(\mathcal{H})$ be *w*-hyponormal such that ker $B^* \subset \text{ker } B$. If AC = CB for some $C \in B(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H})$, then $A^*C = CB^*$.

Proof. Case 1. If B^* is injective. Assume that AC = CB for some $C \in B(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{H})$.

Since $\overline{R(C)}$ is invariant by *A* and $(\ker C)^{\perp}$ is invariant by B^* , we consider the following decompositions:

$$\mathscr{H} = \overline{R(C)} \oplus (R(C))^{\perp}, \ \mathscr{H} = (\ker C)^{\perp} \oplus (\ker C),$$

then it yields

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & A_2 \\ 0 & A_3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} B_1 & 0 \\ B_2 & B_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} C_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} : (\ker C)^{\perp} \oplus (\ker C) \longrightarrow \overline{R(C)} \oplus (R(C))^{\perp}$$

From AC = CB we get

$$A_1C_1 = C_1B_1.$$

Let $B_1^* = U^* |B_1^*|$ be the polar decomposition of B_1^* . Multiply the both members of (1) by $|B_1^*|^{1/2}$, we obtain

$$A_1C_1|B_1^*|^{1/2} = C_1B_1|B_1^*|^{1/2}.$$

Hence

(2)
$$A_1C_1|B_1^*|^{1/2} = C_1|B_1^*|^{1/2}(\widetilde{B_1^*})^*.$$

In equation (2), A_1 is is an injective (p,k)-hyponormal operator by Lemma and B_1^* is *w*-hyponormal by Lemma , and $(\widetilde{B_1^*})^*$ is semi-hyponormal by Lemma . By applying Theorem , the pair $(A_1, \widetilde{B_1^*})$ satisfies the Fuglede-Putnam's theorem. Therefore $A_1|_{R(C_1|B_1^*|^{1/2})}$ and $\widetilde{B_1^*}|_{(\ker(C_1|B_1^*|^{1/2})^{\perp})}$ are normal operators. Since C_1 is injective with dense range and $|B_1^*|^{1/2}$ is injective, then

$$\overline{R(C_1|B_1^*|^{1/2})} = \overline{R(C_1)} = \overline{R(C)},$$

and

$$\ker(C_1|B_1^*|^{1/2}) = \{0\}.$$

It follows that $\widetilde{B_1^*}$ is normal and $(\ker C)^{\perp}$ reduces B^* . Therefore $\overline{R(C)}$ reduces A and $(\ker C)^{\perp}$ reduces B. Thus, $A_2 = 0$ and $B_2 = 0$. Hence $A_1C_1 = C_1B_1$ with A_1, B_1 normal operators, then $A_1^*C_1 = C_1B_1^*$. Consequently $A^*C = CB^*$.

Case 2. If B^* is not injective, the condition ker $B^* \subset \text{ker } B$ implies ker B^* reduces B^* , since ker A reduces A, the operators A and B can be written on the following decompositions

$$\mathscr{H} = (\ker A)^{\perp} \oplus \ker A, \ \mathscr{K} = (\ker B^*)^{\perp} \oplus \ker B^*,$$

as follows

$$A = \left(\begin{array}{cc} A_1 & 0\\ 0 & 0 \end{array}\right), \ B = \left(\begin{array}{cc} B_1 & 0\\ 0 & 0 \end{array}\right).$$

A. BACHIR

Since A_1 is an injective (p,k)-hyponormal operator and B_1^* is injective *w*-hyponormal operator. Let

$$C: (\ker B^*)^{\perp} \oplus \ker B^* \to (\ker A)^{\perp} \oplus \ker A,$$

and let $C = [C_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^2$ be the matrix representation of *C*. Then AC = CB implies $A_1C_{11} = C_{11}B_1$ and $C_{12} = 0, C_{21} = 0$. From case 1, we deduce that $A_1^*C_{11} = C_{11}B_1^*$. Thus $A^*C = CB^*$. Since AC = CB implies $C^*A^* = B^*C^*$, then $C^*A = BC^*$ and $A^*C = CB^*$ by theorem . This completes the proof.

Corollary 3.2. Let $A \in B(\mathcal{H})$ be w-hyponormal operator such that ker $A \subseteq \ker A^*$ and $B^* \in B(\mathcal{H})$ be an injective (p,k)-hyponormal operator. If AC = CB for some $C \in B(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H})$, then $A^*C = CB^*$.

Corollary 3.3. $A \in B(\mathscr{H})$ is normal if and only if A is an injective (p,k)-hyponormal and A^* is w-hyponormal such that ker $A^* \subset \ker A$.

Theorem 3.4. Let $A, B \in B(\mathcal{H})$. If one of the following assertions

- (1) A is an injective (p,k)-hyponormal operator and B^* is w-hyponormal such that ker $B^* \subset$ ker B.
- (2) A is w-hyponormal such that ker $A \subset \ker A^*$ and B^* is an injective (p,k)-hyponormal operator.

holds, then $R(\delta_{A,B})$ is orthogonal to ker $(\delta_{A,B})$.

Proof. The pair (A, B) verify the Fuglede-Putman's theorem by Theorem and Corollary respectively. Let $C \in B(\mathcal{H})$ be such that AC = CB. According to the following decompositions of \mathcal{H} :

$$\mathscr{H} = \mathscr{H}_1 = \overline{R(C)} \oplus \overline{R(C)}^{\perp}, \ \mathscr{H} = \mathscr{H}_2 = (\ker C)^{\perp} \oplus \ker C,$$

we can write A, B, C and X

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & 0 \\ 0 & A_2 \end{pmatrix}, B = \begin{pmatrix} B_1 & 0 \\ 0 & B_2 \end{pmatrix}, C = \begin{pmatrix} C_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, X = \begin{pmatrix} X_1 & X_2 \\ X_3 & X_4 \end{pmatrix},$$

where A_1 and B_1 are normal operators and X is an operator from \mathcal{H}_1 to \mathcal{H}_2 . Since AC = CB, then $A_1C_1 = C_1B_1$. Hence

$$AX - XB - C = \begin{pmatrix} A_1X_1 - X_1B_1 - C_1 & A_2X_2 - X_2B_2 \\ A_1X_3 - X_3B_1 & A_2X_4 - X_4B_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

Since $C_1 \in \text{ker}(\delta_{A_1,B_1})$ and A_1, B_1 are normal, it follows by [4]

$$\|AX - XB - C\| \ge \|A_1X_1 - X_1B_1 - C_1\| \ge \|C_1\| = \|C\|, \forall X \in B(\mathscr{H}).$$

This implies that $R(\delta_{A,B})$ is orthogonal to ker($\delta_{A,B}$).

Conflict of Interests

The author declares that there is no conflict of interests.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Aluthge, On p-hyponormal operators for 0 , Integral Equations Operator Theory, 13 (1990), 307-315.
- [2] A. Aluthge and D. Wang, w-hyponormal operators, Integral Equations Operator Theory, 36 (2000), 1-10.
- [3] A. Aluthge and D. Wang, An operator inequality which implies paranormality, Math. Inequal. Appl. 2 (1999), 113-119.
- [4] J.H. Anderson and C. Foias, properties which normal operators share with normal derivations and related operators, Pacific J. Math., 61 (1975), 313-325.
- [5] A. Bachir, Generalized Derivation, SUT J. Math. 40 (2004), 111-116.
- [6] A. Bachir and F. Lombarkia, Fuglede-Putnam's Theorem for w-hyponormal operators, Math. Inequal. Appl. 12 (2012), 777-782.
- [7] M. Cho, Spectral properties of p-hyponormal operators for 0 , Glasgow. Math. J. 36 (1992), 117-122.
- [8] M. Cho and T. Huruya, P-hyponormal operators for 0 , Comment. Math. Prace Math. 33 (1993), 23-29.
- [9] M. Ito, T. Yamazaki, Relation between two inequalities $\left(B^{\frac{r}{2}}A^{p}B^{\frac{r}{2}}\right)^{\frac{r}{p+r}} \ge B^{r}$ and $A^{p} \ge \left(A^{\frac{p}{2}}B^{r}A^{\frac{p}{2}}\right)^{\frac{p}{p+r}}$ and *their applications*, Integral Equations Operator Theory, 44 (2002), 442-450.
- [10] I. H. Kim, On (p,k)-quasihyponormal operators, Math. Inequal. Appl. 7 (2004), 629?-638.
- [11] I. H. Kim, The Fuglede-Putnam's theorem (p,k)-quasihyponormal operators, J. Inequal. Appl. 2006 (2006), Article ID 47481.
- [12] C. R. Putnam, On normal operators in Hilbert space, Amer. J. Math. 73 (1951), 357-362.

A. BACHIR

- [13] J. G. Stampfli and B. Wadhwa An asymmetric Putnam-Fuglede theorem for dominant operators, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 25 (1976), 359-365.
- [14] K. Tanahashi, On the converse of the Fuglede-Putnam Theorem, Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) 43 (1981), 123-125.
- [15] K. Tanahashi, A. Uchiyama and M. Cho, Isolated points of spectrum of (*p*,*k*)-quasihyponormal operators, Lin. Alg. Appl. 382 (2004), 221-229.
- [16] A. Uchiyama and K. Tanahashi, Fuglede-Putnam's theorem for p-hyponormal or log hyponormal operators, Glasgow. Math. J. 44 (2002), 397-416.
- [17] A. Uchiyama, Berger-Shaw's theorem fo p-hyponormal operators, IIntegral Equations Operator Theory, 33 (1999), 307-315.