

## AN INTERPOLATION PROPERTY OF REFLECTIONS INVOLVING ORTHOGONAL PROJECTIONS

YUAN LI, YANAN WANG AND HONGKE DU

(Communicated by I. M. Spitkovsky)

*Abstract.* Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a complex Hilbert space. We consider the interpolation problem: describe the pair  $(W, L)$  of subspaces of  $\mathcal{H}$  such that there is a reflection  $J$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  satisfying  $J(W) \subseteq L$ . We show that two subspaces  $W, L$  have this interpolation property if and only if  $\dim(W \cap L^\perp) \leq \dim(L \cap W^\perp)$ , which is equivalent to that there exists a conjugation  $C$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  such that  $C(W) \subseteq L$ . Moreover, we study the least upper bound of these interpolating reflections.

### 1. Introduction

Let  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{K}$  be separable complex Hilbert spaces, and  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$  be the set of all bounded linear operators from  $\mathcal{H}$  into  $\mathcal{K}$ . An operator  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  is called positive, if  $A \geq 0$ , meaning  $\langle Ax, x \rangle \geq 0$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{H}$ , where  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  is the inner product of  $\mathcal{H}$ . Moreover, if  $P = P^* = P^2$ , then  $P$  is called an (orthogonal) projection. We denote by  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$  the set of all orthogonal projections on  $\mathcal{H}$ . As usual, the operator order (Loewner partial order) relation  $A \geq B$  between two self-adjoint operators is defined as  $A - B \geq 0$ . An operator  $U \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$  is said to be unitary if  $U$  is invertible with  $U^{-1} = U^*$ . The set of all unitary operators from  $\mathcal{H}$  onto  $\mathcal{K}$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ . For an operator  $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ ,  $N(T)$ ,  $R(T)$  and  $\overline{R(T)}$  denote the null space, the range of  $T$ , and the closure of  $R(T)$ , respectively.

An operator  $J \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  is said to be a reflection (or self-adjoint unitary operator) if  $J = J^* = J^{-1}$ . In this case,  $J^+ = \frac{1+J}{2}$  and  $J^- = \frac{1-J}{2}$  are mutually annihilating orthogonal projections. If  $J$  is a non-scalar reflection, then an indefinite inner product is defined by

$$[x, y] := \langle Jx, y \rangle \quad (x, y \in \mathcal{H})$$

and  $(\mathcal{H}, J)$  is called a Krein space ([1]). We denote by  $Ref(\mathcal{H})$  the set of all reflections on  $\mathcal{H}$ . A map  $C : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is called a conjugation if (a)  $C$  is anti-linear, i.e.  $C(\alpha x + y) = \overline{\alpha}Cx + Cy$  for all  $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ , (b)  $C$  is invertible with  $C^{-1} = C$  and (c)  $\langle Cx, Cy \rangle = \langle y, x \rangle$  for all  $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$ . For  $U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H})$ , if both of  $PU = UQ$  and  $UP = QU$  hold, then  $U$  is called an intertwining operator of orthogonal projections  $P$  and  $Q$ .

*Mathematics subject classification* (2020): 47A05, 47B65, 46C20.

*Keywords and phrases:* Orthogonal projections, Intertwining operators, Reflections.

This work was supported by NSF of China (No. 11671242).

It is well-known that orthogonal projections on a Hilbert space are essential in operator theory (see [2–7, 10–11, 13–17] and therein references). Avron, Seiler and Simon ([4]) obtained that if  $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$  with  $\|P - Q\| < 1$ , then there exists an intertwining operator for  $P$  and  $Q$ . A sufficient and necessary condition under which there exists an intertwining operator of  $P$  and  $Q$  has been given in [17, Theorem 6]. More recently, Simon ([16]) by “supersymmetric” approach presented a more elegant proof of [17, Theorem 6]. In particular, Dou et al. ([9]) and Böttcher et al. ([5]) have characterized the set of all intertwining operator of orthogonal projections  $P$  and  $Q$ . According to [9, Theorem 3.1] or [5, Theorem 5], an easy observation is that there exists an intertwining operator of  $P$  and  $Q$  if and only if there exists a reflection  $J \in \text{Ref}(\mathcal{H})$  with  $JPJ = Q$  (which is equivalent to  $J(R(P)) = R(Q)$ ). That is, there exists a reflection  $J \in \text{Ref}(\mathcal{H})$  with  $J(R(P)) = R(Q)$  if and only if  $\dim(R(P) \cap N(Q)) = \dim(N(P) \cap R(Q))$ . Also, Liu et al. ([12]) have given some sufficient and necessary conditions for the existence of a conjugation  $C$  with  $C(R(P)) = R(Q)$ . Moreover, Jorgensen and Tian in [15] presented the reflection-positivity and structures of admissible reflection between orthogonal projections.

The aim of the present paper is to consider the interpolation problem for reflections between two projections  $P$  and  $Q$ . We mainly characterize the pairs  $(W, L)$  of subspaces of  $\mathcal{H}$  such that there is a reflection  $J \in \text{Ref}(\mathcal{H})$  with  $J(W) \subseteq L$ . The motivation to study this interpolation problem stems from the specific structures and decompositions of reflections which was been studied in [13,14]. Also, we want to know whether there is some connection between the interpolation problem of reflections and conjugations. In Section 2, we show that for the pairs  $(W, L)$  of subspaces, there is a reflection  $J \in \text{Ref}(\mathcal{H})$  with  $J(W) \subseteq L$  if and only if  $\dim(W \cap L^\perp) \leq \dim(L \cap W^\perp)$ , which is also equivalent to that there exists a conjugation  $C$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  such that  $C(W) \subseteq L$ . Moreover, the supremum (with respect to the operator order) of the reflection  $J$  with  $JPJ = Q$  and  $PJP \geq 0$  ( $J$  is called reflection positivity) are presented for two orthogonal projections  $P$  and  $Q$ . In Section 3, we mainly consider two example and a characterization of reflections involving three orthogonal projections, which has been studied in [15].

### 2. Interpolation property of reflections

To show our main results, we need the following lemma which is another form of Halmos’ two projections theorem ([10]). Also, we use  $P_L$  to denote the orthogonal projection onto the closed subspace  $L$ .

LEMMA 1. ([8, Lemma 1] or [6, Theorem 1.2]) *Let  $W$  and  $L$  be two closed subspaces of  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then  $P_W$  and  $P_L$  have the operator matrices*

$$P_W = I_1 \oplus I_2 \oplus 0I_3 \oplus 0I_4 \oplus I_5 \oplus 0I_6 \tag{2.1}$$

and

$$P_L = I_1 \oplus 0I_2 \oplus I_3 \oplus 0I_4 \oplus \begin{pmatrix} Q_0 & Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}}(I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}D \\ D^*Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}}(I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} & D^*(I_5 - Q_0)D \end{pmatrix} \tag{2.2}$$

with respect to the space decomposition  $\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^6 \mathcal{H}_i$ , respectively, where  $\mathcal{H}_1 = W \cap L$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_2 = W \cap L^\perp$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_3 = W^\perp \cap L$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_4 = W^\perp \cap L^\perp$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_5 = W \ominus (\mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2)$  and  $\mathcal{H}_6 = \mathcal{H} \ominus (\bigoplus_{j=1}^5 \mathcal{H}_j)$ ,  $Q_0$  is a positive contraction on  $\mathcal{H}_3$ , 0 and 1 are not eigenvalues of  $Q_0$ ,  $D$  is a unitary from  $\mathcal{H}_6$  onto  $\mathcal{H}_5$  and  $I_i$  is the identity on the corresponding subspace  $\mathcal{H}_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, 6$ .

The converse statement of the above lemma also holds.

LEMMA 2. Let  $\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^6 \mathcal{H}_i$  and  $I_i$  is the identity on the corresponding subspace  $\mathcal{H}_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, 6$ . Suppose that  $P$  and  $Q$  have the operator matrices

$$P = I_1 \oplus I_2 \oplus 0I_3 \oplus 0I_4 \oplus I_5 \oplus 0I_6 \tag{2.3}$$

and

$$Q = I_1 \oplus 0I_2 \oplus I_3 \oplus 0I_4 \oplus \begin{pmatrix} Q_0 & Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}}(I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}D \\ D^*Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}}(I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} & D^*(I_5 - Q_0)D \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.4}$$

If  $Q_0$  is a positive contraction on  $\mathcal{H}_3$ , 0 and 1 are not eigenvalues of  $Q_0$  and  $D$  is a unitary from  $\mathcal{H}_6$  onto  $\mathcal{H}_5$ , then  $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$  with  $\mathcal{H}_1 = R(P) \cap R(Q)$  and  $\mathcal{H}_2 = R(P) \cap N(Q)$ .

Proof.  $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$  are verified directly. It is obvious that

$$R(P) = \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2 \oplus \mathcal{H}_5$$

and

$$R(Q) = \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_3 \oplus R \begin{pmatrix} Q_0 & Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}}(I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}D \\ D^*Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}}(I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} & D^*(I_5 - Q_0)D \end{pmatrix}.$$

If  $x \in R(P) \cap R(Q)$ , we get that

$$x = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ x_5 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = Qx = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ Q_0x_5 \\ D^*Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}}(I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}x_5 \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $x_i \in \mathcal{H}_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, 5$ . Thus  $x_2 = 0$  and  $x_5 = 0$ , so  $R(P) \cap R(Q) \subseteq \mathcal{H}_1$ . Clearly,  $\mathcal{H}_1 \subseteq R(P) \cap R(Q)$ , which implies  $R(P) \cap R(Q) = \mathcal{H}_1$ . In a similar way, we have  $\mathcal{H}_2 = R(P) \cap N(Q)$ .  $\square$

REMARK 1. We can also get from Lemma 2 that  $\mathcal{H}_3 = N(P) \cap R(Q)$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_4 = N(P) \cap N(Q)$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_5 = R(P) \ominus (\mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2)$  and  $\mathcal{H}_6 = \mathcal{H} \ominus (\bigoplus_{i=1}^5 \mathcal{H}_i)$ .

LEMMA 3. *Let  $W$  and  $L$  be two closed subspaces of  $\mathcal{H}$ . If  $\dim(W \cap L^\perp) \leq \dim(L \cap W^\perp)$ , then there exists a closed subspace  $L_0 \subseteq L$  such that  $\dim(W \cap L_0^\perp) = \dim(L_0 \cap W^\perp)$  and  $W \cap L = W \cap L_0$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\mathcal{H}_i$  is same to Lemma 1 for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, 6$ . Then Lemma 1 implies that  $P_W$  and  $P_L$  have the operator matrices

$$P_W = I_1 \oplus I_2 \oplus 0I_3 \oplus 0I_4 \oplus I_5 \oplus 0I_6 \tag{2.5}$$

and

$$P_L = I_1 \oplus 0I_2 \oplus I_3 \oplus 0I_4 \oplus \begin{pmatrix} Q_0 & Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}}(I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}D \\ D^*Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}}(I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} & D^*(I_5 - Q_0)D \end{pmatrix} \tag{2.6}$$

with respect to the space decomposition  $\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^6 \mathcal{H}_i$ .

Since  $\dim(W \cap L^\perp) \leq \dim(L \cap W^\perp)$ , it follows  $\dim \mathcal{H}_2 \leq \dim \mathcal{H}_3$ . Then the subspace  $\mathcal{H}_3$  can be divide into  $\mathcal{H}_3 = \mathcal{H}'_3 \oplus \mathcal{H}''_3$ , where  $\dim \mathcal{H}'_3 = \dim \mathcal{H}_2$ . Let  $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_i = \mathcal{H}_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, 5, 6$ ,  $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_3 = \mathcal{H}'_3$ , and  $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_4 = \mathcal{H}''_3 \oplus \mathcal{H}_4$ . So we have a new space decomposition  $\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^6 \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_i$ . Define the operator  $S$  with respect to the space decomposition  $\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^6 \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_i$  as the form

$$S := I_1 \oplus 0I_2 \oplus I'_3 \oplus 0I'_4 \oplus \begin{pmatrix} Q_0 & Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}}(I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}D \\ D^*Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}}(I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} & D^*(I_5 - Q_0)D \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is easy to see that  $S \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$  with  $S \leq P_L$ . Setting  $L_0 := R(S)$ , we get that  $L_0 \subseteq L$ . Then Lemma 2 yields that

$$\dim(W \cap L_0^\perp) = \dim \mathcal{H}_2 = \dim \mathcal{H}'_3 = \dim(L_0 \cap W^\perp)$$

and  $W \cap L = \mathcal{H}_1 = \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_1 = W \cap L_0$ .  $\square$

LEMMA 4. ([12, Theorem 1.7]) *Let  $W$  and  $L$  be two closed subspaces of  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then there exists a conjugation  $C$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  such that  $C(W) = L$  if and only if  $\dim(W \cap L^\perp) = \dim(L \cap W^\perp)$ .*

The following theorem is one of the main results of this section.

THEOREM 1. *Let  $W$  and  $L$  be two closed subspaces of  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (a) *There exists a  $J \in \text{Ref}(\mathcal{H})$  such that  $J(W) \subseteq L$ ,*
- (b)  *$\dim(W \cap L^\perp) \leq \dim(L \cap W^\perp)$ ,*
- (c) *There exists a conjugation  $C$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  such that  $C(W) \subseteq L$ .*

*Proof.* (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b). For the self-adjoint unitary operator  $J$ , we get that  $J(W^\perp) = J(W)^\perp$ . Indeed, for all  $x \in W$  and  $y \in W^\perp$ , we have  $\langle Jx, Jy \rangle = \langle x, y \rangle = 0$ . Thus  $J(W) \subseteq J(W^\perp)^\perp$  and  $J(W^\perp) \subseteq J(W)^\perp$ , so  $J(W^\perp) = J(W)^\perp$ . Since  $J(W) \subseteq L$ , it follows  $L^\perp \subseteq J(W)^\perp = J(W^\perp)$ . Then

$$\dim(W \cap L^\perp) = \dim(J(W \cap L^\perp)) = \dim(J(W) \cap J(L^\perp)) \leq \dim(L \cap W^\perp).$$

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (c). By Lemma 3, there exists  $L_0 \subseteq L$  such that  $\dim(W \cap L_0^\perp) = \dim(L_0 \cap W^\perp)$ . Then we conclude from Lemma 4 that there exists a conjugation  $C$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  with  $C(W) = L_0$ , so  $C(W) \subseteq L$ .

(c)  $\Rightarrow$  (b). If  $L_1 := C(W) \subseteq L$ , then by Lemma 4 again, we have  $\dim(W \cap L_1^\perp) = \dim(L_1 \cap W^\perp)$ , which yields

$$\dim(W \cap L^\perp) \leq \dim(W \cap L_1^\perp) = \dim(L_1 \cap W^\perp) \leq \dim(L \cap W^\perp).$$

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (a). Since  $\dim(W \cap L^\perp) \leq \dim(L \cap W^\perp)$ , it follows  $\dim \mathcal{H}_2 \leq \dim \mathcal{H}_3$ , where  $\mathcal{H}_i$  is the same as in Lemma 1. With respect to the space decomposition  $\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^6 \mathcal{H}_i$ , we define an operator  $J$  as the form

$$J = I_1 \oplus \begin{pmatrix} 0 & V^* \\ V & I_3 - VV^* \end{pmatrix} \oplus I_4 \oplus \begin{pmatrix} Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}} & (I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}D \\ D^*(I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} & -D^*Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}}D \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $V$  is a isometry operator from  $\mathcal{H}_2$  into  $\mathcal{H}_3$ ,  $D$  and  $Q_0$  are the same as in Lemma 1. By a direct calculation, we know that  $J = J^* = J^{-1}$ . It is easy to calculate that

$$JP_W = I_1 \oplus \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ V & 0 \end{pmatrix} \oplus 0 \oplus \begin{pmatrix} Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}} & 0 \\ D^*(I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$P_L JP_W = I_1 \oplus \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ V & 0 \end{pmatrix} \oplus 0 \oplus \begin{pmatrix} Q_0 Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}} + Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}}(I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}DD^*(I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} & 0 \\ D^*Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}}(I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}} + D^*(I_5 - Q_0)DD^*(I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Obviously,

$$Q_0 Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}} + Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}}(I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}DD^*(I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}} = Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

and

$$D^*Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}}(I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}} + D^*(I_5 - Q_0)DD^*(I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} = D^*(I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

so  $P_L JP_W = JP_W$ , which yields  $J(W) \subseteq L$ .  $\square$

LEMMA 5. ([9, Theorem 3.1] or [5, Theorem 5]) *Let  $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$  with operator matrices (2.1) and (2.2), respectively. Then there exists a unitary  $U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H})$  such that  $PU = UQ$  and  $UP = QU$  if and only if  $\dim \mathcal{R}(P) \cap \mathcal{N}(Q) = \dim \mathcal{N}(P) \cap \mathcal{R}(Q)$ . In this case,*

$$\left\{ U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}) : PU = UQ \text{ and } UP = QU \right\} = \left\{ U_1 \oplus \begin{pmatrix} 0 & C_2 \\ C_3 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \oplus U_4 \oplus \begin{pmatrix} Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}} & (I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}D \\ D^*(I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} & -D^*Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}}D \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} U_0 & 0 \\ 0 & D^*U_0D \end{pmatrix} : \right. \\ \left. \begin{array}{l} U_1 \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}_1), C_2 \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}_3, \mathcal{H}_2), C_3 \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_3), \\ U_4 \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}_4), U_0 \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}_5), U_0Q_0 = Q_0U_0 \end{array} \right\}.$$

By Theorem 1, if  $W$  and  $L$  are closed subspaces of  $\mathcal{H}$ , then there exists a reflection  $J$  such that  $J(W) = L$  if and only if  $\dim(W \cap L^\perp) = \dim(L \cap W^\perp)$ . Moreover, we have the following.

PROPOSITION 1. Let  $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$  and  $J \in \text{Ref}(\mathcal{H})$ . Then the following statements are equivalent:

- (a)  $JPJ = Q$ ,
- (b)  $JP = QJP$  and  $JQ = PJQ$ ,
- (c)

$$J = J_1 \oplus \begin{pmatrix} 0 & V \\ V^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} \oplus J_4 \oplus \begin{pmatrix} Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}} J_5 & (I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} J_5 D \\ D^* (I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} J_5 & -D^* Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}} J_5 D \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.7}$$

with respect to the space decomposition  $\mathcal{H} = \oplus_{i=1}^6 \mathcal{H}_i$ , where  $\mathcal{H}_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, 6$ ),  $Q_0$  and  $D$  are the same as Lemma 2 and Remark 1,  $J_i \in \text{Ref}(\mathcal{H}_i)$  for  $i = 1, 4, 5$  with  $Q_0 J_5 = J_5 Q_0$  and  $V \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}_3, \mathcal{H}_2)$ .

*Proof.* (a)  $\iff$  (b) is clear.

(a)  $\iff$  (c). Since  $J \in \text{Ref}(\mathcal{H})$ , it follows that  $JPJ = Q$  if and only if  $J \in \{U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}) : PU = UQ \text{ and } UP = QU\}$ . Then Lemma 5 and the fact of  $J = J^*$  imply that  $JPJ = Q$  is equivalent to  $J$  has the matrix form (2.7).  $\square$

COROLLARY 1. Let  $W$  and  $L$  be two closed subspaces of  $\mathcal{H}$  with  $\dim(W \cap L^\perp) \leq \dim(L \cap W^\perp)$ . If  $\mathcal{F} := \{L_0 \subseteq L : \dim(W \cap L_0^\perp) = \dim(L_0 \cap W^\perp)\}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} & \{J \in \text{Ref}(\mathcal{H}) : J(W) \subseteq L\} \\ &= \bigcup_{L_0 \in \mathcal{F}} \{J_1 \oplus \begin{pmatrix} 0 & V \\ V^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} \oplus J_4 \oplus \begin{pmatrix} Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}} J_5 & (I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} J_5 D \\ D^* (I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} J_5 & -D^* Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}} J_5 D \end{pmatrix} : J_i \in \text{Ref}(\mathcal{H}_i) \\ & \text{for } i = 1, 4, 5 \text{ with } Q_0 J_5 = J_5 Q_0 \text{ and } V \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}_3, \mathcal{H}_2)\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $Q_0$  and  $D$  is the same as in Lemma 1,  $\mathcal{H}_1 = W \cap L_0$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_2 = W \cap L_0^\perp$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_3 = W^\perp \cap L_0$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_4 = W^\perp \cap L_0^\perp$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_5 = W \ominus (\mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2)$ , and  $\mathcal{H}_6 = \mathcal{H} \ominus (\oplus_{i=1}^5 \mathcal{H}_i)$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\dim(W \cap L^\perp) \leq \dim(L \cap W^\perp)$ , it follows from Lemma 3 that  $\mathcal{F} \neq \emptyset$ .

Let  $J \in \{J \in \text{Ref}(\mathcal{H}) : J(W) \subseteq L\}$ . Setting  $L_0 = J(W)$ , we conclude that  $L_0 \subseteq L$  and  $\dim(W \cap L_0^\perp) = \dim(L_0 \cap W^\perp)$ , so  $L_0 \in \mathcal{F}$ . Moreover, Proposition 1 implies that the inclusion  $\subseteq$  holds. Another inclusion  $\supseteq$  is obvious.  $\square$

The following two corollaries give the simpler conditions under which there exists a  $J \in \text{Ref}(\mathcal{H})$  with  $J(W) \subseteq L$  for two closed subspaces  $W$  and  $L$  which satisfy certain conditions.

COROLLARY 2. Let  $W$  and  $L$  be two closed subspaces of  $\mathcal{H}$ . If  $\dim W < +\infty$ , then there exists a  $J \in \text{Ref}(\mathcal{H})$  with  $J(W) \subseteq L$  if and only if  $\dim W \leq \dim L$ .

*Proof.* Necessity is clear. Sufficiency. Suppose that  $\mathcal{H}_i$  is the same as Lemma 1 for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, 6$ . Then  $\dim W < +\infty$  implies  $\dim \mathcal{H}_i < +\infty$  for  $i = 1, 2, 5$ , so  $\dim \mathcal{H}_6 = \dim \mathcal{H}_3 < +\infty$ .

Case 1. If  $\dim L = +\infty$ , then equation (2.2) implies  $\dim \mathcal{H}_3 = +\infty$ , so  $\dim \mathcal{H}_2 \leq \dim \mathcal{H}_3$ . Thus we conclude from Theorem 1 that there exists a  $J \in \text{Ref}(\mathcal{H})$  with  $J(W) \subseteq L$ .

Case 2. If  $\dim L < +\infty$ , then equation (2.2) induces

$$\dim L = \dim \mathcal{H}_1 + \dim \mathcal{H}_3 + \dim R \begin{pmatrix} Q_0 & Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}}(I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}D \\ D^*Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}}(I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} & D^*(I_5 - Q_0)D \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is easy to see that  $V = \begin{pmatrix} Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ D^*(I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix} : \mathcal{H}_5 \rightarrow R(VV^*)$  is a unitary operator. Thus

$$\dim R \begin{pmatrix} Q_0 & Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}}(I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}D \\ D^*Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}}(I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} & D^*(I_5 - Q_0)D \end{pmatrix} = \dim R(VV^*) = \dim \mathcal{H}_5,$$

so

$$\dim L = \dim \mathcal{H}_1 + \dim \mathcal{H}_3 + \dim \mathcal{H}_5. \tag{2.8}$$

Since

$$\dim W = \dim \mathcal{H}_1 + \dim \mathcal{H}_2 + \dim \mathcal{H}_5, \tag{2.9}$$

we have

$$\dim(W \cap L^\perp) - \dim(L \cap W^\perp) = \dim \mathcal{H}_2 - \dim \mathcal{H}_3 = \dim W - \dim L \leq 0.$$

Hence,  $J(W) \subseteq L$  follows from Theorem 1.  $\square$

**COROLLARY 3.** *Let  $W$  and  $L$  be two closed subspaces of  $\mathcal{H}$ . If  $W \subseteq L^\perp$ , then there exists a  $J \in \text{Ref}(\mathcal{H})$  with  $J(W) \subseteq L$  if and only if  $\dim W \leq \dim L$ .*

*Proof.* Sufficiency. Since  $W \subseteq L^\perp$ , it follows  $L \subseteq W^\perp$ , so  $\dim(W \cap L^\perp) = \dim W \leq \dim L = \dim(W^\perp \cap L)$ . Thus  $J(W) \subseteq L$  follows from Theorem 1. Necessity is obvious.  $\square$

For unit vectors  $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$ , it is well known that there is a unitary operator  $U \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  with  $Ux = y$ . The following corollary gives an equivalent condition for the existence of a reflection  $J$  with  $Jx = y$ .

**COROLLARY 4.** *Let  $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$  be unit vectors. Then there exists a reflection  $J$  with  $Jx = y$  if and only if  $\langle x, y \rangle = \langle y, x \rangle$ .*

*Proof.* Sufficiency. Let  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{N}$  be subspaces spanned by vectors  $x$  and  $y$ , respectively. It is easy to check that  $\dim(\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{N}^\perp) = \dim(\mathcal{N} \cap \mathcal{M}^\perp)$ , so Theorem 1 implies that there exists a reflection  $J'$  with  $J'x = e^{i\theta}y$ . If  $\langle x, y \rangle = \langle y, x \rangle$ , then  $\langle x, y \rangle$  is a real number. Moreover,  $e^{i\theta} \langle y, x \rangle = \langle J'x, x \rangle$  is also a real number, which yields  $e^{i\theta} = 1$  or  $e^{i\theta} = -1$ . Thus  $J'x = y$  or  $J'x = -y$ . In the second case, we set  $J = -J'$ . Necessity is clear.  $\square$

The following result describes the partial order of a class of special orthogonal projections, which is used in the proof of Theorem 2.

PROPOSITION 2. Let  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{K}$  be Hilbert spaces with  $\dim\mathcal{H} = \dim\mathcal{K}$ . If

$V \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{H})$  and  $P_V := \begin{pmatrix} \frac{I}{2} & \frac{V}{2} \\ \frac{V^*}{2} & \frac{I}{2} \end{pmatrix} : \mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{K}$ , then

- (a)  $P_V \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{K})$  with  $P_V^\perp = P_{-V}$ , where  $P_V^\perp := I - P_V$ .
- (b) If  $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{K})$ , then  $P \leq P_V$  if and only if

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{P_1}{2} & \frac{P_1 V}{2} \\ \frac{V^* P_1}{2} & \frac{V^* P_1 V}{2} \end{pmatrix} : \mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{K}, \text{ where } P_1 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}). \tag{2.10}$$

- (c) If  $Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{K})$ , then  $P_V \leq Q$  if and only if

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} I - \frac{Q_1}{2} & \frac{Q_1 V}{2} \\ \frac{V^* Q_1}{2} & I - \frac{V^* Q_1 V}{2} \end{pmatrix} : \mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{K}, \text{ where } Q_1 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}).$$

*Proof.* (a) is obvious.

- (b) Sufficiency is clear. Necessity. Assume

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{12}^* & A_{22} \end{pmatrix} : \mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{K},$$

where  $A_{11}$  and  $A_{22}$  are positive contraction operators. Since  $0 \leq P \leq P_V$ , we have

$$P P_V^\perp = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{12}^* & A_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{I}{2} & \frac{-V}{2} \\ \frac{-V^*}{2} & \frac{I}{2} \end{pmatrix} = 0,$$

so a direct calculation yields

$$\begin{cases} \frac{A_{11}}{2} - \frac{A_{12} V^*}{2} = 0 & \text{①} \\ -\frac{A_{12}^* V}{2} + \frac{A_{22}}{2} = 0 & \text{②} \end{cases}$$

From ① and ②, we get that  $A_{11} = A_{12} V^*$  and  $A_{22} = A_{12}^* V$ . Furthermore,  $P^2 = P$  implies that

$$(A_{12} V^*)^2 + A_{12} A_{12}^* = A_{12} V^*. \tag{2.11}$$

This coupled with the fact that  $A_{11} = A_{12} V^* = V A_{12}^* \geq 0$  gives  $2(A_{12} V^*)^2 = A_{12} V^*$ . Setting  $P_1 := 2A_{12} V^*$ , we conclude that  $P_1^2 = P_1$  and (2.10) holds as desired.

- (c) If  $Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{K})$  and  $P_V \leq Q$ , then  $Q^\perp \leq P_V^\perp = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{I}{2} & \frac{-V}{2} \\ \frac{-V^*}{2} & \frac{I}{2} \end{pmatrix}$ . It follows from (b) that

$$Q^\perp = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{Q_1}{2} & \frac{-Q_1 V}{2} \\ -\frac{V^* Q_1}{2} & \frac{V^* Q_1 V}{2} \end{pmatrix} : \mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{K}, \text{ where } Q_1 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}).$$

Therefore,  $P_V \leq Q$  if and only if

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} I - \frac{Q_1}{2} & \frac{Q_1 V}{2} \\ \frac{V^* Q_1}{2} & I - \frac{V^* Q_1 V}{2} \end{pmatrix} : \mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{K}, \text{ where } Q_1 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}). \quad \square$$



We denote

$$\mathcal{F}(P, Q) := \{J : J P J = Q, J \in \text{Ref}(\mathcal{H})\}$$

and

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}(P, Q) := \{J : J \in \mathcal{F}(P, Q) \text{ and } P J P \geq 0\}.$$

Let  $\emptyset \neq \Gamma \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$ . We also denote by  $\bigvee_{E \in \Gamma} E \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$  the supremum of all projections in  $\Gamma$ . That is,  $R(\bigvee_{E \in \Gamma} E) = \overline{\bigcup_{E \in \Gamma} R(E)}$ .

Another main result of this section is the following.

**THEOREM 2.** *Let  $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$  with  $\dim(R(P) \cap N(Q)) = \dim(N(P) \cap R(Q))$ . Then*

(a)  $\sup\{J : J \in \mathcal{F}(P, Q)\} = I$ .

(b)  $\sup\{J : J \in \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}(P, Q)\} = I_1 \oplus I_2 \oplus I_3 \oplus I_4 \oplus \begin{pmatrix} Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}} & (I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} D \\ D^*(I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} & -D^* Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}} D \end{pmatrix}$ .

(c)  $\max\{J : J \in \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}(P, Q)\}$  exists if and only if  $\dim(R(P) \cap N(Q)) = \dim(N(P) \cap R(Q)) = 0$ .

*Proof.* (a) It is conclude from Proposition 1 that  $J \in \mathcal{F}(P, Q)$  if and only if

$$J = J_1 \oplus \begin{pmatrix} 0 & V \\ V^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} \oplus J_4 \oplus \begin{pmatrix} Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}} J_5 & (I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} J_5 D \\ D^*(I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} J_5 & -D^* Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}} J_5 D \end{pmatrix}.$$

For all  $J \in \mathcal{F}(P, Q)$ , define the projection

$$\widetilde{P}_J := \frac{I+J}{2} = \frac{I_1+J_1}{2} \oplus \begin{pmatrix} \frac{I_2}{2} & \frac{V}{2} \\ \frac{V^*}{2} & \frac{I_3}{2} \end{pmatrix} \oplus \frac{I_4+J_4}{2} \oplus \begin{pmatrix} \frac{I_5+Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}} J_5}{2} & \frac{(I_5-Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} J_5 D}{2} \\ \frac{D^*(I_5-Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} J_5}{2} & \frac{I_6-D^* Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}} J_5 D}{2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then

$$\bigvee_{J \in \mathcal{F}(P, Q)} \widetilde{P}_J = I_1 \oplus I_2 \oplus I_3 \oplus I_4 \oplus I_5 \oplus I_6.$$

Indeed, if  $J \in \mathcal{F}(P, Q)$ , then  $-J \in \mathcal{F}(P, Q)$  and  $\widetilde{P}_{-J} = \widetilde{P}_J^\perp$ . This means that both  $\widetilde{P}_J$  and  $\widetilde{P}_J^\perp$  are in  $\bigvee_{J \in \mathcal{F}(P, Q)} \widetilde{P}_J$ . Hence,

$$\sup\{J \mid J \in \mathcal{F}(P, Q)\} = 2 \bigvee_{J \in \mathcal{F}(P, Q)} \widetilde{P}_J - I = I.$$

(b) It is easy to see that if  $J \in \mathcal{F}(P, Q)$ , then  $P J P \geq 0$  iff  $Q J Q \geq 0$ , which is equivalent to  $J_5 = I_5$ . Thus

$$\bigvee_{J \in \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}(P, Q)} \widetilde{P}_J = I_1 \oplus I_2 \oplus I_3 \oplus I_4 \oplus \begin{pmatrix} \frac{I_5+Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2} & \frac{(I_5-Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} D}{2} \\ \frac{D^*(I_5-Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2} & \frac{I_6-D^* Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}} D}{2} \end{pmatrix},$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} \sup\{J \mid J \in \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}(P, Q)\} &= 2 \vee_{J \in \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}(P, Q)} \widetilde{P}_J - I \\ &= I_1 \oplus I_2 \oplus I_3 \oplus I_4 \oplus \begin{pmatrix} Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}} & (I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} D \\ D^* (I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} & -D^* Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}} D \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

(c) It follows from (b) that  $\max\{J : J \in \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}(P, Q)\}$  exists if and only if

$$I_1 \oplus I_2 \oplus I_3 \oplus I_4 \oplus \begin{pmatrix} Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}} & (I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} D \\ D^* (I_5 - Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} & -D^* Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}} D \end{pmatrix} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}(P, Q). \tag{2.12}$$

By Proposition 1, (2.12) is equivalent to  $\dim(R(P) \cap N(Q)) = \dim(N(P) \cap R(Q)) = 0$ .  $\square$

### 3. Some examples and applications

In [15], some interpolation relations of the three orthogonal projections and a reflection were considered. Here, we use the same notations as that in [15]. That is,  $\varepsilon := (E_0, E_{\pm})$ ,

$$R(\varepsilon) := \{J \in \text{Ref}(\mathcal{H}) : E_- J E_+ = J E_+\} \tag{3.1}$$

and

$$R_0(\varepsilon) := \{J \in \text{Ref}(\mathcal{H}) : J E_0 = E_0, E_- J E_+ = J E_+, E_+ J E_- = J E_-\}, \tag{3.2}$$

where  $E_0, E_+$  and  $E_-$  are orthogonal projections. Then Theorem 1 implies that  $R(\varepsilon) \neq \emptyset$  if and only if  $\dim(R(E_+) \cap N(E_-)) \leq \dim(R(E_-) \cap N(E_+))$ . However, the condition for  $R_0(\varepsilon) \neq \emptyset$  was not given in [15]. As an application, we present a characterization of  $R_0(\varepsilon) \neq \emptyset$ .

**THEOREM 3.** *Let  $\varepsilon = (E_0, E_{\pm})$  and  $R_0(\varepsilon)$  be as above. Then  $R_0(\varepsilon) \neq \emptyset$  if and only if  $\dim(R(E_+) \cap N(E_-)) = \dim(N(E_+) \cap R(E_-))$  and  $R(E_0) \subseteq M_1 \oplus R \begin{pmatrix} V \\ I_3 \end{pmatrix} \oplus M_4 \oplus R \begin{pmatrix} (I_5 + Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}} J_5)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ D^* J_5 (I_5 - Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}} J_5)^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix}$ , where  $M_1 \subseteq \mathcal{H}_1$  and  $M_4 \subseteq \mathcal{H}_4$  are two closed subspaces,  $V$  is a unitary operator from  $\mathcal{H}_3$  onto  $\mathcal{H}_2$ ,  $J_5 \in \text{Ref}(\mathcal{H}_3)$  with  $J_5 Q_0 = Q_0 J_5$ .*

*Proof.* For all  $J \in \text{Ref}(\mathcal{H})$ , it is clear that  $E_- J E_+ = J E_+$  and  $E_+ J E_- = J E_-$  if and only if  $J E_+ J = E_-$ , which is equivalent to  $J(R(E_+)) = R(E_-)$ . By Proposition 1, there exists a  $J \in \text{Ref}(\mathcal{H})$  with  $J E_+ J = E_-$  if and only if

$$\dim(R(E_+) \cap N(E_-)) = \dim(R(E_-) \cap N(E_+)).$$

Furthermore,  $JE_0 = E_0$  is equivalent to

$$R(E_0) \subseteq R\left(\frac{I+J}{2}\right). \tag{3.3}$$

Considering that  $J$  has form (2.7), we have

$$\frac{I+J}{2} = P_1 \oplus \begin{pmatrix} \frac{I_1}{2} & \frac{V}{2} \\ \frac{V^*}{2} & \frac{I_2}{2} \end{pmatrix} \oplus P_4 \oplus \begin{pmatrix} \frac{I_5+Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}}J_5}{2} & \frac{(I_5-Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}J_5D}{2} \\ \frac{D^*(I_5-Q_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}J_5}{2} & \frac{I_6-D^*Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}}J_5D}{2} \end{pmatrix},$$

which implies

$$R\left(\frac{I+J}{2}\right) = M_1 \oplus R\begin{pmatrix} V \\ I_3 \end{pmatrix} \oplus M_4 \oplus R\begin{pmatrix} (I_5+Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}}J_5)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ D^*J_5(I_5-Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}}J_5)^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix},$$

so  $R(E_0) \subseteq M_1 \oplus R\begin{pmatrix} V \\ I_3 \end{pmatrix} \oplus M_4 \oplus R\begin{pmatrix} (I_5+Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}}J_5)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ D^*J_5(I_5-Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}}J_5)^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix}$  as desired.  $\square$

The following example follows from [15, Theorem 7.2], which gives the equivalent condition for  $E_+E_0E_- = E_+E_-$ . Here, we use the example to describe the specific forms of  $\mathcal{R}_0(\mathcal{E})$ .

EXAMPLE 1. Let  $C \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$  be a contraction. Suppose that  $E_+$  and  $E_-$  are orthogonal projections with  $R(E_+) = \text{Graph}(C)$  and  $R(E_-) = \text{Graph}(-C)$ , respectively. If

$$E_0 = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} : \mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{K}, \tag{3.4}$$

then

$$R_0(\mathcal{E}) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & J_{22} \end{pmatrix} : J_{22} \in \text{Ref}(\mathcal{K}) \text{ with } C^*J_{22} = -C^* \right\}.$$

Indeed, it is clear that

$$R(E_+) = \text{Graph}(C) = \{x + Cx : x \in \mathcal{H}\}$$

and

$$R(E_-) = \text{Graph}(-C) = \{x - Cx : x \in \mathcal{H}\}.$$

Then a direct calculation implies that  $E_+$  and  $E_-$  with respect to space decomposition  $\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{K}$  have the operator matrix form

$$E_+ = \begin{pmatrix} (I + C^*C)^{-1} & (I + C^*C)^{-1}C^* \\ C(I + C^*C)^{-1} & C(I + C^*C)^{-1}C^* \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$E_- = \begin{pmatrix} (I + C^*C)^{-1} & -(I + C^*C)^{-1}C^* \\ -C(I + C^*C)^{-1} & C(I + C^*C)^{-1}C^* \end{pmatrix},$$

respectively. Let  $J \in R_0(\varepsilon)$ . Then  $JE_0 = E_0$  if and only if  $J = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & J_{22} \end{pmatrix}$ , where  $J_{22} \in \text{Ref}(\mathcal{H})$ . In this case, the equation  $JE_+J = E_-$  is equivalent to  $C^*J_{22} + C^* = 0$ .

Let  $\varepsilon := (E_0, E_{\pm})$  as above. In [15], the sets

$$\mathcal{S}_{OS}(J) := \{(E_0, E_{\pm}) \mid E_+JE_+ \geq 0\},$$

$$\varepsilon(\text{Markov}) := \{(E_0, E_{\pm}) \mid E_+E_0E_- = E_+E_-\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{S}(\varepsilon) := \{J \in \text{Ref}(\mathcal{H}) : E_-JE_+ = JE_+, JE_0 = E_0J\}$$

are also defined. In the following, we give an example to illustrate  $\bigcap_{J \in \mathcal{S}(\varepsilon)} \mathcal{S}_{OS}(J) \not\subseteq \varepsilon(\text{Markov})$ . Thus, there is a gap in [15, Theorem 6.4].

EXAMPLE 2. Let  $E_+ = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} : \mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H}$ ,  $E_- = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} : \mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H}$ , and  $E_0 = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{I}{2} & \frac{U}{2} \\ \frac{U^*}{2} & \frac{I}{2} \end{pmatrix} : \mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H}$ , where  $U \in B(\mathcal{H})$  is a unitary operator. Let  $J \in \text{Ref}(\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H})$ . Then a direct calculation implies that equations  $E_-JE_+ = JE_+$  and  $JE_0 = E_0J$  are equivalent to  $J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & J_1U \\ U^*J_1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ , where  $J_1 \in \text{Ref}(\mathcal{H})$ . That is

$$\mathcal{S}(\varepsilon) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & J_1U \\ U^*J_1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, J_1 \in \text{Ref}(\mathcal{H}) \right\}.$$

It is easy to check that  $E_+JE_+ = 0$  for any  $J \in \mathcal{S}(\varepsilon)$  and  $E_+E_0E_- \neq E_+E_-$ . Thus  $\varepsilon = (E_0, E_{\pm}) \in \bigcap_{J \in \mathcal{S}(\varepsilon)} \mathcal{S}_{OS}(J)$ , whereas  $\varepsilon = (E_0, E_{\pm}) \notin \varepsilon(\text{Markov})$ . So  $\bigcap_{J \in \mathcal{S}(\varepsilon)} \mathcal{S}_{OS}(J) \not\subseteq \varepsilon(\text{Markov})$ .

*Acknowledgements.* The authors would like to express their thanks to the anonymous referees for some valuable comments.

REFERENCES

- [1] T. ANDO, *Linear operators on Krein spaces*, Lecture Note, Hokkaido University, Sapporo, Japan, 1979.
- [2] S. ALBEVERIO, A. K. MOTOVILOV, *Sharpening the norm bound in the subspace perturbation theory*, *Complex Anal. Oper. Theory.*, 7 (2013) 1389–1416.
- [3] W. O. AMREIN, K. B. SINHA, *On pairs of projections in a Hilbert space*, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 208/209 (1994) 425–435.
- [4] J. AVRON, R. SEILER AND B. SIMON, *The index of a pair of projections*, *J. Funct. Anal.*, 120 (1994) 220–237.
- [5] A. BÖTTCHER, B. SIMON, I. M. SPITKOVSKY, *Similarity between two projections*, *Integr. Equ. Oper. Theory*, 89 (2017) 507–518.
- [6] A. BÖTTCHER, I. M. SPITKOVSKY, *A gentle guide to the basics of two projections theory*, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 432 (2010) 1412–1459.
- [7] F. BOTELHO, J. JAMISON, L. MOLNÁR, *Surjective isometries on Grassmann spaces*, *J. Funct. Anal.*, 265 (2013) 2226–2238.

- [8] H. K. DU, C. Y. DENG, *A new characterization of gaps between two subspaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 133 (2005) 3065–3070.
- [9] Y. N. DOU, W. J. SHI, M. M. CUI, H. K. DU, *General explicit descriptions for intertwining operators and direct rotations of two orthogonal projections*, Linear Algebra Appl., 531 (2010) 575–591.
- [10] P. R. HALMOS, *Two subspaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 144 (1969) 381–389.
- [11] T. KATO, *Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin/Heidelberg, 1966.
- [12] T. LIU, L. SHI, C. WANG, S. ZHU, *An interpolation problem for conjugations*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 500 (2021) 125118.
- [13] Y. LI, X. M. CAI, J. J. NIU, J. X. ZHANG, *The minimal and maximal symmetries for  $J$ -contractive projections*, Linear Algebra Appl., 563 (2019) 313–330.
- [14] Y. LI, J. ZHANG, N. WEI, *The structures and decompositions of symmetries involving idempotents*, Banach J. Math. Anal., 14 (2020) 413–432.
- [15] P. JORGENSEN, F. TIAN, *Reflection positivity, duality, and spectral theory*, J. Appl. Math. Comput., 59 (2019) 361–404.
- [16] B. SIMON, *Unitaries permuting two orthogonal projection*, Linear Algebra Appl., 528 (2017) 436–441.
- [17] Y. Q. WANG, H. K. DU, Y. N. DOU, *On the index of Fredholm pairs of idempotents*, Acta Mathematica Sinica, 25 (2009) 679–686.

(Received June 27, 2021)

*Yuan Li*

*School of Mathematics and statistics  
Shaanxi Normal University  
Xi'an, 710062, People's Republic of China  
e-mail: liyuan0401@aliyun.com*

*Yanan Wang*

*School of Mathematics and statistics  
Shaanxi Normal University  
Xi'an, 710062, People's Republic of China*

*Hongke Du*

*School of Mathematics and statistics  
Shaanxi Normal University  
Xi'an, 710062, People's Republic of China  
e-mail: hkdu@snnu.edu.cn*