

The parallel sum for adjointable operators on Hilbert C^* -modules

Wei Luo^a, Chuanning Song^{a,1}, Qingxiang Xu^{a,1,*}

^a*Department of Mathematics, Shanghai Normal University, Shanghai 200234, PR China*

Abstract

The parallel sum for adjointable operators on Hilbert C^* -modules is introduced and studied. Some results known for matrices and bounded linear operators on Hilbert spaces are generalized to the case of adjointable operators on Hilbert C^* -modules. It is shown that there exist a Hilbert C^* -module H and two positive operators $A, B \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ such that the operator equation $A^{1/2} = (A + B)^{1/2}X, X \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ has no solution, where $\mathcal{L}(H)$ denotes the set of all adjointable operators on H .

Keywords: Hilbert C^* -module; Moore-Penrose inverse; parallel sum
2000 MSC: 15A09; 46L08

1. Introduction

Throughout this paper, $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ is the set of all $m \times n$ complex matrices. For any $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$, let $\mathcal{R}(A)$ and A^\dagger denote the range and the Moore-Penrose inverse of A , respectively. The parallel sum of two Hermitian positive semi-definite matrices was first introduced by Anderson and Duffin in [2]. Let $A, B \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ be Hermitian positive semi-definite matrices, the parallel sum of A and B is defined by

$$A : B = A(A + B)^\dagger B, \quad (1.1)$$

which can be proved to be equal to $A(A+B)^-B$ for any $\{1\}$ -inverse $(A+B)^-$ of $A + B$. In view of such an observation, the parallel sum was generalized

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: luoweipig1@163.com (Wei Luo), songning@shnu.edu.cn (Chuanning Song), qxxu@shnu.edu.cn, qingxiang_xu@126.com (Qingxiang Xu)

¹Supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (11671261).

by Mitra and Odell [14] to non-square matrices A and B of the same size such that

$$\mathcal{R}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(A + B) \text{ and } \mathcal{R}(A^*) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(A^* + B^*). \quad (1.2)$$

Meanwhile, Anderson [1] showed that the parallel sum defined by (1.1) can be viewed as a shorted operator for Hermitian positive semi-definite matrices A and B . There are also many different equivalent definitions and properties of the parallel sum for matrices, the reader is referred to a recent review paper [7] and the references therein.

Another direction of the generalization of the parallel sum is from the finite-dimensional space to the Hilbert space. The parallel sum of positive operators A and B on a Hilbert space was studied by Anderson-Schreiber [3] when the range of $A + B$ is closed, and furthermore studied in [12, 15] without any restrictions on the range of $A + B$. As the generalizations of the parallel sum, shorted operators and the weakly parallel sum for bounded linear operators on Hilbert spaces are also studied in [4, 8] and [6, 9], respectively.

Hilbert C^* -modules are generalizations of both C^* -algebras and Hilbert spaces, which possess some new phenomena compared with that of Hilbert spaces. For instance, a closed submodule of a Hilbert C^* -module may fail to be orthogonally complemented [13, P. 7], a bounded linear operator from one Hilbert C^* -module to another may not be adjointable [13, P. 8], an adjointable operator from one Hilbert C^* -module to another may have no polar decomposition [17, Theorem 15.3.7] and the famous Douglas theorem [10, Theorem 1] is recently proved to be not true in the Hilbert C^* -module case [11, Theorem 3.2]. Another big difference will be shown by Proposition 6.2 of this paper, which indicates that the alternative interpretation of the parallel sum initiated in [12] is also no longer true in the Hilbert C^* -module case.

The purpose of this paper is to set up the general theory of the parallel sum for adjointable operators on Hilbert C^* -modules. The paper is organized as follows. Some basic knowledge about Hilbert C^* -modules are given in Section 2. The term of the parallel sum is generalized to the Hilbert C^* -module case in Section 3, where parallel summable conditions similar to (1.2) are established. Some properties of the parallel sum are provided in Section 4. Section 5 focusses on the derivation of a formula for the norm upper bound of the parallel sum. Based on the polar decomposition and the famous Douglas theorem, an alternative interpretation of the parallel sum was introduced in [12] for positive operators on a Hilbert space. It is shown in Section 6 that the same is not true for adjointable positive operators on Hilbert C^* -modules.

2. Some basic knowledge about Hilbert C^* -modules

In this section, we recall some basic knowledge about C^* -algebra [16], Hilbert C^* -module [13] and the Moore-Penrose inverse [19, 20, 23]. An element a of a C^* -algebra \mathfrak{A} is said to be self-adjoint if $a = a^*$; and positive, written $a \geq 0$, if it is self-adjoint and its spectrum $Sp(a)$ lies in $[0, +\infty)$. It is known that a is positive if and only if $a = b^*b$ for some $b \in \mathfrak{A}$ [16, Theorem 1.3.3].

Let a and b be two self-adjoint elements of a C^* -algebra \mathfrak{A} . By $b \geq a$ we mean that $b - a \geq 0$. If $a \geq 0$ and $b \geq 0$, then $a + b \geq 0$ [16, Theorem 1.3.3]. If furthermore $0 \leq a \leq b$, then $\|a\| \leq \|b\|$ [16, Proposition 1.3.5] and $a^t \leq b^t$ for any $t \in (0, 1]$ [16, Proposition 1.3.8].

Throughout the rest of this paper, \mathfrak{A} is a C^* -algebra. An inner-product \mathfrak{A} -module is a linear space E which is a right \mathfrak{A} -module, together with a map $(x, y) \rightarrow \langle x, y \rangle : E \times E \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ such that for any $x, y, z \in E, \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$ and $a \in \mathfrak{A}$, the following conditions hold:

- (i) $\langle x, \alpha y + \beta z \rangle = \alpha \langle x, y \rangle + \beta \langle x, z \rangle$;
- (ii) $\langle x, ya \rangle = \langle x, y \rangle a$;
- (iii) $\langle y, x \rangle = \langle x, y \rangle^*$;
- (iv) $\langle x, x \rangle \geq 0$, and $\langle x, x \rangle = 0 \iff x = 0$.

Let E be an inner-product \mathfrak{A} -module. By [13, Proposition 1.1], it has

$$\|\langle x, y \rangle\| \leq \|x\| \|y\| \text{ for any } x, y \in E,$$

which induces a norm on E defined by

$$\|x\| = \sqrt{\|\langle x, x \rangle\|} \text{ for any } x \in E. \quad (2.1)$$

If E is complete with respect to this induced norm, then E is called a (right) Hilbert \mathfrak{A} -module. For any $F \subseteq E$, let \overline{F} denote the norm closure of F .

Definition 2.1. A closed submodule M of a Hilbert \mathfrak{A} -module H is said to be orthogonally complemented if $H = M \dot{+} M^\perp$, where

$$M^\perp = \{x \in H \mid \langle x, y \rangle = 0 \text{ for any } y \in M\}.$$

In this case, the projection from H onto M is denoted by P_M .

Given two Hilbert \mathfrak{A} -modules H and K , let $\mathcal{L}(H, K)$ be the set of operators $T : H \rightarrow K$ for which there is an operator $T^* : K \rightarrow H$ such that

$$\langle Tx, y \rangle = \langle x, T^*y \rangle \text{ for any } x \in H \text{ and } y \in K.$$

It is known that any element T of $\mathcal{L}(H, K)$ must be a bounded linear operator, which is also \mathfrak{A} -linear in the sense that

$$T(xa) = (Tx)a \text{ for any } x \in H \text{ and } a \in \mathfrak{A}. \quad (2.2)$$

We call $\mathcal{L}(H, K)$ the set of adjointable operators from H to K .

For any $T \in \mathcal{L}(H, K)$, the range and the null space of T are denoted by $\mathcal{R}(T)$ and $\mathcal{N}(T)$, respectively. In case $H = K$, $\mathcal{L}(H, H)$ which we abbreviate to $\mathcal{L}(H)$, is a C^* -algebra whose unit, written I_H , is the identity operator on H . Let $\mathcal{L}(H)_+$ be the set of all positive elements of $\mathcal{L}(H)$. For any $T \in \mathcal{L}(H)$, the notation $T \geq 0$ is used to indicate that T is a positive element. In the special case that H is a Hilbert space, $\mathcal{L}(H)$ consists of all bounded linear operators on H , and in this case we use the notation $\mathbb{B}(H)$ instead of $\mathcal{L}(H)$.

Throughout the rest of this section, H and K are two Hilbert \mathfrak{A} -modules.

Lemma 2.1. [18, Lemma 2.3] *Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(H)_+$. Then $\overline{\mathcal{R}(T^\alpha)} = \overline{\mathcal{R}(T)}$ for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.*

Definition 2.2. The Moore-Penrose inverse (In brief, M-P inverse) of $T \in \mathcal{L}(H, K)$ is denoted by T^\dagger , which is the unique element $X \in \mathcal{L}(K, H)$ satisfying

$$TXT = T, \quad XTX = X, \quad (TX)^* = TX \text{ and } (XT)^* = XT. \quad (2.3)$$

If such a T^\dagger exists, then T is said to be M-P invertible.

Lemma 2.2. [20, Theorem 2.2] *For any $T \in \mathcal{L}(H, K)$, T is M-P invertible if and only if $\mathcal{R}(T)$ is closed.*

Lemma 2.3. (cf. [13, Theorem 3.2] and [20, Remark 1.1]) *Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(H, K)$. Then the closeness of any one of the following sets implies the closeness of the remaining three sets:*

$$\mathcal{R}(T), \mathcal{R}(T^*), \mathcal{R}(TT^*) \text{ and } \mathcal{R}(T^*T).$$

If $\mathcal{R}(T)$ is closed, then $\mathcal{R}(T) = \mathcal{R}(TT^)$, $\mathcal{R}(T^*) = \mathcal{R}(T^*T)$ and the following orthogonal decompositions hold:*

$$H = \mathcal{N}(T) \dot{+} \mathcal{R}(T^*) \text{ and } K = \mathcal{R}(T) \dot{+} \mathcal{N}(T^*).$$

Remark 2.1. Suppose that $T \in \mathcal{L}(H, K)$ is M-P invertible. Then from [23] we know that

$$\mathcal{R}(T^\dagger) = \mathcal{R}(T^*), \mathcal{N}(T^\dagger) = \mathcal{N}(T^*), \mathcal{R}(T) = \mathcal{N}(T^*)^\perp, \mathcal{R}(T^*) = \mathcal{N}(T)^\perp.$$

Furthermore, it easily follows from (2.3) that $(T^*)^\dagger = (T^\dagger)^*$ and $(T^*T)^\dagger = T^\dagger(T^*)^\dagger$. Specifically, if $H = K$ and $T = T^*$, then $TT^\dagger = T^\dagger T$. If in addition $T \geq 0$, then $T^\dagger = T^\dagger TT^\dagger = (T^{\frac{1}{2}}T^\dagger)^*(T^{\frac{1}{2}}T^\dagger) \geq 0$, and $\mathcal{R}(T^{\frac{1}{2}}) = \mathcal{R}(T)$ by Lemma 2.3 such that

$$T^\dagger = (T^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot T^{\frac{1}{2}})^\dagger = (T^{\frac{1}{2}})^\dagger \cdot (T^{\frac{1}{2}})^\dagger,$$

which means that $(T^\dagger)^{\frac{1}{2}} = (T^{\frac{1}{2}})^\dagger$.

Remark 2.2. Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(H, K)$. By Lemma 2.2 we can conclude that the following two conditions are equivalent:

- (i) There exists $X \in \mathcal{L}(K, H)$ such that $TXT = T$;
- (ii) $\mathcal{R}(T)$ is closed.

Definition 2.3. Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(H, K)$ be M-P invertible. Denote by

$$T\{1\} = \{X \in \mathcal{L}(K, H) \mid TXT = T\}.$$

Any element T^- of $T\{1\}$ is called a $\{1\}$ -inverse of T .

3. Parallel summable conditions

Throughout this section, H, H_1, H_2, H_3 and K are Hilbert \mathfrak{A} -modules unless otherwise specified.

Definition 3.1. [14] Let $A, B \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ be such that $A+B$ is M-P invertible. Then A and B are said to be parallel summable if $A(A+B)^-B$ is invariant under any choice of $(A+B)^-$. In such case, the parallel sum of A and B is denoted by (1.1).

Let $A, B \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ be such that $A+B$ is M-P invertible. As in the matrix case, in this section we will show that A and B are parallel summable if and only if (1.2) is satisfied; see Theorem 3.3 and Remark 3.1. In the special case that A and B are both positive, we will prove in Theorem 3.6 that the M-P invertibility of $A+B$ will guarantee automatically the parallel summability of A and B .

To achieve the main results of this section, we need two auxiliary lemmas as follows.

Lemma 3.1. [13, Proposition 3.7] *It holds that $\overline{\mathcal{R}(TT^*)} = \overline{\mathcal{R}(T)}$ for any $T \in \mathcal{L}(H, K)$.*

Lemma 3.2. [21, Lemma 2.4] Suppose that both $A \in \mathcal{L}(H_2, H_3)$ and $B \in \mathcal{L}(H_1, H_2)$ are M - P invertible. Let A^- and B^- be any $\{1\}$ -inverses of A and B , respectively. Then for any $C \in \mathcal{L}(H_1, H_3)$, the equation

$$AXB = C, \quad X \in \mathcal{L}(H_2) \quad (3.1)$$

has a solution if and only if $AA^-CB^-B = C$. In such case, the general solution X to Eq. (3.1) is of the form

$$X = A^-CB^- + V - A^-AVBB^-,$$

where $V \in \mathcal{L}(H_2)$ is arbitrary.

Now, we state the main result of this section as follows:

Theorem 3.3. Let $A, B \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ be such that $A+B$ is M - P invertible. Then A and B are parallel summable if and only if

$$A = A(A+B)^+(A+B) \text{ and } B = (A+B)(A+B)^+B. \quad (3.2)$$

Proof. Note that any $\{1\}$ -inverse $(A+B)^-$ is a solution to the equation

$$(A+B)X(A+B) = A+B, \quad (3.3)$$

which guarantees the solvability of the equation above. By Lemma 3.2, we know that the general solution X to Eq. (3.3) is of the form

$$X = (A+B)^\dagger + Y - (A+B)^\dagger(A+B)Y(A+B)(A+B)^\dagger,$$

where $Y \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ is arbitrary. It follows that A and B are parallel summable if and only if

$$AYB = A(A+B)^\dagger(A+B)Y(A+B)(A+B)^\dagger B, \text{ for any } Y \in \mathcal{L}(H). \quad (3.4)$$

Suppose that (3.2) is satisfied, then the equation above is valid obviously and thus A and B are parallel summable. Conversely, suppose that A and B are parallel summable; or equivalently, Eq. (3.4) is satisfied. Then we put

$$Y = [I_H - (A+B)^\dagger(A+B)]B^*. \quad (3.5)$$

Substituting such an operator Y into (3.4) gives

$$A[I_H - (A+B)^\dagger(A+B)]B^*B = 0. \quad (3.6)$$

Note that

$$(A + B)[I_H - (A + B)^\dagger(A + B)] = 0, \quad (3.7)$$

so the equation above together with (3.6) yields

$$B[I_H - (A + B)^\dagger(A + B)]B^*B = 0, \quad (3.8)$$

which leads clearly to $(YB)^*(YB) = 0$, where Y is defined by (3.5). Therefore, we have $YB = 0$. It follows that

$$[I_H - (A + B)^\dagger(A + B)]\xi = 0 \text{ for any } \xi \in \overline{\mathcal{R}(B^*B)}.$$

Since $\mathcal{R}(B^*) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{R}(B^*)}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{R}(B^*)} = \overline{\mathcal{R}(B^*B)}$ by Lemma 3.1, we have

$$[I_H - (A + B)^\dagger(A + B)]B^* = 0.$$

Taking $*$ -operation, we get

$$B[I_H - (A + B)^\dagger(A + B)] = 0. \quad (3.9)$$

The first equation in (3.2) then follows immediately from (3.7) and (3.9).

Similarly, the second equation in (3.2) can be obtained by substituting $Y = A^*[I_H - (A + B)(A + B)^\dagger]$ into (3.4). \square

Remark 3.1. Let $A, B \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ be such that $A + B$ is M-P invertible. The proof of Theorem 3.3 indicates that

$$\begin{aligned} A = A(A + B)^\dagger(A + B) &\iff B = B(A + B)^\dagger(A + B) \\ \updownarrow &\qquad\qquad\qquad \updownarrow \\ \mathcal{R}(A^*) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(A^* + B^*) &\qquad\qquad \mathcal{R}(B^*) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(A^* + B^*). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} B = (A + B)(A + B)^\dagger B &\iff A = (A + B)(A + B)^\dagger A \\ \updownarrow &\qquad\qquad\qquad \updownarrow \\ \mathcal{R}(B) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(A + B) &\qquad\qquad \mathcal{R}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(A + B). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.2. Let $A, B \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ be parallel summable. Then it holds that

$$A : B = A - A(A + B)^\dagger A = B - B(A + B)^\dagger B. \quad (3.10)$$

In fact, from Remark 3.1 we have

$$A : B = (A + B)(A + B)^\dagger B - B(A + B)^\dagger B = B - B(A + B)^\dagger B.$$

Similarly,

$$A : B = A(A + B)^\dagger(A + B) - A(A + B)^\dagger A = A - A(A + B)^\dagger A.$$

Next, we consider the special case that both A and B are positive.

Lemma 3.4. [13, Lemma 4.1] *Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(H)$. Then $T \geq 0$ if and only if $\langle Tx, x \rangle \geq 0$ for any $x \in H$.*

Lemma 3.5. *Let $A, B \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ be such that $0 \leq A \leq B$. Then $\mathcal{R}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(B)$ whenever B is M-P invertible.*

Proof. Since $0 \leq B$ and B is M-P invertible, we have $\mathcal{R}(B) = \mathcal{R}(B^*) = \mathcal{N}(B)^\perp$. Furthermore, from the assumption $0 \leq A \leq B$ and Lemma 3.4 we can get $\mathcal{N}(B) \subseteq \mathcal{N}(A)$, therefore

$$\mathcal{R}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{N}(A^*)^\perp = \mathcal{N}(A)^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{N}(B)^\perp = \mathcal{R}(B). \quad \square$$

Theorem 3.6. *Suppose that $A, B \in \mathcal{L}(H)_+$ and $A + B$ is M-P invertible. Then A and B are parallel summable such that $A : B \geq 0$.*

Proof. Since $A, B \in \mathcal{L}(H)_+$, we have $0 \leq A \leq A + B$. As $A + B$ is M-P invertible, by Lemma 3.5 we have $\mathcal{R}(A^*) = \mathcal{R}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(A+B) = \mathcal{R}(A^*+B^*)$. It follows from Remark 3.1 that (3.2) is satisfied, and hence A and B are parallel summable by Theorem 3.3.

Next, we prove that $A : B \geq 0$. Indeed, since $A + B \geq 0$, we have

$$(A + B)^\dagger \geq 0 \text{ and } (A + B)(A + B)^\dagger = (A + B)^\dagger(A + B),$$

therefore

$$(A + B) \left((A + B)^\dagger \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \left((A + B)^\dagger \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} (A + B).$$

Let $T = B^{\frac{1}{2}} \left((A + B)^\dagger \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|B^{\frac{1}{2}}(A + B)^\dagger B^{\frac{1}{2}}\| &= \|TT^*\| = \|T^*T\| = \left\| \left((A + B)^\dagger \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} B \left((A + B)^\dagger \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \\ &\leq \left\| \left((A + B)^\dagger \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} (A + B) \left((A + B)^\dagger \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\| = \|(A + B)(A + B)^\dagger\| \leq 1, \end{aligned}$$

which means that $I_H - B^{\frac{1}{2}}(A + B)^\dagger B^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq 0$. Accordingly,

$$A : B = B - B(A + B)^\dagger B = B^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[I_H - B^{\frac{1}{2}}(A + B)^\dagger B^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] B^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq 0. \quad \square$$

4. Some properties of the parallel sum

Throughout this section, H is a Hilbert \mathfrak{A} -module. In this section, we provide some properties of the parallel sum in the general setting of adjointable operators on Hilbert C^* -modules. First, we derive certain properties of $A : B$ similar to that in [2, Section III] with no demanding on the existence of A^\dagger and B^\dagger .

Proposition 4.1. (cf. [2, Lemma 1]) *Let $A, B \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ be parallel summable. Then $A : B = B : A$.*

Proof. By (3.10), (3.2) and Remark 3.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A : B &= B - B(A + B)^\dagger B = B(A + B)^\dagger (A + B) - B(A + B)^\dagger B \\ &= B(A + B)^\dagger A = B : A. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 4.2. (cf. [2, Lemma 3]) *Let $A, B \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ be parallel summable. Then*

$$\mathcal{R}(A : B) = \mathcal{R}(A) \cap \mathcal{R}(B). \quad (4.1)$$

Proof. It follows clearly from (3.10) that $\mathcal{R}(A : B) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(A) \cap \mathcal{R}(B)$. Conversely, given any $\xi \in \mathcal{R}(A) \cap \mathcal{R}(B)$, let $u \in A^{-1}\{\xi\}$ and $v \in B^{-1}\{\xi\}$ be chosen arbitrary. Then by (3.10) and (3.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (A : B)(u + v) &= [A - A(A + B)^\dagger A]u + [B - B(A + B)^\dagger B]v \\ &= [I_H - A(A + B)^\dagger]\xi + [I_H - B(A + B)^\dagger]\xi \\ &= \xi + [I_H - (A + B)(A + B)^\dagger]\xi \\ &= \xi + [I_H - (A + B)(A + B)^\dagger]Bv = \xi. \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

This completes the proof of $\mathcal{R}(A) \cap \mathcal{R}(B) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(A : B)$. Therefore, (4.1) is satisfied. \square

Proposition 4.3. (cf. [2, Theorem 8]) *Suppose that $P, Q \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ are two projections such that $P + Q$ is M - P invertible. Then $P : Q = \frac{1}{2}P_M$, where $M = \mathcal{R}(P) \cap \mathcal{R}(Q)$.*

Proof. From Theorem 3.6 we know that $T = 2(P : Q) \geq 0$, hence T is self-adjoint. For any $x \in H$, we have $\xi = (P : Q)x \in \mathcal{R}(P) \cap \mathcal{R}(Q)$ by Proposition 4.2, hence $\xi \in P^{-1}\{\xi\} \cap Q^{-1}\{\xi\}$ since P and Q are projections. It follows from (4.2) that

$$T^2x = 4(P : Q)\xi = 2(P : Q)(\xi + \xi) = 2\xi = 2(P : Q)x = Tx,$$

which means that T is idempotent. Therefore, T is a projection. \square

Proposition 4.4. (cf. [2, Lemma 6]) *Let $A, B, C \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ be such that both $(A : B) : C$ and $A : (B : C)$ are well-defined. Then*

$$(A : B) : C = A : (B : C).$$

Proof. Given any $\xi \in \mathcal{R}(A) \cap \mathcal{R}(B) \cap \mathcal{R}(C)$, let $u \in A^{-1}\{\xi\}, v \in B^{-1}\{\xi\}$ and $w \in C^{-1}\{\xi\}$ be chosen arbitrary. Then from (4.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} [(A : B) : C](u + v + w) &= [(A : B) : C](u + v) + [(A : B) : C]w \\ &= C[(A : B) + C]^\dagger(A : B)(u + v) + [C - C[(A : B) + C]^\dagger C]w \\ &= C[(A : B) + C]^\dagger \xi + \xi - C[(A : B) + C]^\dagger \xi = \xi. \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

Now for any $x \in H$, let

$$\xi = [A : (B : C)]x \in \mathcal{R}(A) \cap \mathcal{R}(B) \cap \mathcal{R}(C). \quad (4.4)$$

Then $\xi = (A - A[A + (B : C)]^\dagger A)x = Au$, where

$$u = (I_H - [A + (B : C)]^\dagger A)x \in A^{-1}\{\xi\}. \quad (4.5)$$

Furthermore,

$$\xi = (B : C)[A + (B : C)]^\dagger Ax = [B - B(B + C)^\dagger B][A + (B : C)]^\dagger Ax,$$

hence

$$v = [I_H - (B + C)^\dagger B][A + (B : C)]^\dagger Ax \in B^{-1}\{\xi\}. \quad (4.6)$$

Similarly, we know that

$$w = [I_H - (B + C)^\dagger C][A + (B : C)]^\dagger Ax \in C^{-1}\{\xi\}. \quad (4.7)$$

Let u, v and w be given by (4.5)–(4.7). Then by (4.3)–(4.4), we have

$$[(A : B) : C](u + v + w) = [A : (B : C)]x. \quad (4.8)$$

On the other hand, by (4.5)–(4.7) we have

$$u + v + w = x + [I_H - (B + C)^\dagger(B + C)][A + (B : C)]^\dagger Ax. \quad (4.9)$$

Note that $C[I_H - (B + C)^\dagger(B + C)] = 0$ and

$$(A : B) : C = (A : B)[(A : B) + C]^\dagger C,$$

so from (4.9) we obtain $[(A : B) : C](u + v + w) = [(A : B) : C]x$. This equality together with (4.8) yields

$$[(A : B) : C]x = [A : (B : C)]x, \text{ for any } x \in H.$$

The asserted equality then follows from the arbitrariness of x in H . \square

Remark 4.1. It is unknown for us that the existence of $(A : B) : C$ will imply the existence of $A : (B : C)$, and vice visa.

Next, we provide two new properties. A characterization of the M-P invertibility of $A : B$ is as follows:

Proposition 4.5. *Let $A, B \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ be parallel summable. Then the following two statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *A and B are both M-P invertible;*
- (ii) *$A : B$ is M-P invertible.*

Proof. “(i) \implies (ii)”: Assume that A and B are both M-P invertible. Then both $\mathcal{R}(A)$ and $\mathcal{R}(B)$ are closed, hence $A : B$ has a closed range by (4.1), therefore $A : B$ is M-P invertible by Lemma 2.2.

“(ii) \implies (i)”: Assume that $A : B$ is M-P invertible. Then for any $y \in \overline{\mathcal{R}(B)}$, there exists a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in H such that $Bx_n \rightarrow y$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. It follows that

$$(A : B)x_n = Bx_n - B(A + B)^\dagger Bx_n \rightarrow y - B(A + B)^\dagger y \stackrel{def}{=} z.$$

Since $\mathcal{R}(A : B)$ is closed, we have $z \in \mathcal{R}(A : B) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(B)$ and thus

$$y = z + B(A + B)^\dagger y \in \mathcal{R}(B).$$

This completes the proof of the closeness of $\mathcal{R}(B)$. The proof of the closeness of $\mathcal{R}(A)$ is similar. \square

As an application of the parallel, we establish a proposition as follows:

Proposition 4.6. *Let M and N be two orthogonally complemented closed submodules of H such that $M + N$ is closed in H . Then both $M + N$ and $M \cap N$ are orthogonally complemented such that $(M \cap N)^\perp = M^\perp + N^\perp$.*

Proof. Let P_M and P_N be the projections from H onto M and N , respectively. Put

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ P_M & P_N \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{L}(H \oplus H).$$

Then clearly,

$$\mathcal{R}(T) = \{0\} \oplus (M + N) \text{ and } \mathcal{R}(TT^*) = \{0\} \oplus \mathcal{R}(P_M + P_N).$$

By assumption we know that $\mathcal{R}(T)$ is closed, which means by Lemma 2.3 that $\mathcal{R}(P_M + P_N)$ is closed such that $\mathcal{R}(P_M + P_N) = M + N$. It follows from Lemma 2.2 that $P_M + P_N$ is M-P invertible, hence $M + N$ is orthogonally complemented such that $P_{M+N} = (P_M + P_N)(P_M + P_N)^\dagger$. Furthermore, from Proposition 4.3 we know that $M \cap N$ is also orthogonally complemented such that $P_M : P_N = \frac{1}{2}P_{M \cap N}$.

Now, we show that $(M \cap N)^\perp = M^\perp + N^\perp$. Indeed, it is obvious that $M^\perp + N^\perp \subseteq (M \cap N)^\perp$. On the other hand, for any $x \in (M \cap N)^\perp$, we have

$$P_M x - P_M(P_M + P_N)^\dagger P_M x = (P_M : P_N)x = \frac{1}{2}P_{M \cap N}x = 0,$$

hence $x_1 = x - (P_M + P_N)^\dagger P_M x \in M^\perp$. Note that

$$P_N(x - x_1) = P_N(P_M + P_N)^\dagger P_M x = (P_M : P_N)x = 0,$$

therefore $x = x_1 + (x - x_1) \in M^\perp + N^\perp$. Since $x \in (M \cap N)^\perp$ is arbitrary, we have $(M \cap N)^\perp \subseteq M^\perp + N^\perp$. \square

5. A formula for the norm upper bound of the parallel sum

Let $A, B \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ be Hermitian positive semi-definite matrices. Norm upper bound (5.2) below was obtained in [2, Theorem 25] with the usage of the M-P inverses A^\dagger and B^\dagger . The purpose of this section is to investigate whether (5.2) is true or not for general parallel summable operators A and B in $\mathcal{L}(H)$, where H is a Hilbert \mathfrak{A} -module. Our first result is Theorem 5.1, which indicates that (5.2) is true if A and B are both positive. The proof of Theorem 5.1 is carried out without any use of A^\dagger and B^\dagger , since this two M-P inverses may not exist. A counterexample is constructed in Remark 5.1, which shows that (5.2) might be false even if A and B are both self-adjoint. If however, an additional condition established in Theorem 5.4 is satisfied, then (5.2) is valid for such A and B which need not to be self-adjoint. Thus, a generalization of Theorem 5.1 is obtained.

Let $A, B \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ be parallel summable. Trivially, $A : B = 0$ if $A = 0$ or $B = 0$. So throughout the rest of this section, it is assumed that both A and B are non-zero. Throughout the rest of this section, H is a Hilbert \mathfrak{A} -module.

Definition 5.1. For any $a, b \in (0, +\infty)$, let $a : b$ be the parallel sum of a and b defined by

$$a : b = \frac{ab}{a + b}. \quad (5.1)$$

Theorem 5.1. (cf. [2, Theorem 25]) *Let $A, B \in \mathcal{L}(H)_+$ be such that $A + B$ is M - P invertible. Let $\|A\| : \|B\|$ be defined by (5.1). Then*

$$\|A : B\| \leq \|A\| : \|B\|. \quad (5.2)$$

Proof. By Theorem 3.6, we know that A and B are parallel summable such that $A : B \geq 0$. Since $A \geq 0$ and $B \geq 0$, we have

$$A \geq \frac{A^2}{\|A\|} \text{ and } B \geq \frac{B^2}{\|B\|}. \quad (5.3)$$

For any $x \in H$, let

$$u = [I_H - (A + B)^\dagger A]x \text{ and } v = [I_H - (A + B)^\dagger B]x.$$

In view of (3.10) and (5.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle u, (A : B)x \rangle &= \langle u, Au \rangle = \langle Au, u \rangle \geq \frac{1}{\|A\|} \langle A^2 u, u \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{\|A\|} \langle Au, Au \rangle = \frac{1}{\|A\|} \langle (A : B)x, (A : B)x \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

Similarly, it holds that

$$\langle v, (A : B)x \rangle \geq \frac{1}{\|B\|} \langle (A : B)x, (A : B)x \rangle. \quad (5.5)$$

Note that $(A : B)[I_H - (A + B)^\dagger(A + B)] = 0$, so by (5.4) and (5.5) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (A : B)x, x \rangle &= \left\langle (A : B) \left[I_H + I_H - (A + B)^\dagger(A + B) \right] x, x \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \left[I_H + I_H - (A + B)^\dagger(A + B) \right] x, (A : B)x \right\rangle = \langle u + v, (A : B)x \rangle \\ &= \langle u, (A : B)x \rangle + \langle v, (A : B)x \rangle \geq \left(\frac{1}{\|A\|} + \frac{1}{\|B\|} \right) \langle (A : B)x, (A : B)x \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\langle (A : B)x, (A : B)x \rangle \leq (\|A\| : \|B\|) \langle (A : B)x, x \rangle,$$

which means that

$$\|(A : B)x\|^2 \leq (\|A\| : \|B\|) \|\langle (A : B)x, x \rangle\| \leq (\|A\| : \|B\|) \|(A : B)x\| \|x\|,$$

hence

$$\|(A : B)x\| \leq (\|A\| : \|B\|) \|x\|, \text{ for any } x \in H.$$

This completes the proof of (5.2). \square

Definition 5.2. For any $T \in \mathcal{L}(H)$, let $|T| \in \mathcal{L}(H)_+$ and $\rho(T)$ be self-adjoint defined by

$$|T| = (T^*T)^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{ and } \rho(T) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & T \\ T^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{L}(H \oplus H). \quad (5.6)$$

It is proved in [22, Lemma 4.1] that $\|\rho(T)\| = \|T\|$.

Lemma 5.2. [5, Theorem 2.3] *Let K be a Hilbert space and $X, Y \in \mathbb{B}(K)$. Then the triangle equality $|X + Y| = |X| + |Y|$ holds if and only if there exists a partial isometry $U \in \mathbb{B}(K)$ such that $X = U|X|$ and $Y = U|Y|$.*

Lemma 5.3. *Let K be a Hilbert space and $A, B \in \mathbb{B}(K)$ be such that $|A + B| = |A| + |B|$. Then $A + B$ is M-P invertible if and only if $|A| + |B|$ is M-P invertible. In such case, A and B are parallel summable, and norm upper bound (5.2) is valid.*

Proof. (1) By Lemma 5.2, there exists a partial isometry $U \in \mathbb{B}(K)$ such that $A = U|A|$ and $B = U|B|$. For any $x \in K$, we have

$$\langle |A|x, |A|x \rangle = \langle Ax, Ax \rangle = \langle U|A|x, U|A|x \rangle = \langle U^*U|A|x, |A|x \rangle,$$

and thus $\langle (I_K - U^*U)|A|x, |A|x \rangle = 0$, which implies that $U^*U|A| = |A|$ since $I_H - U^*U$ is a projection. It follows that $U^*A = U^*U|A| = |A|$. Similarly, we have $U^*B = |B|$. As a result, $UU^*A = U|A| = A$ and $UU^*B = U|B| = B$.

Based on the observation above, it can be verify directly by (2.3) that $A + B$ is M-P invertible if and only if $|A| + |B|$ is M-P invertible. In such case, it holds that

$$(|A| + |B|)^\dagger = (A + B)^\dagger U \text{ and } (A + B)^\dagger = (|A| + |B|)^\dagger U^*. \quad (5.7)$$

(2) Suppose that $|A| + |B|$ is M-P invertible. Then by Theorems 3.3, 3.6 and 5.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_1 &= |A| \cdot [I_K - (|A| + |B|)^\dagger(|A| + |B|)] = 0, \\ \Sigma_2 &= [I_K - (|A| + |B|)(|A| + |B|)^\dagger] \cdot |B| = 0, \\ \||A| : |B|\| &\leq \||A|\| : \||B|\| = \|A\| : \|B\|. \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

Eq. (5.7) together with the relationship between A and $|A|$, B and $|B|$, gives

$$\begin{aligned} A[I_K - (A + B)^\dagger(A + B)] &= U\Sigma_1 = 0, \\ [I_K - (A + B)(A + B)^\dagger]B &= U\Sigma_2 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

In other words, Eq. (3.2) is satisfied and thus A and B are parallel summable. Furthermore, we have

$$\|A : B\| = \|A(A + B)^\dagger B\| = \|U(|A| : |B|)\| = \||A| : |B|\|.$$

The equation above together with (5.8) yields (5.2). \square

A generalization of Theorem 5.1 is as follows:

Theorem 5.4. *Let $A, B \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ be such that $|A + B| = |A| + |B|$ and $A + B$ is M-P invertible. Then A and B are parallel summable, and norm upper bound (5.2) is valid.*

Proof. Note that $\mathcal{L}(H)$ is a C^* -algebra, so there exist a Hilbert space K and a C^* -morphism $\pi : \mathcal{L}(H) \rightarrow \mathbb{B}(K)$ such that π is faithful [16, Corollary 3.7.5]. Replacing K with $\pi(I_H)K$ if necessary, we may assume that π is unital, that is, $\pi(I_H) = I_K$. It is obvious that $|\pi(T)| = \pi(|T|)$ for any $T \in \mathcal{L}(H)$, and if T is M-P invertible in $\mathcal{L}(H)$, then $\pi(T)$ is M-P invertible in $\mathbb{B}(K)$ such that $\pi(T)^\dagger = \pi(T^\dagger)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} |\pi(A) + \pi(B)| &= |\pi(A + B)| = \pi(|A + B|) = \pi(|A| + |B|) \\ &= \pi(|A|) + \pi(|B|) = |\pi(A)| + |\pi(B)|. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, $\pi(A) + \pi(B) = \pi(A + B) \in \mathbb{B}(K)$ is M-P invertible since $(A + B) \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ is M-P invertible. It follows from Lemma 5.3 that $\pi(A)$ and $\pi(B)$ are parallel summable, which means that $\pi(\Lambda_1) = 0$ and $\pi(\Lambda_2) = 0$, where

$$\Lambda_1 = A[I_H - (A + B)^\dagger(A + B)], \Lambda_2 = [I_H - (A + B)(A + B)^\dagger]B.$$

As π is faithful, we have $\Lambda_1 = 0$ and $\Lambda_2 = 0$, hence Eq. (3.2) is satisfied and thus A and B are parallel summable.

Finally, by Lemma 5.3 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|A : B\| &= \|A(A + B)^\dagger B\| = \|\pi(A(A + B)^\dagger B)\| \\ &= \|\pi(A)(\pi(A + B))^\dagger \pi(B)\| = \|\pi(A)(\pi(A) + \pi(B))^\dagger \pi(B)\| \\ &= \|\pi(A) : \pi(B)\| \leq \|\pi(A)\| : \|\pi(B)\| = \|A\| : \|B\|. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Remark 5.1. There exist Hilbert space H and $A, B \in \mathbb{B}(H)$ such that $A = A^*, B = B^*$ and $A, B, A + B$ are all M-P invertible, whereas (5.2) is not valid. Such an example is as follows:

Let K be any Hilbert space with $\dim(K) \geq 1$, and e be any non-zero element of K . Let P be the projection from K onto the (closed) linear subspace spanned by e . Put $T = iP$ and $S = I_K - T$, where $i^2 = -1$. Clearly, $T^\dagger = -T$, $S^{-1} = I_K + \frac{i-1}{2}P$, $\|T\| = 1$ and

$$\|S\|^2 = \|S^*S\| = \|I_K + P\| = 2,$$

hence $\|S\| = \sqrt{2}$. Furthermore, $\|TS\| = \|(1+i)P\| = \sqrt{2}$.

Let $H = K \oplus K$, and $A = \rho(T), B = \rho(S) \in \mathbb{B}(H)$ be defined by (5.6). Then

$$A^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & T \\ T^* & 0 \end{pmatrix}, B^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (S^{-1})^* \\ S^{-1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, (A+B)^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I_K \\ I_K & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

So

$$A : B = A(A+B)^\dagger B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & TS \\ T^*S^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & TS \\ S^*T^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \rho(TS),$$

hence $\|A : B\| = \|TS\| = \sqrt{2}$. As $\|A\| = \|T\| = 1$ and $\|B\| = \|S\| = \sqrt{2}$, norm upper bound (5.2) is not valid for such A and B .

6. A further remark on the parallel sum for positive operators

In our previous sections, the parallel sum for adjointable positive operators A and B are defined under the precondition that $A+B$ is M-P invertible. As shown in [12], such an additional assumption is actually redundant in the Hilbert space case. Here is the details:

Let H be a Hilbert space and $T \in \mathbb{B}(H)$. By Douglas Theorem [10, Theorem 1], it holds that

$$\mathcal{R}(T) = \mathcal{R}((TT^*)^{1/2}). \quad (6.1)$$

Now, given any $A, B \in \mathbb{B}(H)_+$, let

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ A^{1/2} & B^{1/2} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{B}(H \oplus H).$$

Direct application of (6.1) yields the following proposition:

Proposition 6.1. *Let H be a Hilbert space and $A, B \in \mathbb{B}(H)_+$. Then*

$$\mathcal{R}(A^{1/2}) + \mathcal{R}(B^{1/2}) = \mathcal{R}((A + B)^{1/2}). \quad (6.2)$$

It follows from (6.2) and Douglas Theorem that there are uniquely determined operators $C, D \in \mathbb{B}(H)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} A^{1/2} &= (A + B)^{1/2}C \text{ and } \mathcal{R}(C) \subseteq \mathcal{N}((A + B)^{1/2})^\perp, \\ B^{1/2} &= (A + B)^{1/2}D \text{ and } \mathcal{R}(D) \subseteq \mathcal{N}((A + B)^{1/2})^\perp. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 6.1. [12, P.277] Let H be a Hilbert space and $A, B \in \mathbb{B}(H)_+$. The parallel sum of A and B is defined by

$$A : B = A^{1/2}C^*DB^{1/2}.$$

Note that if $A + B$ is M-P invertible, then it is easy to verify that

$$C = \left((A + B)^\dagger\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot A^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{ and } D = \left((A + B)^\dagger\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot B^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

so in this case we have $A^{1/2}C^*DB^{1/2} = A(A + B)^\dagger B$. Thus, the term of the parallel sum $A : B$ is generalized for positive operators A and B without any restrictions on $\mathcal{R}(A + B)$. The proposition below indicates that the same is not true in the Hilbert C^* -module case.

Proposition 6.2. *There exist a Hilbert C^* -module H and $A, B \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})_+$ such that the operator equation*

$$A^{1/2} = (A + B)^{1/2}X, \quad X \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}) \quad (6.3)$$

has no solution.

Proof. Let E be any countably infinite-dimensional Hilbert space and let $\mathbb{B}(E)$ (resp. $\mathbb{C}(E)$) be the set of all bounded (resp. compact) linear operators on E . Given any orthogonal normalized basis $\{e_n | n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ for E , let $A_1, B_1 \in \mathbb{C}(E)$ be defined by

$$A_1(e_{2n-1}) = \frac{e_{2n-1}}{2n-1} \text{ and } A_1(e_{2n}) = 0, \quad (6.4)$$

$$B_1(e_{2n-1}) = 0 \text{ and } B_1(e_{2n}) = \frac{e_{2n}}{2n} \quad (6.5)$$

for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\mathfrak{A} = \mathbb{C}(E) \dot{+} \mathbb{C}I$, where I is the identity operator on E . Then \mathfrak{A} is a unital C^* -algebra, which itself is a Hilbert \mathfrak{A} -module with the inner product given by

$$\langle X, Y \rangle = X^*Y \text{ for any } X, Y \in \mathfrak{A}. \quad (6.6)$$

Given any $a \in \mathfrak{A}$, let $L_a : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ be the left regular representation defined by $L_a(x) = ax$ for any $x \in \mathfrak{A}$. Then clearly, $L_a \in \mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{A})$ such that $(L_a)^* = L_{a^*}$. Conversely, given any $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{A})$, if we put $a = T(I) \in \mathfrak{A}$, then by (2.2) we have $T(x) = T(I \cdot x) = T(I)x = ax = L_a(x)$ for any $x \in \mathfrak{A}$. It follows that $\mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{A}) \cong \mathfrak{A}$ via left regular representation.

Now let $A = L_{A_1}$ and $B = L_{B_1}$, where A_1 and B_1 are defined by (6.4) and (6.5), respectively. It is obvious that $A, B \in \mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{A})_+$ such that

$$A^{\frac{1}{2}} = L_{A_1^{\frac{1}{2}}} \text{ and } (A + B)^{\frac{1}{2}} = L_{(A_1 + B_1)^{\frac{1}{2}}}. \quad (6.7)$$

In what follows, we show that Eq. (6.3) is unsolvable for such A and B .

Suppose on the contrary that there exists $C_1 = D_1 + \lambda I \in \mathfrak{A}$ with $D_1 \in \mathbb{C}(E)$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $A^{1/2} = (A + B)^{1/2} L_{C_1}$. In view of (6.7) we obtain

$$A_1^{1/2} = (A_1 + B_1)^{1/2} (D_1 + \lambda I). \quad (6.8)$$

We may combine (6.4) and (6.5) with (6.8) to get

$$D_1 + \lambda I = P, \quad (6.9)$$

where P is the projection from E onto the closed linear span of $\{e_1, e_3, \dots\}$. Since $P = P^*$, by (6.9) we have

$$D_1 - D_1^* = (\bar{\lambda} - \lambda)I \in \mathbb{C}(E),$$

which happens only if $\lambda = \bar{\lambda}$. Similarly, the equation $P = P^2$ gives $\lambda = 0$ or $\lambda = 1$. If $\lambda = 0$, then from (6.9) we have $P = D_1 \in \mathbb{C}(E)$, which is a contradiction since $\dim(\mathcal{R}(P)) = +\infty$. If on the other hand $\lambda = 1$, then $I - P = -D_1 \in \mathbb{C}(E)$, which is also a contradiction. \square

References

- [1] W. N. Anderson, Jr., Shorted operators, SIAM J. Appl. Math. 20 (1971), 520–525.
- [2] W. N. Anderson, Jr. and R. J. Duffin, Series and parallel addition of matrices, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 26 (1969), 576–594.
- [3] W. N. Anderson, Jr. and M. Schreiber, The infimum of two projections, Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) 33 (1972), 165–168.

- [4] W. N. Anderson, Jr. and G. E. Trapp, Shorted operators II, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* 28 (1975), 60–71.
- [5] T. Ando and T. Hayashi, A characterization of the operator-valued triangle equality, *J. Operator Theory* 58 (2007), 463–468.
- [6] J. Antezana, G. Corach, and D. Stojanoff, Bilateral shorted operators and parallel sums, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 2006 (414), 570–588.
- [7] P. Berkics, On parallel sum of matrices, *Linear Multilinear Algebra.* 65 (2017), 2114–2123.
- [8] C. A. Butler and T. D. Morley, A note on the shorted operator, *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.* 9 (1988), 147–155.
- [9] M. S. Djikić, Extensions of the Fill-Fishkind formula and the infimum-parallel sum relation, *Linear Multilinear Algebra.* 64 (2015), 2335–2349.
- [10] R. Douglas, On majorization, factorization, and range inclusion of operators on Hilbert spaces, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 17 (1966), 413–415.
- [11] X. Fang, M. S. Moslehian and Q. Xu, On majorization and range inclusion of operators on Hilbert C^* -modules, *Linear Multilinear Algebra.*, to appear
- [12] P. A. Fillmore and J. P. Williams, On operator ranges, *Adv. Math.* 7 (1971), 254C281.
- [13] E. C. Lance, *Hilbert C^* -modules—A toolkit for operator algebraists*, Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- [14] S. K. Mitra and P. L. Odell, On parallel summability of matrices, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 74 (1986), 239–255.
- [15] T. D. Morley, An alternative approach to the parallel sum, *Adv. Appl. Math.* 10 (1989), 358–369.
- [16] G. K. Pedersen, *C^* -algebras and their automorphism groups* (London Math. Soc. Monographs 14), Academic Press, 1979.
- [17] N. E. Wegge-Olsen, *K -theory and C^* -algebras: A friendly approach*, Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, England, 1993.
- [18] Q. Xu and X. Fang, A note on majorization and range inclusion of adjointable operators on Hilbert C^* -modules, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 516 (2017), 118–125.

- [19] Q. Xu, Y. Chen and C. Song, Representations for weighted Moore-Penrose inverses of partitioned adjointable operators, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 438 (2013), 10–30.
- [20] Q. Xu and L. Sheng, Positive semi-definite matrices of adjointable operators on Hilbert C^* -modules, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 428 (2008), 992–1000.
- [21] Q. Xu, L. Sheng and Y. Gu, The solutions to some operator equations, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 429 (2008), 1997–2024.
- [22] Q. Xu, Y. Wei and Y. Gu, Sharp norm-estimations for Moore-Penrose inverses of stable perturbations of Hilbert C^* -module operators, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 47 (2010), 4735–4758.
- [23] Q. Xu and X. Zhang, The generalized inverses $A_{T,S}^{(1,2)}$ of the adjointable operators on the Hilbert C^* -modules, *J. Korean Math. Soc.* 47 (2010), 363–372.