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Abstract. Let $H$ be a complex Hilbert space and let $F_s(H)$ be the real vector space formed by all self-adjoint finite rank operators on $H$. We prove the following non-injective version of Wigner’s theorem: every linear operator on $F_s(H)$ sending rank one projections to rank one projections (without any additional assumption) is induced by a linear or conjugate-linear isometry or it is constant on the set of rank one projections.

1. Introduction

Wigner’s theorem plays an important role in mathematical foundations of quantum mechanics. Pure states of a quantum mechanical system are identified with rank one projections (see, for example, [21]) and Wigner’s theorem [22] characterizes all symmetries of the space of pure states as unitary and anti-unitary operators. We present a non-injective version of this result in terms of linear operators on the real vector space of self-adjoint finite rank operators which send rank one projections to rank one projections.

Let $H$ be a complex Hilbert space. For every natural $k < \dim H$ we denote by $P_k(H)$ the set of all rank $k$ projections, i.e. self-adjoint idempotents of rank $k$. Let $F_s(H)$ be the real vector space formed by all self-adjoint finite rank operators on $H$. This vector space is spanned by $P_k(H)$ for every $k$.

Classical Wigner’s theorem says that every bijective transformation of $\mathcal{P}_1(H)$ preserving the angle between the images of any two projections, or equivalently, preserving the trace of the composition of any two projections, is induced by a unitary or anti-unitary operator. The first rigorous proof of this statement was given in [8], see also [20] for the case when $\dim H \geq 3$. By the non-bijective version of this result [2], arbitrary (not necessarily bijective) transformation of $\mathcal{P}_1(H)$ preserving the angles between the images of projections (it is clear that such a transformation is injective) is induced by a linear or conjugate-linear isometry.

Various analogues of Wigner’s theorem for $\mathcal{P}_k(H)$ can be found in [4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 18]. In particular, transformations of $\mathcal{P}_k(H)$ preserving the principal angles between the images of any two projections and transformations preserving the trace of the composition of any two projections (these conditions are not equivalent if $k \neq 1, \dim H - 1$) are determined in [9, 11] and [4], respectively. All such transformations are induced by linear or conjugate-linear isometries, except in the case $\dim H = 2k \geq 4$ when there is an additional class of transformations. The description of transformations preserving the trace of the composition given in [4] is based on the following fact from [21]: every transformation of $\mathcal{P}_k(H)$ preserving the trace of the composition of two projections can be extended to an injective linear
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operator on \( \mathcal{F}_s(H) \). So, there is an intimate relation between Wigner’s type theorems mentioned above and results concerning linear operators sending projections to projections \([1] [16] [17] [19]\). 

Consider a linear operator \( L \) on \( \mathcal{F}_s(H) \) such that

\[
(1) \quad L(\mathcal{P}_k(H)) \subset \mathcal{P}_k(H)
\]

for a certain natural \( k \) such that the restriction of \( L \) to \( \mathcal{P}_k(H) \) is injective. We also assume that \( \dim H \geq 3 \). By \([16]\), this operator is induced by a linear or conjugate-linear isometry if \( \dim H \neq 2k \). In the case when \( \dim H = 2k \), it can be also a composition of an operator induced by a linear or conjugate-linear isometry and an operator which sends any projection on a \( k \)-dimensional subspace \( X \) to the projection on the orthogonal complement \( X^\perp \). This statement is a small generalization of the result obtained in \([1]\). The main result of \([16]\) concerns linear operators sending \( \mathcal{P}_k(H) \) to \( \mathcal{P}_m(H) \), as above, whose restrictions to \( \mathcal{P}_k(H) \) are injective.

In this paper, we determine all possibilities for a linear operator \( L \) on \( \mathcal{F}_s(H) \) satisfying (1) for \( k = 1 \) without any additional assumption. Such an operator is induced by a linear or conjugate-linear isometry or its restriction to \( \mathcal{P}_1(H) \) is constant.

We briefly describe the construction playing a crucial role in our proof. Every projection can be identified with its image. Via this identification, \( \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{C}^2) \) is a complex projective line. Following \([4]\), for any distinct \( P, Q \in \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{C}^2) \) we consider the set of all \( T \in \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{C}^2) \) such that \( P + Q - T \) is a rank one projection. If the images of \( P \) and \( Q \) are orthogonal, then this set coincides with \( \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{C}^2) \); otherwise, we obtain a subset of \( \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{C}^2) \) homeomorphic to a circle, it will be called a small circle on \( \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{C}^2) \). The identity \( \Phi \) defines an isomorphism between the group \( \Phi \) and the Pauli matrices form a basis of \( \mathcal{F}_s(\mathbb{C}^2) \). Consider the linear isomorphism \( \Phi : \mathcal{F}_s(\mathbb{C}^2) \to \mathbb{R}^4 \) defined as

\[
\Phi(x_0\sigma_0 + x_1\sigma_1 + x_2\sigma_2 + x_3\sigma_3) = (x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3).
\]

It transfers \( \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{C}^2) \) to a 2-dimensional sphere and small circles on \( \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{C}^2) \) correspond to small circles on this sphere. Also, \( \Phi \) defines an isomorphism between the group of all transformations of \( \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{C}^2) \) induced by unitary and anti-unitary operators and the group \( O(3) \) (note that this isomorphism sends \( SU(2) \) to \( SO(3) \)). Using these facts, we show that the restriction of any operator \( L \) satisfying (1) for \( k = 1 \) to every complex projective line is constant or a homeomorphism to other complex projective line. Every such homeomorphism preserves the family of small circles which implies that it is induced by a unitary or anti-unitary operator. Some remarks concerning the case when \( k > 1 \) will be given in Section 5.

2. Main result

We investigate linear operators \( L \) on \( \mathcal{F}_s(H) \) satisfying the condition

\[
(2) \quad L(\mathcal{P}_1(H)) \subset \mathcal{P}_1(H).
\]

This holds, for example, for the following two types of operators:

- the operator induced by a linear or conjugate-linear isometry \( U : H \to H \); it sends every \( A \in \mathcal{F}_s(H) \) to \( UAU^* \);
- the operator which transfers every \( A \in \mathcal{F}_s(H) \) to \( \text{tr}(A)P \) for a fixed projection \( P \in \mathcal{P}_1(H) \).

Our main result is the following.
Theorem 1. Every linear operator \( L \) on \( \mathcal{F}_k(H) \) satisfying (2) is of the first or the second type considered above.

3. SMALL CIRCLES ON THE COMPLEX PROJECTIVE LINE

Denote by \( P_X \) the projection whose image is a closed subspace \( X \subset H \). Since \( P_X \) belongs to \( \mathcal{P}_k(H) \) if and only if \( X \) is a \( k \)-dimensional subspace, \( \mathcal{P}_k(H) \) will be identified with the Grassmannian \( \mathcal{G}_k(H) \). For any \( X, Y \in \mathcal{G}_k(H) \) define the set

\[ \chi_k(X, Y) = \{ Z \in \mathcal{G}_k(H) : P_X + P_Y - P_Z \in \mathcal{P}_k(H) \} . \]

The case when \( X = Y \) is trivial, we get the one-element set \( \{ X \} \). Since the image of \( P_X + P_Y \) coincides with \( X + Y \), we have

\[ \chi_k(X, Y) \subset \mathcal{G}_k(X + Y) . \]

The inverse inclusion holds if and only if \( X, Y \) are orthogonal (the existence of orthogonal \( k \)-dimensional subspaces implies that \( \dim H \geq 2k \)). If \( U \) is a unitary or anti-unitary operator on \( H \), then

\[ U[\chi_k(X, Y)] = \chi_k(U(X), U(Y)) . \]

If \( X, Y \) are non-orthogonal elements of \( \mathcal{G}_1(\mathbb{C}^2) \), then \( \chi_1(X, Y) \) is a subset of \( \mathcal{G}_1(\mathbb{C}^2) \) homeomorphic to a circle and we say that \( \chi_1(X, Y) \) is a small circle on \( \mathcal{G}_1(\mathbb{C}^2) \) generated by \( X \) and \( Y \).

Given an orthonormal basis of \( \mathbb{C}^2 \), any element of \( \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{C}^2) \) has a matrix representation

\[ (3) \begin{bmatrix} t & z \\ \bar{z} & 1 - t \end{bmatrix}, \quad |z| = \sqrt{t(1-t)}, \quad t \in [0,1]. \]

The sum of projections \( P, Q \in \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{C}^2) \) is a self-adjoint positive operator of trace 2. Thus, there exists an orthonormal basis of \( \mathbb{C}^2 \), in which \( P + Q \) has a matrix representation

\[ (4) \begin{bmatrix} 2t & 0 \\ 0 & 2(1-t) \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{for some} \quad t \in [0,1] . \]

The projections \( P \) and \( Q \) are distinct if and only if \( t \in (0,1) \) and they are orthogonal if and only if \( t = 1/2 \). Using these observations, we prove the following.

Lemma 1. Let \( X \) and \( Y \) be distinct non-orthogonal elements of \( \mathcal{G}_1(\mathbb{C}^2) \). Let \( \mathcal{B} \) be an orthonormal basis of \( \mathbb{C}^2 \) in which \( P_X + P_Y \) has the matrix representation (3). Then \( t \neq 0,1,1/2 \) and \( Z \in \mathcal{G}_1(\mathbb{C}^2) \) belongs to \( \chi_1(X, Y) \) if and only if \( P_Z \) has the matrix representation (3) according to the basis \( \mathcal{B} \), where \( t \) is the same in both (3) and (4). Also, \( \chi_1(X, Y) \) does not contain a pair of orthogonal elements.

Proof. We have \( t \neq 0,1,1/2 \) by the remark after (4).

Let \( Z \in \mathcal{G}_1(\mathbb{C}^2) \). Then \( P_Z \) has the matrix representation

\[ \begin{bmatrix} s & z \\ \bar{z} & 1 - s \end{bmatrix}, \quad |z| = \sqrt{s(1-s)}, \quad s \in [0,1] \]

in the basis \( \mathcal{B} \), so

\[ P_X + P_Y - P_Z = \begin{bmatrix} 2t - s & -z \\ -\bar{z} & 1 + s - 2t \end{bmatrix} . \]
We have $Z \in \chi_1(X,Y)$ if and only if the rank of this operator equals 1, which is equivalent to

$$(5) \quad (2t-s)(1+s-2t) = s(1-s).$$

An easy calculation shows that $t \neq 1/2$ implies the equivalence of (5) and $s = t$, as desired.

If $X', Y' \in \chi_1(X,Y)$ are orthogonal, then $P_{X'} + P_{Y'}$ is identity which implies that $t = 1/2$, a contradiction. \qed

**Lemma 2.** Let $X$ and $Y$ be as in the previous lemma. Then for any distinct $X', Y' \in \chi_1(X,Y)$ one of the following possibilities is realized:

- $P_{X'} + P_{Y'} = P_X + P_Y$ and $\chi_1(X',Y') = \chi_1(X,Y)$.
- $P_{X'} + P_{Y'} \neq P_X + P_Y$ and $\chi_1(X',Y') \cap \chi_1(X,Y) = \{X', Y'\}$.

**Proof.** It is clear that the equality $P_{X'} + P_{Y'} = P_X + P_Y$ implies that the small circles generated by $X,Y$ and $X',Y'$ are coincident. Assume now that

$$(6) \quad P_{X'} + P_{Y'} \neq P_X + P_Y.$$

As in the previous lemma, we choose an orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{C}^2$ in which $P_X + P_Y$ has the matrix representation (4). By Lemma 1 there exist distinct $w, z \in \mathbb{C}$ satisfying $|w| = |z| = \sqrt{t(1-t)}$, where $t$ is as in (4), and such that

$$P_{X'} = \begin{bmatrix} t & w \\ \overline{w} & 1-t \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad P_{Y'} = \begin{bmatrix} t & z \\ \overline{z} & 1-t \end{bmatrix}.$$  

Similarly, for every $Z \in \chi_1(X,Y)$ there is $\rho \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $|\rho| = \sqrt{t(1-t)}$ and

$$P_Z = \begin{bmatrix} t & \rho \\ \overline{\rho} & 1-t \end{bmatrix}.$$  

Since

$$P_{X'} + P_{Y'} - P_Z = \begin{bmatrix} t & w + z - \rho \\ w + z - \rho & 1-t \end{bmatrix},$$

$Z$ belongs to $\chi_1(X',Y')$ if and only if

$$|w + z - \rho| = \sqrt{t(1-t)}.$$

In other words, $\rho$ belongs to the intersection of the circles of radius $\sqrt{t(1-t)}$ and the centers in 0 and $w + z$. By (6), $w + z \neq 0$ and these circles are distinct. Then they intersect precisely in $z$ and $w$. \qed

**Remark 1.** Let $X'$ and $Y'$ be as in the proof of Lemma 2. Then we have $\chi_1(X',Y') = \chi_1(X,Y)$ if and only if $w + z = 0$.

Let $B$ be an orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{C}^2$ and let $\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3$ be the operators on $\mathbb{C}^2$ with the following matrix representations in this basis

$$\sigma_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \sigma_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \sigma_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \sigma_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}.$$  

Then $\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3$ is a basis of the real vector space $\mathcal{F}_4(\mathbb{C}^2)$. Consider the linear isomorphism $\Phi : \mathcal{F}_4(\mathbb{C}^2) \to \mathbb{R}^4$ defined as

$$\Phi(x_0\sigma_0 + x_1\sigma_1 + x_2\sigma_2 + x_3\sigma_3) = (x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3).$$
Lemma 3. The map of orthogonal transformations of \( SO(3) \) (see, for example, [12, Section 4.2]). Consider the transformation of 

\[ \Phi(x) = \left( \frac{1}{2}, \sqrt{t(1-t)} \cos \alpha, \sqrt{t(1-t)} \sin \alpha, t - \frac{1}{2} \right). \]

Therefore, \( \Phi(P_1(\mathbb{C}^2)) \) coincides with the 2-dimensional sphere 

\[ S^2 = \{(1/2, x_1, x_2, x_3) : x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 = 1/4\}. \]

Lemma 3. The map \( u \mapsto \Phi u \Phi^{-1} \) is an isomorphism between the group of transformations of \( P_1(\mathbb{C}^2) \) induced by unitary and anti-unitary operators and the group of orthogonal transformations of \( S^2 \).

Proof. It is well-known that \( u \mapsto \Phi u \Phi^{-1} \) is an isomorphism between the group of transformations of \( P_1(\mathbb{C}^2) \) induced by unitary operators and the rotation group \( SO(3) \) (see, for example, [12, Section 4.2]). Consider the transformation of \( P_1(\mathbb{C}^2) \) induced by the anti-unitary operator which leaves fixed the vectors of the basis \( B \).

An easy verification shows that it corresponds to a reflection from \( O(3) \). □

Example 1. For any \( t \in [0, 1] \) we denote by \( C_t \) the intersection of \( S^2 \) with the hyperplane \( x_3 = t - 1/2 \). If \( t \neq 0, 1/2, 1 \), then \( \Phi^{-1}(C_t) \) is a small circle on \( G_1(\mathbb{C}^2) \) (see Lemma 3). It is generated by any \( X, Y \in \Phi^{-1}(C_t) \) such that \( \Phi(X) \) and \( \Phi(Y) \) are distant points on \( C_t \), i.e.

\[ \Phi(X) = (1/2, x_1, x_2, t - 1/2) \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi(Y) = (1/2, -x_1, -x_2, t - 1/2) \]

(see Remark 4). Any two distant points \((1/2, x_1, x_2, 0)\) and \((1/2, -x_1, -x_2, 0)\) on the great circle \( C_{1/2} \) correspond to orthogonal elements of \( G_1(\mathbb{C}^2) \). Therefore, \( \Phi^{-1}(C_{1/2}) \) is not a small circle by Lemma 3.

There is a one-to-one correspondence between small circles on \( S^2 \), i.e. spherical sections obtained by hyperplanes which do not pass through the center of \( S^2 \), and small circles on \( G_1(\mathbb{C}^2) \). Lemmas 3 and 4 show that a curve \( C \) on \( G_1(\mathbb{C}^2) \) is a small circle if and only if \( \Phi(C) \) is a small circle on \( S^2 \).

Now, we describe the small circle generated by arbitrary distinct non-orthogonal \( X, Y \in G_1(\mathbb{C}^2) \). Consider the points \( \Phi(X) \) and \( \Phi(Y) \) on \( S^2 \). Let \( O \) be the center of the straight segment between these points and let \( r \) be the distance from \( O \) to each of them. Denote by \( C(X,Y) \) the intersection of \( S^2 \) and the sphere of radius \( r \) and the center \( O \). Then \( C(X,Y) \) passes through both \( \Phi(X), \Phi(Y) \) and it is easy to verify that it coincides with the intersection of \( S^2 \) and the hyperplane through \( O \), whose normal vector is the position vector of \( O \). If \( v \) is an orthogonal transformation, which maps \( O \) to a point on the \( z \)-axis, then \( v \) sends \( C(X,Y) \) to \( C_t \) for some \( t \neq 0, 1/2 \). Then \( v\Phi(X) \) and \( v\Phi(Y) \) are distant points on \( C_t \) and the corresponding elements of \( G_1(\mathbb{C}^2) \) generate the small circle \( \Phi^{-1}(C_t) \). Since \( \Phi^{-1}v\Phi \) is a transformation of \( G_1(\mathbb{C}^2) \) induced by a unitary or anti-unitary operator, \( \Phi^{-1}(C(X,Y)) \) is the small circle on \( G_1(\mathbb{C}^2) \) generated by \( X \) and \( Y \).
4. Proof of Theorem 1

Recall that $L$ is a linear operator on $F_a(H)$ satisfying

$$L(P_1(H)) \subset P_1(H).$$

Denote by $f$ the transformation of $G_1(H)$ induced by $L$, i.e. $L(P_X) = P_{f(X)}$ for all $X \in G_1(H)$.

**Lemma 4.** The following assertions are fulfilled:

1. For any $X, Y \in G_1(H)$ we have

   $$f(\chi_1(X, Y)) \subset \chi_1(f(X), f(Y)).$$

   If $f(X) = f(Y)$, then $f$ is constant on $\chi_1(X, Y)$.

2. $f$ transfers any projective line to a subset of a projective line.

**Proof.** (1). Easy verification.

(2). If $S \in G_2(H)$ and $X, Y \in G_1(S)$ are orthogonal, then $\chi_1(X, Y)$ coincides with $G_1(S)$ and we have

$$f(G_1(S)) \subset \chi_1(f(X), f(Y)) \subset G_1(S').$$

with $S' = f(X) + f(Y)$ if $f(X) \neq f(Y)$, otherwise we take any 2-dimensional subspace $S'$ containing $f(X) = f(Y)$. \hfill \Box

**Lemma 5.** The restriction of $f$ to any projective line is a continuous map to other projective line.

**Proof.** Let $S \in G_2(H)$. The statement is trivial if the restriction of $f$ to $G_1(S)$ is constant. Otherwise, there is a unique $S' \in G_2(H)$ such that

$$f(G_1(S)) \subset G_1(S').$$

Then

$$L(F_a(S)) \subset F_a(S')$$

and the restriction of $L$ to $F_a(S)$ is bounded which guarantees that the restriction of $f$ to $G_1(S)$ is continuous. \hfill \Box

**Lemma 6.** The restriction of $f$ to any projective line is injective or constant.

**Proof.** Let $S \in G_2(H)$. Suppose that the restriction of $f$ to $G_1(S)$ is not injective. By the first part of Lemma 4 there are distinct $X, Y \in G_1(S)$ such that $f$ is constant on $\chi_1(X, Y)$. If $X$ and $Y$ are orthogonal, then $\chi_1(X, Y)$ coincides with $G_1(S)$ and $f$ is constant on our projective line.

From this moment, we suppose that $X$ and $Y$ are non-orthogonal. Then $\chi_1(X, Y)$ is a small circle on the complex projective line $G_1(S)$.

According the previous section, $G_1(S)$ is identified with the sphere $S^2$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $\chi_1(X, Y)$ corresponds to $C_t$ with $t \neq 0, 1, 1/2$. So, we consider the restriction of $f$ to $G_1(S)$ as a transformation $g$ of $S^2$ and suppose that there is $a \in S^2$ such that $g(C_t) = a$ for certain $t \neq 0, 1, 1/2$. By Lemma 5 $g$ is continuous.

Let $I = (0, 1/2) \cup (1/2, 1)$. Denote by $J$ the set of all $t \in I$ such that $g(C_t) = a$. This set is non-empty (by our assumption) and $J$ is closed in $I$ (since $g$ is continuous). We next show that $J$ is open in $I$.

Let $t \in J$ and let $x$ be a point on $C_t$. We take distant points $z, z' \in C_t$ at the same distance from $x$ and denote by $C$ the connected component of $C_t \setminus \{z, z'\}$
containing \( x \). See Fig. 1. For each \( y \in C \) there is a unique \( y' \in C \) such that the center of the straight segment between \( y \) and \( y' \) is on the line joining \( x \) with the center of \( C_t \). Let \( o \) be the center of this segment and let \( r \) be the distance from \( o \) to \( y, y' \). Denote by \( C(y) \) the circle on \( S^2 \) with radius \( r \) and the center \( o \). Let \( \frac{1}{2}C \) be one of the connected components of \( C \setminus \{x\} \). We add the point \( x \) to the union of all \( C(y), y \in \frac{1}{2}C \) and get an open subset \( U(x) \) of \( S^2 \) which contains \( x \).
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**Figure 1.**

By Section 3, each \( C(y) \) corresponds to the small circle on \( \mathcal{G}_1(S) \) generated by \( \Phi^{-1}(y) \) and \( \Phi^{-1}(y') \). Since \( y, y' \in C_t \) and \( t \in J \), we have \( g(y) = g(y') = a \) and the first part of Lemma 4 implies that \( g(C(y)) = a \) for every \( y \in \frac{1}{2}C \). Therefore, \( g(U(x)) = a \) for each \( x \in C_t \). Observe that \( \cup_{x \in C_t} U(x) \) is an open neighborhood of \( C_t \) in \( S^2 \), so it contains \( C_t \) whenever \( |t-t'| \) is sufficiently small.

So, \( J \) is an open-closed subset of \( I \). Then one of the following possibilities is realized:

- \( J = I \),
- \( J = (0, 1/2) \) or \( J = (1/2, 1) \).

In the first case, \( g \) is constant on \( S^2 \) as a continuous map; consequently, the restriction of \( f \) to \( \mathcal{G}_1(S) \) is constant.

In the second case, we have \( g(C_{1/2}) = a \). Since \( C_{1/2} \) contains antipodal points of \( S^2 \) and any pair of such points corresponds to a pair of orthogonal elements of \( \mathcal{G}_1(S) \), there exist orthogonal \( X, Y \in \mathcal{G}_1(S) \) such that \( f(X) = f(Y) \), i.e. the restriction of \( f \) to \( \mathcal{G}_1(S) \) is constant again.

**Lemma 7.** If the restriction of \( f \) to a projective line is non-constant, then it is a homeomorphism to a projective line which preserves the family of small circles and the orthogonality relation in both directions.

**Proof.** Suppose that \( S \in \mathcal{G}_2(H) \) and the restriction of \( f \) to \( \mathcal{G}_1(S) \) is non-constant. By Lemma 4 this restriction is injective and there is a unique \( S' \in \mathcal{G}_2(H) \) such that \( f(\mathcal{G}_1(S)) \) is contained in \( \mathcal{G}_1(S') \). Since \( \mathcal{G}_1(S) \) is compact and the restriction is continuous, this is a homeomorphism to \( f(\mathcal{G}_1(S)) \). Then \( f(\mathcal{G}_1(S)) \) is an open-closed subset of \( \mathcal{G}_1(S') \) which implies that

\[
f(\mathcal{G}_1(S)) = \mathcal{G}_1(S')
\]

(by connectedness). Then \( L(F_n(S)) = F_n(S') \) and it is easy to see that

\[
f(\chi_1(X, Y)) = \chi_1(f(X), f(Y))
\]
for any \(X, Y \in \mathcal{G}_1(S)\). The orthogonality relation is preserved in both directions, since \(X, Y\) are orthogonal if and only if \(\chi_1(X, Y)\) coincides with \(\mathcal{G}_1(S)\).

\[\square\]

**Proof of Theorem 1 for the case when \(\dim H = 2\).** If \(f\) is constant, then there is \(Y \in \mathcal{G}_1(H)\) such that \(f(X) = Y\) for all \(X \in \mathcal{G}_1(H)\) and we have \(L(P_X) = P_Y\) for all \(X \in \mathcal{G}_1(H)\) which implies that \(L(A) = \text{tr}(A)P_Y\) for every \(A \in \mathcal{F}_s(H)\) (since \(\mathcal{F}_s(H)\) is spanned by \(\mathcal{P}_1(H)\)).

In the case when \(f\) is non-constant, we identify \(f\) with a homeomorphism \(g\) of \(\mathbb{S}^2\) to itself. This homeomorphism preserves in both directions the family of small circles and the relation to be antipodal for pairs of points (recall that there is a one-to-one correspondence between pairs of antipodal points on \(\mathbb{S}^2\) and pairs of orthogonal elements of \(\mathcal{G}_1(H)\)). We consider a great circle on \(\mathbb{S}^2\) as the limit of a sequence of small circles and establish that \(g\) preserves the family of great circles in both directions. There is an orthogonal transformation \(s\) such that \(sg\) leaves fixed a pair of antipodal points. Then \(sg\) can be identified with a Möbius or conjugate Möbius transformation on \(\mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}\) which leaves fixed 0 and \(\infty\), i.e., a transformation of type \(z \mapsto az\) or \(z \mapsto az^2\) for some \(a \in \mathbb{C}\). It sends any circle \(|z| = r\) to a circle \(|z| = |a|r\) and only one such circle corresponds to a great circle on \(\mathbb{S}^2\). Since this circle is preserved by \(sg\), we have \(|a| = 1\), yielding that \(sg\) is orthogonal. Then \(g\) is orthogonal and \(f\) is induced by a unitary or anti-unitary operator \(U\) on \(H\). Therefore, \(L(P) = UPU^*\) for every \(P \in \mathcal{P}_1(H)\) which implies that \(L(A) = UAU^*\) for all \(A \in \mathcal{F}_s(H)\).

\[\square\]

**Remark 2.** Suppose that \(\dim H \geq 3\) and \(f\) transfers \(\mathcal{G}_1(S)\) to \(\mathcal{G}_1(S')\) for some \(S, S' \in \mathcal{G}_2(H)\). The above arguments show that the restriction of \(f\) to \(\mathcal{G}_1(S)\) is induces by a unitary or anti-unitary operator \(U : S \to S'\).

From this moment, we assume that \(\dim H \geq 3\). If \(f\) is constant, then, as for the case when \(\dim H = 2\), we establish the existence of \(P \in \mathcal{P}_1(H)\) such that \(L(A) = \text{tr}(A)P\) for all \(A \in \mathcal{F}_s(H)\).

**Lemma 8.** If \(\dim H \geq 3\) and \(f\) is non-constant, then the image \(f(\mathcal{G}_1(H))\) is not contained in a projective line.

**Proof.** Suppose that \(f(\mathcal{G}_1(H)) \subset \mathcal{G}_1(S)\) for a certain \(S \in \mathcal{G}_2(H)\). If \(f\) is constant on every projective line of \(\mathcal{G}_1(H)\), then it is constant (since for any pair of projective lines there is a projective line intersecting each of these lines). Therefore, \(f\) is non-constant on some projective lines and the image of every such line is \(\mathcal{G}_1(S)\). We take any 3-dimensional subspace \(T \subset H\) such that \(f(\mathcal{G}_1(T)) = \mathcal{G}_1(S)\), i.e., \(f\) is non-constant on some of these projective lines contained in \(\mathcal{G}_1(T)\).

If \(X, Y, Z \in \mathcal{G}_1(T)\) are mutually orthogonal, then \(P_X + P_Y + P_Z = \text{Id}_T\) and

\[P_{f(X)} + P_{f(Y)} + P_{f(Z)} = L(\text{Id}_T).\]

We have \(f(X) = f(Y)\) or \(f(X), f(Y)\) are orthogonal elements of \(\mathcal{G}_1(S)\) and the same holds for the pairs \(X, Z\) and \(Y, Z\). If \(f(X) = f(Y) = f(Z)\), then \(f\) is constant on any projective line contained in \(\mathcal{G}_1(T)\) which contradicts our assumption; in the case when \(f(X), f(Y), f(Z)\) are mutually distinct, we get three mutually orthogonal elements of \(\mathcal{G}_1(S)\) which is impossible. Therefore, only two elements from \(f(X), f(Y), f(Z)\) are distinct. If \(f(Y) \neq f(Z)\), then \(P_{f(Y)} + P_{f(Z)} = \text{Id}_S\) and

\[P_{f(X)} = L(\text{Id}_T) - \text{Id}_S\]
which means that
\[ L(\text{Id}_T) - \text{Id}_S = P_{X_0} \]
for a certain \( X_0 \in G_1(S) \).

The above arguments show that for \( X \in G_1(T) \) the equality \( f(X) = X_0 \) holds if and only if the restriction of \( f \) to the projective line \( G_1(T \cap X^\perp) \) is injective. Also, for every \( N \in G_2(T) \) one of the following possibilities is realized:

1. \( f(G_1(N)) = X_0 \),
2. the restriction of \( f \) to \( G_1(N) \) is injective.

We denote by \( \mathcal{X}_1 \) and \( \mathcal{X}_2 \) the sets consisting of all \( N \in G_2(T) \) satisfying (1) and (2), respectively. Since the restriction of \( f \) to \( G_1(T) \) is continuous (see the proof of Lemma 5), \( \mathcal{X}_1 \) is a closed subset of \( G_2(T) \), i.e. \( \mathcal{X}_2 \) is open in \( G_2(T) \).

All \( X \in G_1(T) \) satisfying \( f(X) = X_0 \) form a closed subset of \( G_1(T) \). The orthocomplementation map \( X \to T \cap X^\perp \) sends this subset onto \( \mathcal{X}_2 \). This implies that \( \mathcal{X}_2 \) is closed in \( G_2(T) \) (since the orthocomplementation map is a homeomorphism between \( G_1(T) \) and \( G_2(T) \)). So, \( \mathcal{X}_2 \) is a non-empty open-closed subset of \( G_2(T) \). Therefore, \( \mathcal{X}_2 = G_2(T) \) and \( f \) transfers every projective line of \( G_1(T) \) to \( G_1(S) \). Then there are distinct \( X, Y \in G_1(T) \) such that \( f(X) = f(Y) \), i.e. \( f \) is non-injective on the projective line containing \( X, Y \) and we get a contradiction. \( \square \)

To complete the proof of Theorem 1, we use a modification of the Fundamental Theorem of Projective Geometry \([3, 7]\). A map \( U : H \to H \) is called semilinear if
\[ U(x + y) = U(x) + U(y) \]
for all \( x, y \in H \) and there is an endomorphism \( \sigma \) of the field \( \mathbb{C} \) (not necessarily surjective) such that
\[ U(ax) = \sigma(a)U(x) \]
for all \( a \in \mathbb{C} \) and \( x \in H \). Every semilinear injective transformation of \( H \) induces a transformation of \( G_1(H) \) which sends projective lines to subsets of projective lines.

**Theorem 2.** Let \( \dim H \geq 3 \) and \( g \) be a transformation of \( G_1(H) \) which sends projective lines to subsets of projective lines and satisfies the following conditions:

1. the restriction of \( g \) to every projective line is injective or constant,
2. the image \( g(G_1(H)) \) is not contained in a projective line.

Then \( g \) is induced by a semilinear injective transformation of \( H \).

**Remark 3.** There are transformations of \( G_1(H) \) which send projective lines to subsets of projective lines, but their restrictions on some lines are non-injective and non-constant. Such transformations are not induced by semilinear transformations of \( H \). See \([13]\) Example 2.3.

**Proof of Theorem 1 for the case when \( \dim H \geq 3 \).** Suppose that \( f \) is non-constant. By Lemma 5 the image \( f(G_1(H)) \) is not contained in a projective line. Therefore, \( f \) satisfies the condition of Theorem 2 i.e. it is induced by a semilinear injection \( U : H \to H \). It follows from Remark 2 that the associated endomorphism of \( \mathbb{C} \) is identity or the conjugation map, i.e. \( U \) is a linear or conjugate-linear injective operator on \( H \). So, \( f \) is injective and \( U \) sends orthogonal vectors to orthogonal vectors which guarantees that \( U \) is a linear or conjugate-linear isometry. Then we have \( L(A) = UAU^* \) for every \( A \in F_s(H) \). \( \square \)
5. Final remarks

Consider a linear operator $L$ on $F_s(H)$ satisfying

$$L(P_k(H)) \subset P_k(H)$$

for a certain $k \geq 1$. As above, $L$ induces a transformation $f$ of $G_k(H)$ which is not necessarily injective. The general case can be reduced to the case when $\dim H \geq 2k$.

For subspaces $M$ and $N$ satisfying $\dim M < k < \dim N$ and $M \subset N$ we denote by $[M,N]_k$ the set of all $k$-dimensional subspaces $X$ such that $M \subset X \subset N$. For any $X, Y \in G_k(H)$ we have

$$\chi_k(X,Y) \subset [X \cap Y, X + Y]_k$$

and the inverse inclusion holds if and only if $X, Y$ are compatible, i.e. there is an orthonormal basis of $H$ such that $X$ and $Y$ are spanned by subsets of this basis. If $X$ and $Y$ are orthogonal, then $\chi_k(X,Y) = G_k(X + Y)$ and

$$f(G_k(X + Y)) \subset \chi_k(f(X), f(Y)) \subset G_k(f(X) + f(Y)).$$

As in the proof of Lemma 5, we show that for any $(2k)$-dimensional subspace $S \subset H$ the restriction of $f$ to $G_k(S)$ is continuous. In the case when $k = 1$, the restriction of $f$ to any projective line is a continuous map to a projective line.

In the general case, a line of $G_k(H)$ is a subset of type $[M,N]_k$, where $M$ is a $(k-1)$-dimensional subspace contained a $(k+1)$-dimensional subspace $N$. This line can be identified with the line of $G_1(M^\perp)$ associated to the 2-dimensional subspace $N \cap M^\perp$. Two distinct $k$-dimensional subspaces are contained in a common line if and only if they are adjacent, i.e. their intersection is $(k-1)$-dimensional. If $X, Y \in G_k(H)$ are adjacent, then the line containing them is $[X \cap Y, X + Y]_k$. It was noted above that this line coincides with $\chi_k(X,Y)$ only in the case when $X$ and $Y$ are compatible. If $X$ and $Y$ are non-compatible, then $\chi_k(X,Y)$ is a subset of the line $[X \cap Y, X + Y]_k$ homeomorphic to a circle.

For every line there is a $(2k)$-dimensional subspace $S$ such that $G_k(S)$ contains this line, i.e. the restriction of $f$ to each line is continuous. Using the arguments from the proof of Lemma 6 we establish that the restriction of $f$ to every line is injective or constant; but we are not able to show that $f$ sends lines to subsets of lines.

On the other hand, if $f$ is injective, then it is adjacency and orthogonality preserving (see [11, 12, 16] for the details). By [15], this immediately implies that $f$ is induced by a linear or conjugate-linear isometry if $\dim H > 2k$ and there is one other option for $f$ if $\dim H = 2k$.
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