The minimal and maximal symmetries for $J$-contractive projections
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1 Introduction

Let $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{K}$ be separable complex Hilbert spaces and $B(\mathcal{H})$ ($B(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$) be the set of all bounded linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$ (from $\mathcal{H}$ to $\mathcal{K}$). For an operator $A \in B(\mathcal{H})$, the adjoint of $A$ is denoted by $A^*$ and $A$ is called a self-adjoint operator if $A = A^*$. We write $A \geq 0$ if $A$ is a positive operator, meaning $\langle Ax, x \rangle \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathcal{H}$. As usual, the operator order (Loewner partial order) relation $A \geq B$ between two self-adjoint operators is defined as $A - B \geq 0$. Also, denote by $B(\mathcal{H})^+$ the set of all positive bounded linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$. If $A \in B(\mathcal{H})^+$ then $\frac{A^2}{2}$ denotes the positive square root of $A$. Let $A^+$ and $A^-$ be the positive and negative parts of a self-adjoint operator $A$, that is, $A^+ := \frac{|A| + A}{2}$ and $A^- := \frac{|A| - A}{2}$.

For an operator $T \in B(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$, $N(T), R(T)$ and $\overline{R(T)}$ denote the null space, the range of $T$, and the closure of $R(T)$, respectively. An operator $J \in B(\mathcal{H})$ is said to be a symmetry (or self-adjoint involution) if $J = J^* = J^{-1}$. In this case, $J^+ = \frac{I+J}{2}$ and $J^- = \frac{I-J}{2}$ are mutually annihilating orthogonal projections. If $J$ is a non-scalar symmetry, then an indefinite inner product is defined by $[x, y] := \langle Jx, y \rangle$ $(x, y \in \mathcal{H})$.
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and \((\mathcal{H}, J)\) is called a Krein space ([1]).

Let us denote by \(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{id}\) the set of all bounded projections (=idempotents) of \(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})\). A projection \(P \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{id}\) is said to be \(J\)-projection if \(P = JP^*J\). In particular, a projection \(P\) is called \(J\)-positive (or \(J\)-negative) projection if \(JP \geq 0\) (or \(JP \leq 0\)). And \(P \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{id}\) is said to be \(J\)-contractive (or expansive) projection if \(P^*JP \leq J\) (or \(P^*JP \geq J\)). Also, \(P_M\) denotes the orthogonal projection onto \(M\), where \(M\) is a closed subspace of \(\mathcal{H}\). Particularly, we use \(P_A\) to represent the orthogonal projection onto \(R(A)\) and \(P_A^\perp := I - P_A\). Furthermore, \(A \simeq B\) means that the operators \(A\) and \(B\) are unitarily equivalent, that is \(A = UBU^*\), for some unitary operators \(U\).

It is well-known that an operator \(P \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{id}\) can be written as a \(2 \times 2\) operator matrix:

\[
P = \begin{pmatrix} I & P_1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} : R(P) \oplus R(P)^\perp,
\]

(1.1)

where \(P_1 \in \mathcal{B}(R(P)^\perp, R(P))\). In recent years, the existence of \(J\)-positive (negative, contractive, expansive) projections and its properties are considered in [6,7,8]. And some geometry and topological properties of projections and decomposition properties of \(J\)-projections were studied in [3,5,9-13]. In particular, an exposition of operators in Krein spaces can be found in the lecture by T. Ando [1].

In this note, we firstly consider the structures of symmetries \(J\) such that a projection \(P\) is \(J\)-contractive. In particular, the minimal and maximal elements of the symmetries \(J\) with \(P^*JP \leq J\) (or \(JP \geq 0\)) are given. That is

\[
\min\{J : P^*JP \leq J, J = J^* = J^{-1}\} = 2P_{(P_+P_-)^-} - I + 2P_{N(P_+P_-)},
\]

\[
\max\{J : P^*JP \leq J, J = J^* = J^{-1}\} = 2P_{(P_+P_-)^-} - I + 2P_{N(P_-P_+)}
\]

and

\[
\max\{J : JP \geq 0, J = J^* = J^{-1}\} = 2P_{(P_+P_-)^+} - I + 2P_{N(P_+P_-)}.
\]

Moreover, some formulas between \(P_{(2I-P_+P_-)^+}\) \((P_{(2I-P_+P_-)^-}\)\) and \(P_{(P_+P_-)^-}\) \((P_{P_+P_-})\) are established.

2 Main results

It is well known that every operator \(T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})\) has a (unique) polar decomposition \(T = U(T^*T)^{1/2}\), where \(U\) is a partial isometry with kernel space \(N(T)\) ([4]). The following lemmas are needed and their proofs can be found in [8].

**Lemma 1.** ([8, Corollary 11]) Let \(P \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{H})\) and \(S = \begin{pmatrix} I & P \\ P^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} : \mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{K}\). Then

\[
P_{S^-} = \begin{pmatrix} I - T^{-1} & -T^{-1}P \\ -P^*T^{-1} & -P^*T^{-1}V(U+T^{-1}W) \end{pmatrix} : \mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{K},
\]

where \(T = (I + 4PP^*)^{1/2}\) and \(V\) is the unique partial isometry such that \(P^* = V(PP^*)^{1/2}\) with \(R(V) = R(P^*)\) and \(R(V^*) = R(P)\).
Lemma 2. ([8, Lemma 13]) Let \( P \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) have the form (1.1). If \( J \) is a symmetry, then \( P \) is a \( J \)-projection if and only if \( J \) has the operator matrix

\[
J = \begin{pmatrix}
J_1(I + P_1 P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} & J_1(I + P_1 P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} P_1 \\
J_2(I + P_1 P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} J_1 & J_2(I + P_1 P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}}
\end{pmatrix} : R(P) \oplus R(P) = \perp, \tag{2.1}
\]

where \( J_1 \) and \( J_2 \) are symmetries on the subspaces \( R(P) \) and \( R(P) = \perp \), respectively, satisfying \( J_1 P_1 + P_1 J_2 = 0 \).

Lemma 3. ([8, Corollary 14]) Let \( P \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) have the form (1.1). If \( J \) is a symmetry, then \( JP \geq 0 \) if and only if

\[
J = \begin{pmatrix}
(I + P_1 P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} & (I + P_1 P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} P_1 \\
J_1(I + P_1 P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} J_1 & J_2(I + P_1 P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}}
\end{pmatrix} : R(P) \oplus R(P) = \perp, \tag{2.2}
\]

where \( J_2 \) is a symmetry on the subspace \( R(P) = \perp \) with \( P_1 = -P_1 J_2 \).

Lemma 4. ([8, Theorem 15]) Let \( P \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \). Then

\[
\min \{ J : JP \geq 0, \, J = J^* = J^{-1} \} = 2P_{(P+P^*)+} - I, \tag{2.3}
\]

where the “\( \min \)” is in the sense of Loewner partial order.

In what follows, we give a new characterization for symmetry \( J \) with \( P^* JP \leq J \).

Lemma 5. Let \( P \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) have the form (1.1). If \( J \) is a symmetry, then \( P^* JP \leq J \) if and only if

\[
J = \begin{pmatrix}
J_{11} & J_{12} \\
J_{12}^* & J_{22}
\end{pmatrix} : R(P) \oplus R(P) = \perp, \tag{2.4}
\]

where \( J_1 \in \mathcal{B}(R(P)) \) is a symmetry with \( J_1 P_1 + P_1 = 0 \).

Proof. Necessity. We assume

\[
J = \begin{pmatrix}
J_{11} & J_{12} \\
J_{12}^* & J_{22}
\end{pmatrix} : R(P) \oplus R(P) = \perp,
\]

where \( J_{11} \) and \( J_{22} \) are self-adjoint operators. The equation of \( J = J^* = J^{-1} \) implies that

\[
\begin{align*}
J_{11}^2 + J_{12} J_{12}^* &= I \quad \text{(1)} \\
J_{11} J_{12} + J_{12} J_{22} &= 0 \quad \text{(2)} \\
J_{12} J_{12} + J_{22}^2 &= J \quad \text{(3)}
\end{align*}
\tag{2.5}
\]

On the other hand, a direct calculation shows that the inequality \( P^* JP \leq J \) yields

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
J_{11} & J_{12} P_1 \\
P_1 J_{11} & P_1 J_{11} P_1
\end{pmatrix} \leq \begin{pmatrix}
J_{11} & J_{12} \\
J_{12}^* & J_{22}
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

Thus

\[
J_{22} \geq P_1 J_{11} P_1 \quad \text{and} \quad J_{12} = J_{11} P_1. \tag{2.6}
\]

Using equations (1) of (2.5) and (2.6), we have

\[
J_{11}(I + P_1 P_1^*) J_{11} = I,
\]
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which yields that \( J_{11} \) is invertible on the subspace \( R(P) \) and \( J_{11}^2 = (I + P_1 P_1^*)^{-1} \).

Setting \( J_1 := J_{11}(J_{11}^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \), we easily verify that \( J_1 = J_1^* = J_1^{-1} \) and

\[
J_{11} = J_1(I + P_1 P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{2.7}
\]

Also, equations (3) of (2.5) and (2.6) imply

\[
J_{22}^2 = I - P_1^* J_{11}^2 P_1 = I - P_1^* (I + P_1^* P_1)^{-1} = I - (I + P_1^* P_1)^{-1}_1 \cdot P_1 = (I + P_1^* P_1)^{-1}.
\]

By equations (2) of (2.5) and (2.6), it follows that \( J_{11}^2 P_1 + J_{11} P_1 J_{22} = 0 \), so

\[
J_{11} P_1 + P_1 J_{22} = 0,
\]

which induces \( P_1^* J_{11} P_1 = - P_1^* P_1 J_{22} \). Thus inequality \( J_{22} - P_1^* J_{11} P_1 \geq 0 \) implies

\[
(I + P_1^* P_1) J_{22} \geq 0,
\]

which yields

\[
(I + P_1^* P_1) J_{22} = (I + P_1^* P_1)^{\frac{1}{2}} J_{22} (I + P_1^* P_1)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\]

Then \( J_{22} \geq 0 \), so

\[
J_{22} = (I + P_1^* P_1)^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{2.8}
\]

Moreover, using equations (2) of (2.5) and (2.6)-(2.8), we get that

\[
(J_1 P_1 + P_1)(I + P_1^* P_1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} = J_{11} P_1 + P_1 J_{22} = 0,
\]

that is \( J_1 P_1 + P_1 = 0 \).

Sufficiency is clear from a direct calculation. \( \square \)

**Lemma 6.** Let \( P \in B(\mathcal{H})^{Id} \) have the form (1.1). Then

(i) \( N(P + P^*) = 0 \oplus N(P_1) \).

(ii) \( N(P - P^*) = N(P_1^* \oplus N(P_1) \).

**Proof.** (i) Clearly,

\[
P + P^* = \begin{pmatrix} 2I & P_1 \\ P_1^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} : R(P) \oplus R(P)^{\perp}. \tag{2.9}
\]

Let \( x \in R(P), y \in R(P)^{\perp} \) satisfy \((P + P^*)(x \oplus y) = 0\). Then

\[
2x + P_1 y = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad P_1^* x = 0.
\]

So \( P_1^* P_1 y = -2P_1^* x = 0 \), which implies that \( y \in N(P_1) \) and \( x = 0 \). That is

\[
N(P + P^*) \subseteq 0 \oplus N(P_1).
\]

Another inclusion relation \( 0 \oplus N(P_1) \subseteq N(P + P^*) \) is obvious. Thus

\[
N(P + P^*) = 0 \oplus N(P_1).
\]

(ii) Obviously,

\[
P - P^* = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & P_1 \\ -P_1^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} : R(P) \oplus R(P)^{\perp}.
\]
Let $x \in R(P)$ and $y \in R(P)^\perp$. Then $(P - P^*)(x \oplus y) = 0$ if and only if

$$P_1y = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad P_1^*x = 0,$$

which yields $x \in N(P_1^*)$ and $y \in N(P_1)$. Hence

$$N(P - P^*) = N(P_1^*) \oplus N(P_1).$$

\[ \square \]

The following is our main result.

**Theorem 7.** Let $P \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^{id}$. Then

(i) $\min\{J : P^*JP \leq J, J = J^* = J^{-1}\} = 2P_{(P+P^*)} - I + 2P_{N(P+P^*)}$.

(ii) $\max\{J : P^*JP \leq J, J = J^* = J^{-1}\} = 2P_{(P+P^*)} - I + 2P_{N(P-P^*)}$,

where the “min” and “max” are in the sense of Loewner partial order.

**Proof.** (i) Suppose that $P$ has the matrix form (1.1). Then by Lemma 1, we get that

$$P_{(P+P^*)} = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} I - T^{-1} & -T^{-1}P_1 \\ -P_1^*T^{-1} & V(I + T^{-1})V^* \end{pmatrix}: R(P) \oplus R(P)^\perp.$$

where $T = (I + P_1P_1^*)^\frac{1}{2}$ and $V$ is the unique partial isometry such that $P_1^* = V|P_1^*|$, $R(V) = R(P_1^*)$ and $R(V^*) = R(P_1)$. Then by Lemma 6,

$$2P_{(P+P^*)} - I + 2P_{N(P+P^*)} = \begin{pmatrix} -T^{-1} & -T^{-1}P_1 \\ -P_1^*T^{-1} & V(I + T^{-1})V^* - I + 2P_{N(P_1)} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $VV^* = P_{P_1}$, then $P_{N(P_1)} = I - P_{P_1} = I - VV^*$, so

$$V(I + T^{-1})V^* - I + 2P_{N(P_1)} = V(T^{-1} - I)V^* + I.$$

Clearly, $P_1$ and $V$ have the operator matrices forms

$$P_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & P_{11} \end{pmatrix}: N(P_1) \oplus N(P_1)^\perp \rightarrow R(P_1)^\perp \oplus R(P_1) \quad (2.10)$$

and

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & V_1 \end{pmatrix}: R(P_1)^\perp \oplus R(P_1) \rightarrow N(P_1) \oplus N(P_1)^\perp,$$

respectively, where $V_1 \in \mathcal{B}(R(P_1), N(P_1)^\perp)$ is a unitary operator. Then

$$V(T^{-1} - I)V^* + I = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & V_1(I + P_{11}P_{11}^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}}V_1^* \end{pmatrix}: N(P_1) \oplus N(P_1)^\perp$$

and

$$(I + P_{11}^*P_1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & (I + P_{11}^*P_1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix}: N(P_1) \oplus N(P_1)^\perp. \quad (2.11)$$

Moreover,

$$V_1P_{11}P_{11}^*V_1 = V_1|P_{11}^*||P_{11}|V_1^* = P_{11}^*P_{11},$$
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which implies $V_1 P_{11} P_{11}^* = P_{11}^* P_{11} V_1$, so

$$V_1 (I + P_{11} P_{11}^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} = (I + P_{11}^* P_{11})^{-\frac{1}{2}} V_1.$$  

Thus

$$V(T^{-1} - I)V^* + I = (I + P_1^* P_1)^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Defining

$$J_0 := 2P_{(P+P^*)} - I + 2P_{N(P+P^*)} = \left( \begin{array}{cc} -T^{-1} & -T^{-1} P_1 \\ -P_1^* T^{-1} & (I + P_1^* P_1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \end{array} \right),$$

we know that $J_0$ is a symmetry with $P^* J_0 P \leq J_0$ from Lemma 5.

On the other hand, if $P^* J_0 P \leq J$, then Lemma 5 implies that $J$ has the form (2.4) and

$$J - J_0 = \left( \begin{array}{cc} (J_1 + I)(I + P_1 P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} & (J_1 + I)(I + P_1 P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} P_1 \\ P_1^* (I + P_1 P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (J_1 + I) & 0 \end{array} \right).$$

It is easy to see that the equation $J_1 P_1 = -P_1$ yields

$$J_1 P_1 P_1^* = -P_1 P_1^* = -P_1 (-P_1^* J_1) = P_1 P_1^* J_1,$$

which implies

$$(J_1 + I)(I + P_1 P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} = (J_1 + I)^{\frac{1}{2}} (I + P_1 P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (J_1 + I)^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq 0,$$

since $J_1 + I \geq 0$ and $(I + P_1 P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \geq 0$. Also, we have

$$(J_1 + I)(I + P_1 P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} P_1 = (I + P_1 P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (J_1 P_1 + P_1) = 0$$

and

$$P_1^* (I + P_1 P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (J_1 + I) = 0.$$

Hence $J - J_0 \geq 0$, which induces the desired result.

(ii) Suppose that $P$ has the matrix form (1.1) and $P^* J P \leq J$. Then Lemma 5 implies that $J$ has the form (2.4) and $J_1 P_1 + P_1 = 0$, so $P_1^* J_1 + P_1^* = P_1^* J_1 + P_1 = 0$. Thus $P_1^* (I + J_1) = 0$, which means $R(I + J_1) \subseteq N(P_1^*)$.

Then we may assume that

$$I + J_1 = \left( \begin{array}{cc} J_{11} & J_{12} \\ 0 & 0 \end{array} \right): N(P_1^*) \oplus N(P_1^*)^\perp,$$

so $J_{12} = 0$ follows from the fact that $I + J_1 = I + J_1^*$. Thus

$$I + J_1 = \left( \begin{array}{cc} J_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{array} \right),$$

which yields

$$J_1 = \left( \begin{array}{cc} J_{11} - I & 0 \\ 0 & -I \end{array} \right): N(P_1^*) \oplus N(P_1^*)^\perp.$$  

(2.12)
Therefore,
\[ \tilde{J}_1 := \max \{ J_1 : J_1 P_1 + P_1 = 0, \ J_1 = J_1^* = J_1^{-1} \} = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & -I \end{pmatrix} = 2P_{N(P_1^*)} - I. \]

Also, suppose that \( P_1 \) has the operator matrix form (2.10). Then
\[ P_1 P_1^* = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & P_{11} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & P_{11}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & P_{11} P_{11}^* \end{pmatrix} : N(P_1^*) \oplus N(P_1^*)^\perp \]
and
\[ (I + P_1 P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} = \begin{pmatrix} I \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} (I + P_{11} P_{11}^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \begin{pmatrix} I \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} : N(P_1^*) \oplus N(P_1^*)^\perp. \] (2.13)

Thus
\[ P_{N(P_1^*)}(I + P_1 P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} = P_{N(P_1^*)} \]
and
\[ P_{N(P_1^*)}(I + P_1 P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} P_1 = P_{N(P_1^*)} P_1 = 0. \]

We claim that when setting \( J_1 = \tilde{J}_1 = \text{diag}(I, -I) \) in equation (2.4), \( J \) is the maximal element with \( P^* JP \leq J \). Indeed, we only need to verify that
\[ \begin{pmatrix} (\tilde{J}_1 - J_1)(I + P_1 P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\ P_1^*(I + P_1 P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\tilde{J}_1 - J_1) \end{pmatrix} \geq 0, \]
where \( J_1 \) has the form (2.12). Combining the equations (2.12) and (2.13), we get that
\[ (\tilde{J}_1 - J_1)(I + P_1 P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} = \begin{pmatrix} 2I - J_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \geq 0 \]
and
\[ (\tilde{J}_1 - J_1)(I + P_1 P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} P_1 = (I + P_1 P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\tilde{J}_1 - J_1)P_1 = (I + P_1 P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}}(-P_1 + P_1) = 0. \]

So the assertion is valid. Then by (i) and Lemma 6,
\[ \max \{ J : P^* JP \leq J, \ J = J^* = J^{-1} \} = \begin{pmatrix} (2P_{N(P_1^*)} - I)T^{-1} \\ P_1^* T^{-1}(2P_{N(P_1^*)} - I) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I + P_1 P_1^* \end{pmatrix}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \]
\[ = \begin{pmatrix} -T^{-1} & -T^{-1} P_1 \\ -P_1^* T^{-1} (I + P_1 P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 2P_{N(P_1^*)} T^{-1} \\ 2P_{N(P_1^*)} T^{-1} P_{N(P_1^*)} \end{pmatrix} \]
\[ = (2P_{(P + P^*)} - I + P_{N(P + P^*)}) + (2P_{N(P_1^*)} \oplus 0) \]
\[ = 2P_{(P + P^*)} - I + 2(P_{N(P_1^*)} + P_{N(P_1)}) \]
\[ = 2P_{(P + P^*)} - I + 2P_{N(P - P^*)}. \]

where \( T = (I + P_1 P_1^*)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \) \( \square \)

In the following, the maximal element of the symmetries \( J \) with \( JP \geq 0 \) is given. Note that the minimal element of those symmetries was obtained in [8, Theorem 15]. Also, we consider the minimal and maximal elements of the symmetries \( J \) with \( JP = P^* \).
Theorem 8. Let $P \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^{id}$. Then

(i) $\max \{J : JP \geq 0, J = J^* = J^{-1}\} = 2P_{(P^+P^*)^+} - I + 2P_{N(P^+P^*)}$.

(ii) The following statements are equivalent:

(a) $\max \{J : JPJ = P^*, J = J^* = J^{-1}\}$ exists.

(b) $P$ is an orthogonal projection.

(c) $\max \{J : JPJ = P^*, J = J^* = J^{-1}\} = I$.

(d) $\min \{J : JPJ = P^*, J = J^* = J^{-1}\}$ exists.

(e) $\min \{J : JPJ = P^*, J = J^* = J^{-1}\} = -I$.

Proof. The proof of (i) is similar to that of (ii) of Theorem 7. By Lemma 3, We claim that

$$\max \{J_2 : P_1 = -P_1J_2, J_2 = J_2^* = J_2^{-1}\} = P_{N(P_1)} - P_{N(P_1)^\perp}.$$ 

Indeed, since $P_1 + P_1J_2 = 0$, then $P_1(I + J_2) = 0$, which implies

$$I + J_2 = \begin{pmatrix} J_{11} & J_{12} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} : N(P_1) \oplus N(P_1)^\perp.$$ 

It follows from the fact $J_2 = J_2^*$ that $J_{12} = 0$, so

$$I + J_2 = \begin{pmatrix} J_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} : N(P_1) \oplus N(P_1)^\perp,$$

which yields that

$$J_2 = \begin{pmatrix} J_{11} - I & 0 \\ 0 & -I \end{pmatrix} : N(P_1) \oplus N(P_1)^\perp.$$ 

Therefore,

$$\tilde{J}_2 := \max \{J_2 : P_1 = -P_1J_2, J_2 = J_2^* = J_2^{-1}\} = P_{N(P_1)} - P_{N(P_1)^\perp}.$$ 

Let $P_1$ be the operator matrix form (2.10). Then

$$P_{N(P_1)}(I + P_1^*P_1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} = P_{N(P_1)}.$$ 

follows from equation (2.11). Similarly, setting $J_2 := \tilde{J}_2$ in equation (2.2), we also get that $J$ is the maximal element with $JP \geq 0$. Thus by the proof of [8, Theorem 15] (Lemma 4), we have

$$\max \{J : JP \geq 0, J = J^* = J^{-1}\} = \begin{pmatrix} (I + P_1P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} & (I + P_1P_2^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\ P_1^*(I + P_1P_2^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} & (P_{N(P_1)} - P_{N(P_1)^\perp})(I + P_1^*P_1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} (I + P_1P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} & (I + P_1P_2^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\ P_1^*(I + P_1P_2^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} & -(I + P_1^*P_1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2P_{N(P_1)}(I + P_1^*P_1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$= 2P_{(P^+P^*)^+} - I + (0 \oplus 2P_{N(P)})$$

$$= 2P_{(P^+P^*)^+} - I + 2P_{N(P^+P^*)}.$$ 

(ii) (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b). If $J_0 := \max \{J : JPJ = P^*, J = J^* = J^{-1}\}$, then by Lemma 2,

$$J_0 = \begin{pmatrix} J_{01}(I + P_1P_2^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} & J_{01}(I + P_1P_2^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}}P_1 \\ P_1^*(I + P_1P_2^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}}J_{01} & J_{02}(I + P_1P_2^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix} : R(P) \oplus R(P)^\perp,$$
where $J_{01}$ and $J_{02}$ are self-adjoint involutions on the subspaces $R(P)$ and $R(P)^\perp$, respectively, with $J_{01}P_1 + P_1J_{02} = 0$. Clearly, by Lemma 2, for $k = 1, 2$,

$$
\tilde{J}_k := \begin{pmatrix}
(-I_1)^k(I + P_1P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} & (-I_1)^k(I + P_1P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{P_1}{2} \\
P_1^*(I + P_1P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}}(-I_1)^k & (-I_2)^{k+1}(I_1^*P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}}
\end{pmatrix}
$$

are symmetries and satisfy $\tilde{J}_k P \tilde{J}_k = P^*$, where $I_1, I_2$ are identity operators on the subspaces of $R(P)$ and $R(P)^\perp$, respectively.

It is easy to verify that $J_0 \geq \tilde{J}_1$ implies $J_{02} \geq I_2$. Also, $J_0 \geq \tilde{J}_2$ yields $J_{01} \geq I_1$. Thus $J_{01} = I_1$ and $J_{02} = I_2$, so $P_1 = 0$ follows from the fact $J_{01}P_1 + P_1J_{02} = 0$. Hence, $P$ is an orthogonal projection. In a similarly way, we have $(d) \Rightarrow (b)$.

(b) $\Rightarrow$ (c) $\Rightarrow$ (a) and (b) $\Rightarrow$ (e) $\Rightarrow$ (d) are obvious. □

Remark. Let $P \in B(H)^{id}$. According to the proof of [8, Theorem 15] and [3, Proposition 6.2], we know that

$$
2P((P + P^*)^+) - I = \begin{pmatrix}
(I + P_1P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} & (I + P_1P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{P_1}{2} \\
P_1^*(I + P_1P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} & -(I + P_1P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\frac{P_1}{2}
\end{pmatrix} = (P + P^* - I)|P + P^* - I|^{-1}.
$$

Thus

$$
\max\{J : JP \geq 0, J = J^* = J^{-1}\} = (P + P^* - I)|P + P^* - I|^{-1} + 2P_{N(P + P^*)}
$$

and

$$
(P + P^* - I)|P + P^* - I|^{-1}P_{N(P + P^*)} = -P_{N(P + P^*)}.
$$

□

In the following, we shall study the relations between $P_{(2I - P - P^*)^+}$, $(P_{(2I - P - P^*)^-})$ and $P_{(P + P^*)^+}$, $(P_{(P + P^*)^+})$. The following observation is needed.

Proposition 9. Let $P \in B(H)^{id}$. If $P$ and $I - P$ have respectively the operator matrices

$$
P = \begin{pmatrix}
I & P_1 \\
0 & 0
\end{pmatrix} : R(P) \oplus R(P)^\perp \quad \text{and} \quad I - P = \begin{pmatrix}
I & Q_1 \\
0 & 0
\end{pmatrix} : R(I - P) \oplus R(I - P)^\perp,
$$

then there exist unitary operators $U_1 \in B(R(P)^\perp, R(I - P))$ and $V_1 \in B(R(I - P)^\perp, R(P))$ such that $Q_1 = U_1P_1^*V_1$.

Proof. It is clear that

$$
I - P = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & -P_1 \\
0 & I
\end{pmatrix} : R(P) \oplus R(P)^\perp.
$$

Thus there exists a unitary operator

$$
\tilde{U} = \begin{pmatrix}
U_{11} & U_{12} \\
U_{21} & U_{22}
\end{pmatrix} : R(P) \oplus R(P)^\perp \rightarrow R(I - P) \oplus R(I - P)^\perp,
$$

such that

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
U_{11} & U_{12} \\
U_{21} & U_{22}
\end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix}
0 & -P_1 \\
0 & I
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}
I & Q_1 \\
0 & 0
\end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix}
U_{11} & U_{12} \\
U_{21} & U_{22}
\end{pmatrix},
$$
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which yields \( U_{11} + Q_1 U_{21} = 0 \) and \( -U_{21} P_1 + U_{22} = 0 \). So

\[
U_{11} = -Q_1 U_{21} \tag{2.15}
\]

and

\[
U_{22} = U_{21} P_1. \tag{2.16}
\]

On the other hand, the equation \( \widetilde{U}^* \widetilde{U} = I \) implies that

\[
U_{11}^* U_{11} + U_{21}^* U_{21} = I,
\]

so

\[
U_{21}^* (I + Q_1^* Q_1) U_{21} = I \tag{2.17}
\]

follows from equation (2.15).

Analogously, the equation \( \widetilde{U} U^* = I \) implies that

\[
U_{21} U_{21}^* + U_{22} U_{22}^* = I,
\]

so

\[
U_{21} (I + P_1 P_1^*) U_{21}^* = I \tag{2.18}
\]

follows from equation (2.16).

In view of (2.17) and (2.18), \( U_{21} \) is invertible from the subspace \( R(P) \) onto \( R(I - P)^\perp \). Using the polar decomposition theorem, we denote

\[
U_{21} = U (U_{21}^* U_{21})^{1/2}, \tag{2.19}
\]

where \( U \) is a unitary operator from the subspace \( R(P) \) onto \( R(I - P)^\perp \). Combining equations (2.18) and (2.19), we have

\[
(U_{21}^* U_{21})^{1/2} = (I + P_1 P_1^*)^{-1/2}. \tag{2.20}
\]

Also, equation (2.19) implies \( U_{21} = (U_{21} U_{21}^*)^{1/2} U \), so

\[
(U_{21} U_{21}^*)^{1/2} = (I + Q_1^* Q_1)^{-1/2} \tag{2.21}
\]

follows from equation (2.17).

In a similar way, equations \( \widetilde{U} U^* = I \) and \( \widetilde{U}^* \widetilde{U} = I \) imply

\[
U_{11} U_{11}^* + U_{12} U_{12}^* = I \quad \text{and} \quad U_{12}^* U_{12} + U_{22}^* U_{22} = I.
\]

Thus equations (2.15) and (2.21) yield that

\[
U_{12} U_{12}^* = I - Q_1 (U_{21} U_{21}^*) Q_1^* = I - Q_1 (I + Q_1^* Q_1)^{-1} Q_1^* = (I + Q_1 Q_1^*)^{-1}. \tag{2.22}
\]

Similarly, equations (2.16) and (2.21) imply

\[
U_{12}^* U_{12} = I - U_{22}^* U_{22} = I - P_1^* (I + P_1 P_1^*)^{-1} P_1 = (I + P_1^* P_1)^{-1}. \tag{2.23}
\]

Thus \( U_{12} \) is invertible from the subspace \( R(P)^\perp \) onto \( R(I - P) \). Using the polar decomposition theorem again, we get that

\[
U_{12} = V (U_{12}^* U_{12})^{1/2} = V (I + P_1^* P_1)^{-1/2}, \tag{2.24}
\]
where $V$ is a unitary operator from the subspace $R(P)^\perp$ onto $R(I-P)$.

Furthermore, equation $UU^* = I$ implies that
\[ U_2U_{11}^* + U_2U_{12}^* = 0. \]

Combining equations (2.15), (2.16), (2.19), (2.20) and (2.24), we conclude that
\[ -U(I + P_1P_1^*)^{-1}U^*Q_1^* + U(I + P_1P_1^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}}P_1(I + P_1^*P_1)^{-\frac{1}{2}}V^* = 0. \]

Then
\[ U(I + P_1P_1^*)^{-1}(-U^*Q_1^* + P_1V^*) = 0, \]
so $Q_1 = VP_1^*U^*$. Setting $U_1 = V$ and $V_1 = U^*$, we get that $U_1 \in \mathcal{B}(R(P)^\perp, R(I-P))$ and $V_1 \in \mathcal{B}(R(I-P)^\perp, R(P))$ are unitary operators with $Q_1 = U_1P_1^*V_1$.

**Corollary 10.** Let $P \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^{Id}$. Then
(i) $P \simeq P^*$.
(ii) $R(P + P^*)$ is closed if and only if $R(2I - P - P^*)$ is closed.
(iii) $P^* + 2P_1^\perp \simeq 2I - P - P^* + 2P_1^\perp$.

**Proof.** Let $P$ and $I-P$ have the operator matrices (2.14). Then by Proposition 9, we have
\[ P_1 = V_1Q_1^*U_1, \]
where unitary operators $U_1 \in \mathcal{B}(R(P)^\perp, R(I-P))$ and $V_1 \in \mathcal{B}(R(I-P)^\perp, R(P))$.

(i) Obviously,
\[ P^* = I - (I-P)^* = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ -Q_1^* & I \end{pmatrix} : R(I-P) \oplus R(I-P)^\perp. \]

Defining a unitary operator
\[ U := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -U_1 \\ V_1^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} : R(P) \oplus R(P)^\perp \rightarrow R(I-P) \oplus R(I-P)^\perp, \]
we easily verify that $U^*P^*U = P$, that is $P \simeq P^*$.

(ii) Setting
\[ S := \begin{pmatrix} I & -P_1^\perp \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} : R(P) \oplus R(P)^\perp, \]
we know that $S$ is invertible. Considering that $P + P^*$ has form (2.9) and
\[ S^*(P + P^*)S = \begin{pmatrix} 2I & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{-P_1^*P_1}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \]
we get that $R(P + P^*)$ is closed if and only if $R(P_1^*P_1)$ is closed. By a well-known theorem (or see [14, Lemma 2.1]), $R(P_1^*P_1)$ is closed if and only if $R(P_1^*)$ is closed if and only if $R(P_1)$ is closed. Thus $R(P + P^*)$ is closed if and only if $R(P_1)$ is closed. Similarly, $R(2I - P - P^*)$ is closed if and only if $R(Q_1^*)$ is closed. Moreover, Proposition 9 implies $R(P_1)$ is closed if and only if $R(Q_1^*)$ is closed, so the desired result holds.
In view of Lemma 11 and (ii) of Theorem 7, we have

Then equations (2.27) and (2.28) imply that

\[ P_{N(2I-P-P^*)} = P_{N(P-P^*)} - P_{N(P^*)}, \]  
(2.29)

so

\[ P_{N(Q_1)} = P_{N(2I-P-P^*)} = P_{N(P-P^*)} - P_{N(P^*)} = P_{N(P_1^*)}. \]
follows from Lemma 6. In a similar way, we have
\[ P_N(P_1) = P_N(P_1 + P^*) = P_N(P^* - P_1) - P_N(2I - P - P^*) = P_N(Q_1). \]  
(2.30)

(iii) follows from (i). □

Lemma 13. ([2, Theorem 2.3]) For a \(-J\)-projection \(P\), there exists uniquely a \(-J\)-positive projection \(Q\), a \(-J\)-negative projection \(R\) such that
\[ P = Q + R, \quad QR = RQ = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad QR^* = R^*Q = 0. \]

The following result is obtained in [2,7]. However, our method is more concrete than those of [2,7].

Corollary 14. ([2, Theorem 2.12]) or [7, Theorem 2]) For a \(-J\)-projection \(P\), there exists uniquely a \(-J\)-contractive projection \(E_1\) and a \(-J\)-expansive projection \(E_2\) such that
\[ P = E_1E_2 = E_2E_1 = E_1 + E_2 - I \quad \text{and} \quad E_1E_2^* = E_2^*E_1 = E_1 + E_2^* - I. \]

Proof. Suppose that \(P\) has operator matrix form (1.1). It follows from the fact \(P = JP^*J\) that \(J\) has the form (2.1) in Lemma 2. With respect to the space decomposition \(\mathcal{H} = R(P) \oplus R(P)^\perp\), we define \(E_1\) and \(E_2\) as the following operator matrices
\[
E_1 := \begin{pmatrix}
I_1 & P_1^\frac{1}{2} \frac{I_2 + J_2}{2} \\
0 & \frac{I_2 - J_2}{2}
\end{pmatrix}
\quad \text{and} \quad
E_2 := \begin{pmatrix}
I_1 & \frac{P_1^\frac{1}{2} \frac{I_2 - J_2}{2}}{2} \\
0 & \frac{I_2 + J_2}{2}
\end{pmatrix},
\]
where \(I_1\) and \(I_2\) are identity operators on the subspaces of \(R(P)\) and \(R(P)^\perp\), respectively.

Clearly, \(E_2^2 = E_1\) and \(E_2^2 = E_2\). Then a direct calculation yields that
\[ P = E_1E_2 = E_2E_1 = E_1 + E_2 - I \quad \text{and} \quad E_1E_2^* = E_2^*E_1 = E_1 + E_2^* - I, \]
as \(P_1^*P_1J_2 = J_2^*P_1P_1\). It is easy to verify that
\[ J(I - E_1) = 0 \oplus (I + P_1^*P_1)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{I_2 + J_2}{2} \geq 0 \]
and
\[ J(I - E_2) = 0 \oplus (I + P_1^*P_1)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{I_2 - J_2}{2} \leq 0. \]
Thus by Lemma 11, we conclude that \(E_1\) is a \(-J\)-contractive projection and \(E_2\) is a \(-J\)-expansive projection as desired.

To show the uniqueness, we note that \(I - P\) is also a \(-J\)-projection. If
\[ P = F_1F_2 = F_2F_1 = F_1 + F_2 - I \quad \text{and} \quad F_1F_2^* = F_2^*F_1 = F_1 + F_2^* - I, \]
where \(F_1\) is a \(-J\)-contractive projection and \(F_2\) is a \(-J\)-expansive projection. Setting \(Q := I - F_1\) and \(R := I - F_2\), we get that
\[ I - P = Q + R, \quad QR = RQ = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad QR^* = R^*Q = 0. \]
Furthermore, Lemma 11 implies that \(Q\) is a \(-J\)-positive projection and \(R\) is a \(-J\)-negative projection, so \(Q = I - E_1\) and \(R = I - E_2\) follow from the uniqueness of Lemma 13. Thus \(F_1 = E_1\) and \(F_2 = E_2\). □
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