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Abstract

We introduce the notion of continuous controlled $g$-fusion frame in Hilbert space which is the generalization of discrete controlled $g$-fusion frame and give an example. Some characterizations of continuous controlled $g$-fusion frame have been presented. We define the frame operator and multiplier of continuous controlled $g$-fusion Bessel families in Hilbert spaces. Continuous resolution of the identity operator on a Hilbert space using the theory of continuous controlled $g$-fusion frame is being considered. Finally, we discuss perturbation results of continuous controlled $g$-fusion frame.
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1 Introduction

In 1952, Duffin and Schaeffer [10] introduced frame for Hilbert space to study some fundamental problems in non-harmonic Fourier series. Later on, after some decades, frame theory was popularized by Daubechies et al. [8].

Frame for Hilbert space was defined as a sequence of basis-like elements in Hilbert space. A sequence $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subseteq H$ is called a frame for a separable Hilbert space $(H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$, if there exist positive constants $0 < A \leq B < \infty$ such that

$$A \|f\|^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |\langle f, f_i \rangle|^2 \leq B \|f\|^2 \text{ for all } f \in H.$$ 

For the past few years many other types of frames were proposed such as $K$-frame [13], fusion frame [5], $g$-frame [27], $g$-fusion frame [16, 25] and $K$-$g$-fusion frame [1] etc. P. Ghosh and T. K. Samanta [15] have discussed generalized atomic subspaces for operators in Hilbert spaces.
Controlled frame is one of the newest generalizations of frame. P. Balaz et al. [4] introduced controlled frame to improve the numerical efficiency of interactive algorithms for inverting the frame operator. In recent times, several generalizations of controlled frame namely, controlled $K$-frame [22], controlled $g$-frame [23], controlled fusion frame [19], controlled $g$-fusion frame [26], controlled $Kg$-fusion frame [24] etc. have been appeared. Continuous frames were proposed by Kaiser [17] and it was independently studied by Ali et al. [2]. At present, frame theory has been widely used in signal and image processing, filter bank theory, coding and communications, system modeling and so on.

In this paper, continuous controlled $g$-fusion frame in Hilbert space is presented and some of their properties are going to be established. We will see that any continuous controlled $g$-fusion frame is a continuous $g$-fusion frame and converse part is also true under some sufficient conditions. We consider the frame operator for a pair of continuous controlled $g$-fusion Bessel families. Multiplier of continuous controlled $g$-fusion Bessel families in Hilbert spaces is also discussed. Some useful results about continuous resolution of the identity operator on a Hilbert space using the theory of continuous controlled $g$-fusion frame is constructed. At the end, we study some perturbation results of continuous controlled $g$-fusion frame.

Throughout this paper, $H$ is considered to be a separable Hilbert space with associated inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and $\mathbb{H}$ is the collection of all closed subspace of $H$. $(X, \mu)$ denotes abstract measure space with positive measure $\mu$. $I_H$ is the identity operator on $H$. $B(H_1, H_2)$ is a collection of all bounded linear operators from $H_1$ to $H_2$. In particular $B(H)$ denotes the space of all bounded linear operators on $H$. For $S \in B(H)$, we denote $\mathcal{N}(S)$ and $\mathcal{R}(S)$ for null space and range of $S$, respectively. Also, $P_M \in B(H)$ is the orthonormal projection onto a closed subspace $M \subset H$. $\mathcal{GB}(H)$ denotes the set of all bounded linear operators which have bounded inverse. If $S, R \in \mathcal{GB}(H)$, then $R^*, R^{-1}$ and $SR$ are also belongs to $\mathcal{GB}(H)$. $\mathcal{GB}^+(H)$ is the set of all positive operators in $\mathcal{GB}(H)$ and $T, U$ are invertible operators in $\mathcal{GB}(H)$.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we recall some necessary definitions and theorems.

Theorem 2.1. (Douglas’ factorization theorem) [9] Let $S, V \in B(H)$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

(i) $\mathcal{R}(S) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(V)$.

(ii) $SS^* \leq \lambda^2 VV^*$ for some $\lambda > 0$.

(iii) $S = VW$ for some bounded linear operator $W$ on $H$.

Theorem 2.2. [7] The set $S(H)$ of all self-adjoint operators on $H$ is a partially ordered set with respect to the partial order $\leq$ which is defined as for $R, S \in S(H)$

$$R \leq S \iff \langle Rf, f \rangle \leq \langle Sf, f \rangle \quad \forall f \in H.$$
Definition 2.3. [27] A self-adjoint operator $U : H \to H$ is called positive if $\langle U x, x \rangle \geq 0$ for all $x \in H$. In notation, we can write $U \geq 0$. A self-adjoint operator $V : H \to H$ is called a square root of $U$ if $V^2 = U$. If, in addition $V \geq 0$, then $V$ is called positive square root of $U$ and is denoted by $V = U^{1/2}$.

Theorem 2.4. [20] The positive square root $V : H \to H$ of an arbitrary positive self-adjoint operator $U : H \to H$ exists and is unique. Further, the operator $V$ commutes with every bounded linear operator on $H$ which commutes with $U$.

In a complex Hilbert space, every bounded positive operator is self-adjoint and any two bounded positive operators can be commute with each other.

Theorem 2.5. [12] Let $M \subset H$ be a closed subspace and $T \in B(H)$. Then $P_M T^* = P_M T^* P_{TM}$. If $T$ is an unitary operator (i.e $T^* T = I_H$), then $P_{TM} T = T P_M$.

Definition 2.6. [28] Let $\{W_j\}_{j \in J}$ be a collection of closed subspaces of $H$ and $\{v_j\}_{j \in J}$ be a collection of positive weights, $\{H_j\}_{j \in J}$ be a sequence of Hilbert spaces and let $\Lambda_j \in B(H, H_j)$ for each $j \in J$. Then $\Lambda = \{(W_j, \Lambda_j, v_j)\}_{j \in J}$ is called a generalized fusion frame or a $g$-fusion frame for $H$ with respect to $\{H_j\}_{j \in J}$ if there exist constants $0 < A \leq B < \infty$ such that

$$A \| f \|^2 \leq \sum_{j \in J} v_j^2 \| \Lambda_j P_{W_j}(f) \|^2 \leq B \| f \|^2 \quad \forall f \in H. \quad (1)$$

The constants $A$ and $B$ are called the lower and upper bounds of $g$-fusion frame, respectively. If $A = B$ then $\Lambda$ is called tight $g$-fusion frame and if $A = B = 1$ then we say $\Lambda$ is a Parseval $g$-fusion frame. If $\Lambda$ satisfies only the right inequality of (1), it is called a $g$-fusion Bessel sequence in $H$ with bound $B$.

Define the space

$$l^2 \left( \{H_j\}_{j \in J} \right) = \left\{ \{f_j\}_{j \in J} : f_j \in H_j, \sum_{j \in J} \| f_j \|^2 < \infty \right\}$$

with inner product is given by

$$\langle \{f_j\}_{j \in J}, \{g_j\}_{j \in J} \rangle = \sum_{j \in J} \langle f_j, g_j \rangle_{H_j}.$$  

Clearly $l^2 \left( \{H_j\}_{j \in J} \right)$ is a Hilbert space with the pointwise operations $\llbracket \rrbracket$.

Definition 2.7. [26] Let $\{W_j\}_{j \in J}$ be a collection of closed subspaces of $H$ and $\{v_j\}_{j \in J}$ be a collection of positive weights. Let $\{H_j\}_{j \in J}$ be a sequence of Hilbert spaces, $T, U \in GB(H)$ and $\Lambda_j \in B(H, H_j)$ for each $j \in J$. Then the family $\Lambda_{TU} = \{(W_j, \Lambda_j, v_j)\}_{j \in J}$ is a $(T, U)$-controlled $g$-fusion frame for $H$ if there exist constants $0 < A \leq B < \infty$ such that

$$A \| f \|^2 \leq \sum_{j \in J} v_j^2 \langle \Lambda_j P_{W_j} U f, \Lambda_j P_{W_j} T f \rangle \leq B \| f \|^2 \quad \forall f \in H. \quad (2)$$
If \( A = B \) then \( \Lambda_{TU} \) is called \((T, U)\)-controlled tight g-fusion frame and if \( A = B = 1 \) then we say \( \Lambda_{TU} \) is a \((T, U)\)-controlled Parseval g-fusion frame. If \( \Lambda_{TU} \) satisfies only the right inequality of (2) it is called a \((T, U)\)-controlled g-fusion Bessel sequence in \( H \).

**Definition 2.8.** Let \( \Lambda_{TU} \) be a \((T, U)\)-controlled g-fusion Bessel sequence in \( H \) with a bound \( B \). The synthesis operator \( T_C : K_{\Lambda_j} \rightarrow H \) is defined as

\[
T_C \left( \{ v_j (T^* P_{W_j} \Lambda_j^* \Lambda_j P_{W_j} U)^{1/2} f \} \right)_{j \in J} = \sum_{j \in J} v_j^2 T^* P_{W_j} \Lambda_j^* \Lambda_j P_{W_j} U f,
\]

for all \( f \in H \) and the analysis operator \( T_C^* : H \rightarrow K_{\Lambda_j} \) is given by

\[
T_C^* f = \left\{ v_j (T^* P_{W_j} \Lambda_j^* \Lambda_j P_{W_j} U)^{1/2} f \right\}_{j \in J} \quad \forall f \in H,
\]

where

\[
K_{\Lambda_j} = \left\{ \left\{ v_j (T^* P_{W_j} \Lambda_j^* \Lambda_j P_{W_j} U)^{1/2} f \right\}_{j \in J} : f \in H \right\} \subset l^2 \left( \{ H_j \}_{j \in J} \right).
\]

The frame operator \( S_C : H \rightarrow H \) is defined as follows:

\[
S_C f = T_C T_C^* f = \sum_{j \in J} v_j^2 T^* P_{W_j} \Lambda_j^* \Lambda_j P_{W_j} U f \quad \forall f \in H
\]

and it is easy to verify that

\[
\langle S_C f, f \rangle = \sum_{j \in J} v_j^2 \langle \Lambda_j P_{W_j} U f, \Lambda_j P_{W_j} T f \rangle \quad \forall f \in H.
\]

Furthermore, if \( \Lambda_{TU} \) is a \((T, U)\)-controlled g-fusion frame with bounds \( A \) and \( B \) then \( AI_H \leq S_C \leq BI_H \). Hence, \( S_C \) is bounded, invertible, self-adjoint and positive linear operator. It is easy to verify that \( B^{-1} I_H \leq S_C^{-1} \leq A^{-1} I_H \).

**Definition 2.9.** Let \( F : X \rightarrow \mathbb{H} \) be such that for each \( h \in H \), the mapping \( x \rightarrow P_{F(x)}(h) \) is measurable (i.e. is weakly measurable), \( v : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+ \) be a measurable function and \( \{ K_x \}_{x \in X} \) be a collection of Hilbert spaces. For each \( x \in X \), suppose that \( \Lambda_x \in \mathcal{B}(F(x), K_x) \). Then \( \Lambda_F = \{ (F(x), \Lambda_x, v(x)) \}_{x \in X} \) is called a generalized continuous fusion frame or a gc-fusion frame for \( H \) with respect to \((X, \mu)\) and \( v \), if there exists \( 0 < A \leq B < \infty \) such that

\[
A \| h \|^2 \leq \int_X v^2(x) \| \Lambda_x P_{F(x)}(h) \|^2 \, d\mu \leq B \| h \|^2 \quad \forall h \in H,
\]

where \( P_{F(x)} \) is the orthogonal projection onto the subspace \( F(x) \). \( \Lambda_F \) is called a tight gc-fusion frame for \( H \) if \( A = B \) and Parseval if \( A = B = 1 \). If we have only the upper bound, we call \( \Lambda_F \) is a Bessel gc-fusion mapping for \( H \).
Continuous controlled $g$-fusion frame

Let $K = \oplus_{x \in X} K_x$ and $L^2(X, K)$ be a collection of all measurable functions $\varphi : X \to K$ such that for each $x \in X$, $\varphi(x) \in K_x$ and $\int_X \| \varphi(x) \|^2 d\mu < \infty$. It can be verified that $L^2(X, K)$ is a Hilbert space with inner product given by

$$\langle \phi, \varphi \rangle = \int_X \langle \phi(x), \varphi(x) \rangle d\mu$$

for $\phi, \varphi \in L^2(X, K)$.

**Definition 2.10.** [11] Let $\Lambda_f = \{(F(x), \Lambda_x, v(x))\}_{x \in X}$ be a Bessel gc-fusion mapping for $H$. Then the gc-fusion pre-frame operator or synthesis operator $T_{gF} : L^2(X, K) \to H$ is defined by

$$\langle T_{gF}(\varphi), h \rangle = \int_X v(x) \langle P_{F(x)} \Lambda_x^* (\varphi(x)), h \rangle d\mu$$

where $\varphi \in L^2(X, K)$ and $h \in H. T_{gF}$ is a bounded linear mapping and its adjoint operator is given by

$$T_{gF}^*: H \to L^2(X, K), T_{gF}^*(h) = \{v(x) \Lambda_x P_{F(x)}(h)\}_{x \in X}, h \in H$$

and $S_{gF} = T_{gF}T_{gF}^*$ is called gc-fusion frame operator.

For each $f, h \in H$,

$$\langle S_{gF}(f), h \rangle = \int_X v^2(x) \langle P_{F(x)} \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} f, h \rangle d\mu.$$ 

The operator $S_{gF}$ is bounded, self-adjoint, positive and invertible operator on $H$.

**Definition 2.11.** [18] A sequence $\{T_x : H \to H : x \in X\}$ is said to be a continuous resolution of the identity operator on $H$ if for each $f, g \in H$, the following are hold:

1. $x \to \langle T_x f, g \rangle$ is measurable functional on $X$.
2. $\langle f, g \rangle = \int_X \langle T_x f, g \rangle d\mu(x)$

### 3 Continuous controlled $g$-fusion frame

In this section, we give the continuous version of controlled $g$-fusion frame for $H$. Some of the recent results of controlled $g$-fusion frame are extended to continuous controlled $g$-fusion frame.

**Definition 3.1.** Let $F : X \to \mathbb{H}$ be a mapping, $v : X \to \mathbb{R}^+$ be a measurable function and $\{K_x\}_{x \in X}$ be a collection of Hilbert spaces. For each $x \in X$, suppose that $\Lambda_x \in \mathcal{B}(F(x), K_x)$ and $T, U \in \mathcal{G}\mathcal{B}^+(H)$. Then $\Lambda_{TU} = \{(F(x), \Lambda_x, v(x))\}_{x \in X}$ is called a continuous $(T, U)$-controlled generalized fusion frame or continuous $(T, U)$-controlled $g$-fusion frame for $H$ with respect to $(X, \mu)$ and $v$, if
(i) for each \( f \in H \), the mapping \( x \rightarrow P_{F(x)}(f) \) is measurable (i.e. is weakly measurable).

(ii) there exist constants \( 0 < A \leq B < \infty \) such that

\[
A \|f\|^2 \leq \int_X v^2(x) \left\langle \Lambda_x P_{F(x)}U f, \Lambda_x P_{F(x)}T f \right\rangle \, d\mu_x \leq B \|f\|^2, \tag{3}
\]

for all \( f \in H \), where \( P_{F(x)} \) is the orthogonal projection onto the subspace \( F(x) \). The constants \( A, B \) are called the frame bounds.

Now, we consider the following cases:

(I) If only the right inequality of (3) holds then \( \Lambda_T U \) is called a continuous \((T, U)\)-controlled \( g \)-fusion Bessel family for \( H \).

(II) If \( U = I_H \) then \( \Lambda_T U \) is called a continuous \((T, I_H)\)-controlled \( g \)-fusion frame for \( H \).

(III) If \( T = U = I_H \) then \( \Lambda_T U \) is called a continuous \( g \)-fusion frame for \( H \).

**Remark 3.2.** If the measure space \( X = \mathbb{N} \) and \( \mu \) is the counting measure then a continuous \((T, U)\)-controlled \( g \)-fusion frame will be the discrete \((T, U)\)-controlled \( g \)-fusion frame.

### 3.0.1 Example

Let \( H = \mathbb{R}^3 \) and \( \{e_1, e_2, e_3\} \) be an standard orthonormal basis for \( H \). Consider

\[
B = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \|x\| \leq 1 \}.
\]

Then it is a measure space equipped with the Lebesgue measure \( \mu \). Suppose \( \{B_1, B_2, B_3\} \) is a partition of \( B \) where \( \mu(B_1) \geq \mu(B_2) \geq \mu(B_3) > 1 \). Let \( \mathbb{H} = \{W_1, W_2, W_3\} \), where \( W_1 = \text{span} \{e_2, e_3\} \), \( W_2 = \text{span} \{e_1, e_3\} \) and \( W_3 = \text{span} \{e_1, e_2\} \). Define

\[
F : B \to \mathbb{H} \quad \text{by} \quad F(x) = \begin{cases} W_1 & \text{if } x \in B_1 \\ W_2 & \text{if } x \in B_2 \\ W_3 & \text{if } x \in B_3 \end{cases}
\]

and

\[
v : B \to [0, \infty) \quad \text{by} \quad v(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \in B_1 \\ 2 & \text{if } x \in B_2 \\ -1 & \text{if } x \in B_3. \end{cases}
\]

It is easy to verify that \( F \) and \( v \) are measurable functions. For each \( x \in B \), define the operator

\[
\Lambda_x(f) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu(B_k)}} \langle f, e_k \rangle e_k, \quad f \in H,
\]
where $k$ is such that $x \in B_k$. Let $T(f_1, f_2, f_3) = (2f_1, 3f_2, 5f_3)$ and $U(f_1, f_2, f_3) = \left(\frac{f_1}{2}, \frac{f_2}{3}, \frac{f_3}{4}\right)$ be two operators on $H$. Then it is easy to verify that $T, U \in \mathcal{GB}^+(H)$ and $TU = UT$. Now, for any $f = (f_1, f_2, f_3) \in H$, we have

$$\int_B v^2(x) \langle \Lambda_x P_F(x) U f, \Lambda_x P_F(x) T f \rangle \, d\mu_x$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^3 \int_{B_i} v^2(x) \langle \Lambda_x P_F(x) U f, \Lambda_x P_F(x) T f \rangle \, d\mu_x$$

$$= f_1^2 + 4f_2^2 + \frac{5f_3^2}{4}.$$ 

$$\Rightarrow \| f \|^2 \leq \int_B v^2(x) \langle \Lambda_x P_F(x) U f, \Lambda_x P_F(x) T f \rangle \, d\mu_x \leq 4 \| f \|^2.$$

Thus, $\Lambda_{TU}$ be a continuous $(T, U)$-controlled $g$-fusion frame for $\mathbb{R}^3$ with bounds 1 and 4.

**Proposition 3.3.** Let $\Lambda_{TU}$ be a continuous $(T, U)$-controlled $g$-fusion Bessel family for $H$ with bound $B$. Then there exists a unique bounded linear operator $S_C : H \to H$ such that

$$\langle S_C f, g \rangle = \int_X v^2(x) \langle T^* P_F(x) \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_F(x) U f, g \rangle \, d\mu_x \forall f, g \in H.$$

Furthermore, if $\Lambda_{TU}$ is a continuous $(T, U)$-controlled $g$-fusion frame for $H$ then $AI_H \leq S_C \leq BI_H$.

**Proof.** Define the mapping $\Psi : H \times H \to \mathbb{C}$ by

$$\Psi(f, g) = \int_X v^2(x) \langle T^* P_F(x) \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_F(x) U f, g \rangle \, d\mu_x \forall f, g \in H.$$
Then \( \Psi \) is a sesquilinear functional. Now, by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

\[
|\Psi(f, g)| = \left| \int_X v^2(x) \left( (T^* P_F(x) \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_F(x) U)^{1/2} f, (T^* P_F(x) \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_F(x) U)^{1/2} g \right) d\mu_x \right|
\]

\[
\leq \left( \int_X v^2(x) \left\| (T^* P_F(x) \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_F(x) U)^{1/2} f \right\|^2 d\mu_x \right)^{1/2} \times \left( \int_X v^2(x) \left\| (T^* P_F(x) \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_F(x) U)^{1/2} g \right\|^2 d\mu_x \right)^{1/2}
\]

\[
= \left( \int_X v^2(x) \left\langle \Lambda_x P_F(x) U f, \Lambda_x P_F(x) T f \right\rangle d\mu_x \right)^{1/2} \times \left( \int_X v^2(x) \left\langle \Lambda_x P_F(x) U g, \Lambda_x P_F(x) T g \right\rangle d\mu_x \right)^{1/2}
\]

\[
\leq B \left\| f \right\| \left\| g \right\|.
\]

Thus, \( \Psi \) is a bounded sesquilinear functional with \( \| \Psi \| \leq B. \) Therefore, by Theorem 2.3.6 in \([21]\), there exists a unique operator \( S_C : H \rightarrow H \) such that \( \Psi(f, g) = \langle S_C f, g \rangle \) and \( \| \Psi \| = \| S_C \|. \) Thus, for each \( f, g \in H \), we have

\[
\langle S_C f, g \rangle = \int_X v^2(x) \left\langle T^* P_F(x) \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_F(x) U f, g \right\rangle d\mu_x.
\]

Now, for each \( f \in H \), we have

\[
\langle S_C f, f \rangle = \int_X v^2(x) \left\langle \Lambda_x P_F(x) U f, \Lambda_x P_F(x) T f \right\rangle d\mu_x
\]

\[
= \int_X v^2(x) \left\| (T^* P_F(x) \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_F(x) U)^{1/2} f \right\|^2 d\mu_x.
\]

This verifies that \( S_C \) is a positive operator. Also, it is easy to verify that \( S_C \) is a self-adjoint. Furthermore, if \( \Lambda_{TU} \) is a continuous \( (T, U) \)-controlled \( g \)-fusion frame for \( H \) then by \( \Box \) it is easy to verify that \( A I_H \leq S_C \leq B I_H. \)

**Theorem 3.4.** Let \( \Lambda_{TU} \) be a continuous \( (T, U) \)-controlled \( g \)-fusion Bessel family for \( H \) with bound \( B. \) Then the mapping \( T_C : L^2(X, K) \rightarrow H \) defined by

\[
\langle T_C \Phi, g \rangle = \int_X v^2(x) \left\langle T^* P_F(x) \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_F(x) U f, g \right\rangle d\mu_x,
\]
where for all \( f \in H, \) \( \Phi = \left\{ v(x) \left( T^* P_{F(x)} \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} U \right)^{1/2} f \right\}_{x \in X} \) and \( g \in H, \) is a linear and bounded operator with \( \| T_C \| \leq \sqrt{B}. \) Furthermore, for each \( g \in H, \) we have

\[
T_C^* g = \left\{ v(x) \left( T^* P_{F(x)} \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} U \right)^{1/2} g \right\}_{x \in X}.
\]

\textit{Proof.} For \( \Phi = \left\{ v(x) \left( T^* P_{F(x)} \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} U \right)^{1/2} f \right\}_{x \in X} \in L^2(X, K), \)

\[
\| T_C \Phi \| = \sup_{\| g \| = 1} | \langle T_C \Phi, g \rangle |
\]

\[
= \sup_{\| g \| = 1} \left| \int_X v^2(x) \left\langle T^* P_{F(x)} \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} U f, g \right\rangle d\mu_x \right|^{1/2}
\]

\[
\leq \sup_{\| g \| = 1} \left( \int_X v^2(x) \left\| \left( T^* P_{F(x)} \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} U \right)^{1/2} g \right\|^2 d\mu_x \right)^{1/2} \| \Phi \|_2
\]

\[
= \sup_{\| g \| = 1} \left( \int_X v^2(x) \left\langle \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} U g, \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} T g \right\rangle d\mu_x \right)^{1/2} \| \Phi \|_2
\]

\[
\leq \sqrt{B} \| \Phi \|_2.
\]

This shows that \( T_C \) is a bounded linear operator with \( \| T_C \| \leq \sqrt{B}. \) Now, for each \( g \in H \) and \( \Phi \in L^2(X, K), \) we have

\[
\langle \Phi, T_C^* g \rangle = \langle T_C \Phi, g \rangle
\]

\[
= \int_X v^2(x) \left\langle \left( T^* P_{F(x)} \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} U \right)^{1/2} f, \left( T^* P_{F(x)} \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} U \right)^{1/2} g \right\rangle d\mu_x
\]

\[
= \left\langle \Phi, \left\{ v(x) \left( T^* P_{F(x)} \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} U \right)^{1/2} g \right\}_{x \in X} \right\rangle.
\]

This completes the proof. \( \square \)

The operators \( T_C \) and \( T_C^* \) are called the synthesis operator and analysis operator of \( \Lambda_{TU}, \) respectively.

In the following proposition, we will see that it is enough to check the continuous controlled \( g \)-fusion frame condition on a dense subset \( M \) of \( H. \)

\textbf{Proposition 3.5.} Suppose that \( (X, \mu) \) is a measure space with \( \mu \) is \( \sigma \)-finite and \( \Lambda_{TU} \) is a continuous \( (T, U) \)-controlled \( g \)-fusion frame for a dense subset \( M \) of \( H \) having bounds \( A \) and \( B. \) Then \( \Lambda_{TU} \) is a continuous \( (T, U) \)-controlled \( g \)-fusion frame for \( H \) with same bounds.
Proof. Let \( \{ X_n \}_{n=1}^{\infty} \) be a sequence of disjoint measurable subsets of \( X \) such that \( X = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n \) with \( \mu \left( X_n \right) < \infty \) for each \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). Let
\[
\Omega_m = \left\{ x \in X : m \leq \| \phi (x) \| < m + 1, \forall \phi \in L^2 (X, K) \right\}, \ m \geq 0.
\]
It is easy to verify that for each \( m \geq 0 \), \( \Omega_m \) is a measurable set and \( X = \bigcup_{m=0, n=1}^{\infty} (X_n \cap \Omega_m) \). If possible suppose that \( \Lambda_{TU} \) is not a continuous \((T, U)\)-controlled \( g \)-fusion Bessel mapping for \( H \). Then there exists \( f \in H \) such that
\[
\int_X v^2 (x) \left\langle \Lambda_x P_F(x) U f, \Lambda_x P_F(x) T f \right\rangle \, d\mu_x > B \| f \|^2
\]
\[
\Rightarrow \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{X_n \cap \Omega_m} v^2 (x) \left\langle \Lambda_x P_F(x) U f, \Lambda_x P_F(x) T f \right\rangle \, d\mu_x > B \| f \|^2.
\]
Therefore, there exist finite subsets \( I, J \) such that
\[
\sum_{m \in I} \sum_{n \in J} \int_{X_n \cap \Omega_m} v^2 (x) \left\langle \Lambda_x P_F(x) U f, \Lambda_x P_F(x) T f \right\rangle \, d\mu_x > B \| f \|^2. \tag{4}
\]
Let \( \{ f_k \} \) be a sequence in \( M \) such that \( f_k \to f \) as \( k \to \infty \). Then, we have
\[
\sum_{m \in I} \sum_{n \in J} \int_{X_n \cap \Omega_m} v^2 (x) \left\langle \Lambda_x P_F(x) U f_k, \Lambda_x P_F(x) T f_k \right\rangle \, d\mu_x \leq B \| f_k \|^2,
\]
and therefore by Lebesgue’s Dominated Convergence Theorem, it is a contradiction of (4). Hence, \( \Lambda_{TU} \) is a continuous \((T, U)\)-controlled \( g \)-fusion Bessel mapping for \( H \). So, the analysis operator \( T_C^* \) is well-defined for \( H \). Let \( f \in H \) be arbitrary and \( \{ f_k \} \) be a sequence in \( M \) such that \( f_k \to f \) as \( k \to \infty \). Then
\[
A \| f_k \|^2 \leq \| T_C^* f_k \|^2.
\]
Taking \( k \to \infty \), we get
\[
A \| f \|^2 \leq \| T_C^* f \|^2 = \int_X v^2 (x) \left\langle \Lambda_x P_F(x) U f, \Lambda_x P_F(x) T f \right\rangle \, d\mu_x.
\]
This completes the proof. \( \square \)

Next we will see that continuous controlled \( g \)-fusion Bessel families for \( H \) becomes continuous controlled \( g \)-fusion frames for \( H \) under some sufficient conditions. Consider \( G: X \to \mathbb{H} \) be such that for each \( h \in H \), the mapping \( x \to P_{G(x)}(h) \) is measurable and \( w: X \to \mathbb{R}^+ \) be a measurable function.

**Theorem 3.6.** Let the families \( \Lambda_{TU} = \left\{ (F(x), \Lambda_x, v(x)) \right\}_{x \in X} \) and \( \Gamma_{TU} = \left\{ (G(x), \Gamma_x, w(x)) \right\}_{x \in X} \) be two continuous \((T, U)\)-controlled \( g \)-fusion Bessel families for \( H \) with bounds \( B \) and \( D \), respectively. Suppose that \( T_C \) and \( T_C^* \) be their synthesis operators such that \( T_C, T_C^* = I_H \). Then \( \Lambda_{TU} \) and \( \Gamma_{TU} \) are continuous \((T, U)\)-controlled \( g \)-fusion frame for \( H \).
Thus, $\Gamma_{TU}$ is a continuous $(T, U)$-controlled $g$-fusion frame for $H$ with bounds $1/D$ and $B$. Similarly, it can be shown that $\Gamma_{TU}$ is a continuous $(T, U)$-controlled $g$-fusion frame for $H$. \hfill \Box$

In the next result, we construct continuous controlled $g$-fusion frame by using bounded linear operator.

**Theorem 3.7.** Let $\Lambda_{TU}$ be a continuous $(T, U)$-controlled $g$-fusion frame for $H$ with bounds $A$, $B$ and $V \in B(H)$ be an invertible operator on $H$ such that $V^*$ commutes with $T, U$. Then $\Gamma_{TU} = \{ (VF(x), \Lambda_xPF(x) V^*, v(x)) \}_{x \in X}$ is a continuous $(T, U)$-controlled $g$-fusion frame for $H$.

**Proof.** Since $PF(x) V^* = PF(x) V^* PF(x)$ for all $x \in X$, the mapping $x \to PF(x)$ is weakly measurable. Now, for each $f \in H$, using Theorem 2.5 we have

$$
\int_X v^2(x) \langle \Lambda_x PF(x)V^* P_{VF(x)}Uf, \Lambda_x PF(x)V^* P_{VF(x)}Tf \rangle \, d\mu_x
$$

$$
= \int_X v^2(x) \langle \Lambda_x PF(x)V^* Uf, \Lambda_x PF(x)V^* Tf \rangle \, d\mu_x
$$

$$
= \int_X v^2(x) \langle \Lambda_x PF(x)U V^* f, \Lambda_x PF(x) TV^* f \rangle \, d\mu_x
$$

$$
\leq B \| V^* f \|^2 \leq B \| V \|^2 \| f \|^2.
$$

On the other hand, from (5), we get

$$
\int_X v^2(x) \langle \Lambda_x PF(x)V^* P_{VF(x)}Uf, \Lambda_x PF(x)V^* P_{VF(x)}Tf \rangle \, d\mu_x
$$

$$
\geq A \| V^* f \|^2 \geq A \| V^{-1} \|^{-2} \| f \|^2 \forall f \in H.
$$

Thus, $\Gamma_{TU}$ is a continuous $(T, U)$-controlled $g$-fusion frame for $H$. 

---

**Proof.** For each $f \in H$, we have

$$
\| f \|^4 = \langle f, f \rangle^2 = \langle T_C^* f, T_C^* f \rangle^2 \leq \| T_C^* f \|^2 \| T_C^* f \|^2
$$

$$
= \int_X v^2(x) \langle \Lambda_x PF(x)Uf, \Lambda_x PF(x)Tf \rangle \, d\mu_x \times
$$

$$
\int_X w^2(x) \langle \Gamma_x PG(x)Uf, \Gamma_x PG(x)Tf \rangle \, d\mu_x
$$

$$
\leq D \| f \|^2 \int_X v^2(x) \langle \Lambda_x PF(x)Uf, \Lambda_x PF(x)Tf \rangle \, d\mu_x
$$

$$
\Rightarrow \frac{1}{D} \| f \|^2 \leq \int_X v^2(x) \langle \Lambda_x PF(x)Uf, \Lambda_x PF(x)Tf \rangle \, d\mu_x.
$$

This shows that $\Lambda_{TU}$ is a continuous $(T, U)$-controlled $g$-fusion frame for $H$ with bounds $1/D$ and $B$. Similarly, it can be shown that $\Gamma_{TU}$ is a continuous $(T, U)$-controlled $g$-fusion frame for $H$. \hfill \Box$

In the next result, we construct continuous controlled $g$-fusion frame by using bounded linear operator.
Furthermore, for each \( f \in H \), using (5), we have
\[
\int_X v^2(x) \left\langle \Lambda_x P_F(x) V^* P_{V F(x)} U f, \Lambda_x P_F(x) V^* P_{V F(x)} T f \right\rangle \, d\mu_x \\
= \int_X v^2(x) \left\langle \Lambda_x P_F(x) U V^* f, \Lambda_x P_F(x) T V^* f \right\rangle \, d\mu_x \\
= \left\langle S_C V^* f, V^* f \right\rangle = \left\langle V S_C V^* f, f \right\rangle,
\]
where \( S_C \) is the corresponding frame operator for \( \Lambda T U \).

In particular, if \( V = S_C^{-1} \) then by the Theorem 3.7, the family \( \Lambda_T U = \left\{ (S_C^{-1} F(x), \Lambda_x P_F(x) S_C^{-1}, v(x)) \right\} \) is also a continuous \((T, U)\)-controlled \( g \)-fusion frame for \( H \). The family \( \Lambda_T U \) is called the canonical dual continuous controlled \( g \)-fusion frame of \( \Lambda T U \). It is easy to verify that the corresponding frame operator for \( \Lambda_T U \) is \( S_C^{-1} \).

A characterization of a continuous controlled \( g \)-fusion frame is given by in the next theorem.

**Theorem 3.8.** The family \( \Lambda_T U \) is a continuous \((T, U)\)-controlled \( g \)-fusion frame for \( H \) if and only if \( \Lambda_T U \) is a continuous \((T U, I_H)\)-controlled \( g \)-fusion frame for \( H \).

**Proof.** For each \( f \in H \), we have
\[
\int_X v^2(x) \left\langle \Lambda_x P_F(x) U f, \Lambda_x P_F(x) T f \right\rangle \, d\mu_x = \left\langle T S_g F U f, f \right\rangle = \left\langle S_g F T U f, f \right\rangle \\
= \int_X v^2(x) \left\langle P_F(x) \Lambda^* x \Lambda_x P_F(x) T U f, f \right\rangle \, d\mu_x \\
= \int_X v^2(x) \left\langle \Lambda_x P_F(x) T U f, \Lambda_x P_F(x) f \right\rangle \, d\mu_x,
\]
where
\[
\left\langle S_g U f, f \right\rangle = \int_X v^2(x) \left\langle P_F(x) \Lambda^* x \Lambda_x P_F(x) f, f \right\rangle \, d\mu_x.
\]
Hence, \( \Lambda_T U \) is continuous \((T, U)\)-controlled \( g \)-fusion frame for \( H \) with bounds \( A \) and \( B \) is equivalent to:
\[
A \| f \|^2 \leq \int_X v^2(x) \left\langle \Lambda_x P_{W_s} T U f, \Lambda_x P_{W_s} f \right\rangle \, d\mu_x \leq B \| f \|^2 \quad \forall f \in H.
\]
Thus, \( \Lambda_T U \) is a continuous \((T U, I_H)\)-controlled \( g \)-fusion frame for \( H \) with bounds \( A \) and \( B \). \( \square \)
Continuous controlled $g$-fusion frame

**Corollary 3.9.** The family $\Lambda_{TU}$ is a continuous $(T, U)$-controlled $g$-fusion frame for $H$ if and only if $\Lambda_{TU}$ is a continuous $((TU)^{1/2}, (TU)^{1/2})$-controlled $g$-fusion frame for $H$.

The following theorem shows that any continuous controlled $g$-fusion frame is a continuous $g$-fusion frame and conversely any continuous $g$-fusion frame is a continuous controlled $g$-fusion frame under some conditions.

**Theorem 3.10.** Let $T, U \in \mathcal{G}^+(H)$ and $S_{gF}T = TS_{gF}$. Then $\Lambda_{TU}$ is a continuous $(T, U)$-controlled $g$-fusion frame for $H$ if and only if $\Lambda_{TU}$ is a continuous $g$-fusion frame for $H$, where $S_{gF}$ is the continuous $g$-fusion frame operator defined by

$$\langle S_{gF} f, f \rangle = \int_X v^2(x) \langle P_{F(x)} \Lambda^*_x \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} f, f \rangle \, d\mu_x, \ f \in H.$$ 

**Proof.** First we suppose that $\Lambda_{TU}$ is a continuous $g$-fusion frame for $H$ with bounds $A$ and $B$. Then for each $f \in H$, we have

$$A \| f \|^2 \leq \int_X v^2(x) \| \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} f \|^2 \, d\mu_x \leq B \| f \|^2.$$ 

Now according to the Lemma 3.10 of [3], we can deduced that

$$m m' A I_H \leq T S_{gF} U \leq M M' B I_H,$$

where $m$, $m'$ and $M$, $M'$ are positive constants. Then for each $f \in H$, we have

$$m m' A \| f \|^2 \leq \int_X v^2(x) \langle T P_{F(x)} \Lambda^*_x \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} U f, f \rangle \, d\mu_x \leq M M' B \| f \|^2$$

$$\Rightarrow m m' A \| f \|^2 \leq \int_X v^2(x) \langle \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} U f, \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} T f \rangle \, d\mu_x \leq M M' B \| f \|^2.$$ 

Hence, $\Lambda_{TU}$ is a continuous $(T, U)$-controlled $g$-fusion frame for $H$.

Conversely, suppose that $\Lambda_{TU}$ is a continuous $(T, U)$-controlled $g$-fusion frame
for $H$ with bounds $A$ and $B$. Now, for each $f \in H$, we have

$$A \| f \|^2 = A \left\| (TU)^{1/2} (TU)^{-1/2} f \right\|^2$$

$$\leq \left\| (TU)^{1/2} \right\|^2 \int_X v^2(x) \left\langle \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} U (TU)^{-1/2} f, \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} T (TU)^{-1/2} f \right\rangle d\mu_x$$

$$= \left\| (TU)^{1/2} \right\|^2 \int_X v^2(x) \left\langle U^{-1/2} T^{1/2} P_{F(x)} \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} U^{1/2} T^{-1/2} f, f \right\rangle d\mu_x$$

$$= \left\| (TU)^{1/2} \right\|^2 \int_X v^2(x) \left\langle P_{F(x)} \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} f, f \right\rangle d\mu_x$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{A}{\left\| (TU)^{1/2} \right\|^2} \| f \|^2 \leq \int_X v^2(x) \| \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} f \|^2 d\mu_x.$$ 

On the other hand, it is easy to verify that

$$\int_X v^2(x) \| \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} f \|^2 d\mu_x = \left\langle (TU)^{-1/2} (TU)^{1/2} S_{gF} f, f \right\rangle$$

$$= \left\langle (TU)^{1/2} S_{gF} f, (TU)^{-1/2} f \right\rangle = \left\langle S_{gF} (TU) (TU)^{-1/2} f, (TU)^{-1/2} f \right\rangle$$

$$= \left\langle T S_{gF} U (TU)^{-1/2} f, (TU)^{-1/2} f \right\rangle = \left\langle S_C (TU)^{-1/2} f, (TU)^{-1/2} f \right\rangle$$

$$\leq B \left\| (TU)^{-1/2} \right\|^2 \| f \|^2.$$ 

Thus, $\Lambda_{TU}$ is a continuous $g$-fusion frame for $H$. This completes the proof. □

4 Frame operator for a pair of continuous controlled $g$-fusion Bessel families

In this section, the frame operator for a pair of continuous controlled $g$-fusion Bessel families in $H$ is considered and some properties are going to be established. Also, we present multiplier of continuous controlled $g$-fusion Bessel families in $H$. We start this section by giving continuous resolution of the identity operator on $H$.

Let $\Lambda_{TU}$ be a continuous $(T, U)$-controlled $g$-fusion frame for $H$ with the
corresponding frame operator $S_C$. Then for each $f, g \in H$, we have
\[
\langle f, g \rangle = \langle S_C S_C^{-1} f, g \rangle = \langle S_C^{-1} S_C f, g \rangle
\]
\[
= \int_X v^2(x) \langle T^* P_F(x) \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_F(x) U S_C^{-1} f, g \rangle d\mu_x
\]
\[
= \int_X v^2(x) \langle S_C^{-1} T^* P_F(x) \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_F(x) U f, g \rangle d\mu_x
\]
Thus, the families of bounded operators $\{ T^* P_F(x) \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_F(x) U S_C^{-1} \}_{x \in X}$ and $\{ S_C^{-1} T^* P_F(x) \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_F(x) U \}_{x \in X}$ are continuous resolution of the identity operator on $H$.

**Theorem 4.1.** Let $\Lambda_{TU}$ be a continuous $(T, U)$-controlled $g$-fusion frame for $H$ with frame bounds $A, B$ and $S_C$ be its corresponding frame operator. Assume that $S_C^{-1}$ commutes with $T$ and $U$. Then $\{ v^2(x) T^* P_F(x) \Lambda_x^* T_x U \}_{x \in X}$ is a continuous resolution of the identity operator on $H$, where $T_x = \Lambda_x P_F(x) S_C^{-1}, x \in X$. Furthermore, for each $f \in H$, we have
\[
\frac{A}{B^2} \| f \|^2 \leq \int_X v^2(x) \langle T_x U f, T_x T f \rangle d\mu_x \leq \frac{B}{A^2} \| f \|^2.
\]

**Proof.** For $f, g \in H$, we have the reconstruction formula for $\Lambda_{TU}$:
\[
\langle f, g \rangle = \int_X v^2(x) \langle T^* P_F(x) \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_F(x) U S_C^{-1} f, g \rangle d\mu_x
\]
\[
= \int_X v^2(x) \langle T^* P_F(x) \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_F(x) S_C^{-1} U f, g \rangle d\mu_x
\]
\[
= \int_X v^2(x) \langle T^* P_F(x) \Lambda_x^* T_x U f, g \rangle d\mu_x.
\]
Thus, $\{ v^2(x) T^* P_F(x) \Lambda_x^* T_x U \}_{x \in X}$ is a continuous resolution of the identity operator on $H$. Since $\Lambda_{TU}$ is a continuous $(T, U)$-controlled $g$-fusion frame for $H$ with frame bounds $A$ and $B$, for each $f \in H$, we have
\[
\int_X v^2(x) \langle T_x U f, T_x T f \rangle d\mu_x
\]
\[
= \int_X v^2(x) \langle \Lambda_x P_F(x) S_C^{-1} U f, \Lambda_x P_F(x) S_C^{-1} T f \rangle d\mu_x
\]
\[
= \int_X v^2(x) \langle \Lambda_x P_F(x) U S_C^{-1} f, \Lambda_x P_F(x) T S_C^{-1} f \rangle d\mu_x
\]
\[
\leq B \| S_C^{-1} f \|^2 \leq B \| S_C^{-1} \|^2 \| f \|^2 \leq \frac{B}{A^2} \| f \|^2.
\]
On the other hand, for each \( f \in H \), we have
\[
\int_X v^2(x) \langle T_x U f, T_x T f \rangle \, d\mu_x \geq A \| S^{-1}_C f \|^2 \geq \frac{A}{B^2} \| f \|^2.
\]
This completes the proof. \( \square \)

Next we will see that a continuous controlled \( g \)-fusion Bessel family becomes a continuous controlled \( g \)-fusion frame by using a continuous resolution of the identity operator on \( H \).

**Theorem 4.2.** Let \( \Lambda_{TT} \) be a continuous \((T, T)\)-controlled \( g \)-fusion Bessel family in \( H \) with bound \( B \). Then \( \Lambda_{TT} \) is a continuous \((U, U)\)-controlled \( g \)-fusion frame for \( H \) provided \( \{ v^2(x) T^* P_{F(x)}^* \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} U \}_{x \in X} \) is a continuous resolution of the identity operator on \( H \).

**Proof.** Since \( \{ v^2(x) T^* P_{F(x)}^* \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} U \}_{x \in X} \) is a continuous resolution of the identity operator on \( H \), for \( f, g \in H \), we have
\[
\langle f, g \rangle = \int_X v^2(x) \langle T^* P_{F(x)} \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} U f, g \rangle \, d\mu_x.
\]
By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, for each \( f \in H \), we have
\[
\| f \|^4 = (\langle f, f \rangle)^2 = \left( \int_X v^2(x) \langle T^* P_{F(x)} \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} U f, g \rangle \, d\mu_x \right)^2
\]
\[
= \left( \int_X v^2(x) \langle \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} U f, \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} T f \rangle \, d\mu_x \right)^2
\]
\[
\leq \int_X v^2(x) \| \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} U f \|^2 \, d\mu_x \int_X v^2(x) \| \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} T f \|^2 \, d\mu_x
\]
\[
\leq B \| f \|^2 \int_X v^2(x) \langle \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} U f, \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} U f \rangle \, d\mu_x
\]
\[
\Rightarrow \frac{1}{B} \| f \|^2 \leq \int_X v^2(x) \langle \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} U f, \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} U f \rangle \, d\mu_x.
\]
On the other hand, for each \( f \in H \), we have
\[
\int_X v^2(x) \langle \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} U f, \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} U f \rangle \, d\mu_x
\]
\[
= \int_X v^2(x) \langle \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} TT^{-1} U f, \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} TT^{-1} U f \rangle \, d\mu_x
\]
\[
\leq B \| T^{-1} U f \|^2 \leq B \| T^{-1} \|^2 \| U \|^2 \| f \|^2.
\]
Thus, \( \Lambda_{TT} \) is a continuous \((U, U)\)-controlled \(g\)-fusion frame for \(H\). Similarly, it can be shown that if \( \Lambda_{TT} \) is a continuous \((U, U)\)-controlled \(g\)-fusion Bessel family in \(H\) then \( \Lambda_{TT} \) is also a continuous \((T, T)\)-controlled \(g\)-fusion frame for \(H\). □

Suppose \(G : X \to \mathbb{H}\) be a weakly measurable function, \(w : X \to \mathbb{R}^+\) be a measurable function and for each \(x \in X\), \(\Gamma_x \in \mathcal{B}(G(x), K_x)\) and \(\Gamma_{UU}\) denotes the family \(\{(G(x), \Gamma_x, w(x))\}_{x \in X}\). Now, we present the frame operator for a pairs of continuous controlled \(g\)-fusion Bessel families.

**Definition 4.3.** Let \(\Lambda_{TT}\) and \(\Gamma_{UU}\) be continuous \((T, T)\)-controlled and \((U, U)\)-controlled \(g\)-fusion Bessel families for \(H\) with bounds \(B\) and \(D\), respectively. Then the operator \(S_{\Lambda_{TT}U} : H \to H\) defined by

\[
\langle S_{\Lambda_{TT}U}f, g \rangle = \int_X v(x) w(x) \langle U P_{G(x)} \Gamma_x^* \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} T f, g \rangle \, d\mu_x, \quad f, g \in H
\]

is called the frame operator for the pair of continuous controlled \(g\)-fusion Bessel families \(\Lambda_{TT}\) and \(\Gamma_{UU}\).

**Theorem 4.4.** Let \(S_{\Lambda_{TT}U}\) be the frame operator for the pair of continuous \((T, T)\)-controlled and \((U, U)\)-controlled \(g\)-fusion Bessel families \(\Lambda_{TT}\) and \(\Gamma_{UU}\) with bounds \(B\) and \(D\), respectively. Then \(S_{\Lambda_{TT}U}\) is well-defined and bounded operator with \(\|S_{\Lambda_{TT}U}\| \leq \sqrt{BD}\).

**Proof.** Let \(f, g \in H\). Then by Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we have

\[
\|\langle S_{\Lambda_{TT}U}f, g \rangle \| = \left| \int_X v(x) w(x) \langle U P_{G(x)} \Gamma_x^* \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} T f, g \rangle \, d\mu_x \right|
\]

\[
\leq \int_X v(x) w(x) \left| \langle \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} T f, \Gamma_x P_{G(x)} U g \rangle \right| \, d\mu_x
\]

\[
\leq \int_X v(x) w(x) \| \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} T f \| \| \Gamma_x P_{G(x)} U g \| \, d\mu_x
\]

\[
\leq \left( \int_X v^2(x) \| \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} T f \|^2 \, d\mu_x \right)^{1/2} \left( \int_X w^2(x) \| \Gamma_x P_{G(x)} U g \|^2 \, d\mu_x \right)^{1/2}
\]

\[
\leq \sqrt{BD} \| f \| \| g \|.
\]

Thus, \(S_{\Lambda_{TT}U}\) is a well-defined and bounded operator with \(\|S_{\Lambda_{TT}U}\| \leq \sqrt{BD}\). □

In particular, for \(T = U = I_H\), the operator \(S_{\Lambda} : H \to H\) defined by

\[
\langle S_{\Lambda}f, g \rangle = \int_X v(x) w(x) \langle P_{G(x)} \Gamma_x^* \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} f, g \rangle \, d\mu_x, \quad f, g \in H
\]
is well-defined bounded operator. Also, for each \( f, g \in H \), we have

\[
\langle S_{\Lambda T U} f, g \rangle = \int_X v(x) w(x) \langle U P G(x) \Gamma^*_x \Lambda_x P F(x) T f, g \rangle \, d\mu_x
\]

\[
= \int_X v(x) w(x) \langle f, T P F(x) \Lambda^*_x \Gamma_x P G(x) U g \rangle \, d\mu_x = \langle f, S_{U \Lambda T} g \rangle
\]

and hence \( S_{T \Lambda U}^* = S_{\Upsilon \Lambda T} \).

**Theorem 4.5.** Let \( S_{\Lambda T U} \) be the frame operator for the pair of continuous \((T, T)\)-controlled and \((U, U)\)-controlled \( g \)-fusion Bessel families \( \Lambda_{TT} \) and \( \Gamma_{UU} \) with bounds \( B \) and \( D \), respectively. Then the following statements are equivalent:

(i) \( S_{\Lambda T U} \) is bounded below.

(ii) There exists \( K \in \mathcal{B}(H) \) such that \( \{T_x\}_{x \in X} \) is a continuous resolution of the identity operator on \( H \), where \( T_x = v(x) w(x) K U P G(x) \Gamma^*_x \Lambda_x P F(x) T, x \in X \).

If one of the given conditions hold, then \( \Lambda_{TT} \) is a continuous \((T, T)\)-controlled \( g \)-fusion frame for \( H \).

**Proof.** (i) \( \Rightarrow \) (ii) Suppose that \( S_{\Lambda T U} \) is bounded below. Then for each \( f \in H \), there exists \( A > 0 \) such that

\[
\|f\|^2 \leq A \|S_{\Lambda T U} f\|^2 \Rightarrow \langle I_H f, f \rangle \leq A \langle S_{\Lambda T U}^* S_{\Lambda T U} f, f \rangle
\]

\[
\Rightarrow I_H^* I_H \leq A S_{\Lambda T U}^* S_{\Lambda T U}.
\]

So, by Theorem 2.1 there exists \( K \in \mathcal{B}(H) \) such that \( K S_{\Lambda T U} = I_H \).

Therefore, for each \( f, g \in H \), we have

\[
\langle f, g \rangle = \langle K S_{\Lambda T U} f, g \rangle = \int_X v(x) w(x) \langle K U P G(x) \Gamma^*_x \Lambda_x P F(x) T f, g \rangle \, d\mu_x.
\]

Thus, \( \{T_x\}_{x \in X} \) is a continuous resolution of the identity operator on \( H \), where \( T_x = v(x) w(x) K U P G(x) \Gamma^*_x \Lambda_x P F(x) T, x \in X \).

(ii) \( \Rightarrow \) (i) Since \( \{T_x\}_{x \in X} \) is a continuous resolution of the identity operator on \( H \), for each \( f, g \in H \), we have

\[
\langle f, g \rangle = \int_X v(x) w(x) \langle K U P G(x) \Gamma^*_x \Lambda_x P F(x) T f, g \rangle \, d\mu_x = \langle K S_{\Lambda T U} f, g \rangle.
\]

Thus, \( I_H = K S_{\Lambda T U} \). So, by Theorem 2.1 there exists some \( \alpha > 0 \) such that \( I_H^* I_H \leq \alpha S_{\Lambda T U}^* S_{\Lambda T U} \) and hence \( S_{\Lambda T U} \) is bounded below.
Last part: First we suppose that $S_{\Lambda T \Gamma U}$ is bounded below. Then for all $f \in H$, there exists $M > 0$ such that $\| S_{\Lambda T \Gamma U} f \| \geq M \| f \|$ and therefore by (10), we have

$$M^2 \| f \|^2 \leq \| S_{\Lambda T \Gamma U} f \|^2 \leq D \left( \int_X v^2(x) \| \Lambda_x P_{G(x)} T f \|^2 \, d\mu_x \right)^{1/2}$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{M^2}{D} \| f \|^2 \leq \int_X v^2(x) \langle \Lambda_x P_{G(x)} T f, \Lambda_x P_{G(x)} T f \rangle \, d\mu_x$$

Hence, $\Lambda_{TT}$ is a continuous $(T, T)$-controlled $g$-fusion frame for $H$ with bounds $M^2 / D$ and $B$. Similarly, it can be shown that $\Gamma_{UU}$ is a continuous $(U, U)$-controlled $g$-fusion frame for $H$ with bounds $M^2 / B$ and $D$.

Next, we suppose that the given condition (ii) holds. Then for each $f, g \in H$, we have

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \int_X v(x) w(x) \langle K U P_{G(x)} \Gamma^*_x \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} T f, g \rangle \, d\mu_x, \quad K \in B(H).$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, for each $f \in H$, we have

$$\| f \|^2 = \langle f, f \rangle = \int_X v(x) w(x) \langle K U P_{G(x)} \Gamma^*_x \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} T f, f \rangle \, d\mu_x$$

$$= \int_X v(x) w(x) \langle \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} T f, \Gamma_{x} P_{G(x)} U K^* f \rangle \, d\mu_x$$

$$\leq \left( \int_X v^2(x) \| \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} T f \|^2 \, d\mu_x \right)^{1/2} \left( \int_X w^2(x) \| \Gamma_x P_{G(x)} U K^* f \|^2 \, d\mu_x \right)^{1/2}$$

$$\leq \sqrt{D} \| K^* f \| \left( \int_X v^2(x) \| \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} T f \|^2 \, d\mu_x \right)^{1/2}$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{1}{D \| K \|^2} \| f \|^2 \leq \int_X v^2(x) \langle \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} T f, \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} T f \rangle \, d\mu_x$$

Therefore, in this case $\Lambda_{TT}$ is also a continuous $(T, T)$-controlled $g$-fusion frame for $H$.

**Theorem 4.6.** Let $\Lambda_{TT}$ and $\Gamma_{UU}$ be continuous $(T, T)$-controlled and $(U, U)$-controlled $g$-fusion frames for $H$ and $T, U, S_{\Lambda \Gamma} + S_{\Gamma \Lambda} \in GB^+(H)$ such that they are commutes with each others. Then $S_{\Lambda TT U} + S_{\Gamma U \Lambda T}$ is a positive operator.
Proof. For each \( f, g \in H \), we have
\[
\langle (S_{\Lambda T} + S_{\Gamma U}) f, g \rangle = \int_X v^2(x) \langle U P_G(x) \Delta^*_x \Gamma_x P_T(x) T f, g \rangle d\mu_x + \int_X v^2(x) \langle T P_F(x) \Delta^*_x \Gamma_x P_G(x) U f, g \rangle d\mu_x
\]
\[
= \langle U S_{\Lambda T} T f, g \rangle + \langle T S_{\Gamma U} U f, g \rangle = \langle U S_{\Lambda T} T f, g \rangle + \langle U S_{\Gamma U} T f, g \rangle
\]
This shows that \( S_{\Lambda T} + S_{\Gamma U} = U (S_{\Lambda T} + S_{\Gamma U}) T \). Since \( T, U \) and \( S_{\Lambda T} + S_{\Gamma U} \) are positive and commutes with each other. Therefore, \( S_{\Lambda T} + S_{\Gamma U} \) is a positive operator.

**Theorem 4.7.** Let \( \Lambda_{TT} \) and \( \Gamma_{UU} \) be continuous \((T, T)\)-controlled and \((U, U)\)-controlled \( g \)-fusion Bessel families for \( H \) with bounds \( B \) and \( D \), respectively. Let \( m \in L^\infty (X, \mu) \). Then the operator \( M_{m, \Lambda_{TT}, \Gamma_{UU}} : H \to H \) defined by
\[
\langle M_{m, \Lambda_{TT}, \Gamma_{UU}} f, g \rangle = \int_X m(x) v(x) w(x) \langle T P_F(x) \Delta^*_x \Gamma_x P_G(x) U f, g \rangle d\mu_x
\]
for \( f, g \in H \), is well-defined and bounded operator.

**Proof.** For each \( f, g \in H \), we have
\[
\| \langle M_{m, \Lambda_{TT}, \Gamma_{UU}} f, g \rangle \| = \left| \int_X m(x) v(x) w(x) \langle T P_F(x) \Delta^*_x \Gamma_x P_G(x) U f, g \rangle d\mu_x \right|
\]
\[
\leq \int_X |m(x)| v(x) w(x) \| \Delta_x P_F(x) T g \| \| \Gamma_x P_G(x) U f \| d\mu_x
\]
\[
\leq \| m \|_\infty \left( \int_X v^2(x) \| \Delta_x P_F(x) T g \|^2 d\mu_x \right)^{1/2} \left( \int_X w^2(x) \| \Gamma_x P_G(x) U f \|^2 d\mu_x \right)^{1/2}
\]
\[
\leq \| m \|_\infty \sqrt{BD} \| f \| \| g \|.
\]
Thus, \( M_{m, \Lambda_{TT}, \Gamma_{UU}} \) is a well-defined and bounded operator with \( \| M_{m, \Lambda_{TT}, \Gamma_{UU}} \| \leq \| m \|_\infty \sqrt{BD} \).}

Now, multiplier of continuous controlled \( g \)-fusion Bessel families in Hilbert spaces is presented.

**Definition 4.8.** Let \( \Lambda_{TT} \) and \( \Gamma_{UU} \) be continuous \((T, T)\)-controlled and \((U, U)\)-controlled \( g \)-fusion Bessel families for \( H \) with bounds \( B \) and \( D \), respectively. Let \( m \in L^\infty (X, \mu) \). Then the operator \( M_{m, \Lambda_{TT}, \Gamma_{UU}} : H \to H \) defined by
\[
\langle M_{m, \Lambda_{TT}, \Gamma_{UU}} f, g \rangle = \int_X m(x) v(x) w(x) \langle T P_F(x) \Delta^*_x \Gamma_x P_G(x) U f, g \rangle d\mu_x,
\]
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for $f, g \in H$, is called the continuous $(T, U)$-controlled $g$-fusion Bessel multiplier of $\Lambda_{TT}$, $\Gamma_{UU}$ and $m$.

For each $f, g \in H$, we have

$$\langle M_{m, \Lambda T, \Gamma U} f, g \rangle = \int_X m(x) v(x) w(x) \langle T P_F(x) \Lambda^*_x \Gamma_x P_G(x) U f, g \rangle \, d\mu_x$$

$$= \int_X m(x) v(x) w(x) \langle f, U P_G(x) \Gamma_x \Lambda_x P_F(x) T g \rangle \, d\mu_x$$

$$= \langle f, M_{m, \Gamma U, \Lambda T} g \rangle$$

and hence $M^*_{m, \Lambda T, \Gamma U} = M_{m, \Gamma U, \Lambda T}$.

**Theorem 4.9.** Let $M_{m, \Lambda T, \Gamma U}$ be the continuous $(T, U)$-controlled $g$-fusion Bessel multiplier of $\Lambda_{TT}$, $\Gamma_{UU}$ and $m$. Assume $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\| f - M_{m, \Lambda T, \Gamma U} f \| \leq \lambda \| f \| \quad \forall f \in H.$$

Then $\Lambda_{TT}$ and $\Gamma_{UU}$ are continuous $(T, T)$-controlled and $(U, U)$-controlled $g$-fusion frame for $H$.

**Proof.** For each $f \in H$, we have

$$(1 - \lambda) \| f \| \leq \| M_{m, \Lambda T, \Gamma U} f \| = \sup_{\| g \| = 1} \langle M_{m, \Lambda T, \Gamma U} f, g \rangle$$

$$= \sup_{\| g \| = 1} \int_X m(x) v(x) w(x) \langle T P_F(x) \Lambda^*_x \Gamma_x P_G(x) U f, g \rangle \, d\mu_x$$

$$\leq \sup_{\| g \| = 1} \| m \|_{\infty} \left( \int_X v^2(x) \| \Lambda_x P_F(x) T g \|^2 \, d\mu_x \right)^{1/2} \times$$

$$\left( \int_X w^2(x) \| \Gamma_x P_G(x) U f \|^2 \, d\mu_x \right)^{1/2}$$

$$\leq \| m \|_{\infty} \sqrt{B} \left( \int_X w^2(x) \| \Gamma_x P_G(x) U f \|^2 \, d\mu_x \right)^{1/2}$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{(1 - \lambda)^2}{B \| m \|_{\infty}^2} \| f \|^2 \leq \int_X w^2(x) \langle \Gamma_x P_G(x) U f, \Gamma_x P_G(x) U f \rangle \, d\mu_x.$$

Thus, $\Gamma_{UU}$ is a continuous $(U, U)$-controlled $g$-fusion frame for $H$. Similarly, it can be shown that $\Lambda_{TT}$ is a continuous $(T, T)$-controlled $g$-fusion frame for $H$. 

$\square$
5 Perturbation of continuous controlled $g$-fusion frame

In frame theory, one of the most important problems is the stability of frame under some perturbation. P. Casazza and Christensen [6] have been generalized the Paley-Wiener perturbation theorem to perturbation of frame in Hilbert space. P. Ghosh and T. K. Samanta [14] discussed stability of dual $g$-fusion frame in Hilbert space. Like the perturbation of discrete frames, we present a perturbation of continuous controlled $g$-fusion frame.

**Theorem 5.1.** Let $\Lambda_{TU}$ be a continuous $(T, U)$-controlled $g$-fusion frame for $H$ with bounds $A, B$ and $\Gamma_{TU} = \{(G(x), \Gamma_x, v(x))\}_{x \in X}$. If there exist constants $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \mu$ with

$$0 \leq \lambda_1, \lambda_2 < 1, \quad A(1 - \lambda_1) - \mu \int_X v^2(x) \, d\mu_x > 0$$

such that for each $f \in H$,

$$0 \leq \langle T^* (P_{G(x)} \Gamma_x^* \Gamma_x P_{G(x)} - P_{F(x)} \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_{F(x)}) U f, f \rangle$$

$$\leq \lambda_1 \langle T^* P_{F(x)} \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} U f, f \rangle + \lambda_2 \langle T^* P_{G(x)} \Gamma_x^* \Gamma_x P_{G(x)} U f, f \rangle + \mu \|f\|^2$$

then $\Gamma_{TU}$ is a continuous $(T, U)$-controlled $g$-fusion frame for $H$.

**Proof.** For each $f \in H$, we have

$$\int_X v^2(x) \langle T^* P_{G(x)} \Gamma_x^* \Gamma_x P_{G(x)} U f, f \rangle \, d\mu_x$$

$$= \int_X v^2(x) \langle T^* (P_{G(x)} \Gamma_x^* \Gamma_x P_{G(x)} - P_{F(x)} \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_{F(x)}) U f, f \rangle \, d\mu_x +$$

$$+ \int_X v^2(x) \langle T^* P_{F(x)} \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} U f, f \rangle \, d\mu_x$$

$$\leq (1 + \lambda_1) \int_X v^2(x) \langle T^* P_{F(x)} \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} U f, f \rangle \, d\mu_x + \mu \|f\|^2 \int_X v^2(x) \, d\mu_x$$

$$+ \lambda_2 \int_X v^2(x) \langle T^* P_{G(x)} \Gamma_x^* \Gamma_x P_{G(x)} U f, f \rangle \, d\mu_x$$

$$\Rightarrow (1 - \lambda_2) \int_X v^2(x) \langle T^* P_{G(x)} \Gamma_x^* \Gamma_x P_{G(x)} U f, f \rangle \, d\mu_x$$

$$\leq (1 + \lambda_1) \int_X v^2(x) \langle T^* P_{F(x)} \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} U f, f \rangle \, d\mu_x + \mu \|f\|^2 \int_X v^2(x) \, d\mu_x.$$
On the other hand, for each \( f \in H \), we have

\[
\int_X v^2(x) \left\langle T^* P_G(x) \Gamma_x^* \Gamma_x P_G(x) U f, f \right\rangle d\mu_x \\
\geq \int_X v^2(x) \left\langle T^* P_F(x) \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_F(x) U f, f \right\rangle d\mu_x - \\
- \int_X v^2(x) \left\langle T^* \left( P_G(x) \Gamma_x^* \Gamma_x P_G(x) - P_F(x) \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_F(x) \right) U f, f \right\rangle d\mu_x.
\]

\[
\Rightarrow (1 + \lambda_2) \int_X v^2(x) \left\langle T^* P_G(x) \Gamma_x^* \Gamma_x P_G(x) U f, f \right\rangle d\mu_x \\
\geq (1 - \lambda_1) \int_X v^2(x) \left\langle T^* P_F(x) \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_F(x) U f, f \right\rangle d\mu_x - \mu \| f \|^2 \int_X v^2(x) d\mu_x.
\]

\[
\Rightarrow \int_X v^2(x) \left\langle \Gamma_x P_G(x) U f, \Gamma_x P_G(x) T f \right\rangle d\mu_x \geq \left[ \frac{(1 - \lambda_1) A - \mu \int_X v^2(x) d\mu_x}{(1 + \lambda_2)} \right] \| f \|^2.
\]

Thus, \( \Gamma_{TU} \) is a continuous \((T, U)\)-controlled \(g\)-fusion frame for \( H \). \( \square \)

**Corollary 5.2.** Let \( \Lambda_{TU} \) be a continuous \((T, U)\)-controlled \(g\)-fusion frame for \( H \) with bounds \( A, B \) and \( \Gamma_{TU} = \left\{ (G(x), \Gamma_x, v(x)) \right\}_{x \in X} \). If there exists constant \( 0 < D \int_X v^2(x) d\mu_x < A \) such that for each \( f \in H \),

\[
0 \leq \left\langle T^* \left( P_G(x) \Gamma_x^* \Gamma_x P_G(x) - P_F(x) \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_F(x) \right) U f, f \right\rangle \leq D \| f \|^2
\]

then \( \Gamma_{TU} \) is a continuous \((T, U)\)-controlled \(g\)-fusion frame for \( H \).

**Proof.** For each \( f \in H \), we have

\[
\int_X v^2(x) \left\langle \Gamma_x P_G(x) U f, \Gamma_x P_G(x) T f \right\rangle d\mu_x = \int_X v^2(x) \left\langle T^* P_G(x) \Gamma_x^* \Gamma_x P_G(x) U f, f \right\rangle d\mu_x
\]

\[
= \int_X v^2(x) \left\langle T^* \left( P_G(x) \Gamma_x^* \Gamma_x P_G(x) - P_F(x) \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_F(x) \right) U f, f \right\rangle d\mu_x + \\
+ \int_X v^2(x) \left\langle T^* P_F(x) \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_F(x) U f, f \right\rangle d\mu_x
\]

\[
\leq \left( B + D \int_X v^2(x) d\mu_x \right) \| f \|^2.
\]
On the other hand,
\[
\int_X v^2(x) \left< T^* P_{G(x)} \Gamma_x^* \Gamma_x P_{G(x)} U f, f \right> d\mu_x
\geq \int_X v^2(x) \left< T^* P_{F(x)} \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} U f, f \right> d\mu_x -
- \int_X v^2(x) \left< T^* \left( P_{G(x)} \Gamma_x^* \Gamma_x P_{G(x)} - P_{F(x)} \Lambda_x^* \Lambda_x P_{F(x)} \right) U f, f \right> d\mu_x
\geq \left( A - D \int_X v^2(x) d\mu_x \right) \| f \|^2 \quad \forall f \in H.
\]
This completes the proof.
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