

# Asymmetric Metrics on the Full Grassmannian of Subspaces of Different Dimensions

André L. G. Mandolesi \*

August 11, 2022

## Abstract

Metrics on Grassmannians have a wide array of applications: machine learning, wireless communication, computer vision, etc. But the available distances between subspaces of distinct dimensions present problems, and the dimensional asymmetry of the subspaces calls for the use of asymmetric metrics. We extend the Fubini-Study metric as an asymmetric angle with useful properties, and whose relations to products of Grassmann and Clifford geometric algebras make it easy to compute. We also describe related angles that provide extra information, and a method to extend other Grassmannian metrics to asymmetric metrics on the full Grassmannian.

**Keywords:** Grassmannian, Grassmann manifold, metric, asymmetric metric, distance between subspaces, angle between subspaces.

**MSC 2020:** Primary 14M15; Secondary 15A75, 51K99

## 1 Introduction

Subspaces represent data in many areas: machine learning [27, 29, 38], computer vision [40, 58, 59], coding theory [7], etc. Data sets are compared using various metrics on Grassmannians, sets of subspaces of a given dimension [22, 53, 56, 66]: Fubini-Study, geodesic, chordal, etc. The first one is natural for quantum computation and other uses of quantum theory [10, 50, 51], appearing also in wireless communication [2, 19, 39]. Grassmannians of complex subspaces are used in both areas.

The full Grassmannian of subspaces of different dimensions is used for image recognition [8, 21, 57, 60], numerical linear algebra [9, 55], wireless communication [52], etc. But distances available for subspaces of distinct dimensions, like the gap and containment gap [9, 32, 55], directional and symmetric distances [57, 60], projection Frobenius [8, 21, 52], and others [66], have shortcomings: some are not metrics, others give little information or lack useful properties.

---

\*Instituto de Matemática e Estatística, Universidade Federal da Bahia, Av. Adhemar de Barros s/n, 40170-110, Salvador - BA, Brazil. E-mail: [andre.mandolesi@ufba.br](mailto:andre.mandolesi@ufba.br)

Part of the problem is a natural asymmetry between subspaces of distinct dimensions, which usual (symmetric) metrics fail to express. Intuitively, a small region around a line does not contain a plane, but a neighborhood of a plane contains lines; a line can be closer or farther from being in a given plane, but a plane is never any closer to being contained in a line; a plane can be close to containing a given line, but not vice versa. Formalizing these ideas requires an asymmetric metric.

Asymmetric metrics [4, 36, 48], in which the distance, time, cost, etc. to go from  $A$  to  $B$  is not the same as from  $B$  to  $A$ , appear naturally in many situations: e.g. a city with one-way streets, rush-hour traffic, going uphill or downhill, etc. An example on the full Grassmannian is the containment gap, but its asymmetry is usually neglected instead of put to good use, and many authors use instead the (symmetrized) gap. Both gaps are rough distances, not suited for all applications.

The Fubini-Study metric [19, 24, 39] is an angle whose cosine (squared, in the complex case) measures volume contraction in orthogonal projections between subspaces. It extends to an asymmetric metric on the full Grassmannian, given by an asymmetric angle [41] with better properties than similar symmetric angles [24, 26, 31]. Links with products of Grassmann and Clifford algebras [20, 44, 45] give formulas to compute it. Angles with orthogonal complements can be used to gain extra information.

Our focus on the asymmetric Fubini-Study metric was motivated by use in quantum information theory, but its useful properties make it well suited for general applications involving subspaces of various dimensions. We also show how other Grassmannian metrics can be extended to asymmetric metrics on the full Grassmannian. In particular, the Binet-Cauchy metric [27] becomes the sine of the asymmetric angle.

Section 2 sets up notation and reviews concepts and results. We study the asymmetric angle in Section 3, and related angles in Section 4. Section 5 gives a method to obtain asymmetric metrics. Section 6 closes with a few remarks. Some inequalities are proven in Appendix A.

## 2 Preliminaries

In this article  $X = \mathbb{F}^n$  for  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$  or  $\mathbb{C}$ , with inner product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  (Hermitian product if  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$ , conjugate linear in the left entry). A  $p$ -subspace is a  $p$ -dimensional subspace, a *line* is a 1-subspace,  $\mathbb{F}v = \{cv : c \in \mathbb{F}\}$  for  $v \in X$ , and  $U(X)$  is the unitary group of  $X$  (orthogonal group, if  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$ ). For a subspace  $V$ ,  $P_V : X \rightarrow V$  is the orthogonal projection, and its underlying real space is  $V_{\mathbb{R}} (= V$  if  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R})$ , with inner product  $\text{Re}\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ . We use the term ‘distance’ loosely, and ‘metric’ in the formal sense (of metric spaces). When we say ‘projected’, it means ‘orthogonally projected’.

*Euclidean and Hermitian angles* for nonzero  $v, w \in X$  are, respectively,  $\theta_{v,w} = \cos^{-1} \frac{\text{Re}\langle v, w \rangle}{\|v\| \|w\|} \in [0, \pi]$  and  $\gamma_{v,w} = \cos^{-1} \frac{|\langle v, w \rangle|}{\|v\| \|w\|} \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$ . Also, let  $\theta_{0,v} = \theta_{0,0} = \gamma_{0,v} = \gamma_{0,0} = 0$  and  $\theta_{v,0} = \gamma_{v,0} = \frac{\pi}{2}$ . If  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\theta_{v,w}$  is the usual angle and  $\gamma_{v,w} = \min\{\theta_{v,w}, \pi - \theta_{v,w}\}$ . If  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$ ,  $\theta_{v,w}$  is the usual angle in  $X_{\mathbb{R}}$  and  $\gamma_{v,w} = \theta_{v, P_{\mathbb{C}w}v}$  [54]. If  $\langle v, w \rangle \geq 0$  (so  $\theta_{v,w} = \gamma_{v,w}$ ) we say  $v$  and  $w$  are *aligned*, what happens when  $P_{\mathbb{F}w}v = \lambda w$  for  $\lambda \geq 0$ . The same definitions will later apply to multivectors.




Figure 1: In  $\bigwedge \mathbb{R}^3$ , a 0-blade is a scalar  $\lambda$ , a 1-blade is a vector  $u$ , a 2-blade is shown as a parallelogram  $u \wedge v$ , and a 3-blade as a parallelepiped  $u \wedge v \wedge w$ . Their spaces are a point  $[\lambda] = \{0\}$ , a line  $[u]$ , a plane  $[u \wedge v]$  and the space  $[u \wedge v \wedge w] = \mathbb{R}^3$ . Their norms are  $|\lambda|$ , the length of  $u$ , the area of  $u \wedge v$  and the volume of  $u \wedge v \wedge w$ .

For  $q = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  let  $\mathcal{I}^q = \bigcup_{p=0}^q \mathcal{I}_p^q$  with  $\mathcal{I}_0^q = \{\emptyset\}$  and, for  $1 \leq p \leq q$ ,  $\mathcal{I}_p^q = \{(i_1, \dots, i_p) \in \mathbb{N}^p : 1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_p \leq q\}$ . We also write a multi-index  $(i_1, \dots, i_p)$  as  $i_1 \dots i_p$ . For  $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{I}^q$ , we form  $\mathbf{i} \cup \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{i} - \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{I}^q$  from the union and intersection of their indices, and by removing from  $\mathbf{i}$  any indices of  $\mathbf{j}$ . We write  $\mathbf{i} \subset \mathbf{j}$  if all indices of  $\mathbf{i}$  are in  $\mathbf{j}$ . If  $\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{j} = \emptyset$ ,  $\epsilon_{\mathbf{ij}}$  is the sign of the permutation that puts  $\mathbf{ij}$  (the indices of  $\mathbf{i}$  followed by those of  $\mathbf{j}$ ) in increasing order. For  $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}_p^q$ , let  $\mathbf{i}' = (1, \dots, q) - \mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}_{q-p}^q$ .

## 2.1 Grassmann algebra

Grassmann's exterior algebra [12, 63, 67] is a natural formalism for working with subspaces. It is a graded algebra  $\bigwedge X = \bigoplus_{p \in \mathbb{Z}} \bigwedge^p X$  of *multivectors*, with  $\bigwedge^0 X = \mathbb{F}$ ,  $\bigwedge^1 X = X$  and  $\bigwedge^p X = \{0\}$  for  $p \notin [0, n]$ . It has a bilinear associative *exterior product*  $\wedge : \bigwedge^p X \times \bigwedge^q X \rightarrow \bigwedge^{p+q} X$  such that, for  $\kappa, \lambda \in \mathbb{F}$  and  $u, v \in X$ ,  $\kappa \wedge \lambda = \kappa \lambda$ ,  $\lambda \wedge v = \lambda v$  and  $u \wedge v = -v \wedge u$  (so  $v \wedge v = 0$ ). If  $A \in \bigwedge^p X$  and  $B \in \bigwedge^q X$ ,  $A \wedge B = (-1)^{pq} B \wedge A$ . Elements of  $\bigwedge^p X$  have *grade*  $p$  and are linear combinations of *p-blades*  $B = v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_p$  for  $v_1, \dots, v_p \in X$ . If  $B \neq 0$ , it *represents* a  $p$ -subspace  $[B] = \text{span}\{v_1, \dots, v_p\} = \{v \in X : v \wedge B = 0\}$ . A scalar  $\lambda \in \bigwedge^0 X$  is a 0-blade, and  $[\lambda] = \{0\}$  (but we only say it represents  $\{0\}$  if  $\lambda \neq 0$ ).

The inner product of  $A = v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_p$  and  $B = w_1 \wedge \dots \wedge w_p$  is  $\langle A, B \rangle = \det(\langle v_i, w_j \rangle)$ , and  $\langle \kappa, \lambda \rangle = \bar{\kappa} \lambda$  for  $\kappa, \lambda \in \bigwedge^0 X$ . It is extended linearly (sesquilinearly, if  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$ ) with distinct  $\bigwedge^p X$ 's being orthogonal. If  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\|A\| = \sqrt{\langle A, A \rangle}$  is the  $p$ -volume of the parallelotope spanned by  $v_1, \dots, v_p$  (Fig. 1). If  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$ ,  $\|A\|^2$  is the  $2p$ -volume of the parallelotope spanned by  $v_1, iv_1, \dots, v_p, iv_p$ . If  $[A] \perp [B]$ ,  $\|A \wedge B\| = \|A\| \|B\|$ . For  $u, v \in X$ ,  $\|u \wedge v\| = \|u\| \|v\| \sin \gamma_{u,v}$ .

We write just  $P_A$  for  $P_{[A]}$ , and, given a subspace  $V \subset X$ , use  $P_V$  for the orthogonal projection  $P_{\bigwedge V} : \bigwedge X \rightarrow \bigwedge V$ , as it extends  $P_V : X \rightarrow V$  via  $P_V 1 = 1$  and  $P_V(A \wedge B) = P_V A \wedge P_V B$  for  $A, B \in \bigwedge X$ .

Given  $v_1, \dots, v_q \in X$ , we write  $v_{\mathbf{i}} = v_{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge v_{i_p}$  for  $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_p) \in \mathcal{I}_p^q$ , and  $v_{\emptyset} = 1$ . If  $\beta = (v_1, \dots, v_q)$  is a basis of  $V$ ,  $\{v_{\mathbf{i}}\}_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}_p^q}$  and  $\{v_{\mathbf{i}}\}_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}^q}$  are bases of  $\bigwedge^p V$  and  $\bigwedge V$ , and are orthonormal if  $\beta$  is. As  $\dim \bigwedge^p V = \binom{q}{p}$ ,  $\bigwedge^q V = \text{span}\{v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_q\}$  is a line in  $\bigwedge X$ . Each  $[v_{\mathbf{i}}]$  is a *coordinate*




Figure 2: Angular, chordal and gap distances between lines ( $u$  and  $v$  aligned)

*subspace.* For  $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{I}^q$ , if  $\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{j} = \emptyset$  then  $v_{\mathbf{i}} \wedge v_{\mathbf{j}} = \epsilon_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{j}} v_{\mathbf{i} \cup \mathbf{j}}$ , otherwise  $v_{\mathbf{i}} \wedge v_{\mathbf{j}} = 0$ . For nonzero blades, if  $[A] \cap [B] = \{0\}$  then  $[A \wedge B] = [A] \oplus [B]$ , otherwise  $A \wedge B = 0$ . For any multivectors, with those bases one obtains:

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $A \in \bigwedge V$  and  $B \in \bigwedge W$  for disjoint subspaces  $V, W \subset X$ . Then  $A \wedge B = 0 \Leftrightarrow A = 0$  or  $B = 0$ .*

## 2.2 Algebraic varieties

The *projective space* [25] of  $X$  is  $\mathbb{P}(X) = \{\text{lines of } X\}$ . *Angular, chordal and gap distances* for  $K = \text{span}\{u\}$  and  $L = \text{span}\{v\}$  are  $\theta_{K,L} = \gamma_{u,v}$ ,  $c_{K,L} = \|u - v\| = 2 \sin \frac{\gamma_{u,v}}{2}$  and  $g_{K,L} = \|u - P_L u\| = \sin \gamma_{u,v}$ , respectively (Fig. 2). As argued in [53],  $\theta_{K,L}$  is more fundamental, since  $c_{K,L}$  and  $g_{K,L}$  derive from it via concave functions, and while for these the triangle inequality attains equality only in trivial cases,  $\mathbb{P}(X)$  is a geodesic metric space with the *Fubini-Study metric*  $d_{FS}(K, L) = \theta_{K,L}$ .

We prove the following spherical triangle inequality in Appendix A, as usual proofs omit details we need when  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$ . Of course, the result also holds in  $\mathbb{P}(\bigwedge X)$  with  $u, v, w$  being multivectors.

**Proposition 2.2.**  *$\theta_{J,L} \leq \theta_{J,K} + \theta_{K,L}$  for  $J, K, L \in \mathbb{P}(X)$ , with equality if, and only if,  $J = \text{span}\{u\}$ ,  $K = \text{span}\{v\}$ ,  $L = \text{span}\{w\}$  for aligned  $u, v, w \in X$  with  $v = \kappa u + \lambda w$  for  $\kappa, \lambda \geq 0$ .*

Equality means  $K$  is in a minimal geodesic between  $J$  and  $L$ . It happens when  $u, v, w$  are in an isotropic real plane (a real plane where  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  is real), with  $\mathbb{R}v$  in the smaller pair of angles formed by  $\mathbb{R}u$  and  $\mathbb{R}w$ . The next example shows the need for alignment.

**Example 2.3.** In  $X = \mathbb{C}^2$ , let  $u = (i, 0)$ ,  $w = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2})$  and  $v = u + w$ . As  $\gamma_{u,w} = 60^\circ$  and  $\gamma_{u,v} = \gamma_{v,w} \cong 38^\circ$ ,  $\mathbb{C}v$  is not in a geodesic segment between  $\mathbb{C}u$  and  $\mathbb{C}w$  in  $\mathbb{P}(X)$ . But  $\theta_{u,w} = 90^\circ$  and  $\theta_{u,v} = \theta_{v,w} = 45^\circ$ , so  $\mathbb{R}v$  lies in a geodesic segment between  $\mathbb{R}u$  and  $\mathbb{R}w$  in  $\mathbb{P}(X_{\mathbb{R}})$ .

For a  $q$ -subspace  $V$ , the *Grassmannian*  $G_p(V) = \{p\text{-subspaces of } V\}$  is a compact manifold [25, 34, 35]. For  $p > q$ ,  $G_p(V) = \emptyset$ . The *full Grassmannian* is  $G(V) = \bigcup_{p=0}^q G_p(V) = \{\text{subspaces of } V\}$ . The *Plücker embedding*  $G(X) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}(\bigwedge X)$  maps  $U \in G_p(X)$  to its line  $\bigwedge^p U \in \mathbb{P}(\bigwedge X)$ , and lets us identify  $G(X)$  with the set of nonzero blades modulo scalar multiplication.

## 2.3 Principal angles and partial orthogonality

Principal or canonical angles [1, 11, 53] are widely used in the study of Grassmannians and other areas.

**Definition 2.4.** For nonzero  $V, W \in G(X)$ , orthonormal bases  $\beta_V = (e_1, \dots, e_p)$  and  $\beta_W = (f_1, \dots, f_q)$  are *associated principal bases*, formed by *principal vectors*, if  $\langle e_i, f_j \rangle = 0$  for  $i \neq j$  and  $\langle e_i, f_i \rangle = \cos \theta_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq m = \min\{p, q\}$  and *principal angles*  $0 \leq \theta_1 \leq \dots \leq \theta_m \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$ .

We also say  $\beta_W$  is a principal basis of  $W$  w.r.t.  $V$ . Note that  $\theta_i = \theta_{e_i, f_i} = \gamma_{e_i, f_i}$ . The number of null  $\theta_i$ 's is  $\dim(V \cap W)$ .

If  $\sigma_1 \geq \dots \geq \sigma_m$  are the singular values of the orthogonal projection  $P : V \rightarrow W$  then  $\cos \theta_i = \sigma_i$ . So the  $\cos^2 \theta_i$ 's are the eigenvalues of  $P^*P$  if  $p \leq q$ , or  $PP^*$  if  $p > q$ , while the  $e_i$ 's and  $f_i$ 's are orthonormal eigenvectors of  $P^*P$  and  $PP^*$ , respectively. The  $\theta_i$ 's are uniquely defined, but the  $e_i$ 's and  $f_i$ 's are not.

A recursive description is that  $e_1$  and  $f_1$  form the minimal angle  $\theta_1 = \min\{\theta_{v,w} : 0 \neq v \in V, 0 \neq w \in W\}$ ; in their orthogonal complements we find  $e_2, f_2$  and  $\theta_2$  in the same way; and so on. For  $i > m$  other vectors are chosen to complete an orthonormal basis. Geometrically, the unit sphere of  $V$  projects to an ellipsoid in  $W$ , and if  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$  the  $e_i$ 's for  $1 \leq i \leq m$  project onto its semi-axes, of lengths  $\cos \theta_i$ , and the  $f_i$ 's point along them. If  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$ , for each  $i$  there are two semi-axes of equal lengths where  $e_i$  and  $ie_i$  project, so in the underlying real spaces each  $\theta_i$  is twice repeated.

**Example 2.5.** Let  $(f_1, \dots, f_5)$  be the canonical basis of  $\mathbb{R}^5$ . Then  $e_1 = \frac{f_1+f_3}{\sqrt{2}}$ ,  $e_2 = \frac{f_2+f_4}{\sqrt{2}}$ ,  $f_1, f_2$  and  $f_5$  are principal vectors for  $V = [e_{12}]$  and  $W = [f_{125}]$ , with principal angles  $\theta_1 = \theta_2 = 45^\circ$ .

**Example 2.6.** In  $\mathbb{C}^4$ , we have  $e_1 = (\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, 0, 0)$ ,  $e_2 = (0, 0, \frac{i}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2})$ ,  $f_1 = (\frac{1+i}{2}, \frac{1-i}{2}, 0, 0)$  and  $f_2 = (0, 0, i, 0)$  as principal vectors for  $V = [e_{12}]$  and  $W = [f_{12}]$ , with principal angles  $\theta_1 = 45^\circ$  and  $\theta_2 = 60^\circ$ . The underlying real subspaces  $V_{\mathbb{R}}, W_{\mathbb{R}} \subset \mathbb{R}^8$  have principal vectors

$$\begin{aligned} e_1 &= (\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, 0, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0), & f_1 &= (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, 0, 0, 0, 0), \\ \tilde{e}_1 &= ie_1 = (0, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, 0, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, 0, 0, 0, 0), & \tilde{f}_1 &= if_1 = (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 0, 0, 0, 0), \\ e_2 &= (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}, 0), & f_2 &= (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0), \\ \tilde{e}_2 &= ie_2 = (0, 0, 0, 0, -\frac{1}{2}, 0, 0, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}), & \tilde{f}_2 &= if_2 = (0, 0, 0, 0, -1, 0, 0, 0), \end{aligned}$$

with principal angles  $\theta_1 = \tilde{\theta}_1 = 45^\circ$  and  $\theta_2 = \tilde{\theta}_2 = 60^\circ$ .

We will need the following results. The first one is an easy generalization of [65, Thm. 3], and shows a unitarily invariant distance between subspaces must be a function of the dimensions and principal angles [53, 56], all of which are needed to fully describe their relative position.

**Proposition 2.7** ([65]). *For nonzero  $V, V' \in G_p(X)$  and  $W, W' \in G_q(X)$ , there is  $T \in U(X)$  with  $T(V) = V'$  and  $T(W) = W'$  if, and only if,  $V$  and  $W$  have the same principal angles as  $V'$  and  $W'$ .*

**Proposition 2.8** ([53]). *For  $V, W \neq \{0\}$  or  $X$ , the nonzero principal angles of  $V^\perp$  and  $W^\perp$  are the same as those of  $V$  and  $W$ .*

**Lemma 2.9.** With the notation of [Definition 2.4](#), let  $A = e_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_p$ .

- i) If  $V \not\perp W$  then  $P_W(V) = [f_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge f_k]$  for  $k = \max\{i : \theta_i \neq \frac{\pi}{2}\}$ , and the principal angles of  $V$  and  $P_W(V)$  are  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k$ .
- ii)  $P_W A = \cos \theta_1 \cdots \cos \theta_p f_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge f_p$  if  $p \leq q$ , otherwise  $P_W A = 0$ .
- iii)  $[P_W A] = P_W(V) \Leftrightarrow P_W A \neq 0$ .

*Proof.*  $P_W e_i = f_i \cos \theta_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , and  $P_W e_i = 0$  if  $i > m$ .  $\square$

**Definition 2.10.** For  $V, W \in G(X)$ , when  $W^\perp \cap V \neq \{0\}$  we say  $V$  is *partially orthogonal* to  $W$ , and write  $V \perp W$ .

If  $p = q$  then  $V \perp W \Leftrightarrow W \perp V$ . In general the relation is asymmetric.

**Proposition 2.11.** For  $V, W \in G(X)$ ,  $V \perp W$  is equivalent to:

- i)  $\dim P_W(V) < \dim V$ .
- ii)  $\dim W < \dim V$  or a principal angle is  $\frac{\pi}{2}$ .
- iii)  $P_W A = 0$  for a blade  $A$  representing  $V$ .

*Proof.* For  $V, W \neq \{0\}$  it follows from [Lemma 2.9](#).  $\square$

**Definition 2.12.** For  $V \in G_p(X)$  and  $W \in G_q(X)$ , decompose  $W = W_P \oplus W_\perp$  with  $W_P = \{0\}$  and  $W_\perp = W$  if  $m = \min\{p, q\} = 0$ , otherwise  $W_P = [f_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge f_m]$  and  $W_\perp = [f_{m+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge f_q]$  ( $= \{0\}$  if  $m = q$ ) for a principal basis  $(f_1, \dots, f_q)$  of  $W$  w.r.t.  $V$ . We refer to  $W_P$  as a *projective subspace* of  $W$  w.r.t.  $V$ .

If  $V \not\perp W$  then  $W_P = P_W(V)$  and  $W_\perp = V^\perp \cap W$ , otherwise they depend on the principal basis, with  $W_P \supset P_W(V)$  and  $W_\perp \subset V^\perp \cap W$  (strict inclusions if  $p \leq q$ ). The following lemma is immediate:

**Lemma 2.13.** Nonzero  $V, W \in G(X)$  have the same principal angles as  $V$  and  $W_P$ , and the same nonzero principal angles as  $V \oplus W_\perp$  and  $W$ .

## 2.4 Asymmetric metrics

Asymmetric metrics [\[4, 47, 48\]](#) do not require  $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$ , and appear for example in directed graphs or Finsler manifolds, generalizing metrics as Finsler geometry generalizes the Riemannian one [\[23\]](#). Other terms are quasi-metric or quasi-distance [\[3, 15, 23\]](#) and  $T_0$ -quasi-pseudometric [\[33, 37\]](#). Ref. [\[36\]](#) reviews the subject from a topological perspective.

**Definition 2.14.** An *asymmetric metric* on a non-empty set  $M$  is a function  $d : M \times M \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  satisfying, for all  $x, y, z \in M$ :

- i) *Separation condition:*  $d(x, y) = d(y, x) = 0 \Leftrightarrow x = y$ .
- ii) *Oriented triangle inequality:*  $d(x, z) \leq d(x, y) + d(y, z)$ .

The order of  $x, y, z$  is important in ii. Instead of i, some authors [\[13, 62\]](#) use  $d(x, y) = 0 \Leftrightarrow x = y$ , which is too restrictive for some purposes: e.g., intuitively, the distance from a line to a plane containing it is 0.

With the *conjugate* distance  $d^-(x, y) = d(y, x)$ , we have *max* and *mean symmetrized* metrics  $\hat{d} = \max\{d, d^-\}$  and  $\bar{d} = \frac{d+d^-}{2}$ . Symmetrizing by the min does not preserve the triangle inequality. Some commonly used

Type	angular	chordal	gap
$l^2$	geodesic	chordal Frobenius	projection Frobenius
	$d_g = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^p \theta_{[e_i],[f_i]}^2}$	$d_{cF} = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^p c_{[e_i],[f_i]}^2}$	$d_{pF} = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^p g_{[e_i],[f_i]}^2}$
$\wedge$	Fubini-Study	chordal- $\wedge$	Binet-Cauchy
	$d_{FS} = \theta_{\wedge^p V, \wedge^p W}$	$d_{c\wedge} = c_{\wedge^p V, \wedge^p W}$	$d_{BC} = g_{\wedge^p V, \wedge^p W}$
max	Asimov	chordal 2-norm	projection 2-norm
	$d_A = \theta_{[e_p],[f_p]}$	$d_{c2} = c_{[e_p],[f_p]}$	$d_{p2} = g_{[e_p],[f_p]}$

Table 1: Metrics on  $G_p(X)$  in terms of the angular, chordal or gap distances between principal lines  $[e_i]$  and  $[f_i]$  of  $V$  and  $W$ , or between lines  $\wedge^p V$  and  $\wedge^p W$  in  $\wedge X$

metrics, like the gap [32] and the Hausdorff distance [30], are symmetrized versions of asymmetric metrics.

Asymmetric metrics give a choice of *backward*, *forward* or *symmetric* topologies  $\tau^-$ ,  $\tau^+$ ,  $\tau$  generated, respectively, by *backward balls*  $B_r^-(x) = \{y \in M : d(y, x) < r\}$ , *forward balls*  $B_r^+(x) = \{y \in M : d(x, y) < r\}$ , or *symmetric balls*  $B_r(x) = B_r^+(x) \cap B_r^-(x)$ . While  $\tau$  is Hausdorff, as it is the metric topology of  $\hat{d}$ ,  $\tau^\pm$  are just  $T_0$ . Also,  $d$  is continuous in  $\tau$  but not in  $\tau^\pm$ , as ii gives  $\max\{d(x, y) - d(x, z), d(z, x) - d(y, x)\} \leq d(z, y)$  instead of  $|d(x, y) - d(x, z)| \leq d(y, z)$ . On the other hand, there are more continuous paths with  $\tau^\pm$  than  $\tau$ : in  $\tau^-$  (resp.  $\tau^+$ ),  $p : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$  is continuous at  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  if, given  $\epsilon > 0$ , there is  $\delta > 0$  with  $d(p(s), p(t)) < \epsilon$  (resp.  $d(p(t), p(s)) < \epsilon$ ) for all  $s \in (t - \delta, t + \delta)$ , while  $\tau$  requires both conditions.

## 2.5 Metrics on Grassmannians

Usual metrics on  $G_p(X)$  [22, 53, 56, 66] are obtained by embedding it in other metric spaces, or as geodesic distances, but are ultimately based on the distances of Fig. 2, fitting into the scheme of Table 1.

Let  $V, W \in G_p(X)$  have principal angles  $\theta_1 \leq \dots \leq \theta_p$  and associated principal bases  $(e_1, \dots, e_p)$  and  $(f_1, \dots, f_p)$ . Also, let  $\mathbf{E}$  and  $\mathbf{F}$  be  $n \times p$  matrices formed with these vectors,  $A = e_1 \wedge \dots \wedge e_p$ ,  $B = f_1 \wedge \dots \wedge f_p$ ,  $\|\cdot\|_F$  be the Frobenius norm, and  $\|\cdot\|_{\text{op}}$  the operator norm. We have:

- 1)  $l^2$  metrics: given by the  $l^2$  norm of the vector formed by the angular, chordal or gap distances of principal lines  $[e_i]$  and  $[f_i]$ .
  - a) *Geodesic* [19, 34, 65]:  $d_g = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^p \theta_i^2}$  is the canonical metric, being the geodesic distance for the unique<sup>1</sup> (up to scaling) Riemannian metric invariant by  $U(X)$ , obtained by identifying the tangent space at  $V$  with  $\text{Hom}(V, V^\perp)$  and using the Hilbert-Schmidt product. Also called *Grassmann distance* [18, 66].
  - b) *Chordal Frobenius* [22]: embedding  $G_p(X)$  in  $\mathbb{F}^{n \times p}$  with  $\|\cdot\|_F$ ,  $d_{cF} = \|\mathbf{E} - \mathbf{F}\|_F = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^p \|e_i - f_i\|^2} = 2\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^p \sin^2 \frac{\theta_i}{2}}$ . Also called *Procrustes distance* [14, 27, 58].

<sup>1</sup>Except in  $G_2(\mathbb{R}^4)$  [35, p. 2249], [65, p. 591].




Figure 3: Metrics on  $G_2(X)$  as functions of principal angles  $\theta_1 \leq \theta_2$

- c) *Projection Frobenius* [21, 27]: embedding  $G_p(X)$  in the set of projection matrices with  $\|\cdot\|_F$ , we find  $d_{pF} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\|P_V - P_W\|_F = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^p \|e_i - P_W e_i\|^2} = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^p \sin^2 \theta_i}$ . Often called *chordal distance*, due to another embedding in a sphere [7, 17, 19, 66].
- 2)  $\wedge$  *metrics*: obtained via the Plücker embedding, with the angular, chordal or gap distance of  $\wedge^p V = \text{span}\{A\}$  and  $\wedge^p W = \text{span}\{B\}$ .
  - a) *Fubini-Study* [19, 39, 56]:  $d_{FS} = \gamma_{A,B} = \cos^{-1}(\prod_{i=1}^p \cos \theta_i)$ . It is a geodesic distance through the ambient space  $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^p X)$ , and an angle that measures volume contraction [24].
  - b) *chordal- $\wedge$* :  $d_{c\wedge} = \|A - B\| = 2 \sin \frac{\gamma_{A,B}}{2} = \sqrt{2 - 2 \prod_{i=1}^p \cos \theta_i}$ . This metric does not seem to have been considered before.
  - c) *Binet-Cauchy* [27, 59, 64]:  $d_{BC} = \|A - P_W A\| = \sin \gamma_{A,B} = \sqrt{1 - \prod_{i=1}^p \cos^2 \theta_i}$ .
- 3) *max metrics*: maximum angular, chordal or gap distance of principal lines (so, for  $[e_p]$  and  $[f_p]$ ).
  - a) *Asimov* [5]:  $d_A = \theta_p$  is the geodesic distance for a Finsler metric given by  $\|\cdot\|_{\text{op}}$  in the tangent space  $\text{Hom}(V, V^\perp)$  [61].
  - b) *Chordal 2-norm* [7]: as in (1b), but with  $\|\cdot\|_{\text{op}}$ , we have  $d_{c2} = \|\mathbf{E} - \mathbf{F}\|_{\text{op}} = \|e_p - f_p\| = 2 \sin \frac{\theta_p}{2}$ . The ‘2-norm’ refers to the norm in  $X$ . Also called *spectral distance* [18, 66].
  - c) *Projection 2-norm* [22]: as in (1c), but with  $\|\cdot\|_{\text{op}}$ , we have  $d_{p2} = \|P_V - P_W\|_{\text{op}} = \|e_p - P_W e_p\| = \sin \theta_p = \max_{v \in V, \|v\|=1} \|v - P_W v\|$ . Also called *gap* [32, 56] or *min-correlation* [27].

Inequalities in Appendix A show these metrics (Fig. 3) give the same topology on  $G_p(X)$ , and decrease as we move right (if  $V \neq W$ ) or down (if  $\dim(V \cap W) < p - 1$ ) in Table 1. For small principal angles,  $l^2$  and  $\wedge$  metrics converge asymptotically to  $d_g$ , so their embeddings are isometric (in the Riemannian sense) [22].

The  $l^2$  metrics are maximized when  $V \perp W$  (assuming  $\dim X \geq 2p$ ). The  $\wedge$  ones, when  $V \lhd W$ , so once  $\theta_p = \frac{\pi}{2}$  they ignore the other  $\theta_i$ ’s. Max metrics also maximize when  $V \lhd W$ , but always take only  $\theta_p$  into account, being unsuitable for applications in which many small differences between subspaces can be more relevant than a single large one.

We note that the following are not metrics on  $G_p(X)$ :



- The *max-correlation* [27] or *spectral distance* [19]  $d_{mc} = \sin \theta_1$  does not satisfy a triangle inequality, and  $d_{mc} = 0 \Leftrightarrow V \cap W \neq \{0\}$ .
- The *Martin metric* for ARMA models [46] is presented in [18, 66] as a metric  $d_M = \sqrt{-\log \prod_{i=1}^p \cos^2 \theta_i}$  for subspaces. But this formula is obtained in [16] for specific subspaces associated to the models. For arbitrary subspaces  $d_M$  does not satisfy a triangle inequality (e.g. take lines in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ ), and it is  $\infty$  when  $V \perp W$ .

## 2.6 Distances on the full Grassmannian

Let  $V \in G_p(X)$  and  $W \in G_q(X)$  have principal angles  $\theta_1 \leq \dots \leq \theta_{\min\{p,q\}}$  and associated principal bases  $(e_1, \dots, e_p)$  and  $(f_1, \dots, f_q)$ . On the full Grassmannian  $G(X)$  we have the following distances:

- *Full Fubini-Study metric*: obtained via the full Plücker embedding, it extends  $d_{FS}$  trivially: as blades of distinct grades are orthogonal,  $d_{FS}(V, W) = \frac{\pi}{2}$  whenever  $p \neq q$ .
- *Containment gap* [9, 32]: asymmetric metric generalizing  $d_{p2}$  via

$$\delta(V, W) = \max_{v \in V, \|v\|=1} \|v - P_W v\| = \begin{cases} \sin \theta_p & \text{if } p \leq q, \\ 1 & \text{if } p > q. \end{cases}$$

Since  $\delta(V, W) = 0 \Leftrightarrow V \subset W$ , it shows how far  $V$  is from being contained in  $W$ . Its maximum occurs when  $V \perp W$ .

- *Gap* [32]:  $\hat{\delta}(V, W) = \max\{\delta(V, W), \delta(W, V)\} = \|P_V - P_W\|_{\text{op}}$ . It is a metric extending  $d_{p2}$  trivially, with  $\hat{\delta}(V, W) = 1$  for  $p \neq q$ .
- *Projection Frobenius* [8, 21, 52]:  $d_{pF} = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{\min\{p,q\}} \sin^2 \theta_i}$  does not satisfy a triangle inequality (e.g. take two lines and their plane).
- *Directional distance* [60]: generalizes  $d_{pF}$  via

$$\vec{d}(V, W)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^p \|e_i - P_W e_i\|^2 = \begin{cases} \sum_{i=1}^p \sin^2 \theta_i & \text{if } p \leq q, \\ p - q + \sum_{i=1}^q \sin^2 \theta_i & \text{if } p > q. \end{cases}$$

It is not clear whether it satisfies a triangle inequality. For fixed  $p$  and  $q$ , its minimum is  $\sqrt{\max\{0, p - q\}}$ , if  $V \subset W$  or  $W \subset V$ .

- *Symmetric distance* [57, 60]:  $d_s(V, W) = \max\{\vec{d}(V, W), \vec{d}(W, V)\} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \|P_V - P_W\|_F = \sqrt{|p - q| + \sum_{i=1}^{\min\{p,q\}} \sin^2 \theta_i}$ . It is a metric. For fixed  $p$  and  $q$ , its minimum is  $\sqrt{|p - q|}$ , if  $V \subset W$  or  $W \subset V$ .

For  $p \neq q$ ,  $d_{FS}$  and  $\hat{\delta}$  have fixed values, so do not give any new information. As  $\delta$  and  $\hat{\delta}$  do not take all  $\theta_i$ 's into account, they are rather rough distances. Lack of a triangle inequality limits the usefulness of  $d_{pF}$  and (possibly)  $\vec{d}$ . For  $p \neq q$ ,  $d_s$  is a nontrivial metric, and its nonzero minimum may be useful if subspaces of distinct dimensions must be kept apart. But if they are similar when one is almost contained in the other, it is inconvenient to have this expressed by  $d_s(V, W) < \sqrt{|p - q|} + \epsilon$ , specially if  $p$  or  $q$  are not known beforehand (e.g. if the subspaces are approximate representations obtained by truncating the spectrum of an operator). Other metrics obtained in [66] have similar problems.




Figure 4: The area of  $A$  contracts by  $\cos \Theta_{V,W}$  when projected on  $W$

### 3 Asymmetric angle

We first describe an angle between subspaces of arbitrary dimensions, and later we show it extends  $d_{FS}$  as an asymmetric metric on  $G(X)$ .

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $V, W \in G(X)$ , and  $A$  be a blade representing  $V$ . The *asymmetric angle*<sup>2</sup> from  $V$  to  $W$  is  $\Theta_{V,W} = \cos^{-1} \frac{\|P_W A\|}{\|A\|} \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$ .

Similar angles [24, 26, 31] that project from the smaller to the larger subspace do not satisfy a triangle inequality. We project from  $V$  to  $W$  even if  $\dim V > \dim W$ , in which case  $\Theta_{V,W} = \frac{\pi}{2}$ . As a result, in general  $\Theta_{V,W} \neq \Theta_{W,V}$  if dimensions are different. This reflects the dimensional asymmetry of subspaces, and lets the angle carry some dimensional data ( $\Theta_{V,W} \neq \frac{\pi}{2} \Rightarrow \dim P_W(V) = \dim V \leq \dim W$ ), what simplifies proofs (e.g. in Theorem 3.16). Many of our results, like the triangle inequality, only hold in full generality thanks to the angle asymmetry.

By Proposition 2.7, having equal asymmetric angles does not mean pairs of subspaces can be related via  $U(X)$ , so  $\Theta_{V,W}$  does not describe completely the relative position of  $V$  and  $W$ . What it does is codify information about projection factors [42].

**Definition 3.2.** Let  $V, W \in G(X)$ ,  $k = \dim V_{\mathbb{R}}$  and  $|\cdot|_k$  be the  $k$ -dimensional Lebesgue measure in  $X_{\mathbb{R}}$ . The *projection factor* of  $V$  on  $W$  is  $\pi_{V,W} = \frac{|P_W(S)|_k}{|S|_k}$ , for a Lebesgue measurable set  $S \subset V$  with  $|S|_k \neq 0$ .

**Proposition 3.3.**  $\pi_{V,W} = \begin{cases} \cos \Theta_{V,W} & \text{if } \mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}, \\ \cos^2 \Theta_{V,W} & \text{if } \mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}. \end{cases}$

*Proof.* Immediate, as  $\|A\|$  and  $\|P_W A\|$  (squared, if  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$ ) are  $k$ -volumes of a parallelotope and its projection.  $\square$

So  $\cos \Theta_{V,W}$  (squared, if  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$ ) measures the contraction of volumes orthogonally projected from  $V$  to  $W$  (Fig. 4).

**Corollary 3.4.**  $\cos \Theta_{V_{\mathbb{R}}, W_{\mathbb{R}}} = \cos^2 \Theta_{V,W}$ , if  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$ .

*Proof.*  $\pi_{V,W} = \pi_{V_{\mathbb{R}}, W_{\mathbb{R}}}$ , as the Lebesgue measure is taken in  $X_{\mathbb{R}}$ .  $\square$

<sup>2</sup>Formerly called *Grassmann angle* [41, 42].

So, in general,  $\Theta_{V_{\mathbb{R}}, W_{\mathbb{R}}} > \Theta_{V, W}$  if  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$ , what may seem strange since  $X_{\mathbb{R}} \cong X$  as metric spaces. An explanation is that these angles are different ways to encode the same projection factor. One might say  $\Theta_{V, W}$  should be defined as equal to  $\Theta_{V_{\mathbb{R}}, W_{\mathbb{R}}}$ , but formulas would differ if  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$ : e.g.  $|\langle A, B \rangle| = \|A\| \|B\| \sqrt{\cos \Theta_{V_{\mathbb{R}}, W_{\mathbb{R}}}}$  in [Proposition 3.20](#). Another inconvenient is that working in  $X_{\mathbb{R}}$  increases dimensions and wastes symmetries of the complex structure, leading to repeated principal angles (see the observations and examples after [Proposition 3.25](#)). Quantum theory gives us another reason to prefer  $\Theta_{V, W}$ : the Bures angle [\[10\]](#) for pure quantum states  $\psi$  and  $\phi$  corresponds to  $\Theta_{\mathbb{C}\psi, \mathbb{C}\phi}$ .

**Proposition 3.5.** *For nonzero  $V \in G_p(X)$  and  $W \in G_q(X)$ , with principal angles  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{\min\{p, q\}}$ ,*

$$\cos \Theta_{V, W} = \begin{cases} \prod_{i=1}^p \cos \theta_i & \text{if } p \leq q, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

*Proof.* Follows from [Lemma 2.9ii](#).  $\square$

In general  $\Theta_{V, W} > \theta_i \forall i$ , so no line of  $V$  makes such angle with  $W$ . This formula gives another way to look at [Proposition 3.3](#): if  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$ , each principal axis  $\mathbb{R}e_i \subset V$  projected to  $W$  contracts by  $\cos \theta_i$ , so  $p$ -volumes contract by  $\cos \Theta_{V, W}$ ; if  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$ , each  $\cos \theta_i$  describes the contraction of 2 real axes,  $\mathbb{R}e_i$  and  $\mathbb{R}(ie_i)$ , so  $2p$ -volumes in  $V$  contract by  $\cos^2 \Theta_{V, W}$ .

**Example 3.6.** In [Example 2.5](#), all lines in  $V$  make a  $45^\circ$  angle with  $W$ , but  $\Theta_{V, W} = \cos^{-1}(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}) = 60^\circ$ , so that, when projected from  $V$  to  $W$ , lengths contract by  $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$ , areas by  $\frac{1}{2}$ . As  $\dim W > \dim V$ , volumes vanish when projected from  $W$  to  $V$ , and  $\Theta_{W, V} = 90^\circ$ .

**Example 3.7.** In [Example 2.6](#),  $\Theta_{V, W} = \cos^{-1}(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{2}) \cong 69.3^\circ$ , while  $\Theta_{V_{\mathbb{R}}, W_{\mathbb{R}}} = \cos^{-1}(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{2}) \cong 82.8^\circ$ . Both angles convey the same information, that 4-volumes in  $V$  contract by a factor  $\cos^2 \Theta_{V, W} = \cos \Theta_{V_{\mathbb{R}}, W_{\mathbb{R}}} = \frac{1}{8}$  when projected on  $W$ .

For equal dimensions,  $\Theta_{V, W}$  is symmetric, equals the Fubini-Study metric (so it is an angle between lines in  $\bigwedge X$ ), and is related to the Binet-Cauchy and chordal- $\wedge$  metrics:

**Corollary 3.8.** *If  $\dim V = \dim W$  then  $\Theta_{V, W} = \Theta_{W, V} = d_{FS}(V, W)$ ,  $d_{BC}(V, W) = \sin \Theta_{V, W}$  and  $d_{c\wedge}(V, W) = 2 \sin \frac{\Theta_{V, W}}{2}$ .*

If  $p = \dim V \neq \dim W$ ,  $\Theta_{V, W}$  is an angle between a line  $\mathcal{L} = \bigwedge^p V$  and a subspace  $\mathcal{W} = \bigwedge^p W$  (given, if  $\mathcal{L} = \text{span}\{A\}$ , by  $\theta_{\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{W}} = \theta_{A, P_{\mathcal{W}}A}$ ).

**Proposition 3.9.**  $\Theta_{V, W} = \theta_{\bigwedge^p V, \bigwedge^p W}$  for  $V, W \in G(X)$  and  $p = \dim V$ .

*Proof.* For  $0 \neq A \in \bigwedge^p V$ , we have  $P_{\bigwedge^p W} A = P_W A$ , so that  $\Theta_{V, W} = \cos^{-1} \frac{\|P_W A\|}{\|A\|} = \theta_{A, P_W A} = \theta_{\bigwedge^p V, \bigwedge^p W}$ .  $\square$

If  $p > \dim W$  then  $\mathcal{W} = \{0\}$  and  $\theta_{\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{W}} = \frac{\pi}{2}$ , so this result reflects the angle asymmetry. It gives another reason why  $\Theta_{V_{\mathbb{R}}, W_{\mathbb{R}}} \neq \Theta_{V, W}$  if  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$ : these are angles in exterior algebras, and  $\bigwedge(X_{\mathbb{R}}) \not\cong \bigwedge X$ .

**Proposition 3.10.** *Let  $V, W \in G(X)$ .*




Figure 5: Generalized spherical Pythagorean theorem, and angles for orthogonal partitions (the figures use lines and planes, but the formulas hold for any dimensions)

- i)  $\Theta_{V, W} = 0 \Leftrightarrow V \subset W$ , and  $\Theta_{V, W} = \frac{\pi}{2} \Leftrightarrow V \perp W$ .
- ii)  $\Theta_{V, W} = \Theta_{V, P_W(V)}$ .
- iii)  $\Theta_{V, W} = \Theta_{V, W \oplus U}$  for any subspace  $U \perp (V + W)$ .
- iv)  $\Theta_{V, W} = \Theta_{V', W'}$  for  $V' = (V \cap W)^\perp \cap V$  and  $W' = (V \cap W)^\perp \cap W$ .
- v)  $\Theta_{T(V), T(W)} = \Theta_{V, W}$  for any  $T \in U(X)$ .
- vi)  $\Theta_{V^\perp, W^\perp} = \Theta_{W, V}$ .

*Proof.* Follow from [Proposition 3.5](#) combined with: (i) [Proposition 2.11ii](#); (ii) [i](#) and [Lemma 2.9i](#); (v) [Proposition 2.7](#); (vi) [Proposition 2.8](#) and  $\dim V^\perp > \dim W^\perp \Leftrightarrow \dim W > \dim V$ .  $\square$

These properties rely on the angle asymmetry (e.g. take [ii](#) with perpendicular planes in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ ), and [i](#) sheds light on it:  $\Theta_{V, W}$  shows how far  $V$  is from being contained in  $W$ , and is  $\frac{\pi}{2}$  if  $V$  has a line orthogonal to  $W$ . A line  $L$  can go from being contained to being orthogonal to a plane  $W$ , so  $\Theta_{L, W}$  can have any value;  $W$  is never any closer to being contained in  $L$ , and always has a line orthogonal to  $L$ , so  $\Theta_{W, L}$  is always  $\frac{\pi}{2}$ .

**Proposition 3.11.**  $\cos^2 \Theta_{V, W} = \det(\bar{\mathbf{P}}^T \mathbf{P})$ , where  $\mathbf{P}$  is a matrix for the orthogonal projection  $V \rightarrow W$  in orthonormal bases of  $V$  and  $W$ . If  $\dim V = \dim W$  then  $\cos \Theta_{V, W} = |\det \mathbf{P}|$ .

*Proof.* Follows from [\(1\)](#), as in associated principal bases  $\mathbf{P}$  is a  $q \times p$  diagonal matrix with the  $\cos \theta_i$ 's.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.12.**  $\cos \Theta_{V, W'} = \cos \Theta_{V, P_W(V)} \cos \Theta_{P_W(V), W'}$  for any  $V, W, W' \in G(X)$  with  $W' \subset W$ .

*Proof.* [Proposition 3.10i](#) lets us assume  $V \not\subset W$ , so  $\dim P_W(V) = \dim V$ . Let  $\mathbf{P}_1, \mathbf{P}_2$  and  $\mathbf{P}_3$  be matrices for the orthogonal projections  $V \rightarrow W'$ ,  $V \rightarrow P_W(V)$  and  $P_W(V) \rightarrow W'$ , respectively, in orthonormal bases. Since  $\mathbf{P}_1 = \mathbf{P}_3 \mathbf{P}_2$  and  $\mathbf{P}_2$  is square,  $\det(\bar{\mathbf{P}}_1^T \mathbf{P}_1) = |\det \mathbf{P}_2|^2 \cdot \det(\bar{\mathbf{P}}_3^T \mathbf{P}_3)$ . The result follows from [Proposition 3.11](#).  $\square$

This formula generalizes the spherical Pythagorean theorem. It relies on the angle asymmetry (e.g. let  $U = V \cap W$  for planes  $V, W \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ ), as does the next result (e.g. partition  $V = \mathbb{R}^3$  into a line  $V'$  and a plane  $V''$ , and let  $W$  be another plane). [Fig. 5](#) illustrates them.




Figure 6:  $\Theta_{V,W} = \Theta_{V,W_P} \leq \Theta_{V,U}$  if  $U \subset W$ ,  $\Theta_{V,W} = \Theta_{V \oplus W_\perp, W} \leq \Theta_{Y,W}$  if  $Y \supset V$

**Proposition 3.13.**  $\cos \Theta_{V,W} = \cos \Theta_{V',W'} \cos \Theta_{V'',W''}$  for orthogonal partitions  $V = V' \oplus V''$  and  $W = W' \oplus W''$  with  $W' = P_W(V')$ .

*Proof.* Given unit blades  $A$  and  $B$  with  $[A] = V'$  and  $[B] = V''$ ,  $A \wedge B$  is a unit blade with  $[A \wedge B] = V$ . If  $V' \lrcorner W$  then  $\Theta_{V,W} = \Theta_{V',W'} = \frac{\pi}{2}$ . If  $V' \not\lrcorner W$  then  $W'' = [P_W A]^\perp \cap W$ , so  $P_W A \wedge P_W B = P_W A \wedge P_{W''} B$  and  $\cos \Theta_{V,W} = \|P_W(A \wedge B)\| = \|P_W A \wedge P_W B\| = \|P_W A \wedge P_{W''} B\| = \|P_W A\| \|P_{W''} B\| = \cos \Theta_{V',W'} \cos \Theta_{V'',W''}$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 3.14.** Let  $V, V', W, W' \in G(X)$  with  $V' \subset V$  and  $W' \subset W$ .

- i)  $\Theta_{V,W'} \geq \Theta_{V,W}$ , with equality if and only if  $V \lrcorner W$  or  $P_W(V) \subset W'$ .
- ii)  $\Theta_{V',W} \leq \Theta_{V,W}$ , with equality if and only if  $V' \lrcorner W$  or  $V'^\perp \cap V \subset W$ .

*Proof.* (i) By Propositions 3.10ii and 3.12,  $\cos \Theta_{V,W'} \leq \cos \Theta_{V,W}$ , with equality if, and only if,  $\Theta_{V,W} = \frac{\pi}{2}$  or  $\Theta_{P_W(V),W'} = 0$ . (ii) By Proposition 3.13,  $\cos \Theta_{V',W} \leq \cos \Theta_{V',P_W(V')}$ , with equality if, and only if,  $V' \lrcorner W$  or  $V'^\perp \cap V \subset (P_W(V'))^\perp \cap W$  ( $\Leftrightarrow V'^\perp \cap V \subset W$ ).  $\square$

This implies the minimum angle in certain sets of subspaces is  $\Theta_{V,W}$ . The decomposition in Definition 2.12 leads to special subspaces attaining this minimum (Fig. 6): if  $p = \dim V \leq \dim W = q$  then  $\dim W_P = p$  and  $\dim V \oplus W_\perp = q$ , so the minima are attained in  $G_p(W)$  and  $G_q(X)$ .

**Corollary 3.15.** For  $V, W \in G(X)$ ,  $\min\{\Theta_{V,U} : U \in G(W)\} = \Theta_{V,W} = \Theta_{V,W_P}$  and  $\min\{\Theta_{Y,W} : Y \in G(X), Y \supset V\} = \Theta_{V,W} = \Theta_{V \oplus W_\perp, W}$ .

*Proof.* If  $0 < \dim V \leq \dim W$ , it follows from Propositions 2.13, 3.5 and 3.14. If  $V = \{0\}$  all values are 0, and if  $\dim V > \dim W$  all are  $\frac{\pi}{2}$ .  $\square$

### 3.1 Metric properties

As seen,  $\Theta_{V,W}$  gives the Fubini-Study metric on each  $G_p(X)$ . We now prove that on  $G(X)$  it is an asymmetric metric, discuss its topologies, and obtain equality conditions for the oriented triangle inequality.

**Theorem 3.16.**  $G(X)$  is an asymmetric metric space, with distances given by  $d(V, W) = \Theta_{V,W}$  for  $V, W \in G(X)$ .




Figure 7: Oriented triangle inequalities for lines  $U$  and  $V$  and a plane  $W$ .

*Proof.* The first condition in Definition 2.14 follows from Proposition 3.10i, and we must prove  $\Theta_{U,W} \leq \Theta_{U,V} + \Theta_{V,W}$  for any  $U, V, W \in G(X)$ . We can assume  $\Theta_{U,V}, \Theta_{V,W} \neq \frac{\pi}{2}$ , and so  $\Theta_{P_V(U),W} \neq \frac{\pi}{2}$  as well. Therefore  $U, P_V(U)$  and  $P_W P_V(U)$  have the same dimension  $p$ , and

$$\Theta_{U,W} \leq \Theta_{U, P_W P_V(U)} \quad (2)$$

$$\leq \Theta_{U, P_V(U)} + \Theta_{P_V(U), P_W P_V(U)} = \Theta_{U,V} + \Theta_{P_V(U), W} \quad (3)$$

$$\leq \Theta_{U,V} + \Theta_{V,W}, \quad (4)$$

using Propositions 3.14i in (2), 2.2, 3.9, 3.10ii in (3), and 3.14ii in (4).  $\square$

Fig. 7 illustrates the oriented triangle inequality. The angle asymmetry and the order of subspaces play a crucial role: in Fig. 7b,  $\Theta_{W,V} = \frac{\pi}{2}$  and so  $\Theta_{U,V} \leq \Theta_{U,W} + \Theta_{W,V}$ , but  $\Theta_{U,V} > \Theta_{U,W} + \Theta_{V,W}$ .

The topologies induced by this asymmetric metric are natural for  $G(X)$ , as we argue in Section 5, and reflect well the dimensional asymmetry of subspaces. For example, a line  $L$  and a plane  $V$  have sensible neighborhoods in the backward topology  $\tau^-$  of  $G(\mathbb{R}^3)$ : for  $0 < r < \frac{\pi}{2}$ ,  $B_r^-(L) = \{U \in G(X) : \Theta_{U,L} < r\}$  has  $\{0\}$  and lines inside a double cone around  $L$  (Fig. 8a), and  $B_r^-(V)$  has  $\{0\}$ , lines and planes outside a double cone (Fig. 8b). If  $\Theta_{L,V} \rightarrow 0$ ,  $L$  will end up in  $B_r^-(V)$ , and the constant  $\Theta_{V,L} = \frac{\pi}{2}$  means  $V$  is never any closer to being in  $B_r^-(L)$ . Depending on the purpose, one can also use the forward topology  $\tau^+$ :  $B_r^+(L) = \{U \in G(X) : \Theta_{L,U} < r\}$  has  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , lines and planes intercepting the interior of the cone of Fig. 8a, and  $B_r^+(V)$  has  $\mathbb{R}^3$  and planes outside the cone of Fig. 8b. The symmetric topology  $\tau$  is the same of the full Fubini-Study metric:  $B_r(L)$  has only lines, and  $B_r(V)$  only planes.

While in  $\tau$  the  $G_p(X)$ 's are disconnected from each other, in  $\tau^\pm$  we have continuous paths linking subspaces of distinct dimensions: e.g. for  $U \subset W$ , the paths  $V_-(t) = \begin{cases} U & \text{if } t < 0, \\ W & \text{if } t \geq 0, \end{cases}$  and  $V_+(t) = \begin{cases} U & \text{if } t \leq 0, \\ W & \text{if } t > 0, \end{cases}$  are continuous in  $\tau^-$  and  $\tau^+$ , respectively, and so are the reversed paths. On the other hand,  $\Theta_{U,W}$  is discontinuous in  $\tau^\pm$  when dimensions change: e.g. if  $U \subsetneq W$  then  $U \in B_r^-(W)$  and  $W \in B_r^+(U)$  for all  $r$ , but  $\Theta_{U,U} = \Theta_{W,W} = 0$  and  $\Theta_{W,U} = \frac{\pi}{2}$ .

The next lemma will help us obtain equality conditions for the triangle inequality. As argued in [53, p. 519] it is important to analyze such extremal cases, which occur for example in geodesics whose lengths equal the distance between its endpoints.




Figure 8: Dimensional asymmetry between backward balls of a line  $L$  and a plane  $V$

**Lemma 3.17.** *Let  $A, B, C$  be nonzero  $p$ -blades with  $[A], [B], [C]$  all distinct. If  $B = \kappa A + \lambda C$  for  $\kappa, \lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ , there are  $u, v, w \in X$  and a unit blade  $D \in \bigwedge^{p-1} X$  with  $v = \kappa u + \lambda w$ ,  $A = u \wedge D$ ,  $B = v \wedge D$ ,  $C = w \wedge D$  and  $[D] = [A] \cap [B] \cap [C]$ . We can choose  $u, v, w$  in any complement of  $[D]$ , and if they are in  $[D]^\perp$  then  $\langle u, w \rangle = \langle A, C \rangle$ .*

*Proof.* If  $x \in [A] \cap [C]$  then  $x \wedge B = x \wedge (\kappa A + \lambda C) = 0$ , so  $x \in [B]$ . As the spaces are distinct,  $\kappa, \lambda \neq 0$ , so  $A$  and  $C$  are also linear combinations of the other blades. Thus  $[A] \cap [C] = [A] \cap [B] = [B] \cap [C] = [A] \cap [B] \cap [C] = [D]$  for a unit  $q$ -blade  $D$ . Given a complement  $X'$  of  $[D]$ , we have  $A = A' \wedge D$ ,  $B = B' \wedge D$  and  $C = C' \wedge D$  for blades  $A', B', C' \in \bigwedge^{p-q} X'$  with  $[A'], [B']$  and  $[C']$  all disjoint. As  $(B' - \kappa A' - \lambda C') \wedge D = 0$  and  $B' - \kappa A' - \lambda C' \in \bigwedge X'$ , Lemma 2.1 gives  $B' = \kappa A' + \lambda C'$ . So for any nonzero  $u' \in [A']$  and  $w' \in [C']$  we have  $B' \wedge u' \wedge w' = 0$ , and as  $B' \wedge u' \neq 0$  (by Lemma 2.1) this means  $w' \in [B' \wedge u'] = [B'] \oplus [u']$ . Since  $w' \notin [B']$  and  $u'$  was chosen at will in  $[A']$ , this implies  $\dim[A'] = 1$ . Thus  $A', B', C'$  are vectors  $u, v, w$ . If  $X' = [D]^\perp$  then  $\langle A, C \rangle = \langle u \wedge D, w \wedge D \rangle = \langle u, w \rangle \cdot \|D\|^2$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 3.18.**  $\Theta_{U,W} = \Theta_{U,V} + \Theta_{V,W}$  for  $U, V, W \in G(X)$  in the following cases, and no other:

- i)  $V \subset W$ , and  $U \perp W$  or  $P_W(U) \subset V$ ;
- ii)  $U \subset V$ , and  $U \perp W$  or  $U^\perp \cap V \subset W$ ;
- iii)  $U = [u] \oplus R$ ,  $V = [v] \oplus S$  and  $W = [w] \oplus T$  for subspaces  $R \subset S \subset T$  and aligned  $u, v, w \in T^\perp$  with  $v = \kappa u + \lambda w$  for  $\kappa, \lambda > 0$ .

*Proof.* By Proposition 3.14, (i) corresponds to  $\Theta_{V,W} = 0$  and  $\Theta_{U,W} = \Theta_{U,V}$ , and (ii) to  $\Theta_{U,V} = 0$  and  $\Theta_{U,W} = \Theta_{V,W}$ . (iii) has  $\Theta_{U,W} = \theta_{[u],[w]}$ ,  $\Theta_{U,V} = \theta_{[u],[v]}$ ,  $\Theta_{V,W} = \theta_{[v],[w]}$ , and Proposition 2.2 gives the equality.

Suppose  $\Theta_{U,W} = \Theta_{U,V} + \Theta_{V,W}$  but (i) and (ii) do not hold (and so  $\Theta_{U,V}, \Theta_{V,W} \neq \frac{\pi}{2}$ ). Equalities in (2) and (4) give  $\Theta_{U, P_W P_V(U)} = \Theta_{U,W}$  and  $\Theta_{P_V(U), W} = \Theta_{V,W}$ . These angles and  $\Theta_{U, P_V(U)} = \Theta_{U,V}$  are nonzero, so  $U$ ,  $P_V(U)$  and  $P_W P_V(U)$  are distinct  $p$ -subspaces. By Proposition 3.9, equality in (3) means  $\theta_{J,L} = \theta_{J,K} + \theta_{K,L}$  for  $J = \bigwedge^p U$ ,  $K = \bigwedge^p P_V(U)$  and  $L = \bigwedge^p P_W P_V(U)$ . Proposition 2.2 gives aligned  $p$ -blades  $A, B, C$  with  $[A] = U$ ,  $[B] = P_V U$ ,  $[C] = P_W P_V(U)$  and  $B = \kappa A + \lambda C$  for  $\kappa, \lambda > 0$  (strict as the spaces are distinct). Lemma 3.17 gives  $u, v, w \in X$  orthogonal to  $R = [A] \cap [B] \cap [C]$ , with  $U = [u] \oplus R$ ,  $P_V(U) = [v] \oplus R$ ,  $P_W P_V(U) = [w] \oplus R$ ,  $v = \kappa u + \lambda w$  and  $\langle u, w \rangle = \langle A, C \rangle \geq 0$ , so  $u, v, w$  are aligned.

Let  $V = [v] \oplus R \oplus S'$  be an orthogonal partition. As  $P_V u \in [v] \oplus R$ , we have  $u \perp S'$  and  $w = \frac{v - \kappa u}{\lambda} \perp S'$ . And as  $\Theta_{P_V(U), W} = \Theta_{V,W} \neq \frac{\pi}{2}$ ,

Proposition 3.14ii gives  $S' = P_V(U)^\perp \cap V \subset W$ . So we have another orthogonal partition  $W = [w] \oplus R \oplus S' \oplus T'$ . As  $v \in P_V(U)$ , we have  $P_W v \in [w] \oplus R$ , so  $v \perp T'$  and  $u = \frac{v-\lambda w}{\kappa} \perp T'$ . All conditions of (iii) are satisfied with  $S = R \oplus S'$  and  $T = R \oplus S' \oplus T'$ .  $\square$

For equal dimensions the equality conditions become simpler [31]:

**Corollary 3.19.**  $\Theta_{U,W} = \Theta_{U,V} + \Theta_{V,W}$  for  $U, V, W \in G_p(X)$  if, and only if,  $V = U$  or  $W$ , or  $U = [u] \oplus R$ ,  $V = [v] \oplus R$  and  $W = [w] \oplus R$  for  $R \in G_{p-1}(X)$  and aligned  $u, v, w \in R^\perp$  with  $v = \kappa u + \lambda w$  for  $\kappa, \lambda > 0$ .

### 3.2 Other properties

The asymmetric angle is linked to various products of Grassmann and Clifford algebras [20, 44], which we use to obtain more properties.

The contraction or interior product  $A \lrcorner B$  of  $A, B \in \bigwedge X$  is defined by  $\langle C, A \lrcorner B \rangle = \langle A \wedge C, B \rangle$  for any  $C \in \bigwedge X$  (there are other conventions [12, 20, 45]). If  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$ , it is conjugate linear on  $A$ . If  $A \in \bigwedge^p X$  and  $B \in \bigwedge^q X$  then  $A \lrcorner B \in \bigwedge^{q-p} X$ . It is asymmetric, with  $A \lrcorner B = 0$  if  $p > q$ . If  $p = q$  then  $A \lrcorner B = \langle A, B \rangle$ . If  $p \leq q$  and  $B = v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_q$ ,

$$A \lrcorner B = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}_p^q} \epsilon_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{i}'} \langle A, B_{\mathbf{i}} \rangle B_{\mathbf{i}'}, \quad (5)$$

with  $B_{\mathbf{i}} = v_{\mathbf{i}}$  for  $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}_p^q$  (so  $B = \epsilon_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{i}'} B_{\mathbf{i}} \wedge B_{\mathbf{i}'}$ ). For  $(v_1, \dots, v_n)$  orthonormal and  $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{I}^n$ , if  $\mathbf{i} \subset \mathbf{j}$  then  $v_{\mathbf{i}} \lrcorner v_{\mathbf{j}} = \epsilon_{\mathbf{i}(\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i})} v_{\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}}$ , otherwise  $v_{\mathbf{i}} \lrcorner v_{\mathbf{j}} = 0$ . For nonzero blades,  $A \lrcorner B = 0$  if  $[A] \not\sim [B]$ , otherwise  $[A \lrcorner B] = [A]^\perp \cap [B]$ .

**Proposition 3.20.**  $\|A \lrcorner B\| = \|A\| \|B\| \cos \Theta_{[A],[B]}$  for blades  $A \in \bigwedge^p X$  and  $B \in \bigwedge^q X$ . If  $p = q$ ,  $|\langle A, B \rangle| = \|A\| \|B\| \cos \Theta_{[A],[B]}$ .

*Proof.* We can assume  $0 < p \leq q$ ,  $A = e_1 \wedge \dots \wedge e_p$  and  $B = f_1 \wedge \dots \wedge f_q$  for associated principal bases  $(e_1, \dots, e_p)$  and  $(f_1, \dots, f_q)$  of  $[A]$  and  $[B]$ . By (5),  $\|A \lrcorner B\| = \langle e_{1\dots p}, f_{1\dots p} \rangle = \prod_{i=1}^p \cos \theta_i$ , so it follows from (1).  $\square$

The angle asymmetry matches that of  $A \lrcorner B$ , so the formula for  $\|A \lrcorner B\|$  holds even if  $p > q$ . These formulas are an easy way to compute  $\Theta_{V,W}$ .

**Example 3.21.** Let  $(u_1, \dots, u_5)$  be the canonical basis of  $\mathbb{R}^5$ ,  $v_1 = 2u_1 - u_2$ ,  $v_2 = 2u_1 + u_3$ ,  $v_3 = u_3$ ,  $w_1 = u_2 + u_5$ ,  $w_2 = u_3 - u_4$  and  $w_3 = u_4$ . For  $A = v_{12} = 2u_{12} + 2u_{13} - u_{23}$ ,  $B = w_{12} = u_{23} - u_{24} - u_{35} + u_{45}$ ,  $C = w_{123} = u_{234} + u_{345}$  and  $D = v_{123} = 2u_{123}$ , we find  $\|A\| = 3$ ,  $\|B\| = 2$ ,  $\|C\| = \sqrt{2}$ ,  $\langle A, B \rangle = -1$ ,  $A \lrcorner C = -u_4$  and  $\langle C, D \rangle = 0$ , so  $\Theta_{[A],[B]} = \cos^{-1} \frac{1}{6} \cong 80.4^\circ$ ,  $\Theta_{[A],[C]} = \cos^{-1} \frac{1}{3\sqrt{2}} \cong 76.4^\circ$  and  $\Theta_{[C],[D]} = 90^\circ$ .

We can write the formulas using matrices. The first one is asymmetric, but works for similar angles if  $p \leq q$ , and is simpler than another of [26].

**Proposition 3.22.** Given bases  $(v_1, \dots, v_p)$  of  $V$  and  $(w_1, \dots, w_q)$  of  $W$ , let  $\mathbf{A}_{p \times p} = (\langle v_i, v_j \rangle)$ ,  $\mathbf{B}_{q \times q} = (\langle w_i, w_j \rangle)$  and  $\mathbf{C}_{q \times p} = (\langle w_i, v_j \rangle)$ . Then  $\cos^2 \Theta_{V,W} = \frac{\det(\tilde{\mathbf{C}}^T \mathbf{B}^{-1} \mathbf{C})}{\det \mathbf{A}}$ . If  $p = q$  then  $\cos^2 \Theta_{V,W} = \frac{|\det \mathbf{C}|^2}{\det \mathbf{A} \cdot \det \mathbf{B}}$ .



*Proof.* Assume  $p \leq q$ , otherwise  $\Theta_{V,W} = \frac{\pi}{2}$  and  $\det(\bar{\mathbf{C}}^T \mathbf{B}^{-1} \mathbf{C}) = 0$ , as it is a  $p \times p$  matrix of rank at most  $q$ . Let  $\mathbf{C}_i$  and  $\mathbf{B}_{i'}$  be the  $p \times p$  and  $(q-p) \times q$  matrices formed by the lines of  $\mathbf{C}$  with indices in  $i \in \mathcal{I}_p^q$ , and the lines of  $\mathbf{B}$  with indices not in  $i$ . For  $A = v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_p$  and  $B = w_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge w_q$ , Laplace expansion, Schur's identity and (5) give  $\|A \lrcorner B\|^2 = \langle A \wedge (A \lrcorner B), B \rangle = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_p^q} \epsilon_{ii'} \langle B_i, A \rangle \langle A \wedge B_{i'}, B \rangle = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_p^q} \epsilon_{ii'} \det \mathbf{C}_i \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} \bar{\mathbf{C}}^T \\ \mathbf{B}_{i'} \end{smallmatrix} \right| = (-1)^{p(q-p)} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_p^q} \epsilon_{ii'} \det \mathbf{C}_i \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} \mathbf{B}_{i'} \\ \bar{\mathbf{C}}^T \end{smallmatrix} \right| = (-1)^{pq+p} \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} \mathbf{C} & \mathbf{B} \\ \mathbf{0} & \bar{\mathbf{C}}^T \end{smallmatrix} \right| = (-1)^p \cdot \left| \begin{smallmatrix} \bar{\mathbf{C}}^T \\ \mathbf{C} & \mathbf{B} \end{smallmatrix} \right| = (-1)^p \det \mathbf{B} \cdot \det(-\bar{\mathbf{C}}^T \mathbf{B}^{-1} \mathbf{C}) = \det \mathbf{B} \cdot \det(\bar{\mathbf{C}}^T \mathbf{B}^{-1} \mathbf{C})$ . The result follows from Proposition 3.20.  $\square$

**Example 3.23.** In  $\mathbb{R}^4$ , let  $V = [v]$  and  $W = [w_{12}]$  for  $v = (1, 0, 1, 0)$ ,  $w_1 = (0, 1, 1, 0)$ ,  $w_2 = (1, 2, 2, -1)$ . With  $\mathbf{A} = (2)$ ,  $\mathbf{B} = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 4 \\ 4 & 10 \end{pmatrix}$ ,  $\mathbf{C} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 3 \end{pmatrix}$ , we find  $\Theta_{V,W} = 45^\circ$ , as one can verify by projecting  $v$  on  $W$ . Switching the roles of  $V$  and  $W$ , we now have  $\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 4 \\ 4 & 10 \end{pmatrix}$ ,  $\mathbf{B} = (2)$ ,  $\mathbf{C} = (1 \ 3)$  and  $\Theta_{W,V} = 90^\circ$ , as expected since  $\dim W > \dim V$ .

**Example 3.24.** In  $\mathbb{C}^3$ , with  $\xi = e^{i\frac{2\pi}{3}}$ , let  $V = [v_{12}]$  and  $W = [w_{12}]$  for  $v_1 = (1, -\xi, 0)$ ,  $v_2 = (0, \xi, -\xi^2)$ ,  $w_1 = (1, 0, 0)$  and  $w_2 = (0, \xi, 0)$ . With  $\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & -1 \\ -1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$ ,  $\mathbf{B} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ ,  $\mathbf{C} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  we find  $\Theta_{V,W} = \cos^{-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \cong 54.7^\circ$ . As  $v = (\xi, \xi^2, -2) \in V$  and  $w = (1, \xi, 0) \in W$  are orthogonal to  $V \cap W = [v_1]$ , Proposition 3.10iv gives  $\Theta_{V,W} = \Theta_{[v],[w]} = \gamma_{v,w}$ , and the Hermitian angle formula confirms the result.

**Proposition 3.25.** Let  $(w_1, \dots, w_n)$  be an orthogonal basis of  $X$ , and  $V \in G_p(X)$ . Then  $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_p^n} \cos^2 \Theta_{V,[w_i]} = 1$ .

*Proof.* We can assume the basis is orthonormal, so  $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_p^n} |\langle A, w_i \rangle|^2 = \|A\|^2$  for  $A \in \bigwedge^p V$ . The result follows from Proposition 3.20.  $\square$

If  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$  then  $\dim X_{\mathbb{R}} = 2 \dim X$ , so there are more real coordinate subspaces  $[w_i]$  than complex ones. As angles in  $X_{\mathbb{R}}$  are larger, this allows the above sum to hold for their smaller but more numerous cosines.

**Example 3.26.** In  $\mathbb{C}^2$ , if  $v = (\frac{i}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2})$ ,  $w_1 = (1, 0)$ ,  $w_2 = (0, 1)$  and  $V = [v]$  then  $\Theta_{V,[w_1]} = 60^\circ$  and  $\Theta_{V,[w_2]} = 30^\circ$ . In the underlying  $\mathbb{R}^4$ ,  $V_{\mathbb{R}} = [u_{12}]$  for  $u_1 = v = (0, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}, 0)$  and  $u_2 = iv = (-\frac{1}{2}, 0, 0, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2})$ , and with the canonical basis  $(y_1, \dots, y_4) = (w_1, iw_1, w_2, iw_2)$  we obtain  $\Theta_{V_{\mathbb{R}},[y_{12}]} = \cos^{-1}(\frac{1}{4}) \cong 75.5^\circ$ ,  $\Theta_{V_{\mathbb{R}},[y_{13}]} = \Theta_{V_{\mathbb{R}},[y_{24}]} = \cos^{-1}(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}) \cong 64.3^\circ$ ,  $\Theta_{V_{\mathbb{R}},[y_{14}]} = \Theta_{V_{\mathbb{R}},[y_{23}]} = 90^\circ$  and  $\Theta_{V_{\mathbb{R}},[y_{34}]} = \cos^{-1}(\frac{3}{4}) \cong 41.4^\circ$ . In both cases the squared cosines add up to 1.

**Example 3.27.** In Example 3.24,  $(w_1, w_2, w_3)$  with  $w_3 = (0, 0, \xi^2)$  is an orthonormal basis. The unitary  $T = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \xi \\ \xi & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \xi & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  maps  $[w_{12}] \mapsto [w_{23}]$ ,  $[w_{23}] \mapsto [w_{13}]$  and preserves  $V$ , so  $\Theta_{V,[w_{12}]} = \Theta_{V,[w_{23}]} = \Theta_{V,[w_{13}]}$  and Proposition 3.25 gives  $\cos \Theta_{V,[w_{ij}]} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$ . While  $V$  is equally distant from all  $[w_{ij}]$ 's, in the underlying  $\mathbb{R}^6$  this is not true for  $V_{\mathbb{R}}$  and the 15 coordinate 4-spaces of the orthonormal basis  $(w_1, iw_1, w_2, iw_2, w_3, iw_3)$ , or we would have  $\cos \Theta_{V_{\mathbb{R}},W_{\mathbb{R}}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{15}}$ , contradicting Corollary 3.4.




Figure 9: If  $V$  is (parallel to) the plane of the triangle  $ABC$ , and  $W$  is the  $xy$  plane, then  $\cos^2 \Theta_{V,W} = \frac{\text{area}^2(OBC)}{\text{area}^2(ABC)}$  and  $\sin^2 \Theta_{V,W} = \frac{\text{area}^2(OAB) + \text{area}^2(OAC)}{\text{area}^2(ABC)}$

[Proposition 3.25](#) leads [\[42\]](#) to a known real volumetric Pythagorean theorem (the squared volume of a region in  $V$  is the sum of squared volumes of its projections on all  $[w_i]$ 's), and a simpler complex one with non-squared volumes (by [Proposition 3.3](#)) and less  $[w_i]$ 's. This is a prime example of the advantages of  $\Theta_{V,W}$  over  $\Theta_{V,W^\perp}$ . In [\[43\]](#) we use this complex Pythagorean theorem, and an interpretation of quantum probabilities as projection factors (with [Proposition 3.25](#) giving unit total probability), to propose a solution to the probability problem of Everettian quantum mechanics and show why the quantum space must be complex.

In general, the asymmetric angle with an orthogonal complement is not the usual complement, i.e.  $\Theta_{V,W^\perp} \neq \frac{\pi}{2} - \Theta_{V,W}$  (e.g. take a plane  $V$  and a line  $W$  in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ ), and so  $\sin \Theta_{V,W} \neq \cos \Theta_{V,W^\perp}$ . This sine involves projections not to  $W^\perp$  but to certain coordinate subspaces partially orthogonal to  $W$ :

**Proposition 3.28.** *For nonzero  $V \in G_p(X)$  and  $W \in G_q(X)$ , extending a principal basis  $(f_1, \dots, f_q)$  of  $W$  w.r.t.  $V$  to an orthonormal basis  $(f_1, \dots, f_n)$  of  $X$  we have  $\sin^2 \Theta_{V,W} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_p^n, i \not\subset 1 \dots q} \cos^2 \Theta_{V,[f_i]}$ .*

*Proof.* Follows from [Proposition 3.25](#), as if  $p > q$  then  $\Theta_{V,W} = \frac{\pi}{2}$  and  $\mathbf{i} \not\subset 1 \dots q$  for all  $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}_p^n$ , and if  $p \leq q$  then  $\sin^2 \Theta_{V,W} = 1 - \cos^2 \Theta_{V,W} = \left( \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_p^n} \cos^2 \Theta_{V,[f_i]} \right) - \cos^2 \Theta_{V,[f_1 \dots p]} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_p^n, i \neq 1 \dots p} \cos^2 \Theta_{V,[f_i]}$  and we have  $\Theta_{V,[f_i]} = \frac{\pi}{2}$  if  $\mathbf{i} \subset 1 \dots q$  and  $\mathbf{i} \neq 1 \dots p$ , as  $f_i \perp V$  for  $p < i \leq q$ .  $\square$

With [Proposition 3.3](#), this means that, given a unit volume in  $V$ ,  $\sin^2 \Theta_{V,W}$  is the sum of the squared (if  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$ ) volumes of its projections on all coordinate  $p$ -subspaces  $[f_i]$  not contained in  $W$  (Fig. 9). It gives a geometric interpretation for the Binet-Cauchy distance  $d_{BC} = \sin \Theta_{V,W}$ .

**Example 3.29.** In [Example 2.5](#), both principal angles of  $V$  and  $W^\perp = [f_{34}]$  are also  $45^\circ$ , so  $\Theta_{V,W^\perp} = 60^\circ = \Theta_{V,W}$ . We also find  $\Theta_{V,[f_i]} = 60^\circ$  for  $\mathbf{i} = 14, 23$  or  $34$ , and  $\Theta_{V,[f_i]} = 90^\circ$  for  $\mathbf{i} = 13, 24, 35$  or  $45$ , so that  $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_2^5, i \not\subset 125} \cos^2 \Theta_{V,[f_i]} = \frac{3}{4} = \sin^2 \Theta_{V,W}$ .

## 4 Related angles

Once a principal angle is  $\frac{\pi}{2}$ ,  $\Theta_{V,W}$  tells us nothing else about the others. But we can gain some extra information from  $\Theta_{V,W^\perp}$  and  $\Theta_{V^\perp,W}$ , which are, in general, somewhat independent of  $\Theta_{V,W}$  [\[41\]](#).




Figure 10:  $\Theta_{V,W}$ ,  $\Theta_{V,W^\perp}$  and  $\Upsilon_{V,W}$  as angles in  $\Lambda^p X$ , for  $p = \dim V$ , between a line  $\Lambda^p V$  and subspaces  $\Lambda^p W$ ,  $\Lambda^p(W^\perp)$  and  $(\Lambda^p(W^\perp))^\perp$  (shown as lines and a plane)

From  $\Theta_{V,W^\perp}$  we form an angle which is similar to the max-correlation in some aspects, but gives finer information, taking all  $\theta_i$ 's into account.

**Definition 4.1.**  $\Upsilon_{V,W} = \frac{\pi}{2} - \Theta_{V,W^\perp}$  is the *disjointness angle* of  $V, W \in G(X)$ .

The name is due to [i](#) below:  $\Upsilon_{V,W} = 0$  unless  $V$  and  $W$  are disjoint, so it gives a measure of how far  $V$  and  $W$  are from intersecting non-trivially, what is relevant in many applications. The angle only reaches  $\frac{\pi}{2}$  when  $V \perp W$ , so, unlike  $\Theta_{V,W}$ , it still gives more information when  $V \lhd W$ .

**Proposition 4.2.** Let  $V \in G_p(X)$  and  $W \in G_q(X)$  be represented by blades  $A$  and  $B$ , respectively.

- i)  $\Upsilon_{V,W} = 0 \Leftrightarrow V \cap W \neq \{0\}$ , and  $\Upsilon_{V,W} = \frac{\pi}{2} \Leftrightarrow V \perp W$ .
- ii)  $\sin \Upsilon_{V,W} = \frac{\|P_{W^\perp} A\|}{\|A\|}$ .
- iii)  $\Upsilon_{V,W} = \theta_{\Lambda^p V, (\Lambda^p(W^\perp))^\perp}$ .
- iv)  $\|A \wedge B\| = \|A\| \|B\| \sin \Upsilon_{[A],[B]}$ .
- v)  $\Upsilon_{V,W} = \Upsilon_{W,V}$ .
- vi) If  $V, W \neq \{0\}$  have principal angles  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m$  for  $m = \min\{p, q\}$  then  $\sin \Upsilon_{V,W} = \prod_{i=1}^m \sin \theta_i$ .
- vii)  $\Upsilon_{V,W} = \Upsilon_{V, P_W(V)}$ .

*Proof.* (i–iii) Immediate. (iv)  $\|A \wedge B\| = \|(P_{W^\perp} A) \wedge B\| = \|P_{W^\perp} A\| \|B\| = \|A\| \|B\| \sin \Upsilon_{V,W}$ . (v) Follows from [iv](#). (vi) Assuming  $p \leq q$ ,  $A = e_1 \wedge \dots \wedge e_p$  and  $B = f_1 \wedge \dots \wedge f_q$  for associated principal bases, we have  $\sin \Upsilon_{V,W} = \|A \wedge B\| = \|e_1 \wedge f_1\| \dots \|e_p \wedge f_p\| \cdot \|f_{p+1}\| \dots \|f_q\| = \sin \theta_1 \dots \sin \theta_p$ . (vii) Follows from [i](#), [vi](#) and [Lemma 2.9i](#).  $\square$

By [i](#),  $\Upsilon_{V,W}$  does not satisfy a triangle inequality (e.g. take two lines and their plane). By [ii](#),  $\sin \Upsilon_{V,W}$  (squared, if  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$ ) is the projection factor from  $V$  to  $W^\perp$ . Fig. 10 illustrates [iii](#). The formula for  $\|u \wedge v\|$  is generalized by [iv](#). The unexpected symmetry in [v](#) means  $\Theta_{V,W^\perp} = \Theta_{W,V^\perp}$ . For  $V, W \neq \{0\}$ , [vi](#) implies  $\Upsilon_{V,W} \leq \theta_i \leq \Theta_{V,W}$  for all  $i$  (in general, with strict inequalities). The product of  $\sin \theta_i$ 's has been studied in [\[1, 49\]](#), but not linked to a particular angle.

**Example 4.3.** In [Example 3.21](#),  $A \wedge B = -2u_{1235} + 2u_{1245} + 2u_{1234} + 2u_{1345} - u_{2345}$ ,  $A \wedge C = 2u_{12345}$  and  $C \wedge D = 0$ , so that  $\Upsilon_{[A],[B]} = \sin^{-1} \frac{\sqrt{17}}{6} \cong 43.4^\circ$ ,  $\Upsilon_{[A],[C]} = \sin^{-1} \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} \cong 28.1^\circ$  and  $\Upsilon_{[C],[D]} = 0$ .

**Proposition 4.4.** Given bases  $(v_1, \dots, v_p)$  of  $V$  and  $(w_1, \dots, w_q)$  of  $W$ , let  $\mathbf{A}_{p \times p} = (\langle v_i, v_j \rangle)$ ,  $\mathbf{B}_{q \times q} = (\langle w_i, w_j \rangle)$  and  $\mathbf{C}_{q \times p} = (\langle w_i, v_j \rangle)$ . Then  $\sin^2 \Upsilon_{V,W} = \frac{\det(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{C}^T \mathbf{B}^{-1} \mathbf{C})}{\det \mathbf{A}} = \frac{\det(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{C} \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{C}^T)}{\det \mathbf{B}}$ .

*Proof.* For  $A = v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_p$  and  $B = w_1 \wedge \dots \wedge w_q$ ,  $\|A \wedge B\|^2 = \left| \begin{smallmatrix} \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{C}^T \\ \mathbf{C} & \mathbf{B} \end{smallmatrix} \right|$ , so the result follows from Schur's identity and [Proposition 4.2iv](#).  $\square$

**Example 4.5.** In [Example 3.23](#) we find  $\Upsilon_{V,W} = \Upsilon_{W,V} = 45^\circ$ , so lengths projected from  $V$  to  $W^\perp$  contract by  $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$ , as do areas from  $W$  to  $V^\perp$ . Principal angles confirm it:  $V$  and  $W^\perp$  have only  $45^\circ$ , while  $W$  and  $V^\perp$  have  $0^\circ$  and  $45^\circ$ . In [Example 3.24](#) we find  $\Upsilon_{V,W} = 0$ , as  $V \cap W \neq \{0\}$ .

**Corollary 4.6.**  $\sin^2 \Upsilon_{V,W} = \det(\mathbb{1}_{p \times p} - \bar{\mathbf{P}}^T \mathbf{P}) = \det(\mathbb{1}_{q \times q} - \mathbf{P} \bar{\mathbf{P}}^T)$ , where  $\mathbf{P}_{q \times p}$  is a matrix for the orthogonal projection  $V \rightarrow W$  in orthonormal bases of  $V$  and  $W$ .

If  $V \perp W$  and  $V \cap W \neq \{0\}$ , no more information can be extracted from  $\Theta_{V,W}$  or  $\Upsilon_{V,W}$ . But we can use a third angle, based on  $\Theta_{V^\perp, W}$ .

This angle is linked to a product of Grassmann-Cayley algebra [\[12, 45\]](#). A choice of a unit  $\Omega \in \bigwedge^n X$  (an *orientation* of  $X$ ) induces an isometry (conjugate-linear, if  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$ )  $*$  :  $\bigwedge^p X \rightarrow \bigwedge^{n-p} X$  given by  $A^* = A \lrcorner \Omega$ , with  $[A^*] = [A]^\perp$  and  $\|A^*\| = \|A\|$  (if  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$ ,  $*$  is the usual Hodge star). It gives a *regressive product*  $\vee$  defined by  $(A \vee B)^* = A^* \wedge B^*$ . If  $A \in \bigwedge^p X$  and  $B \in \bigwedge^q X$  then  $A \vee B \in \bigwedge^{p+q-n} X$  and  $A \vee B = (-1)^{(n-p)(n-q)} B \vee A$ . For an orthonormal basis  $(v_1, \dots, v_n)$ , orientation  $v_1 \dots v_n$  and  $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{I}^n$ , if  $\mathbf{i} \cup \mathbf{j} = 1 \dots n$  then  $v_{\mathbf{i}} \vee v_{\mathbf{j}} = \epsilon_{\mathbf{j} \setminus \mathbf{i}} v_{\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{j}}$ , otherwise  $v_{\mathbf{i}} \vee v_{\mathbf{j}} = 0$ . For blades, if  $[A] + [B] = X$  then  $[A \vee B] = [A] \cap [B]$ , otherwise  $A \vee B = 0$ .

**Definition 4.7.**  $\Psi_{V,W} = \frac{\pi}{2} - \Theta_{V^\perp, W}$  is the *supplementation angle* of  $V, W \in G(X)$ .

By [i](#) below,  $\Psi_{V,W} = 0$  unless  $V$  and  $W$  are *supplementary* (we use the term for  $V + W = X$ , not  $V \oplus W = X$ ), and is  $\frac{\pi}{2}$  when each subspace contains the orthogonal complement of the other.

**Proposition 4.8.** Let  $V \in G_p(X)$  and  $W \in G_q(X)$  be represented by blades  $A$  and  $B$ , respectively, and  $n = \dim X$ .

- i)  $\Psi_{V,W} = 0 \Leftrightarrow V + W \neq X$ , and  $\Psi_{V,W} = \frac{\pi}{2} \Leftrightarrow V^\perp \subset W$ .
- ii)  $\sin \Psi_{V,W} = \frac{\|P_W(A^*)\|}{\|A\|}$ .
- iii)  $\Psi_{V,W} = \theta_{\bigwedge^{n-p}(V^\perp), (\bigwedge^{n-p} W)^\perp}$ .
- iv)  $\Psi_{V,W} = \Upsilon_{V^\perp, W^\perp}$ .
- v)  $\Psi_{V,W} = \Psi_{W,V}$ .
- vi)  $\|A \vee B\| = \|A\| \|B\| \sin \Psi_{[A],[B]}$ .
- vii) If  $V, W \neq \{0\}$  have principal angles  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m$  for  $m = \min\{p, q\}$ , and  $r = \dim(V \cap W)$ , then

$$\sin \Psi_{V,W} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } V + W \neq X, \\ \prod_{i=r+1}^m \sin \theta_i & \text{if } V + W = X \text{ and } V, W \neq X, \\ 1 & \text{if } V = X \text{ or } W = X. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

*Proof.* (i-v) Immediate. (vi) By Proposition 4.2iv,  $\|A \vee B\| = \|A^* \wedge B^*\| = \|A\| \|B\| \sin \Upsilon_{[A]^\perp, [B]^\perp}$ . (vii) The first and last cases follow from i. The second one follows from iv and Proposition 4.2vi, as  $V^\perp \cap W^\perp = \{0\}$  and  $V^\perp, W^\perp \neq \{0\}$  have principal angles  $\theta_{r+1}, \dots, \theta_m$ , by Proposition 2.8.  $\square$

By i,  $\Psi_{V,W}$  does not satisfy a triangle inequality (e.g. take two planes in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  and their intersection). By ii,  $\sin \Psi_{V,W}$  (squared, if  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$ ) is the projection factor from  $V^\perp$  to  $W$ . As vii only has sines of nonzero  $\theta_i$ 's,  $\Psi_{V,W}$  still gives information when  $V \cap W \neq \{0\}$ , unlike  $\Upsilon_{V,W}$ . Note that  $\Psi_{V,W} \neq \Psi_{V, P_W(V)}$  (e.g. take a line and a plane in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ ).

**Corollary 4.9.** For  $V \in G_p(X)$  and  $W \in G_q(X)$ ,  $\Psi_{V,W} = 0$  if  $p+q < n$ ,  $\Psi_{V,W} = \Upsilon_{V,W}$  if  $p+q = n$ , and  $\Upsilon_{V,W} = 0$  if  $p+q > n$ .

*Proof.* Let  $p+q = n$ . Then  $V+W \neq X \Leftrightarrow V \cap W \neq \{0\}$ , in which case both angles are 0. If a subspace is  $X$ , the other is  $\{0\}$ , and both angles are  $\frac{\pi}{2}$ . Otherwise, we have the second case in (6) with  $r = 0$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 4.10.**  $\max\{\Upsilon_{V,W}, \Psi_{V,W}\} \leq \theta_i \leq \Theta_{V,W}$  for any nonzero principal angle  $\theta_i$ .

If there is no  $\theta_i \neq 0$  we can have  $\Theta_{V,W} < \Upsilon_{V,W}$  or  $\Theta_{V,W} < \Psi_{V,W}$ : e.g.  $\Theta_{\{0\},W} = \Theta_{V,X} = 0$  but  $\Upsilon_{\{0\},W} = \Psi_{V,X} = \frac{\pi}{2}$ .

**Example 4.11.** In Example 3.21, the orientation  $e_{1\dots 5}$  gives  $A \vee B = 0$ ,  $A \vee C = 2$  and  $C \vee D = 2u_3$ , so  $\Psi_{[A],[B]} = 0$ ,  $\Psi_{[A],[C]} = \sin^{-1} \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} \cong 28.1^\circ$  and  $\Psi_{[C],[D]} = \sin^{-1} \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} = 45^\circ$ . With Example 4.3, this shows all nonzero principal angles of  $[A]$  and  $[B]$  are in  $[43.4^\circ, 80.4^\circ]$ , those of  $[A]$  and  $[C]$  are in  $[28.1^\circ, 76.4^\circ]$ , and those of  $[C]$  and  $[D]$  are in  $[45^\circ, 90^\circ]$ .

**Proposition 4.12.** Given a basis  $(v_1, \dots, v_p)$  of  $V$  and orthonormal bases  $(w_1, \dots, w_q)$  of  $W$  and  $\beta = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$  of  $X$ , with  $p+q \geq n$ , let  $\mathbf{A}_{p \times p} = (\langle v_i, v_j \rangle)$  and for  $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_{n-p}) \in \mathcal{I}_{n-p}^q$  let  $(\mathbf{M}_\mathbf{i})_{n \times n} = (v_1 \cdots v_p \ w_{i_1} \cdots w_{i_{n-p}})$ , with the vectors decomposed in  $\beta$  as columns. Then  $\sin^2 \Psi_{V,W} = \frac{1}{\det \mathbf{A}} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}_{n-p}^q} |\det \mathbf{M}_\mathbf{i}|^2$ .

*Proof.* Let  $A = v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_p$ , and assume  $\|A\|^2 = \det \mathbf{A} = 1$  for simplicity. By Proposition 4.8ii,  $\sin^2 \Psi_{V,W} = \|P_W(A^*)\|^2 = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}_{n-p}^q} |\langle w_i, A^* \rangle|^2 = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}_{n-p}^q} |\langle A \lrcorner u_{1\dots n}, w_i \rangle|^2 = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}_{n-p}^q} |\langle u_{1\dots n}, A \wedge w_i \rangle|^2 = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}_{n-p}^q} |\det \mathbf{M}_\mathbf{i}|^2. \quad \square$

**Example 4.13.** In Example 3.23,  $p+q < n$ , so  $\Psi_{V,W} = 0$ . In Example 3.24,  $\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & -1 \\ -1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$ ,  $\mathbf{M}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 \\ -\xi & \xi & 0 \\ 0 & -\xi^2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $\mathbf{M}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -\xi & \xi & \xi \\ 0 & -\xi^2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  give  $\Psi_{V,W} = \sin^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \cong 54.7^\circ$  ( $= \Theta_{V,W}$  as the only  $\theta_i \neq 0$  has this value).

**Example 4.14.** In  $\mathbb{R}^4$ , let  $V = [v_{12}]$  and  $W = [w_{12}]$  for  $v_1 = (1, -1, 0, 1)$ ,  $v_2 = (0, 1, 1, -1)$ ,  $w_1 = (1, 0, 0, 0)$  and  $w_2 = (0, 0, 1, 0)$ . With  $\mathbf{M}_{12} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  we obtain  $\Psi_{V,W} = 0$ , so  $V+W \neq \mathbb{R}^4$ .

## 5 Other asymmetric metrics

With  $G_p(\mathbb{F}^n) \subset G_p(\mathbb{F}^{n+1})$  induced by the canonical inclusion  $\mathbb{F}^n \subset \mathbb{F}^{n+1}$ ,  $G_p^\infty = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} G_p(\mathbb{F}^n)$  is the *infinite Grassmannian* of all  $p$ -subspaces in all  $\mathbb{F}^n$ 's, and  $G^\infty = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} G(\mathbb{F}^n) = \bigcup_{p \in \mathbb{N}} G_p^\infty$  is the *infinite full Grassmannian* of all subspaces in all  $\mathbb{F}^n$ 's ('doubly infinite Grassmannian' in [66]).

A method in [66] extends metrics  $d_p$  from  $G_p^\infty$  to  $G^\infty$ : for  $V \in G_p^\infty$  and  $W \in G_q^\infty$  with  $p \leq q$ , it shows  $\delta = \min\{d_p(V, U) : U \in G_p(W)\} = \min\{d_q(W, Y) : Y \in G_q^\infty, Y \supset V\}$ , then turns it into a metric  $d = \max\{d_q(W, Y) : Y \in G_q^\infty, Y \supset V\}$  via an ad hoc inclusion of principal angles  $\theta_{p+1} = \dots = \theta_q = \frac{\pi}{2}$ . One can skip  $\delta$  and include these angles in  $d_p$ , as both have the same formula. Most metrics obtained have a fixed value if  $p \neq q$ . From  $d_{pF}$  the method gives  $d_s$ , and from  $d_g$  and  $d_{cF}$  new metrics with a nonzero minimum value for  $p \neq q$ .

We will prove the following result, giving a simpler way to extend metrics on  $G_p^\infty$  to asymmetric metrics on  $G^\infty$  (which restrict to  $G(X)$ ).

**Theorem 5.1.** *Let  $d_p : G_p^\infty \times G_p^\infty \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  for  $p = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  be metrics such that, for  $p \neq 0$ :*

- I.  $d_p(V, W) = f_p(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_p)$  for a nondecreasing function  $f_p$  of the principal angles  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_p$  of  $V, W \in G_p^\infty$ .
- II.  $f_q(0, \dots, 0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_p) = f_p(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_p)$  for  $q > p$  and any  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_p$ .

Also, let  $\text{diam } G_p^\infty = \sup\{d_p(V, W) : V, W \in G_p^\infty\}$  and  $\inf_p$  be the infimum taken in  $[0, \text{diam } G_p^\infty]$ . An asymmetric metric  $d : G^\infty \times G^\infty \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  is given by  $d(V, W) = \inf_p\{d_p(V, W') : W' \in G_p(W)\}$  with  $p = \dim V$ .

Note that  $d(V, W) \leq \text{diam } G_p^\infty$  for  $p = \dim V$ .

Use of  $\inf_p$  instead of  $\min$  is crucial, as  $G_p(W) = \emptyset$  for  $p > \dim W$  and  $\min \emptyset$  is not defined. On the other hand, the infimum  $\inf_S$  taken in an ordered set  $S$  with greatest element  $M$  satisfies  $\inf_S \emptyset = M$  (by its definition as the greatest lower bound: any  $s \in S$  is a lower bound of  $\emptyset$ , since  $\emptyset$  has no element smaller than  $s$  [6, p. 261]). This may seem like a technicality, but is an important property of the infimum, and plays a central role in our method.

To prove the Theorem we will need some results. The following are particular cases of [28, Cor. 3.1.3], which we state for convenience.

**Proposition 5.2.** *Let  $\sigma_1 \geq \dots \geq \sigma_p$  be the singular values of a  $q \times p$  matrix  $\mathbf{P}$ , with  $p \leq q$ .*

- i) *If  $\sigma'_1 \geq \dots \geq \sigma'_p$  are the singular values of a  $(q-k) \times p$  matrix formed by deleting  $k \leq q-p$  rows of  $\mathbf{P}$  then  $\sigma'_i \leq \sigma_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq p$ .*
- ii) *If  $\sigma'_1 \geq \dots \geq \sigma'_{p-k}$  are the singular values of a  $q \times (p-k)$  matrix formed by deleting  $k$  columns of  $\mathbf{P}$  then  $\sigma'_i \geq \sigma_{i+k}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq p-k$ .*

**Corollary 5.3.** *Let  $\theta_1 \leq \dots \leq \theta_p$  be the principal angles of  $V \in G_p(X)$  and  $W \in G_q(X)$ , with  $p \leq q$ .*

- i) *If  $\theta'_1 \leq \dots \leq \theta'_p$  are the principal angles of  $V$  and  $W' \in G_p(W)$  then  $\theta'_i \geq \theta_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq p$ .*
- ii) *If  $\theta'_1 \leq \dots \leq \theta'_r$  are the principal angles of  $V' \in G_r(V)$  and  $W$  then  $\theta'_i \leq \theta_{i+p-r}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq r$ .*

*Proof.* Follows by extending orthonormal bases of  $V'$  and  $W'$  to  $V$  and  $W$ , and applying [Proposition 5.2](#) to matrices representing, in these bases, orthogonal projections  $V \rightarrow W$ ,  $V \rightarrow W'$  and  $V' \rightarrow W$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 5.4.** *Let  $V \in G_p^\infty$ ,  $W \in G_q^\infty$ , and if  $p, q \neq 0$  let  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_p$  be the principal angles of  $V$  and  $W$ , and  $W_P$  be a projective subspace of  $W$  w.r.t.  $V$ . With the notation of [Theorem 5.1](#),*

$$d(V, W) = \begin{cases} d_p(V, W_P) = f_p(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_p) & \text{if } 0 < p \leq q, \\ \text{diam } G_p^\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

*Proof.* For  $p = 0$ ,  $d(V, W) = 0 = \text{diam } G_0^\infty$ . For  $p > q$ ,  $G_p(W) = \emptyset$ , so  $d(V, W) = \inf_p \emptyset = \text{diam } G_p^\infty$ . For  $0 < p \leq q$ , [Propositions 2.13](#) and [5.3i](#) show the principal angles of  $V$  and  $W_P$  are the  $\theta_i$ 's, which bound from below those of  $V$  and  $W' \in G_p(W)$ , so  $d_p(V, W_P) \leq d_p(V, W')$  by [I](#).  $\square$

**Lemma 5.5.** *Given  $U, V \in G_p^\infty$  and  $U' \in G_r(U)$ , there is  $V' \in G_r(V)$  with  $d_r(U', V') \leq d_p(U, V)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $U$  and  $V$  have principal angles  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_p$ , and  $U'$  and  $V$  have  $\theta'_1, \dots, \theta'_r$ . With [I](#) and [II](#), [Propositions 2.13](#) and [5.3ii](#) give  $d_p(U, V) = f_p(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_p) \geq f_p(0, \dots, 0, \theta'_1, \dots, \theta'_r) = f_r(\theta'_1, \dots, \theta'_r) = d_r(U', V_P)$ , for a projective subspace  $V_P$  of  $V$  w.r.t.  $U'$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.6.**  *$\text{diam } G_p^\infty$  is non-decreasing on  $p$ .*

*Proof.* Any  $G_p^\infty$  has orthogonal subspaces, so, for  $0 < p < q$ ,  $\text{diam } G_p^\infty = f_p(\frac{\pi}{2}, \dots, \frac{\pi}{2}) = f_q(0, \dots, 0, \frac{\pi}{2}, \dots, \frac{\pi}{2}) \leq f_q(\frac{\pi}{2}, \dots, \frac{\pi}{2}) = \text{diam } G_q^\infty$ .  $\square$

The reason why we use  $G_p^\infty$  is that  $\text{diam } G_p(\mathbb{F}^n)$  decreases for large  $p$ . We can now prove the theorem:

*Proof of Theorem 5.1.* Let  $U \in G_r^\infty$ ,  $V \in G_p^\infty$ ,  $W \in G_q^\infty$ . By [\(7\)](#), if  $p \neq 0$  and  $d(V, W) = 0$  then  $d_p(V, W_P) = 0$ , so  $V = W_P \subset W$ . This gives [Definition 2.14i](#), and we prove  $d(U, W) \leq d(U, V) + d(V, W)$ . If  $r > p$ ,  $d(U, W) \leq \text{diam } G_r^\infty = d(U, V)$ . If  $r \leq p$  and  $p > q$ , [Lemma 5.6](#) gives  $d(U, W) \leq \text{diam } G_r^\infty \leq \text{diam } G_p^\infty = d(V, W)$ . If  $0 < r \leq p \leq q$ , [Propositions 5.4](#) and [5.5](#) give  $V_P \in G_r(V)$ ,  $W_P \in G_p(W)$  and  $W' \in G_r(W_P)$  with  $d(U, V) = d_r(U, V_P)$  and  $d(V, W) = d_p(V, W_P) \geq d_r(V_P, W')$ , so  $d(U, W) \leq d_r(U, W') \leq d_r(U, V_P) + d_r(V_P, W') \leq d(U, V) + d(V, W)$ .  $\square$

[Table 2](#) has the asymmetric metrics obtained from metrics of [Table 1](#) ( $d_{FS}$ ,  $d_{e\wedge}$ ,  $d_{BC}$  and  $d_{p2}$  give  $\Theta_{V,W}$ ,  $2 \sin \frac{\Theta_{V,W}}{2}$ ,  $\sin \Theta_{V,W}$  and the containment gap). They are not trivial for  $p \neq q$ , and have a minimum of 0 when  $V \subset W$ , avoiding the problems seen in [Section 2.6](#). Inequalities of [Appendix A](#) still hold, except that some become equalities if  $p > q$ . Hence these asymmetric metrics are topologically equivalent, inducing the same backward, forward and symmetric topologies described in [Section 3.1](#), what suggests these are natural topologies for the full Grassmannian.

If necessary, asymmetric metrics can be symmetrized, but results leave something to be desired. For example,  $\hat{\Theta}_{V,W} = \max\{\Theta_{V,W}, \Theta_{W,V}\}$  gives the full Fubini-Study metric, which is trivial for different dimensions, and

Metric on $G_p^\infty$	diam $G_p^\infty$	Asymmetric metric on $G^\infty$
$d_g$	$\frac{\pi}{2}\sqrt{p}$	$\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^p \theta_i^2}$ if $p \leq q$ , otherwise $\frac{\pi}{2}\sqrt{p}$
$d_{cF}$	$\sqrt{2p}$	$2\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^p \sin^2 \frac{\theta_i}{2}}$ if $p \leq q$ , otherwise $\sqrt{2p}$
$d_{pF}$	$\sqrt{p}$	$\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^p \sin^2 \theta_i}$ if $p \leq q$ , otherwise $\sqrt{p}$
$d_{FS}$	$\frac{\pi}{2}$	$\cos^{-1}(\prod_{i=1}^p \cos \theta_i)$ if $p \leq q$ , otherwise $\frac{\pi}{2}$
$d_{c\wedge}$	$\sqrt{2}$	$\sqrt{2 - 2\prod_{i=1}^p \cos \theta_i}$ if $p \leq q$ , otherwise $\sqrt{2}$
$d_{BC}$	1	$\sqrt{1 - \prod_{i=1}^p \cos^2 \theta_i}$ if $p \leq q$ , otherwise 1
$d_A$	$\frac{\pi}{2}$	$\theta_p$ if $p \leq q$ , otherwise $\frac{\pi}{2}$
$d_{c2}$	$\sqrt{2}$	$2\sin \frac{\theta_p}{2}$ if $p \leq q$ , otherwise $\sqrt{2}$
$d_{p2}$	1	$\sin \theta_p$ if $p \leq q$ , otherwise 1

Table 2: Diameter of  $G_p^\infty$  and asymmetric distances from  $V \in G_p^\infty$  to  $W \in G_q^\infty$  ( $p \neq 0$ )

$\check{\Theta}_{V,W} = \min\{\Theta_{V,W}, \Theta_{W,V}\}$  is a common angle [24, 26, 31] that projects the smaller subspace on the larger one, but does not satisfy a triangle inequality. These angles are linked to the scalar and Hestenes products of Clifford algebra [44], and are the  $d^\phi$  and  $\delta^\phi$  obtained from  $d_{FS}$  in [66]<sup>3</sup>. And  $\bar{\Theta}_{V,W} = \frac{\Theta_{V,W} + \Theta_{W,V}}{2}$  is a nontrivial metric, but has a minimum of  $\frac{\pi}{4}$  for different dimensions, and does not seem to have nice properties.

## 6 Conclusion

The main Grassmannian metrics have been extended to asymmetric metrics which induce natural topologies on the full Grassmannian of subspaces of different dimensions. The Fubini-Study metric extends to an asymmetric angle which we studied in detail, obtaining many properties that facilitate its use and computation. It remains to be seen whether the other asymmetric metrics also have nice properties, and how they all fare in applications.

An aspect of the Fubini-Study distance is that it quickly approaches its maximum value of  $\frac{\pi}{2}$  if various principal angles are large, or even if a large number of them are small but nonzero. This is relevant for quantum entanglement and decoherence, but might be inconvenient for other applications, so this distance may perhaps be more appropriate for problems involving a moderate number of small perturbations.

Other results for asymmetric angles can be found in [41, 44]. They can also be computed via Clifford geometric product [20, 44]: if unit blades  $A$  and  $B$  represent  $V \in G_p(X)$  and  $W \in G_q(X)$  then  $\cos \Theta_{V,W}$  and  $\sin \Upsilon_{V,W}$  are, respectively, the norms of the components of grades  $q - p$  and  $p + q$  in  $AB$ . For applications using oriented subspaces, [44] has a variant of  $\Theta_{V,W}$  that encodes the relative orientation of subspaces.

<sup>3</sup>There is a small error in [66, p. 1189]:  $c_\phi$  should be  $\frac{\pi}{2}$ , not 1.



## A Some inequalities

First we prove the spherical triangle inequality:

*Proof of Proposition 2.2.* Assume distinct lines and  $\theta_{K,L} \neq \frac{\pi}{2}$ . For a unit  $w \in L$ , let  $v = \frac{P_K w}{\|P_K w\|}$ , and if  $\theta_{J,L} \neq \frac{\pi}{2}$  let  $u = \frac{P_J w}{\|P_J w\|}$ , otherwise take any unit  $u \in J$ , so  $\theta_{J,L} = \theta_{u,w}$  and  $\theta_{K,L} = \theta_{v,w}$ . Let  $u^\perp = \frac{u - P_L u}{\|u - P_L u\|} \in L^\perp$  and  $v^\perp = \frac{v - P_L v}{\|v - P_L v\|} \in L^\perp$ . As  $P_L u = w \cos \theta_{u,w}$  and  $\|u - P_L u\| = \sin \theta_{u,w}$ , we find  $u = w \cos \theta_{u,w} + u^\perp \sin \theta_{u,w}$ , and likewise  $v = w \cos \theta_{v,w} + v^\perp \sin \theta_{v,w}$ . Thus  $\cos \theta_{J,K} = |\langle u, v \rangle| = |\cos \theta_{u,w} \cos \theta_{v,w} + \langle u^\perp, v^\perp \rangle \sin \theta_{u,w} \sin \theta_{v,w}| \leq \cos(\theta_{u,w} - \theta_{v,w})$ , so that  $\theta_{J,K} \geq \theta_{u,w} - \theta_{v,w}$ .

Equality gives  $\theta_{u,w} = \theta_{J,K} + \theta_{v,w} > \theta_{v,w}$  and  $\langle u^\perp, v^\perp \rangle = 1$ , so  $v^\perp = u^\perp$  and  $v = w \cos \theta_{v,w} + \frac{u - P_L u}{\|u - P_L u\|} \sin \theta_{v,w} = u \frac{\sin \theta_{v,w}}{\sin \theta_{u,w}} + w \frac{\sin(\theta_{u,w} - \theta_{v,w})}{\sin \theta_{u,w}} = \kappa u + \lambda w$  with  $\kappa, \lambda > 0$ . Conversely, if  $v = \kappa u + \lambda w$  with  $\kappa, \lambda \geq 0$  and  $\langle u, w \rangle \geq 0$ , we find  $\theta_{u,w} = \theta_{u,v} + \theta_{v,w}$ . As  $\langle u, v \rangle = \kappa \|u\|^2 + \lambda \langle u, w \rangle \geq 0$ , and likewise  $\langle v, w \rangle \geq 0$ , we have  $\theta_{J,K} = \theta_{u,v}$ ,  $\theta_{J,L} = \theta_{u,w}$  and  $\theta_{K,L} = \theta_{v,w}$ .  $\square$

The metrics in Table 1 are often said to be topologically equivalent, but we could not locate a proof. Also, an important reference on the subject [22, p. 338] gives, for  $V \neq W$ , strict inequalities  $d_g > d_{FS}$ ,  $d_{cF} > d_{c2}$  and  $d_{pF} > d_{p2}$ , what is incorrect (e.g. take  $\theta_1 = \dots = \theta_{p-1} = 0$  and  $\theta_p \neq 0$ ). The proofs below set the record straight.

**Proposition A.1.** *For distinct  $V, W \in G_p(X)$ :*

- i)  $\frac{\pi}{2} d_{pF} \geq d_g > d_{cF} > d_{pF}$ .
- ii)  $\frac{\pi}{2} d_{BC} \geq d_{FS} > d_{c\wedge} > d_{BC}$ .
- iii)  $\frac{\pi}{2} d_{p2} \geq d_A > d_{c2} > d_{p2}$ .

*Proof.* Follows from the formulas in Table 1, as for distinct lines  $K$  and  $L$  we have  $\frac{\pi}{2} g_{K,L} \geq \theta_{K,L} > c_{K,L} > g_{K,L}$ .  $\square$

**Proposition A.2.** *Let  $V, W \in G_p(X)$ . If  $\dim(V \cap W) < p - 1$  then*

- i)  $\sqrt{p} d_A \geq d_g > d_{FS} > d_A$ .
- ii)  $\sqrt{p} d_{c2} \geq d_{cF} > d_{c\wedge} > d_{c2}$ .
- iii)  $\sqrt{p} d_{p2} \geq d_{pF} > d_{BC} > d_{p2}$ .

*If  $\dim(V \cap W) \geq p - 1$  the strict  $>$ 's become equalities.*

*Proof.* If  $\dim(V \cap W) \geq p - 1$  then  $\theta_i = 0$  for  $i \neq p$ , and the distance formulas give the equalities. For  $\dim(V \cap W) < p - 1$  we prove only the second inequality in each item, as the others are simple.

(i) We show  $\cos^{-1}(\cos \theta_1 \dots \cos \theta_p) \leq \sqrt{\theta_1^2 + \dots + \theta_p^2}$  for  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_p \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$ , with strict inequality if  $\theta_{p-1}, \theta_p \neq 0$ . For  $p = 2$  this is done showing, for  $f(x, y) = \cos^{-1}(\cos x \cos y)$ ,  $g(x, y) = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2}$  and  $x, y \in ]0, \frac{\pi}{2}[$ , that  $\frac{\partial g}{\partial x} = \frac{x}{\sqrt{x^2 + y^2}}$  is increasing on  $x$ , so  $\frac{\partial g}{\partial x} > \frac{\sin x}{\sqrt{\sin^2 x + \tan^2 y}} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}$ . Assuming the result for some  $p \geq 2$ , let  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{p+1} \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$  and  $x = \cos^{-1}(\cos \theta_1 \dots \cos \theta_p) \leq \sqrt{\theta_1^2 + \dots + \theta_p^2}$ . So  $\cos^{-1}(\cos \theta_1 \dots \cos \theta_{p+1}) =$

$\cos^{-1}(\cos x \cos \theta_{p+1}) \leq \sqrt{x^2 + \theta_{p+1}^2} \leq \sqrt{\theta_1^2 + \cdots + \theta_{p+1}^2}$ , and the first inequality is strict if  $\theta_p, \theta_{p+1} \neq 0$  (so  $x \neq 0$ ).

(ii)  $d_{c\wedge} = \sqrt{2 - 2 \prod_{i=1}^p \cos \theta_i}$  and  $d_{cF} = \sqrt{2p - 2 \sum_{i=1}^p \cos \theta_i}$ , so we show  $1 - \prod_{i=1}^p x_i \leq p - \sum_{i=1}^p x_i$  for  $x_1, \dots, x_p \in [0, 1]$ , with strict inequality if  $x_{p-1}, x_p \neq 1$ . For  $p = 2$ ,  $1 - x_1 x_2 \leq 1 - x_1 x_2 + (1 - x_1)(1 - x_2) = 2 - x_1 - x_2$ , with strict inequality if  $x_1, x_2 \neq 1$ . Assuming the result for some  $p \geq 2$ , let  $x_1, \dots, x_{p+1} \in [0, 1]$  and  $x = \prod_{i=1}^p x_i \geq 1 - p + \sum_{i=1}^p x_i$ . Then  $1 - \prod_{i=1}^{p+1} x_i = 1 - x x_{p+1} \leq 2 - x - x_{p+1} \leq p + 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{p+1} x_i$ , and the first inequality is strict if  $x_p, x_{p+1} \neq 1$ .

(iii)  $d_{BC} = \sqrt{1 - \prod_{i=1}^p \cos^2 \theta_i}$  and  $d_{pF} = \sqrt{p - \sum_{i=1}^p \cos^2 \theta_i}$ , so the result follows as in ii.  $\square$

## References

- [1] S. Afriat, *Orthogonal and oblique projectors and the characteristics of pairs of vector spaces*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **53** (1957), no. 4, 800–816.
- [2] D. Agrawal, T.J. Richardson, and R.L. Urbanke, *Multiple-antenna signal constellations for fading channels*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **47** (2001), no. 6, 2618–2626.
- [3] G. E. Albert, *A note on quasi-metric spaces*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **47** (1941), no. 6, 479–482.
- [4] R. Anguelov and M. Mabula, *Asymmetric metric: An application to dealing with uncertainty*, AIP Conf. Proc., vol. 1773, AIP Publishing LLC, 2016, p. 050001.
- [5] D. Asimov, *The grand tour: A tool for viewing multidimensional data*, SIAM J. Sci. Stat. Comp. **6** (1985), no. 1, 128–143.
- [6] B. Bajnok, *An invitation to abstract mathematics*, 2nd ed., Springer, 2020.
- [7] A. Barg and D. Y. Nogin, *Bounds on packings of spheres in the Grassmann manifold*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **48** (2002), no. 9, 2450–2454.
- [8] R. Basri, T. Hassner, and L. Zelnik-Manor, *Approximate nearest subspace search*, IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell. **33** (2011), no. 2, 266–278.
- [9] C. A. Beattie, M. Embree, and D. C. Sorensen, *Convergence of polynomial restart Krylov methods for eigenvalue computations*, SIAM Review **47** (2005), no. 3, 492–515.
- [10] I. Bengtsson and K. Życzkowski, *Geometry of quantum states: an introduction to quantum entanglement*, Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- [11] A. Björck and G. Golub, *Numerical methods for computing angles between linear subspaces*, Math. Comp. **27** (1973), no. 123, 579.
- [12] J. Browne, *Grassmann algebra. Foundations: Exploring extended vector algebra with Mathematica*, vol. 1, Barnard Publishing, 2012.

- [13] I. V. Chenchiah, M. O. Rieger, and J. Zimmer, *Gradient flows in asymmetric metric spaces*, Nonlinear Anal. Theory Methods Appl. **71** (2009), no. 11, 5820–5834.
- [14] Y. Chikuse, *Statistics on special manifolds*, Springer New York, 2012.
- [15] S. Cobzas, *Functional analysis in asymmetric normed spaces*, Springer, 2012.
- [16] K. De Cock and B. De Moor, *Subspace angles between ARMA models*, Syst. Control Lett. **46** (2002), no. 4, 265–270.
- [17] J. H. Conway, R. H. Hardin, and N. J. A. Sloane, *Packing lines, planes, etc.: Packings in Grassmannian spaces*, Exp. Math. **5** (1996), no. 2, 139–159.
- [18] M. M. Deza and E. Deza, *Encyclopedia of distances*, 4th ed., Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2016.
- [19] I. S. Dhillon, R. W. Heath Jr., T. Strohmer, and J. A. Tropp, *Constructing packings in Grassmannian manifolds via alternating projection*, Exp. Math. **17** (2008), no. 1, 9–35.
- [20] L. Dorst, D. Fontijne, and S. Mann, *Geometric algebra for computer science: an object-oriented approach to geometry*, Elsevier, 2007.
- [21] B. Draper, M. Kirby, J. Marks, T. Marrinan, and C. Peterson, *A flag representation for finite collections of subspaces of mixed dimensions*, Linear Algebra Appl. **451** (2014), 15–32.
- [22] A. Edelman, T. A. Arias, and S. T. Smith, *The geometry of algorithms with orthogonality constraints*, SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl. **20** (1999), no. 2, 303–353.
- [23] J. L. Flores, J. Herrera, and M. Sánchez, *Gromov, Cauchy and causal boundaries for Riemannian, Finslerian and Lorentzian manifolds*, AMS, 2013.
- [24] H. Gluck, *Higher curvatures of curves in Euclidean space, II*, Amer. Math. Monthly **74** (1967), no. 9, 1049–1056.
- [25] P. Griffiths and J. Harris, *Principles of algebraic geometry*, John Wiley & Sons, 1994.
- [26] H. Gunawan, O. Neswan, and W. Setya-Budhi, *A formula for angles between subspaces of inner product spaces*, Beitr. Algebra Geom. **46** (2005), no. 2, 311–320.
- [27] J. Hamm and D. Lee, *Grassmann discriminant analysis: A unifying view on subspace-based learning*, Proc. Int. Conf. Mach. Learn., ACM, 2008, pp. 376–383.
- [28] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Topics in matrix analysis*, Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- [29] Z. Huang, J. Wu, and L. Van Gool, *Building deep networks on Grassmann manifolds*, Proc. Conf. AAAI Artif. Intell., vol. 32, 2018.
- [30] D. P. Huttenlocher, G. A. Klanderman, and W. A. Rucklidge, *Comparing images using the Hausdorff distance*, IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell. **15** (1993), no. 9, 850–863.

- [31] S. Jiang, *Angles between Euclidean subspaces*, Geom. Dedicata **63** (1996), 113–121.
- [32] T. Kato, *Perturbation theory for linear operators*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995.
- [33] E. F. Kazeem, C. A. Agyingi, and Y. U. Gaba, *On quasi-pseudometric type spaces*, Chin. J. Math. **2014** (2014), 1–7, Article ID 198685.
- [34] S. E. Kozlov, *Geometry of real Grassmann manifolds. Part III*, J. Math. Sci. **100** (2000), no. 3, 2254–2268.
- [35] ———, *Geometry of real Grassmann manifolds. Parts I, II*, J. Math. Sci. **100** (2000), no. 3, 2239–2253.
- [36] H. P. Künzi, *Nonsymmetric distances and their associated topologies: about the origins of basic ideas in the area of asymmetric topology*, Handbook of the history of general topology (C. E. Aull and R. Lowen, eds.), vol. 3, Springer, 2001, pp. 853–968.
- [37] ———, *An introduction to quasi-uniform spaces*, Contemp. Math. **486** (2009), 239–304.
- [38] G. Lerman and T. Zhang, *Robust recovery of multiple subspaces by geometric  $l_p$  minimization*, Ann. Stat. **39** (2011), no. 5, 2686–2715.
- [39] D. J. Love and R. W. Heath, *Limited feedback unitary precoding for orthogonal space-time block codes*, IEEE Trans. Signal Process. **53** (2005), no. 1, 64–73.
- [40] Y. M. Lui, *Advances in matrix manifolds for computer vision*, Image Vis. Comput. **30** (2012), no. 6-7, 380–388.
- [41] A. L. G. Mandolesi, *Grassmann angles between real or complex subspaces*, [arXiv:1910.00147](#) (2019).
- [42] ———, *Projection factors and generalized real and complex Pythagorean theorems*, Adv. Appl. Clifford Algebras **30** (2020), no. 43.
- [43] ———, *Quantum fractionalism: the Born rule as a consequence of the complex Pythagorean theorem*, Phys. Lett. A **384** (2020), no. 28, 126725.
- [44] ———, *Blade products and angles between subspaces*, Adv. Appl. Clifford Algebras **31** (2021), no. 69.
- [45] ———, *Compendium on multivector contractions*, [arXiv:2205.07608](#) [math.GM] (2022).
- [46] R. J. Martin, *A metric for ARMA processes*, IEEE Trans. Signal Process. **48** (2000), no. 4, 1164–1170.
- [47] A. C. G. Mennucci, *On asymmetric distances*, Anal. Geom. Metr. Spaces **1** (2013), no. 1, 200–231.
- [48] ———, *Geodesics in asymmetric metric spaces*, Anal. Geom. Metr. Spaces **2** (2014), no. 1, 115–153.
- [49] J. Miao and A. Ben-Israel, *On principal angles between subspaces in  $R^n$* , Linear Algebra Appl. **171** (1992), 81–98.
- [50] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum computation and quantum information*, Cambridge University Press, 2010.

- [51] R. Ortega and M. Santander, *Trigonometry of the quantum state space, geometric phases and relative phases*, J. Phys. A Math. Theor. **36** (2002), no. 2, 459–485.
- [52] R. Pereira, X. Mestre, and D. Gregoratti, *Clustering complex subspaces in large dimensions*, 2022 IEEE Int. Conf. Acoust., Speech, Signal Process., 2022.
- [53] L. Qiu, Y. Zhang, and C. Li, *Unitarily invariant metrics on the Grassmann space*, SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl. **27** (2005), no. 2, 507–531.
- [54] K. Scharnhorst, *Angles in complex vector spaces*, Acta Appl. Math. **69** (2001), no. 1, 95–103.
- [55] D. C. Sorensen, *Numerical methods for large eigenvalue problems*, Acta Numer. **11** (2002), 519–584.
- [56] G. Stewart and J. Sun, *Matrix perturbation theory*, Academic Press, 1990.
- [57] X. Sun, L. Wang, and J. Feng, *Further results on the subspace distance*, Pattern Recognit. **40** (2007), no. 1, 328–329.
- [58] P. Turaga, A. Veeraraghavan, and R. Chellappa, *Statistical analysis on Stiefel and Grassmann manifolds with applications in computer vision*, 2008 IEEE Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recog., 2008.
- [59] S. V. N. Vishwanathan, A. J. Smola, and R. Vidal, *Binet-Cauchy kernels on dynamical systems and its application to the analysis of dynamic scenes*, Int. J. Comput. Vis. **73** (2006), no. 1, 95–119.
- [60] L. Wang, X. Wang, and J. Feng, *Subspace distance analysis with application to adaptive Bayesian algorithm for face recognition*, Pattern Recognit. **39** (2006), no. 3, 456–464.
- [61] A. Weinstein, *Almost invariant submanifolds for compact group actions*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. **2** (2000), no. 1, 53–86.
- [62] W. A. Wilson, *On quasi-metric spaces*, Amer. J. Math. **53** (1931), no. 3, 675.
- [63] S. Winitzki, *Linear algebra via exterior products*, Ludwig-Maximilians University, Munich, Germany, 2010.
- [64] L. Wolf and A. Shashua, *Learning over sets using kernel principal angles*, J. Mach. Learn. Res. **4** (2003), 913–931.
- [65] Y. Wong, *Differential geometry of Grassmann manifolds*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **57** (1967), no. 3, 589–594.
- [66] K. Ye and L. H. Lim, *Schubert varieties and distances between subspaces of different dimensions*, SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl. **37** (2016), no. 3, 1176–1197.
- [67] T. Yokonuma, *Tensor spaces and exterior algebra*, AMS, 1992.