

MODULAR BIFRAMES FOR OPERATORS

SALAH EDDINE OUSTANI¹ AND MOHAMED ROSSAFI^{2*}

ABSTRACT. One of the most important problems in the studying of frames and its extensions is the invariance of these systems under perturbation. The current paper is concerned with the invariance of Modular biframes for operators under some class of closed range operators.

1. INTRODUCTION AND PRELIMINARIES

Frames are basis-like systems that span a vector space but allow for linear dependency, that can be used to obtain other desirable features unavailable with orthonormal bases. Theory of frames is a useful tool to expand functions with respect to a system of functions which is, in general, non-orthogonal and overcomplete. The aim of this theory, developed by Duffin and Schaeffer [6], was to solve some problems related to the nonharmonic Fourier series. However, the frame theory had not attracted much attention until the celebrated work by Daubechies, Crossman, and Meyer [5]. Nowadays, Frames attract a steady interests in recent research in applied mathematics because they are used in various areas such as signal processing [9], sampling theory [7]. The theory of frames has been rapidly generalized and, until 2005, various generalizations consisting of vectors in Hilbert spaces or Hilbert C^* -modules have been developed.

It is well known that Hilbert C^* -module is an object like a Hilbert space except that the inner product is not scalar-valued but takes its values in a C^* -algebra of coefficients. Since the geometry of these modules emerges from the C^* -valued inner product, some basic properties of Hilbert spaces like self-duality must be given up. These modules play an important role in the study of non-commutative geometry, locally compact quantum groups and dynamical systems. For more information, we refer the readers to [2, 11, 5, 4, 10, 17, 18, 12, 27].

The main goal of this paper is to study the invariance of K -biframes under some closed range operators in Hilbert C^* -modules.

In continue, we aim to review some topics and basic definitions about frames for Hilbert C^* -module and operator theory that will be needed later. The reader is referred for instance to [24, 4] for more information.

Definition 1.1. [17]. Let \mathcal{A} be a unital C^* -algebra and \mathcal{H} be a left \mathcal{A} -module, such that the linear structures of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{H} are compatible. \mathcal{H} is a pre-Hilbert \mathcal{A} -module if \mathcal{H} is equipped with an \mathcal{A} -valued inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$, such that is sesquilinear, positive definite and respects the module action. In the other words,

- (i) $\langle x, x \rangle_{\mathcal{A}} \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\langle x, x \rangle_{\mathcal{A}} = 0$ if and only if $x = 0$.
- (ii) $\langle ax + y, z \rangle_{\mathcal{A}} = a \langle x, y \rangle_{\mathcal{A}} + \langle y, z \rangle_{\mathcal{A}}$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $x, y, z \in \mathcal{H}$.
- (iii) $\langle x, y \rangle_{\mathcal{A}} = \langle y, x \rangle_{\mathcal{A}}^*$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$.

Date: Received: xxxxxx; Revised: yyyyyy; Accepted: zzzzzz.

* Corresponding author.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 42C15, 47A05, 47A15.

Key words and phrases. K -biframes, semi-regular operator, EP operator.

For $x \in \mathcal{H}$, we define $\|x\| = \|\langle x, x \rangle\|^{\frac{1}{2}}$. If \mathcal{H} is complete with $\|\cdot\|$, it is called a Hilbert \mathcal{A} -module or a Hilbert C^* -module over \mathcal{A} . For every a in C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} , we have $|a| = (a^*a)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and the \mathcal{A} -valued norm on \mathcal{H} is defined by $|x| = \langle x, x \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}$ for $x \in \mathcal{H}$.

Let \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} be two Hilbert \mathcal{A} -modules. A map $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ is said to be adjointable if there exists a map $T^* : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ such that $\langle Tx, y \rangle_{\mathcal{A}} = \langle x, T^*y \rangle_{\mathcal{A}}$ for all $x \in \mathcal{H}$ and $y \in \mathcal{K}$.

We also reserve the notation $End_{\mathcal{A}}^*(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ for the set of all adjointable operators from \mathcal{H} to \mathcal{K} and $End_{\mathcal{A}}^*(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H})$ is abbreviated to $End_{\mathcal{A}}^*(\mathcal{H})$.

Example 1.2. Let us consider the following set

$$l^2(\mathcal{A}) = \{\{a_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \subseteq \mathcal{A} : \sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}} a_j a_j^* \text{ converge in } \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{A}}\}.$$

It is easy to see that $l^2(\mathcal{A})$ with pointwise operations and the inner product

$$\langle \{a_j\}, \{b_j\} \rangle = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}} a_j b_j^*,$$

is a Hilbert C^* -module which is called the standard Hilbert C^* -module over \mathcal{A} .

A biframe is a pair of sequences in a Hilbert space that applies to an inequality similar to a frame inequality.

Definition 1.3. [8] A biframe is a pair $(\{x_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}}, \{y_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}})$ of sequences in a Hilbert space such there exist $\alpha, \beta > 0$

$$\alpha \|x\|^2 \leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \langle x, x_j \rangle \langle y_j, x \rangle \leq \beta \|x\|^2, \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Example 1.4. [8] We consider two following sequences

$$\{x_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq 2} = \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\} \text{ and } \{y_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq 2} = \{(3, 1), (1, 1)\}$$

$(\{x_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq 2}, \{y_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq 2})$ is a biframe with bounds $\frac{1}{2}$ and 3.

Recently, M. Rossafi introduced the concept of biframe in Hilbert C^* -modules as a new generalization of modular frames.

Definition 1.5. [15] Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert \mathcal{A} -module. A sequence $(\{x_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}}, \{y_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}})$ is said to be a biframe for \mathcal{H} , if there exist $\alpha, \beta > 0$ such that

$$\alpha \langle x, x \rangle \leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \langle x, x_j \rangle \langle y_j, x \rangle \leq \beta \langle x, x \rangle, \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{H}.$$

For an operator $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$, we denote by $R(T)$ and $N(T)$ the range and the kernel subspaces of T . We denote by $\mathcal{CR}(\mathcal{H})$ the set of all close range operators on \mathcal{H} and I is the identity operator. As usual, for $E \subset \mathcal{H}$, the orthogonal projection on E is denoted by π_E . We also write $R^\infty(T) = \bigcap_{n \geq 0} R(T^n)$, for the generalized range.

The following lemma is a key tool for the proofs of our main results.

Lemma 1.6. [26] Let \mathcal{H} be Hilbert \mathcal{A} -module and $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$. Then

$$\langle Tx, Tx \rangle \leq \|T\|^2 \langle x, x \rangle, \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Lemma 1.7. [29] Let $T, G \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $R(G)$ is closed. Then the following statements are equivalent:

1. $R(T) \subseteq R(G)$;

2. $\alpha \langle T^*x, T^*x \rangle \leq \langle G^*x, G^*x \rangle$, for some $\alpha > 0$.

It should be noted that the closeness of range of operators is an attractive problem which appears in operator theory, especially, in the theory of Fredholm operators and generalized inverses.

Theorem 1.8. [20] Suppose that $T, G \in \mathcal{CR}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $TG = GT$. Then $R(TG)$ is closed.

Definition 1.9. [19] The Reduced minimum modulus of T is defined by

$$\gamma(T) := \inf \{ \|Tx\|, x \in \mathcal{H}, \text{dist}(x, N(T)) = 1 \}.$$

Formally, we set $\gamma(0) := \infty$. Clearly $\gamma(T) > 0$ if and only if $R(T)$ is closed.

Example 1.10. Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^3)$ be defined as follows

$$\begin{aligned} T : \quad \mathbb{C}^3 &\longrightarrow \mathbb{C}^3 \\ (x_1, x_2, x_3) &\longmapsto (x_1, x_1, x_1). \end{aligned}$$

For $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3$, we have,

$$\|Tx\| = \sqrt{3} |x_1|,$$

and

$$\text{dist}(x, N(T)) = |x_1|.$$

Then

$$\gamma(T) = \sqrt{3}.$$

In addition, the concept of semi-regularity has benefited from the work of many authors, in particular from the work of Mbekhta [19] and Rakocević [23].

Definition 1.11. [19] An operator $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is said to be semi-regular if $R(T)$ is closed and $N(T) \subset R(T^n)$, for every $n \geq 1$.

Example 1.12. All surjective and all injective operators with closed range are semi-regular. Some examples of semi-regular operators may be found in [16].

Next, we collect below some useful properties related to semi-regular operators

Proposition 1.13. [1] Let T be semi-regular. Then

- 1 . $R^\infty(T)$ is closed;
- 2 . $R^\infty(T) = T(R^\infty(T))$;
- 3 . $T - \lambda I$ is semi-regular, for all $|\lambda| < \gamma(T)$.

Recall that the semi-regular resolvent of a bounded operator T is defined by

$$\text{reg}(T) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : T - \lambda I \text{ is semi-regular}\}.$$

Theorem 1.14. [1] Let T be semi-regular and Ω be a connected component of $\text{reg}(T)$ and $\lambda_0 \in \Omega$, then $R^\infty(T - \lambda I) = R^\infty(T - \lambda_0 I)$, for every $\lambda \in \Omega$.

In [30], Recall that the Moore-Penrose inverse of an operator $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ with closed range is defined as the unique operator $T^\dagger \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ such that:

$$TT^\dagger x = x, \text{ for every } x \in R(T).$$

Example 1.15. [25] Let $T \in \mathcal{CR}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $T^2 = T$. We have

$$T^\dagger = T^\dagger T T^\dagger = T^\dagger T T T^\dagger = P_{R(T^*)} P_{R(T)}.$$

Now, we list below some useful properties related to Moore-Penrose inverses.

Proposition 1.16. [21] *Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be a closed range. Then*

1. $R(T^\dagger) = R(T^*) = N(T)^\perp$;
2. $N(T^\dagger) = N(T^*) = R(T)^\perp$;
3. $T^{\dagger*} = T^{*\dagger}$.

The reader is referred for instance to [3, 13] for more information.

Theorem 1.17. [20] *Let $T \in \mathcal{CR}(\mathcal{H})$ be closed range and $G \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be an arbitrary operator which commutes with T . Then G commutes with T^\dagger .*

EP matrix, as an extension of normal matrix, has been extended by Campbell and Meyer [22] to operators with closed range on a Hilbert space.

Definition 1.18. [28] *An operator $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is called an EP operator if $R(T)$ is closed and $R(T) = R(T^*)$.*

Example 1.19. Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(l^2(\mathbb{C}))$ be defined as follows:

$$T \left((x_j)_{j \geq 1} \right) = \left((y_j)_{j \geq 1} \right),$$

where

$$y_j = \begin{cases} x_1 - x_3 & \text{if } j = 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } j = 2 \\ x_j & \text{if } j \geq 3 \end{cases}$$

By some straightforward computations, we obtain that T is an EP-operator.

Proposition 1.20. [14] *Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be a normal operator with closed range. Then T is an EP operator.*

2. MAIN RESULTS

In this section, we begin with the following definition.

Definition 2.1. A pair $(\{x_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}}, \{y_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}})$ of sequences in \mathcal{H} is called K -biframes for \mathcal{H} , if there exist $\alpha, \beta > 0$ such that

$$\alpha \langle K^*x, K^*x \rangle \leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \langle x, x_j \rangle \langle y_j, x \rangle \leq \beta \langle x, x \rangle, \quad (\forall x \in \mathcal{H}).$$

α and β are called lower and upper K -biframe bounds, respectively.

To throw more light on the subject and understand the use of this concept, we exhibit below some examples of the K -biframes.

Example 2.2. Let $K \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^3)$ be defined by

$$Ke_j = \begin{cases} 3e_1 & \text{if } j = 1 \\ e_j & \text{if } j = 2, 3 \end{cases}$$

where $\{e_j\}_{j \geq 1}$ is an orthonormal basis for \mathbb{C}^3 . Obviously, we have

$$K^*e_j = \begin{cases} 3e_1 & \text{if } j = 1 \\ e_j & \text{if } j = 2, 3 \end{cases}$$

For $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3$, we get

$$\|K^*x\|^2 = 9|x_1|^2 + |x_2|^2 + |x_3|^2.$$

Now, consider, for $z \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\theta_j = \begin{cases} e^{iz}e_1 & \text{if } j = 1 \\ \frac{1}{2}e_2 & \text{if } j = 2 \\ e_3 & \text{if } j = 3 \end{cases} \text{ and } \psi_j = \begin{cases} e^{iz}e_1 & \text{if } j = 1 \\ e_2 & \text{if } j = 2 \\ \frac{1}{3}e_3 & \text{if } j = 3 \end{cases}$$

hence

$$\sum_{j=1}^3 \langle x, \theta_j \rangle \langle \psi_j, x \rangle = |x_1|^2 + \frac{1}{2}|x_2|^2 + \frac{1}{3}|x_3|^2.$$

Thus

$$\frac{1}{9} \|K^*x\|^2 \leq \sum_{j=1}^3 \langle x, \theta_j \rangle \langle \psi_j, x \rangle \leq \|x\|^2.$$

Which implies that $(\{\theta_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq 3}, \{\psi_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq 3})$ is a K -biframe for \mathbb{C}^3 .

Example 2.3. Let $\{e_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ be an orthonormal basis of $l^2(\mathbb{C})$ and $K \in \mathcal{L}(l^2(\mathbb{C}))$ be defined as follows

$$\begin{aligned} K : l^2(\mathbb{C}) &\longrightarrow l^2(\mathbb{C}) \\ (x_1, x_2, \dots) &\longmapsto (0, x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots). \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} K^* : l^2(\mathbb{C}) &\longrightarrow l^2(\mathbb{C}) \\ (x_1, x_2, \dots) &\longmapsto (x_2, x_3, \dots). \end{aligned}$$

By setting, for $a \in \mathbb{R}$

$$f_1 = e^{ia}e_1 \text{ and } f_j = e_j, \text{ for } j \geq 2.$$

and

$$g_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}e^{ia}e_1 \text{ and } g_j = e_j, \text{ for } j \geq 2.$$

For $x = (x_j)_{j \geq 1} \in l^2(\mathbb{C})$, we obtain

$$\sum_{j \geq 1} \langle x, f_j \rangle \langle g_j, x \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|x_1|^2 + \sum_{j \geq 2} |x_j|^2,$$

and

$$\|K^*x\|^2 = \sum_{j \geq 1} |x_j|^2.$$

Thus

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \|K^*x\|^2 \leq \sum_{j \geq 1} \langle x, f_j \rangle \langle g_j, x \rangle \leq \|x\|^2.$$

Consequently, $(\{f_j\}_{j \geq 1}, \{g_j\}_{j \geq 1})$ is a K -biframe for $l^2(\mathbb{C})$.

Remark 2.4. Two K -frames may not form a K -biframe. Indeed, define $K \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^r)$ be defined as follows

$$Ke_1 = \sqrt{2}e_1 \text{ and } Ke_j = e_j, \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq r.$$

where $\{e_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq r}$ is an orthonormal basis for \mathbb{C}^r . Thus

$$K^*e_1 = \sqrt{2}e_1 \text{ and } K^*e_j = e_j, \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq r.$$

For $x = (x_j)_{1 \leq j \leq r} \in \mathbb{C}^r$, we get

$$\|K^*x\|^2 = 2|x_1|^2 + \sum_{j=2}^r |x_j|^2.$$

Now, Consider the sequences

$$\{\theta_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq r} = \{e_1, e_1, e_2, e_2, \dots, e_r\}, \text{ and } \{\psi_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq r} = \left\{\frac{1}{2}e_1, -\frac{1}{2}e_1, e_2, e_2, \dots, e_r\right\}.$$

Direct computations show that $\{\theta_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq r}$ is a K -frame with bounds 1 and 2 and $\{\psi_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq r}$ is a K -frame with bounds $\frac{1}{6}$ and 1.

On the other hand, we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^r \langle x, \theta_j \rangle \langle \psi_j, x \rangle = \sum_{j=2}^r |\langle x, e_j \rangle|^2,$$

hence, if we set $x = e_1$, we obtain

$$\sum_{j=1}^r \langle x, \theta_j \rangle \langle \psi_j, x \rangle = 0$$

Therefore, $(\{\theta_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq r}, \{\psi_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq r})$ is not a K -biframe for \mathbb{C}^r .

The next theorem presents some operators that preserve the K -biframe property of a given K -biframe.

Theorem 2.5. *Let $L \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $KLK = K$ and $(\{x_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}}, \{y_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}})$ be a K -biframe for \mathcal{H} . Then $(\{(KL)x_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}}, \{(KL)y_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}})$ is a K -biframe for \mathcal{H} .*

Proof. First, there exist $\alpha, \beta > 0$ such that, for all $x \in \mathcal{H}$

$$\alpha \langle K^*x, K^*x \rangle \leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \langle x, x_j \rangle \langle y_j, x \rangle \leq \beta \langle x, x \rangle,$$

Since

$$KLK = K.$$

Thus

$$\alpha \langle (KLK)^*x, (KLK)^*x \rangle \leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \langle x, (KL)x_j \rangle \langle (KL)y_j, x \rangle \leq \beta \langle (KL)^*x, (KL)^*x \rangle.$$

By Lemma 1.6, we obtain

$$\alpha \langle K^*x, K^*x \rangle \leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \langle x, (KL)x_j \rangle \langle (KL)y_j, x \rangle \leq \beta \|KL\|^2 \langle x, x \rangle.$$

Then, $(\{(KL)x_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}}, \{(KL)y_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}})$ is a K -biframe for \mathcal{H} . □

Example 2.6. Let $K, L \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ be defined as follows:

$$K = \begin{pmatrix} e^{ia} & e^{-ia} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } L = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-ia} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \text{ where } a \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } i^2 = -1.$$

For $x = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$, we have

$$\|K^*x\|^2 = 2|x_1|^2.$$

By setting

$$f_j = \begin{cases} e^{ia}e_1 & \text{if } j = 1 \\ e_2 & \text{if } j = 2 \end{cases} \text{ and } g_j = \begin{cases} e^{ia}e_1 & \text{if } j = 1 \\ 2e_2 & \text{if } j = 2 \end{cases}$$

We obtain

$$\sum_{j=1}^2 \langle x, f_j \rangle \langle g_j, x \rangle = |x_1|^2 + 2|x_2|^2.$$

Thus

$$\frac{1}{2} \|K^*x\|^2 \leq \sum_{j=1}^2 \langle x, f_j \rangle \langle g_j, x \rangle \leq 2 \|x\|^2.$$

Then, $(\{f_1, g_1\}, \{f_2, g_2\})$ is a K -biframe for \mathbb{C}^2 .

By some straightforward computations, we obtain

$$KL = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus

$$\sum_{j=1}^2 \langle x, (KL)f_j \rangle \langle (KL)g_j, x \rangle = |x_1|^2.$$

Then

$$\frac{1}{2} \|K^*x\|^2 \leq \sum_{j=1}^2 \langle x, (KL)f_j \rangle \langle (KL)g_j, x \rangle \leq \|x\|^2.$$

Consequently, $(\{(KL)x_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}}, \{(KL)y_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}})$ is a K -biframe for \mathbb{C}^2 .

In what follows, we assume that T is semi-regular such that $KT = TK$ and Ω is a connected component of $\text{reg}(T)$ and we agree to use the following notation

$$T_\lambda = T - \lambda I \text{ and } \mathcal{H}_0 = R^\infty(T - \lambda_0 I), \quad (\lambda, \lambda_0 \in \Omega).$$

Theorem 2.7. Let $(\{x_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}}, \{y_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}})$ be a K -biframe for \mathcal{H} . Then $(\{T_\lambda x_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}}, \{T_\lambda y_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}})$ is a K -biframe for \mathcal{H}_0 , for every $\lambda \in \Omega$.

Proof. Let $x \in \mathcal{R}_0$. According to Theorem 1.14, there exists $y \in \mathcal{R}_0$ such that

$$x = T_\lambda(y),$$

hence

$$K(x) = (KT_\lambda)(y) = (T_\lambda K)(y).$$

It follows from Theorem 1.8, that $R(T_\lambda K)$ is closed.

By Lemma 1.7, there is exists $\xi > 0$ such that

$$\xi \langle K^*x, K^*x \rangle \leq \langle (T_\lambda K)^*x, (T_\lambda K)^*x \rangle.$$

Since $(\{x_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}}, \{y_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}})$ is a K -biframe for \mathcal{H} with biframe bounds α, β . Then

$$\alpha \langle (T_\lambda K)^* x, (T_\lambda K)^* x \rangle \leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \langle x, T_\lambda x_j \rangle \langle T_\lambda y_j, x \rangle \leq \beta \langle T_\lambda^* x, T_\lambda^* x \rangle.$$

Using Lemma 1.7, we obtain

$$\langle T_\lambda^* x, T_\lambda^* x \rangle \leq \|T_\lambda\|^2 \langle x, x \rangle.$$

Therefore

$$\alpha \xi \langle K^* x, K^* x \rangle \leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \langle x, T_\lambda x_j \rangle \langle T_\lambda y_j, x \rangle \leq \beta \|T_\lambda\|^2 \langle x, x \rangle.$$

This completes the proof. \square

In what follows, Consider $T \in \mathcal{CR}(\mathcal{H})$ and we fix the following notation:

$$\varphi(K) = K^{\dagger*}.$$

Lemma 2.8. *Let $K \in \mathcal{CR}(\mathcal{H})$. Then*

$$R(\varphi(K)) = R(K).$$

Proof. By Proposition 1.16, we have

$$R(\varphi(K)) = R((K^\dagger)^*) = N(K^\dagger)^\perp = (N(K^*))^\perp = R(K).$$

The result is obtained. \square

Next, we aimed to describe some invariant subset of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$

Theorem 2.9. *The following subset*

$$\Gamma = \{K \in \mathcal{CR}(\mathcal{H}) : (\{x_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}}, \{y_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}}) \text{ is a } K\text{-biframe for } \mathcal{H}\}$$

is φ -invariant. Moreover, we have $\pi_{R(K)} \in \Gamma$

Proof. Let $K \in \Gamma$, there exist $\alpha, \beta > 0$ such that

$$\alpha \langle K^* x, K^* x \rangle \leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \langle x, x_j \rangle \langle y_j, x \rangle \leq \beta \langle x, x \rangle, \quad (x \in \mathcal{H}).$$

By Lemma 1.7 and Lemma 1.6, there exists $\xi > 0$ such that

$$\xi \langle \varphi(K)^* x, \varphi(K)^* x \rangle \leq \langle K^* x, K^* x \rangle$$

This implies

$$\alpha \xi \langle \varphi(K)^* x, \varphi(K)^* x \rangle \leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \langle x, x_j \rangle \langle y_j, x \rangle \leq \beta \langle x, x \rangle.$$

Therefore

$$\varphi(\Gamma) \subset \Gamma$$

by Lemma 1.6, we have, For $x \in \mathcal{H}$

$$\langle (\varphi(K) K^*)^* x, (\varphi(K) K^*)^* x \rangle \leq \|K\|^2 \langle (\varphi(K))^* x, (\varphi(K))^* x \rangle.$$

Since

$$\varphi(K) K^* = (K K^\dagger)^* = (\pi_{R(K)})^* = \pi_{R(K)}.$$

Thus

$$\alpha \|K\|^{-2} \langle P_{R(K)}^* x, P_{R(K)}^* x \rangle \leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \langle x, x_j \rangle \langle y_j, x \rangle \leq \beta \langle x, x \rangle.$$

Therefore $\pi_{R(K)} \in \Gamma$ □

Proposition 2.10. *Let $(\{x_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}}, \{y_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}})$ be a K -biframe for \mathcal{H} and $U \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be unitary. Then $(\{Ux_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}}, \{Uy_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}})$ is a $(U\varphi(K)U^*)$ -biframe for \mathcal{H} .*

Proof. Direct computations show that

$$(UK^*U^*)^\dagger = UK^{*\dagger}U^*.$$

This implies,

$$\varphi(UKU^*) = (UKU^*)^{*\dagger} = U\varphi(K)U^*.$$

For $x \in \mathcal{H}$, we have

$$\langle (UKU^*)^* x, (UKU^*)^* x \rangle \leq \langle (K^*U^*) x, (K^*U^*) x \rangle$$

Thus, there exist $\alpha, \beta > 0$ such that

$$\alpha \langle (UKU^*)^* x, (UKU^*)^* x \rangle \leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \langle x, Ux_j \rangle \langle (Uy_j), x \rangle \leq \beta \langle x, x \rangle.$$

Then, $(\{Ux_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}}, \{Uy_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}})$ is a (UKU^*) -frame for \mathcal{H} .

Since

$$\varphi(UKU^*) = U\varphi(K)U^*.$$

By Theorem 2.9, $(\{Ux_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}}, \{Uy_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}})$ is a $(U\varphi(K)U^*)$ -biframe for \mathcal{H} . □

Proposition 2.11. *Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be EP. Then $\varphi(T)$ is EP too.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.8, we obtain

$$R(\varphi(T)^*) = R(\varphi(T^*)) = R(T^*)$$

Since T is EP, we have

$$R(\varphi(T)^*) = R(\varphi(T))$$

Therefore, $\varphi(T)$ is EP. □

In the next, for given an appropriate operator T , we intend to construct some K -biframes for $R(T)$.

Theorem 2.12. *Let T be EP such that $T^*K = KT^*$ and $(\{x_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}}, \{y_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}})$ be a K -biframe for \mathcal{H} . Then $(\{\varphi(T)x_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}}, \{\varphi(T)y_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}})$ is a K -biframe for $R(T)$.*

Proof. Let $x \in R(\varphi(T))$, we have

$$K(x) = K(\varphi(T)\varphi(T)^\dagger x).$$

By Theorem 1.17, we get

$$\varphi(T)K = K\varphi(T).$$

Hence

$$K(x) = (\varphi(T)K)(\varphi(T)^\dagger x).$$

It follows from Theorem 1.8, that $R(\varphi(T)K)$ is closed.

Using Proposition 2.11, we obtain

$$\varphi(T)^\dagger x \in R(\varphi(T)^*) = R(T).$$

By Lemma 1.7, there exist $\xi > 0$ such that

$$\xi \langle K^* x, K^* x \rangle \leq \langle (\varphi(T) K)^* x, (\varphi(T) K)^* x \rangle$$

and by Lemma 1.6, we have

$$\langle \varphi(T)^* x, \varphi(T)^* x \rangle \leq \|T^\dagger\|^2 \langle x, x \rangle.$$

Since, $(\{x_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}}, \{y_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}})$ is a K -biframes for \mathcal{H} , there exist $\alpha, \beta > 0$ such that

$$\alpha \langle K^* x, K^* x \rangle \leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \langle x, x_j \rangle \langle y_j, x \rangle \leq \beta \langle x, x \rangle.$$

Thus

$$\alpha \langle (\varphi(T) K)^* x, (\varphi(T) K)^* x \rangle \leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \langle x, \varphi(T) x_j \rangle \langle \varphi(T) y_j, x \rangle \leq \beta \langle \varphi(T)^* x, \varphi(T)^* x \rangle.$$

By Lemma 1.6, we get

$$\langle \varphi(T)^* x, \varphi(T)^* x \rangle \leq \|T^\dagger\|^2 \langle x, x \rangle$$

Therefore

$$\alpha \xi \langle K^* x, K^* x \rangle \leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \langle x, \varphi(T) x_j \rangle \langle \varphi(T) y_j, x \rangle \leq \beta \|T^\dagger\|^2 \langle x, x \rangle.$$

This completes the proof. □

By assumption of Theorem 2.12, we obtain that

Corollary 2.13. *Let T be a normal operator. Then $(\{\varphi(T) x_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}}, \{\varphi(T) y_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}})$ is a K -biframe for $R(T)$.*

Proof. It follows from Proposition 1.20. □

DECLARATIONS

Availability of data and materials

Not applicable.

Competing interest

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Fundings

Authors declare that there is no funding available for this article.

Authors' contributions

The authors equally conceived of the study, participated in its design and coordination, drafted the manuscript, participated in the sequence alignment, and read and approved the final manuscript.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Aiena, Fredholm and Local Spectral Theory with Applications to Multipliers, Kluwer.Acad.Press, (2004)
- [2] Assila, N., Labrigui, H., Touri, A. et al. Integral operator frames on Hilbert C^* -modules. Ann Univ Ferrara (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11565-024-00501-z>
- [3] A. Ben-Israel, T. N. E. Greville, Generalized inverses. Theory and applications, Second edition, Canadian Mathematical Society, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003.
- [4] O. Christensen, An introduction to frames and Riesz bases. Applied and numerical harmonic analysis. Birkhäuser Boston Inc, Boston (2003).
- [5] I. Daubechies, A. Grossmann, Y. Meyer, Painless non orthogonal expansions, J. Math. Phys. 27(1986) 1271-1283.
- [6] R. J. Duffin, A. C. Schaefer, A class of nonharmonic fourier series, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 72 (1952), 341-366.
- [7] Y. C. Eldar, Sampling with arbitrary sampling and reconstruction spaces and oblique dual frame vectors, J. Fourier. Anal. Appl. 9(1) (2003), 77-96.
- [8] M. Firouzi Parizi, A. Alijani and M. Ali Dehghan, Biframes and some of their properties, J Inequal Appl 2022, 104 (2022).
- [9] P. Ferreira, Mathematics for multimedia signal processing II: Discrete finite frames and signal reconstruction, Byrnes, J.S. (ed.) 17(1999), 35-54.
- [10] M. Frank, D.R. Larson, Frames in Hilbert C^* -modules and C^* algebra, J. Operator Theory. (2002), 48, 273-314.
- [11] Ghiati, M., Rossafi, M., Mouniane, M. et al. Controlled continuous $*$ -g-frames in Hilbert C^* -modules. J. Pseudo-Differ. Oper. Appl. 15, 2 (2024).
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11868-023-00571-1>
- [12] L. Găvruta, Frames for operators. Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal. 32(1), 139-144 (2012).
- [13] R. Harte, M. Mbekhta, On generalized inverses in C^* -algebras. Studia Math. 103(1),71-77 (1992).
- [14] M. Jalaieian, M.M. Karizaki, H. Mahmoud, Conditions that the product of operators is an EP operator in Hilbert C^* -module, Linear Multilinear Algebra **68** (2020), no. 10, 1990-2004.
- [15] A. Karara and M. Rossafi, Biframes in C^* -Hilbert modules, , preprint arXiv:2312.15351, 2023
- [16] J.P. Labrousse, Les opérateurs quasi-Fredholm., Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo, XXIX 2, 161-258 (1980)
- [17] V. M. Manuilov and E. V. Troitsky, Hilbert C^* -Modules, American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I, 2005.
- [18] Massit, H., Rossafi, M., Park, C. Some relations between continuous generalized frames. Afr. Mat. 35, 12 (2024).
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s13370-023-01157-2>
- [19] M. Mbekhta, A. Ouahab, Opérateur s-régulier dans un espace de Banach et théorie spectrale., Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) 59, 525-43(1994).
- [20] M. Mohammadzadeh Karizaki, D.S. Djordjević, Commuting C^* -modular operators. Aequat. Math. 90, (2016),1103-1114.
- [21] J. S. Moghaddam, A. Najati, F. Ghobadzadeh, (F, G) -operator frames for $L(H, K)$, International Journal of Wavelets, Multiresolution and Information Processing, 2050031. (2020)

- [22] L. Stephen, Campbell and D. Carl Meyer, EP Operators and Generalized Inverses, Canadian Mathematical Bulletin, Volume 18, Issue 3, August, 327 - 333 (1975)
- [23] V. Rakocević, Generalized spectrum and commuting compact perturbations, Proc. Edinb. Math. Soc. 36, 197-209 (1993).
- [24] M. Rossafi, S. Kabbaj, $*$ - K -g-frames in Hilbert C^* -modules, Journal of Linear and Topological Algebra Vol.07, No. 01, (2018), 63-71.
- [25] S. E. Oustani and Azadeh Alijani, Continuous frames and Cauchy dual of closed range Operators, U.P.B. Sci. Bull., Series A, Vol. 85, Iss. 4, 2023.
- [26] W. Paschke, Inner product modules over B^* -algebras, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., (182)(1973), 443-468.
- [27] Rossafi, M., Nhari, F.D., Park, C. et al. Continuous g-Frames with C^* -Valued Bounds and Their Properties. Complex Anal. Oper. Theory 16, 44 (2022).
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11785-022-01229-4>
- [28] K. Sharifi, EP modular operators and their products, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 419 (2014), pp. 870-877.
- [29] L. C. Zhang, The factor decomposition theorem of bounded generalized inverse modules and their topological continuity, J. Acta Math. Sin. **23** (2007), 1413-1418.
- [30] Xu, Q.X., Sheng, L.J.: Positive semi-definite matrices of adjointable operators on Hilbert C^* -modules. Linear Algebra Appl. 428, 992-1000(2008)

¹DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS FACULTY OF SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF IBN TOFAIL, B.P. 133, KENITRA, MOROCCO

Email address: salaheddine.oustani.1975@gmail.com

²DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS FACULTY OF SCIENCES, DHAR EL MAHRAZ UNIVERSITY SIDI MOHAMED BEN ABDELLAH, FES, MOROCCO

Email address: rossafimohamed@gmail.com