

## The unitary part of paranormal operators

By Kazuyoshi OKUBO

(Received December 17, 1976)

Let  $T$  be a *contraction* (i. e.  $\|T\| \leq 1$ ) on a complex Hilbert space  $\mathfrak{H}$ . It is known ([3] Theorem 3.2) that there is a unique direct sum decomposition  $T = T^{(u)} \oplus T^{(o)}$  on  $\mathfrak{H}^{(u)} \oplus \mathfrak{H}^{(o)}$  such that  $T^{(u)} = T|_{\mathfrak{H}^{(u)}}$  is unitary while  $T^{(o)} = T|_{\mathfrak{H}^{(o)}}$  is *completely non-unitary*, that is,  $T^{(o)}$  has no non-trivial reducing subspace on which  $T^{(o)}$  is unitary. Actually  $\mathfrak{H}^{(u)}$  is characterized as follows :

$$\mathfrak{H}^{(u)} = \{x \in \mathfrak{H} : \|T^n x\| = \|T^{*n} x\| = \|x\| \quad n = 1, 2, 3, \dots\}.$$

Since the sequence  $\{T^{*n} T^n\}$  and  $\{T^n T^{*n}\}$  are non-negative, monotone decreasing, there exist their strong limits. Then by using the notations  $A := (\lim T^{*n} T^n)^{\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $A_* := (\lim T^n T^{*n})^{\frac{1}{2}}$  the subspace  $\mathfrak{H}^{(u)}$  is written in the following way :

$$\mathfrak{H}^{(u)} = \{x \in \mathfrak{H} : Ax = A_* x = x\}.$$

Recently Putnam ([1], Corollary 1 of Theorem 3) showed that if  $T$  is a *hyponormal* (i. e.  $\|Tx\| \geq \|T^*x\|$ ) contraction  $A_*$  becomes the projection onto  $\mathfrak{H}^{(u)}$ . This result was derived from a rather deep property of a hyponormal operator. The purpose of this paper is to prove the same conclusion for a *paranormal* (i. e.  $\|Tx\|^2 \leq \|T^2x\| \|x\|$ ) contraction, with a very simple proof. Every hypernormal operator is paranormal. In contrast to the case of hyponormality the sum of a paranormal operator and a scalar is not necessarily paranormal. This discrepancy makes it inevitable for us to take an approach different from that of Putnam as well as of Stampfli and Wadhwa [2].

**THEOREM.** *Let  $T$  be a paranormal contraction. Then  $A_*$  is the projection onto the subspace  $\mathfrak{H}^{(u)}$ .*

**Proof.** Define  $\mathfrak{M} := \overline{A_*(\mathfrak{H})}$ . From the definition of  $A_*$ ,  $\|A_* T^* x\| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|T^{*n+1} x\| = \|A_* x\|$  for all  $x \in \mathfrak{H}$ . So there exists a partial isometry  $W$  such that  $A_* T^* = WA_*$  and  $W|_{\mathfrak{M}^\perp} = 0$ . Since  $W$  is isometric on  $\mathfrak{M}$  and  $TA_* = A_* W^*$  we have  $TA_* WA_* = A_* W^* WA_* = A_*^2$ , hence  $\overline{TW\mathfrak{M}} \supset \overline{A_*^2 \mathfrak{H}} = \overline{A_* \mathfrak{H}} = \mathfrak{M}$ , that is,  $\overline{TW\mathfrak{M}} = \mathfrak{M}$ . Let  $x \in \mathfrak{M}$ , and define  $y_n := A_* W^n x$  ( $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ ). Then we have  $Ty_{n+1} = TA_* W^{n+1} x = A_* W^* W^{n+1} x = A_* W^n x = y_n$ .

Since  $T$  is paranormal, we have  $\|y_n\|^2 = \|Ty_{n+1}\|^2 \leq \|T^2y_{n+1}\| \cdot \|y_{n+1}\| = \|y_{n-1}\| \cdot \|y_{n+1}\|$  ( $n=1, 2, \dots$ ), hence  $\{\|y_n\|^2\}$  is convex with respect to  $n$ , and *bounded*:  $\|y_n\|^2 = \|A_*W^n x\|^2 \leq \|x\|^2$  ( $n=0, 1, 2, \dots$ ), therefore  $\{\|y_n\|\}$  is non-increasing. In particular  $\|y_0\| \geq \|y_1\|$ , that is,  $\|A_*x\| \geq \|A_*Wx\|$ . On the other hand, we have  $\|A_*x\| = \|A_*W^*Wx\| = \|TA_*Wx\| \leq \|A_*Wx\|$ , so  $\|A_*x\| = \|A_*Wx\| = \|TA_*Wx\|$ . Since  $A_*Wx = T^*T(A_*Wx) = T^*A_*x$ , it follows  $T^*\mathfrak{M} \subset \mathfrak{M}$  and  $\|T^*A_*x\| = \|A_*x\|$ . Hence we showed  $\mathfrak{M}$  reduces  $T$  and  $T^*|_{\mathfrak{M}}$  is an isometry. Then  $A_*^2 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (TP_{\mathfrak{M}})^n (T^*P_{\mathfrak{M}})^n = P_{\mathfrak{M}}$  where  $P_{\mathfrak{M}}$  is the projection onto  $\mathfrak{M}$ . Therefore  $A_* = P_{\mathfrak{M}}$ . To prove  $T^*\mathfrak{M} = \mathfrak{M}$ , take arbitrary  $x \in \mathfrak{M} \ominus T^*\mathfrak{M}$ . We can easily show that  $TT^*x = x$  and  $T^2T^*x = 0$ . Since  $T$  is paranormal we have  $\|x\|^2 = \|TT^*x\| \leq \|T^2T^*x\| \cdot \|T^*x\| = 0$ , hence  $x = 0$ . Consequently  $\mathfrak{M} = T^*\mathfrak{M}$ , and  $T^*|_{\mathfrak{M}}$  (and  $T|_{\mathfrak{M}}$ ) is unitary. Therefore  $\mathfrak{M} \subset \mathfrak{S}^{(u)}$ . The reverse inclusion is trivial. Q. E. D.

COROLLARY 1. *Let  $T$  be a paranormal completely non-unitary contraction. Then  $T \in C_o$ , i.e.  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T^{*n} = 0$ .*

Proof. By Theorem completely non-unitarity is equivalent to  $A_* = 0$ . Q. E. D.

COROLLARY 2. *Let  $T$  be a paranormal contraction. Then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|T^n x\| \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|T^{*n} x\|$  for all  $x \in \mathfrak{S}$ .*

Proof. Let  $x \in \mathfrak{S}$ . Then we divide  $x$  into  $x = A_*x + (I - A_*)x$ . By the Theorem  $A_*$  is the projection onto the subspace  $\mathfrak{S}^{(u)}$  hence we have  $\|T^n x\|^2 = \|T^n A_*x\|^2 + \|T^n(I - A_*)x\|^2 \geq \|T^n A_*x\|^2 = \|A_*x\|^2$  for all non-negative interger  $n$ . Consequently we have  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|T^n x\|^2 \geq \|A_*x\|^2 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|T^{*n} x\|^2$ . Q. E. D.

By the almost same arguement as in the proof of the Theorem, we can obtain the following proposition;

PROPOSITION. *Let  $T$  be a paranormal contraction. Let  $U$  be unitary. If  $TW = WU$  where  $W$  has dense range, then  $T$  is unitary.*

In contrast to the Theorem, it is not always true that  $A$  is a projection if  $T$  is a paranormal contraction. This can be seen in the following example. Let  $\{e_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$  be an orthonormal basis of  $\mathfrak{S}$ . Let  $Te_n = \frac{1}{2}e_{n+1}$  or  $=e_{n+1}$  according as  $n=0$  or  $n \geq 1$ . Then  $T$  is a paranormal contraction, and by simple computation we have  $Ae_0 = \frac{1}{2}e_0$  and  $A^2e_0 = \frac{1}{4}e_0$ . Hence  $A$  is not a projection.

The author wishes to express his gratitude to Professor T. Ando for his kind advice during the preparation of this paper.

### References

- [1] C. R. PUTNAM: Hyponormal contractions and strong power convergence, *Pacific J. Math.* 57 (1975), 531–538.
- [2] J. G. STAMPFLI and B. L. WADHWA: An asymmetric Putnam-Fuglede theorem for dominant operators, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* 25 (1976), 359–365.
- [3] B. SZ-NAGY and C. FOIAŞ: Harmonic analysis of operators on Hilbert space, Akadémiai Kiadó-North Holland (Budapest-Amsterdam 1970).

Division of Applied Mathematics  
Research Institute of Applied Electricity  
Hokkaido University  
Sapporo, Japan