Kangweon–Kyungki Math. Jour. 3 (1995), No. 2, pp. 309–314

NONSINGULARITY AND INVERTIBILITY FOR A COMMUTING PAIR

CHOON KYUNG CHUNG AND YONG BIN CHOI

Throughout this note, write $\mathcal{L}(X)$ for the set of all bounded linear operators on a Banach space X and suppose $T = (T_1, T_2)$ is a commuting pair of operators in $\mathcal{L}(X)$. Then we say ([3],[4]) that T is *nonsingular* in the sense of Taylor if it has an exact sequence for its Koszul complex(cf. [1],[2]):

$$0 \longrightarrow X \xrightarrow{\begin{matrix} T_1 \\ T_2 \end{matrix}} \begin{bmatrix} X \\ X \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{(-T_2 \quad T_1)} X \longrightarrow 0. \tag{0.1}$$

The exactness resolves itself into three conditions:

(T1) (left) $T_1^{-1}(0) \cap T_2^{-1}(0) = \{0\}$

(T2) (right) $T_1(X) + T_2(X) = X$

(T3) (middle) $(-T_2 \quad T_1)^{-1}(0) = \begin{pmatrix} T_1 \\ T_2 \end{pmatrix}(X)$

We also say ([3],[4]) that T is *invertible* in the sense of Harte if its Koszul complex (0.1) has an interpolation: that is, there are pairs (T_1', T_2') and (T_1'', T_2'') for which

(H1) (left) $T_1'T_1 + T_2'T_2 = I$

(H2) (right) $T_1T_1'' + T_2T_2'' = I$

(H3) (middle) $\begin{pmatrix} -T_2'' \\ T_1'' \end{pmatrix}(-T_2 \quad T_1) + \begin{pmatrix} T_1 \\ T_2 \end{pmatrix}(T_1' \quad T_2') = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix}.$

It is clear that invertibility implies nonsingularity. If the space X is a Hilbert space then nonsingularity implies invertibility. But for Banach spaces this question is open ([1],[3]). Harte ([3]) gave a necessary and sufficient condition for middle nonsingularity.

Received June 28, 1995.

We can also have a necessary and sufficient condition for middle invertibility. For this we recall ([2]) that $T \in \mathcal{L}(X)$ is called *regular* if there is $T' \in \mathcal{L}(X)$ for which

$$T = TT'T; \tag{0.2}$$

then T' is called a generalized inverse for T. In this case $T'T$ and TT' are both projection and

$$(T'T)^{-1}(0) = T^{-1}(0) \quad \text{and} \quad (TT')(X) = T(X). \tag{0.3}$$

We are ready for:

THEOREM 1. *If $T = (T_1, T_2)$ is a commuting pair of operators the following are equivalent:*

(a) T satisfies (H_3)

(b) T satisfies (T_3) and there are pairs (S_1, S_2) and (S_1', S_2') for which

$$\begin{aligned} &\Big(I - (S_1T_1 + S_2T_2)\Big)(X) \subseteq T_1^{-1}(0) \cap T_2^{-1}(0) \\ &\Big(I - (T_1S_1' + T_2S_2')\Big)^{-1}(0) \supseteq T_1(X) + T_2(X) \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

Proof.. (a)⇒(b): If T satisfies (H3), it is evident that T satisfies (T3). Also multiplying on the right of (H3) by $\begin{pmatrix} T_1 \\ T_2 \end{pmatrix}$ and multiplying on the left of (H3) by $\begin{pmatrix} -T_2 & T_1 \end{pmatrix}$ give

$$\left.\begin{aligned} T_1T_1'T_1 + T_1T_2'T_2 &= T_1 \\ T_2T_1'T_1 + T_2T_2'T_2 &= T_2 \\ T_2T_2''T_2 + T_1T_1''T_2 &= T_2 \\ T_2T_2''T_1 + T_1T_1''T_1 &= T_1, \end{aligned}\right\}$$

so that

$$\left.\begin{aligned} T_1\Big(I-(T_1'T_1+T_2'T_2)\Big)&=0\\ T_2\Big(I-(T_1'T_1+T_2'T_2)\Big)&=0\\ \Big(I-(T_1T_1''+T_2T_2'')\Big)T_2&=0\\ \Big(I-(T_1T_1''+T_2T_2'')\Big)T_1&=0, \end{aligned}\right\}$$

which gives (1.1) with $T_1' = S_1$, $T_2' = S_2$, $T_1'' = S_1'$, $T_2'' = S_2'$.

(b)⇒(a): Suppose (1.1) holds. Then $\begin{pmatrix} T_1 \\ T_2 \end{pmatrix}$ and $(\,-T_2 \quad T_1\,)$ and both regular with generalized inverses $(\,S_1 \quad S_2\,)$ and $\begin{pmatrix} -S_2' \\ S_1' \end{pmatrix}$, respectively. If T satisfies (T3) then, by (0.3),

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} -S_2' \\ S_1' \end{pmatrix}(\,-T_2 \quad T_1\,)\right)\begin{pmatrix} X \\ X \end{pmatrix} = (\,-T_2 \quad T_1\,)^{-1}(0)\\ &= \begin{pmatrix} T_1 \\ T_2 \end{pmatrix}(X)\\ &= \left(\begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} T_1 \\ T_2 \end{pmatrix}(\,S_1 \quad S_2\,)\right)^{-1}(0), \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} T_1 \\ T_2 \end{pmatrix}(\,S_1 \quad S_2\,)\right)\left(\begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} -S_2' \\ S_1' \end{pmatrix}(\,-T_2 \quad T_1\,)\right)\\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

which give (H3) with
$T_1' = S_1 - S_1S_2'T_2 - S_2S_1'T_2$, $T_2' = S_2 + S_1S_2'T_1 - S_2S_1'T_1$, $T_1'' = S_1'$, and $T_2'' = S_2'$. □

COROLLARY 2. *If $T = (T_1, T_2)$ is a commuting pair of operators the following are equivalent:*

(a) T is invertible

(b) T is nonsingular together with (H3)

Proof.. If T is nonsingular together with (H3) then it follows from (T1), (T2) and (1.1) that there are pairs (S_1, S_2) and (S_1', S_2') for which

$$S_1T_1 + S_2T_2 = I \quad \text{and} \quad T_1S_1' + T_2S_2' = I,$$

which gives (H1) and (H2). □

COROLLARY 3. *If $T = (T_1, T_2)$ is a commuting pair of operators the following are equivalent:*

(a) T is invertible

(b) T is nonsingular and $\begin{pmatrix} T_1 \\ T_2 \end{pmatrix}(X)$ is complemented.

Proof.. If T satisfies (b), it follows that $\begin{pmatrix} T_1 \\ T_2 \end{pmatrix}$ and $(-T_2 \quad T_1)$ and both regular and hence $\begin{pmatrix} T_1 \\ T_2 \end{pmatrix}$ is left invertible by (T1) and $(-T_2 \quad T_1)$ is right invertible by (T2). Further by the argument of Theorem 1, T satisfies (H3). □

We now meet our main result:

THEOREM 4. *If $T = (T_1, T_2)$ is a commuting pair of regular operators then*

$$T \text{ is nonsingular} \iff T \text{ is invertible.} \tag{4.1}$$

Proof.. In view of Corollary 3, it suffices to show that $(-T_2 \quad T_1)$ is regular. Suppose $T_1 = T_1T_1'T_1$ and $T_2 = T_2T_2'T_2$. Middle nonsingularity gives

$$T_2^{-1}(0) \subseteq T_1(X).$$

By an argument of Harte ([3]), T_2T_1 is regular, and hence $(T_2T_1)(X)$ is complemented. Since again middle nonsingularity gives

$$T_1(X) \cap T_2(X) = (T_2T_1)(X),$$

it follows that $T_1(X) \cap T_2(X)$ is complemented. Thus, by (T2), X can be decomposed as:

$$X = W \oplus T_1(X) \cap T_2(X) \oplus Z,$$

where $T_2(X) = W \oplus T_1(X) \cap T_2(X)$, $T_1(X) = T_1(X) \cap T_2(X) \oplus Z$. Further, we can arrange T_1' and T_2' as

$$(I - T_1T_1')(X) = W \text{ and } (I - T_2T_2')(X) = Z.$$

If we put $P = I - T_2T_2'$ then

$$PT_2 = 0 \tag{4.2}$$

and

$$T_2T_2'T_1 + T_1T_1'PT_1 = T_1 + (I - T_1T_1')(T_2T_2'T_1) = T_1. \tag{4.3}$$

Thus, by (4.2) and (4.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&(-T_2 \quad T_1)\begin{pmatrix} -T_2' \\ T_1'P \end{pmatrix}(-T_2 \quad T_1) \\
&= (-T_2T_2'T_2 - T_1T_1'PT_2 \quad T_2T_2'T_1 + T_1T_1'PT_1) \\
&= (-T_2 \quad T_1),
\end{aligned}$$

which says that $(-T_2 \quad T_1)$ is regular.

Theorem 4 says that if $T = (T_1, T_2)$ is nonsingular then

$$T_1 \text{ and } T_2 \text{ are both regular} \implies \begin{pmatrix} T_1 \\ T_2 \end{pmatrix} \text{ is regular.} \tag{5.1}$$

But the converse of (5.1) is not true in general. For example, let T_1 be not regular and take $T_2 = I$. Then

$$\begin{pmatrix} T_1 \\ I \end{pmatrix}(0 \quad I)\begin{pmatrix} T_1 \\ I \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} T_1 \\ I \end{pmatrix},$$

which says that $\begin{pmatrix} T_1 \\ I \end{pmatrix}$ is regular and further, the pair (T_1, I) is nonsingular. By a similar argument of Theorem 4, we can show that $\begin{pmatrix} T_1 \\ T_2 \end{pmatrix}$ has a generalized inverse $(T_1' \quad (I - T_1T_1')T_2')$. □

References

[1] R. E. Harte, *Proc. Royal Irsh Acad. Sect.A.*

[2] R. E. Harte, *Invertibility, singularity for bounded linear operators*, Dekker, New York, 1988.

[3] R. E. Harte, *Taylor exactness and Kaplansky's lemma*, J. Operator Theory **25** (1991), 399–416.

[4] R. E. Harte, *Taylor exactness and kato's jump*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **119** (1993), 793–802.

Department of mathematics
Kwan Dong University
Kangrung, 210-701, Korea