

INTERPOLATION THEOREMS FOR CONJUGATIONS AND APPLICATIONS

ZOUHEIR AMARA

ABSTRACT. Let H be a separable complex Hilbert space. A conjugate-linear map $C : H \rightarrow H$ is a conjugation if it is an involutive isometry. In this paper, we consider the following interpolation problems: Let $\{x_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $\{y_i\}_{i \in I}$ be orthogonal sets of vectors in H , and let N and $\{N_k\}_{k \in K}$ be normal operators such that the N_k 's mutually commute. Then, under which conditions does there exist a conjugation C on H such that

- (a) $Cx_i = y_i$ and $CN_kC = N_k^*$ for all $i \in I$ and $k \in K$; or
- (b) $Cx_i = y_i$, for every $i \in I$, and $CNC = -N^*$.

Using the spectral projections of normal operators, we provide complete answers to problems (a) and (b). As an application, we characterize hyperinvariant subspaces of normal operators using conjugations. Additionally, we give necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of solutions to certain equations in $L^\infty(\mu)$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout this paper, H and K are separable complex Hilbert spaces. We use the notation $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ for the inner product of both H and K . The algebra of all bounded linear operators on H is denoted by $\mathcal{B}(H)$, and the identity operator on H is denoted by I_H ; if there is no ambiguity, we simply write I . The range and the null space of an operator T are denoted by $\text{ran}(T)$ and $\text{ker}(T)$, respectively. All direct sums in this paper are orthogonal.

A *conjugation* C on H is a conjugate-linear map $C : H \rightarrow H$ that satisfies

- (i) $C^2 = I$;
- (ii) $\langle Ch, Ck \rangle = \langle k, h \rangle$ for all $h, k \in H$.

The simplest example of a conjugation on H is the map given by $C(\sum_i \lambda_i e_i) = \overline{\lambda_i} e_i$, where $\{e_i\}_i$ is an orthonormal basis of H . In fact, according to [14, Lemma 1], any conjugation can be represented in this manner with respect to some orthonormal basis.

Conjugations have been the subject of intensive study in recent years [6, 7, 12, 13, 21, 22], with origins in physics. The composition \mathcal{PT} , of the *parity*

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 47B15, 47B38, 47A15.

Key words and phrases. Conjugations, interpolation, complex-symmetric operators, skew-symmetric operators.

operator $[\mathcal{P}f](x) = f(-x)$ and the *time-reversal* operator $[\mathcal{T}f](x) = \overline{f(x)}$ defines a conjugation on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ which holds significant importance in the theory of \mathcal{PT} -symmetric quantum theory (see, for instance, [4, 5]). For more historical comments about conjugations, we refer the interested reader to [6, 27] and references therein. Recent investigations into conjugations have largely stemmed from their connections to complex-symmetric and skew-symmetric operators.

An operator $T \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ is called *complex-symmetric* (resp. *skew-symmetric*) if there exists a conjugation C on H such that $CTC = T^*$ (resp. $CTC = -T^*$); in this case, we say more precisely that T is *C-symmetric* (resp. *C-skew symmetric*). An equivalent definition is that T has a symmetric (resp. skew-symmetric) matrix M with respect to some orthonormal basis; i.e., $M^{\text{tr}} = M$ (resp. $M^{\text{tr}} = -M$) where tr stands for the transpose ([15, 18]). These classes of linear operators have received significant attention in the last two decades. Applications of complex symmetric operators and skew-symmetric matrices are found in various areas (see, for instance, [14, 15, 16, 25] and [8, 23, 24]).

In [19, 20, 27, 30], the authors investigated various interpolation problems for conjugations. In [19], Liu et al. established that for two orthogonal projections P and Q in $\mathcal{B}(H)$, a conjugation C on H exists with $CPC = Q$ if and only if $\text{ran}(P)$ and $\text{ran}(Q)$ are in symmetric position; i.e.,

$$\dim(\text{ran}(P)^\perp \cap \text{ran}(Q)) = \dim(\text{ran}(P) \cap \text{ran}(Q)^\perp).$$

In [27], Wang et al. proved that for two commuting self-adjoint operators $P, Q \in \mathcal{B}(H)$, there exists a conjugation C on H satisfying $CPC = Q$ if and only if there exists an isometric isomorphism U between Hilbert spaces such that

$$UPU^{-1} = B_1 \oplus B_2 \oplus A \quad \text{and} \quad UQU^{-1} = B_2 \oplus B_1 \oplus A$$

where B_1, B_2 and A are self-adjoint operators such that B_1 and B_2 have the same underlying Hilbert space and commute. These results were applied to characterize conjugate-normal (see the definition below) weighted shifts and partial isometries.

The most relevant problem to our results is the one addressed in [30, Theorem 2.1]. Zhu and Li showed that for two subsets of orthonormal vectors $\{x_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $\{y_i\}_{i \in I}$ in H , there exists a conjugation C on H satisfying $Cx_i = y_i$ for every $i \in I$ if and only if

$$(1.1) \quad \langle x_i, y_j \rangle = \langle x_j, y_i \rangle \quad \text{for all } i, j \in I.$$

It is well-known that for every normal operator N , there exists a conjugation C such that $CNC = N^*$ ([14]). However, this is not always the case if it is also required that $Cx_i = y_i$ for some subsets of orthonormal vectors $\{x_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $\{y_i\}_{i \in I}$. For instance, for $N = I_H$, it is necessary and sufficient that condition (1.1) is fulfilled. The purpose of this paper is to investigate this problem when N is an arbitrary normal operator. The paper is structured as follows.

In Section 2, we present our primary results regarding the interpolation problem: when does there exist a conjugation C on H satisfying $Cx_i = y_i$ and $CN_kC = N_k^*$ for all $i \in I$ and $k \in K$. Here, $\{x_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $\{y_i\}_{i \in I}$ are orthogonal subsets of H , and $\{N_k\}_{k \in K}$ is a collection of mutually commuting normal operators on H . We establish geometric conditions to answer this question, along with several equivalent conditions. As a consequence of these results, we extend a recent result by Mashreghi et al. [21] concerning hyperinvariant subspaces of unitary operators (see Proposition 2.6).

In Section 3, we investigate a “skew-symmetric” version of the earlier interpolation problem. We aim to identify the conditions under which there exists a conjugation C on H that can fulfill the conditions $Cx_i = y_i$ and $CNC = -N^*$ for all $i \in I$, with N being a normal operator. The simplest answer is obtained when I is finite.

In the last section, we apply our main results to give necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of solutions of certain equations in $L^\infty(\mu)$ with coefficients in $L^2(\mu)$.

2. INTERPOLATION THEOREMS FOR CONJUGATIONS : C-SYMMETRIC VERSIONS

Recall that a linear (or conjugate-linear) operator V on H is called *partial isometry* if the restriction of V to $\ker(V)^\perp$ is an isometry.

2.1. Main results. Before stating our results for normal operators, we begin with the following general result.

Theorem 2.1. *Let \mathcal{M} be an abelian von Neumann algebra of operators in $\mathcal{B}(H)$, and let $\{x_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $\{y_i\}_{i \in I}$ be orthogonal sets of non-zero vectors in H . The following statements are equivalents:*

(i) *There exists a conjugation C on H such that*

$$CTC = T^* \text{ and } Cx_i = y_i \text{ for all } T \in \mathcal{M} \text{ and } i \in I.$$

(ii) *There exists a conjugate-linear partial isometry V on H such that*

$$VT = T^*V, \quad x_i \in \ker(V)^\perp, \quad Vx_i = y_i \text{ and } Vy_i = x_i \text{ for all } T \in \mathcal{M} \text{ and } i \in I.$$

(iii) *For every orthogonal projection $P \in \mathcal{M}$ and for all $i, j \in I$, we have*

$$\langle Px_i, x_j \rangle = \langle Py_j, y_i \rangle \text{ and } \langle Px_i, y_j \rangle = \langle Px_j, y_i \rangle.$$

Remark 2.2. Noting that $C(\lambda I)C = (\lambda I)^*$ for all conjugations C and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, one can see that when $\mathcal{M} = \{\lambda I : \lambda \in \mathbb{C}\}$, we recapture [30, Theorem 2.1] discussed in (1.1). It should be noted that their theorem is important in proving our main results.

For a normal operator N , we denote by E_N the associated spectral measure defined on Borel subsets of \mathbb{C} .

If $\mathcal{M} = W^*(N_k : k \in K)$, meaning that \mathcal{M} is the smallest von Neumann algebra containing a collection of mutually commuting normal operators $\{N_k\}_{k \in K}$, then the conditions outlined in Theorem 2.1 can be refined as follows.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $\{N_k\}_{k \in K} \subset \mathcal{B}(H)$ be a set of mutually commuting normal operators, and let $\{x_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $\{y_i\}_{i \in I}$ be orthogonal sets of non-zero vectors in H . The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *There exists a conjugation C on H such that $CTC = T^*$ and $Cx_i = y_i$ for all $T \in W^*(N_k : k \in K)$ and $i \in I$.*
- (ii) *There exists a conjugation C on H such that $CN_kC = N_k^*$ and $Cx_i = y_i$ for all $k \in K$ and $i \in I$.*
- (iii) *There exists a conjugate-linear partial isometry V on H such that $VN_k = N_k^*V$, $x_i \in \ker(V)^\perp$, $Vx_i = y_i$ and $Vy_i = x_i$ for all $k \in K$ and $i \in I$.*
- (iv) *For all finite subsets $K_0 \subseteq K$, Borel subsets $\{\Delta_k\}_{k \in K_0}$ of \mathbb{C} , and $i, j \in I$ we have*

$$\left\langle \left(\prod_{k \in K_0} E_{N_k}(\Delta_k) \right) x_i, x_j \right\rangle = \left\langle \left(\prod_{k \in K_0} E_{N_k}(\Delta_k) \right) y_j, y_i \right\rangle$$

and

$$\left\langle \left(\prod_{k \in K_0} E_{N_k}(\Delta_k) \right) x_i, y_j \right\rangle = \left\langle \left(\prod_{k \in K_0} E_{N_k}(\Delta_k) \right) x_j, y_i \right\rangle.$$

For a subspace M of H denote by $P_M \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ the orthogonal projection of H onto M . The following corollary is an easy consequence of Theorem 2.3.

Corollary 2.4. *Let $\{M_k\}_{k \in K}$ be a family of subspaces of H such that $\{P_{M_k}\}_{k \in K}$ are mutually commuting. The following are equivalent:*

- (i) *There exists a conjugation C on H such that $CM_k = M_k$ and $Cx_i = y_i$ for all $k \in K$ and $i \in I$.*
- (ii) *For all finite subsets $K_0 \subseteq K$ and $i, j \in I$, we have $\langle x_i, y_j \rangle = \langle x_j, y_i \rangle$,*

$$\left\langle \left(\prod_{k \in K_0} P_{M_k} \right) x_i, x_j \right\rangle = \left\langle \left(\prod_{k \in K_0} P_{M_k} \right) y_j, y_i \right\rangle \text{ and } \left\langle \left(\prod_{k \in K_0} P_{M_k} \right) x_i, y_j \right\rangle = \left\langle \left(\prod_{k \in K_0} P_{M_k} \right) x_j, y_i \right\rangle.$$

Given non-zero vectors $x, y \in H$, we denote by $x \otimes y$ the rank-one operator defined by $(x \otimes y)h = \langle h, y \rangle x$ for every $h \in H$.

If I is of cardinal one, then Theorem 2.3 reduces to:

Theorem 2.5. *Let $\{N_k\}_{k \in K} \subset \mathcal{B}(H)$ be a set of mutually commuting normal operators, and let $x, y \in H$ be non-zero vectors. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *There exists a conjugation C on H satisfying $CN_kC = N_k^*$ and $Cx = y$ for every $k \in K$.*
- (ii) *There exists a unitary operator $U \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ satisfying $UN_k = N_kU$ and $Ux = y$ for every $k \in K$.*
- (iii) *There exists a partial isometry $V \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ satisfying $x \in \ker(V)^\perp$, $VN_k = N_kV$ and $Vx = y$ for every $k \in K$.*
- (iv) *For all finite subsets $K_0 \subseteq K$ and Borel subsets $\{\Delta_k\}_{k \in K_0}$ of \mathbb{C} , we have*

$$\left\| \left(\prod_{k \in K_0} E_{N_k(\Delta_k)} \right) x \right\| = \left\| \left(\prod_{k \in K_0} E_{N_k(\Delta_k)} \right) y \right\|.$$

- (v) *$\|x\| = \|y\|$ and there exists a conjugation C on H such that $N_k + \lambda x \otimes y$ is C -symmetric for all $k \in K$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$.*

The proofs of Theorems 2.1, 2.3, and 2.5 will be given later in this section, following the necessary preliminary preparations.

A slight reformulation of [1, Theorem 2.1] shows that if $N \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ is a normal operator, $U \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ is a unitary operator commuting with N , and $x \in H$, then for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, there exists a conjugation C on H such that $N + \lambda x \otimes Ux$ is C -symmetric. It can be seen that the implication (ii) \implies (v) in Theorem 2.5 generalizes this result, as the conjugation C is independent of λ .

A subspace M of H is said to be *hyperinvariant* for $T \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ if M is invariant under every operator that commutes with T . Recently, in [21], Mashreghi et al. proved that M is hyperinvariant for a unitary operator $U \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ if and only if $CM \subseteq M$ for every conjugation C on H satisfying $CUC = U^*$. As a consequence of Theorem 2.5, this result is extended to all normal operators.

Proposition 2.6. *Let $N \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ be normal and M a subspace of H . The following statements are equivalents:*

- (i) *M is hyperinvariant for N .*
- (ii) *$TM \subseteq M$ for every conjugate-linear operator T on H satisfying $TN = N^*T$.*
- (iii) *$CM \subseteq M$ for every conjugation C on H satisfying $CNC = N^*$.*

Proof. (i) \implies (ii). Assume that M is hyperinvariant for N , and let T be a conjugate-linear operator on H such that $TN = N^*T$. Clearly, we need to show that $TP_M = P_MT$. According to [26, Proposition 6.9], there exists a Borel subset $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ such that $P_M = E_N(\Delta)$. Consequently, Lemma 2.12 implies that $TP_M = TE_N(\Delta) = E_N(\Delta)T = P_MT$.

(ii) \implies (iii) If C is a conjugation on H such that $CNC = N^*$, and since $C^{-1} = C$, it follows that $CN = N^*C$, which leads to the desired containment.

(iii) \implies (i). We need to show that for each $T \in \{N\}'$, the commutant of N , $TM \subseteq M$. Additionally, since $\{N\}'$ is a von Neumann algebra, it is spanned by its unitary operators ([10, p. 61, Proposition 13.3 (b)]). Consequently, we can

assume without loss of generality that T is unitary. Let $x \in M$ be non-zero, and put $y = Tx$. Then, according to Theorem 2.5, there exists a conjugation C on H satisfying $CNC = N^*$ and $Cx = y$. Hence, by hypothesis, $Tx = y = Cx \in M$. Since x was arbitrary, we conclude that $TM \subseteq M$. \square

The following example shows that the result in Proposition 2.6 cannot be extended to an arbitrary operator in $\mathcal{B}(H)$.

Example 2.7. Let x and y be orthonormal vectors in H , and put $T = A + iB$ where $A = x \otimes x$ and $B = (x + y) \otimes (x + y)$. Clearly, A and B are self-adjoint operators; moreover, $A = \frac{1}{2}(T + T^*)$. It follows that if C is a conjugation on H such that $CTC = T^*$, then $CAC = A$. Hence, if $M = \text{span}\{x\}$, then $CM = M$. Therefore, the subspace M satisfies the necessary condition in Proposition 2.6; however, $T \in \{T\}'$ and $TM \not\subseteq M$.

Given a conjugation C on H , an operator $T \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ is said to be *C-normal* if $CTT^*C = T^*T$. When T is *C-normal* for some conjugation C , we say that T is *conjugate-normal*. It is easy to verify that if T is *C-symmetric* or *C-skew symmetric*, then it is also *C-normal*. Consequently, conjugate-normality is considered a more general type of symmetry. For further details and properties of such operators, the interested reader is referred to [28].

Another consequence of Theorem 2.5 is the following result, which characterizes normal operators in terms of complex symmetric and conjugate-normal ones.

Corollary 2.8. *Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(H)$. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) T is normal.
- (ii) For every non-zero $x \in H$, there exists a conjugation C on H such that T is *C-symmetric* and $Cx = x$;
- (iii) For every non-zero $x \in H$, there exists a conjugation C on H such that T is *C-normal* and $Cx = x$.

Proof. The implication (i) \implies (ii) follows directly from Theorem 2.5 applied to the normal operator T and the vectors $x = y$.

(ii) \implies (iii) is obvious.

(iii) \implies (i). Let $x \in H$ be non-zero. Then, by hypothesis, there exists a conjugation C on H such that $Cx = x$ and $CTT^*C = T^*T$. It follows that

$$\langle T^*Tx, x \rangle = \langle CTT^*Cx, x \rangle = \langle Cx, CCTT^*Cx \rangle = \langle x, TT^*x \rangle = \langle TT^*x, x \rangle.$$

Since x was arbitrary, we infer that $T^*T = TT^*$, the desired equality. \square

2.2. Proofs of Theorems 2.1, 2.3 and 2.5. The proofs require some preparation and will be provided at the end of this section. In what follows, we denote the set of all complex polynomials in two variables by $\mathbb{C}[x, y]$. We begin with the following technical lemma.

Lemma 2.9. *Let $N \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ and $M \in \mathcal{B}(K)$ be normal operators, and let $x, y \in H$ and $h, k \in K$ be vectors such that*

$$\langle E_N(\Delta)x, y \rangle = \langle E_M(\Delta)h, k \rangle \quad \text{for every Borel subset } \Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}.$$

Then, for every $p \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$, we have $\langle p(N, N^)x, y \rangle = \langle p(M, M^*)h, k \rangle$.*

Proof. Let $p \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$, and put $f(z) = p(z, \bar{z})\chi_K(z)$ where $K = \sigma(N) \cup \sigma(M)$ and χ_K is the characteristic function of K . Then, f is a bounded Borel function on \mathbb{C} ; furthermore, $f(N) = p(N, N^*)$ and $f(M) = p(M, M^*)$. This implies that

$$\langle p(N, N^*)x, y \rangle = \langle f(N)x, y \rangle = \int f \, d\langle E_N(\cdot)x, y \rangle$$

and

$$\langle p(M, M^*)h, k \rangle = \langle f(M)h, k \rangle = \int f \, d\langle E_M(\cdot)h, k \rangle.$$

As the complex-valued measures $\langle E_N(\cdot)x, y \rangle$ and $\langle E_M(\cdot)h, k \rangle$ are presumed equal by hypothesis, we deduce $\int f \, d\langle E_N(\cdot)x, y \rangle = \int f \, d\langle E_M(\cdot)h, k \rangle$. Consequently, $\langle p(N, N^*)x, y \rangle = \langle p(M, M^*)h, k \rangle$. \square

Given a normal operator $N \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ and a subset of vectors $X \subset H$, we denote

$$L_{N,X} = \bigvee \{p(N, N^*)h : p \in \mathbb{C}[x, y] \text{ and } h \in X\}$$

where \bigvee denotes the closed linear span. It is easy to see that $L_{N,X}$ is a reducing subspace of N . The restriction of N to $L_{N,X}$ will be denoted by N_X .

Proposition 2.10. *Let $N \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ and $M \in \mathcal{B}(K)$ be normal operators, and let $X = \{x_i\}_{i \in I} \subseteq H$ and $Y = \{y_i\}_{i \in I} \subseteq K$ be two subsets of vectors such that*

$$\langle E_N(\Delta)x_i, x_j \rangle = \langle E_M(\Delta)y_j, y_i \rangle \quad \text{for all Borel subsets } \Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C} \text{ and } i, j \in I.$$

Then, there exists a conjugate-linear surjective isometry $W : L_{N,X} \rightarrow L_{M,Y}$ such that

$$Wx_i = y_i \quad \text{and} \quad Wp(N_X, N_X^*) = p(M_Y, M_Y^*)^*W \quad \text{for all } i \in I \text{ and } p \in \mathbb{C}[x, y].$$

Proof. According to Lemma 2.9, for every polynomial $p \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$ and all $i, j \in I$, we have

$$(2.1) \quad \langle p(N, N^*)x_i, x_j \rangle = \langle p(M, M^*)y_j, y_i \rangle.$$

For convenience, put

$$H_0 = \text{span}\{p(N, N^*)x_i : p \in \mathbb{C}[x, y], i \in I\}$$

and

$$K_0 = \text{span}\{p(M, M^*)y_i : p \in \mathbb{C}[x, y], i \in I\},$$

and let $W : H_0 \rightarrow K_0$ be the conjugate-linear transformation given by

$$W(p(N, N^*)x_i) = p(M, M^*)^*y_i \quad \text{for all } p \in \mathbb{C}[x, y] \text{ and } i \in I.$$

We will first show that W is well-defined. Arbitrarily choose $h \in H_0$; then, there exists a finite subset J of I and polynomials $p_i \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$, for $i \in J$, such that $h = \sum_{i \in J} p_i(N, N^*)x_i$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|h\|^2 &= \left\langle \sum_{i \in J} p_i(N, N^*)x_i, \sum_{j \in J} p_j(N, N^*)x_j \right\rangle \\
&= \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in J} \langle p_i(N, N^*)x_i, p_j(N, N^*)x_j \rangle \\
&= \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in J} \langle p_j(N, N^*)^* p_i(N, N^*)x_i, x_j \rangle \\
&= \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in J} \langle p_j(M, M^*)^* p_i(M, M^*)y_j, y_i \rangle \quad (\text{by (2.1)}) \\
&= \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in J} \langle p_j(M, M^*)^* y_j, p_i(M, M^*)^* y_i \rangle \\
&= \left\langle \sum_{j \in J} p_j(M, M^*)^* y_j, \sum_{i \in J} p_i(M, M^*)^* y_i \right\rangle = \|Wh\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, if $h, k \in H_0$ are such that $\|h - k\| = 0$, we get $\|Wh - Wk\| = \|W(h - k)\| = \|h - k\| = 0$. Therefore, W is a well-defined conjugate-linear isometry. Moreover, by its construction, W is surjective. By density of H_0 and K_0 in $L_{N,X}$ and $L_{M,Y}$, respectively, it follows that W can be extended to a conjugate-linear surjective isometry from $L_{N,X}$ to $L_{M,Y}$, which we also denote by W . Furthermore, it can be seen that $Wx_i = y_i$ for every $i \in I$.

Now, fix $p \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$ and let us check that $Wp(N_X, N_X^*) = p(M_Y, M_Y^*)^*W$. Let $q \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$, $i \in I$, and put $h = q(N, N^*)x_i$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
Wp(N_X, N_X^*)h &= Wp(N, N^*)h = Wp(N, N^*)q(N, N^*)x_i = p(M, M^*)^*q(M, M^*)^*y_i \\
&= p(M, M^*)^*Wq(N, N^*)x_i = p(M_Y, M_Y^*)^*Wh.
\end{aligned}$$

Since q and i were arbitrary, and $Wp(N_X, N_X^*)$ and $p(M_Y, M_Y^*)^*W$ are both conjugate-linear, we obtain $Wp(N_X, N_X^*)h = p(M_Y, M_Y^*)^*Wh$ for every $h \in H_0$. Consequently, by density of H_0 in $L_{N,X}$, we conclude that $Wp(N_X, N_X^*) = p(M_Y, M_Y^*)^*W$. This completes the proof. \square

Theorem 2.11. *Let $N \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ be normal, and let $X = \{x_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $Y = \{y_i\}_{i \in I}$ be orthogonal sets of non-zero vectors in H . Let $M \in \{N, -N\}$ and assume that for every Borel subset $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ and all $i, j \in I$, we have*

- (a) $\langle E_N(\Delta)x_i, x_j \rangle = \langle E_M(\Delta)y_j, y_i \rangle$;
- (b) $\langle E_N(\Delta)x_i, y_j \rangle = \langle E_M(\Delta)x_j, y_i \rangle$.

Then, there exists a conjugation C on $L_{N,XUY}$ such that

$$CN_{XUY}C = M_{XUY}^* \quad \text{and} \quad Cx_i = y_i \quad \text{for every } i \in I.$$

Proof. First, note that $L_{N,XUY} = L_{M,XUY}$; hence, N_{XUY} and M_{XUY} are both operators on $L_{N,XUY}$, and so the statement $CN_{XUY}C = M_{XUY}^*$ makes sense. Additionally, without loss of generality, we may assume that X and Y are orthonormal subsets of H . In fact, by condition (a),

$$r_i := \|x_i\| = \sqrt{\langle E_N(\mathbf{C})x_i, x_i \rangle} = \sqrt{\langle E_M(\mathbf{C})y_i, y_i \rangle} = \|y_i\|$$

for every $i \in I$; thus, the orthonormal subsets $\{r_i^{-1}x_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $\{r_i^{-1}y_i\}_{i \in I}$ satisfy conditions (a) and (b).

Using condition (a), we infer from Proposition 2.10 that there exists a conjugate-linear surjective isometry $W : L_{N,X} \rightarrow L_{M,Y}$ such that

$$(2.2) \quad Wx_i = y_i \quad \text{and} \quad Wp(N_X, N_X^*) = p(M_Y, M_Y^*)W \quad \text{for all } i \in I \text{ and } p \in \mathbb{C}[x, y].$$

In particular,

$$(2.3) \quad WN_X = M_Y^*W \quad \text{and} \quad WN_X^* = M_YW.$$

Choose an arbitrary orthonormal basis $\{e_j\}_{j \in J}$ of $L_{N,X}$ that contains X and, for each $j \in J$, put $f_j = We_j$. Then, since W is a conjugate-linear surjective isometry, the set $\{f_j\}_{j \in J}$ must be an orthonormal basis of $L_{M,Y}$.

Note that, for each $j \in J$, there exist sequences of finite subsets $I_{j,n} \subseteq I$ and polynomials $p_{j,n,k} \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$, for $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $k \in I_{j,n}$, such that

$$(2.4) \quad e_j = \lim_n \sum_{k \in I_{j,n}} p_{j,n,k}(N, N^*)x_k;$$

hence, by (2.2),

$$(2.5) \quad f_j = We_j = \lim_n \sum_{k \in I_{j,n}} p_{j,n,k}(M, M^*)y_k.$$

Here, \mathbb{Z}^+ stands for the set of positive integers.

Claim: For all $i, j \in J$, we have $\langle e_i, f_j \rangle = \langle e_j, f_i \rangle$. First, note that in the light of condition (b), Lemma 2.9 gives

$$(2.6) \quad \langle p(N, N^*)x_i, y_j \rangle = \langle p(M, M^*)x_j, y_i \rangle \quad \text{for all } i, j \in I \text{ and } p \in \mathbb{C}[x, y].$$

Now, fix $i, j \in J$ and adopt the notations in (2.4) and (2.5); then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle e_i, f_j \rangle &= \lim_n \left\langle \sum_{k \in I_{i,n}} p_{i,n,k}(N, N^*) x_k, \sum_{l \in I_{j,n}} p_{j,n,l}(M, M^*)^* y_l \right\rangle \\ &= \lim_n \sum_{k \in I_{i,n}} \sum_{l \in I_{j,n}} \langle p_{i,n,k}(N, N^*) x_k, p_{j,n,l}(M, M^*)^* y_l \rangle \\ &= \lim_n \sum_{k \in I_{i,n}} \sum_{l \in I_{j,n}} \langle p_{j,n,l}(M, M^*) p_{i,n,k}(N, N^*) x_k, y_l \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, using (2.6), if $M = N$, we can see that

$$\langle e_i, f_j \rangle = \lim_n \sum_{k \in I_{i,n}} \sum_{l \in I_{j,n}} \langle p_{j,n,l}(N, N^*) p_{i,n,k}(N, N^*) x_l, y_k \rangle,$$

and if $M = -N$, we obtain

$$\langle e_i, f_j \rangle = \lim_n \sum_{k \in I_{i,n}} \sum_{l \in I_{j,n}} \langle p_{j,n,l}(N, N^*) p_{i,n,k}(-N, -N^*) x_l, y_k \rangle.$$

In both cases, we have

$$\langle e_i, f_j \rangle = \lim_n \sum_{k \in I_{i,n}} \sum_{l \in I_{j,n}} \langle p_{j,n,l}(N, N^*) p_{i,n,k}(M, M^*) x_l, y_k \rangle.$$

Consequently, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle e_i, f_j \rangle &= \lim_n \sum_{k \in I_{i,n}} \sum_{l \in I_{j,n}} \langle p_{j,n,l}(N, N^*) x_l, p_{i,n,k}(M, M^*)^* y_k \rangle \\ &= \lim_n \left\langle \sum_{l \in I_{j,n}} p_{j,n,l}(N, N^*) x_l, \sum_{k \in I_{i,n}} p_{i,n,k}(M, M^*)^* y_k \right\rangle \\ &= \langle e_j, f_i \rangle \quad (\text{by (2.4) and (2.5)}). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim.

Note that $L_{N, X \cup Y} = \vee (L_{N, X} + L_{M, Y})$; hence, $\{e_j\}_{j \in J}$ and $\{f_j\}_{j \in J}$ are both orthonormal subsets of $L_{N, X \cup Y}$. By [30, Theorem 2.1], there exists a conjugation C on $L_{N, X \cup Y}$ such that $Ce_j = f_j$ for every $j \in J$. In particular, since $\{e_j\}_{j \in J}$ contains X , we get from (2.2) that

$$Cx_i = Wx_i = y_i \quad \text{for every } i \in I.$$

It remains to check that $CN_{X \cup Y}C = M_{X \cup Y}^*$. Noting that, for every $j \in J$, $Ce_j = f_j = We_j$ and $Cf_j = C^2e_j = e_j = W^{-1}f_j$, and taking into account that C, W and W^{-1} are conjugate-linear, it follows that $W = C_1$ and $W^{-1} = C_2$ where C_1 and C_2 are defined as

$$C_1 : L_{N, X} \rightarrow L_{M, Y} \quad \text{and} \quad C_2 : L_{M, Y} \rightarrow L_{N, X} \\ h \mapsto Ch \quad \quad \quad h \mapsto Ch.$$

Combining these facts with (2.3), we get that for every $j \in J$,

$$CM_{XUY}Ce_j = CM_{XUY}We_j = CM_YWe_j = CWN_X^*e_j = C_2WN_X^*e_j = N_X^*e_j = N_{XUY}^*e_j$$

and

$$CN_{XUY}Cf_j = CN_{XUY}e_j = CN_Xe_j = C_1N_Xe_j = WN_Xe_j = M_Y^*We_j = M_Y^*f_j = M_{XUY}^*f_j.$$

Suppose that $M = N$; it follows that $CN_{XUY}Ce_j = N_{XUY}^*e_j$ and $CN_{XUY}Cf_j = N_{XUY}^*f_j$ for every $j \in J$. Hence, since $L_{N,XUY} = \vee (L_{N,X} + L_{M,Y}) = \vee (\{e_j, f_j\}_{j \in J})$, we obtain $CN_{XUY}C = N_{XUY}^*$. On the other hand, if $M = -N$, we get $CN_{XUY}Ce_j = -N_{XUY}^*e_j$ and $CN_{XUY}Cf_j = -N_{XUY}^*f_j$ for every $j \in J$. Therefore, $CN_{XUY}C = -N_{XUY}^*$. In both cases, we have the desired result. This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

The following lemma will be very useful throughout the paper.

Lemma 2.12. *Let $N \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ and $M \in \mathcal{B}(K)$ be normal operators, and let $T : H \rightarrow K$ be a bounded linear (or conjugate-linear) operator. The following statements hold:*

(i) *If T is linear (resp. conjugate-linear) and $TN = MT$ (resp. $TN = M^*T$), then*

$$TE_N(\Delta) = E_M(\Delta)T \quad \text{for every Borel subset } \Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}.$$

(ii) *If T is linear (resp. conjugate-linear) and $TN = -MT$ (resp. $TN = -M^*T$), then*

$$TE_N(\Delta) = E_M(-\Delta)T \quad \text{for every Borel subset } \Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}.$$

Proof. (i) Suppose first that T is linear and $TN = MT$, and put

$$L = \begin{bmatrix} N & 0 \\ 0 & M \end{bmatrix} \begin{matrix} H \\ K \end{matrix} \quad \text{and} \quad A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ T & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{matrix} H \\ K \end{matrix}.$$

Then, L and A are bounded linear operators acting on the Hilbert space $H \oplus K$. Furthermore, one can verify that $AL = LA$. Since L is normal, by the Fuglede Theorem, $AE_L(\Delta) = E_L(\Delta)A$ for every Borel subset $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$.

Fix a Borel subset $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$, and note that

$$E_L(\Delta) = \begin{bmatrix} E_N(\Delta) & 0 \\ 0 & E_M(\Delta) \end{bmatrix} \begin{matrix} H \\ K \end{matrix}.$$

Therefore, the matrix equality $AE_L(\Delta) = E_L(\Delta)A$ implies $TE_N(\Delta) = E_M(\Delta)T$.

Assume now that T is a conjugate-linear operator such that $TN = M^*T$, and let $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ be a Borel subset. Since M is normal, there exists a conjugation C on K such that $CMC = M^*$. Hence, $TN = M^*T = (CMC)T$, and since $C^{-1} = C$, we obtain

$$(2.7) \quad (CT)N = M(CT).$$

Clearly, $CT : H \rightarrow K$ is a bounded linear operator. By our previous result, we have

$$(2.8) \quad CTE_N(\Delta) = E_M(\Delta)CT.$$

By [9, p. 287, Lemma 8.7], $E_M(\Delta) = \chi_\Delta(M) \in W^*(M)$. Hence, there exists a net $\{p_i\}_i$ in $\mathbb{C}[x, y]$ such that $p_i(M, M^*)$ converges to $E_M(\Delta)$ in the weak operator topology. One can easily check that $Cp_i(M, M^*)C = p_i(M, M^*)^*$. Consequently, taking the limit in the weak operator topology, we get $CE_M(\Delta)C = E_M(\Delta)^* = E_M(\Delta)$. Therefore, from (2.8), we obtain

$$TE_N(\Delta) = C^2TE_N(\Delta) = CE_M(\Delta)CT = E_M(\Delta)T,$$

the desired equality.

(ii) Suppose that $TN = -MT$ if T is linear and that $TN = -M^*T$ if T is conjugate-linear. Applying the first part of lemma to N and $-M$, we get $TE_N(\Delta) = E_{-M}(\Delta)T$ for every Borel subset $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$. Since $E_{-M}(\Delta) = \chi_\Delta(-M)$ and $\chi_\Delta(-z) = \chi_{-\Delta}(z)$ for every $z \in \mathbb{C}$, we have

$$TE_N(\Delta) = E_{-M}(\Delta)T = \chi_\Delta(-M)T = \chi_{-\Delta}(M)T = E_M(-\Delta)T.$$

This completes the proof. \square

We are now in a position to prove Theorems 2.1 and 2.3 and 2.5.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. The implication (i) \implies (ii) follows directly from the properties of C as a conjugate-linear isometry, satisfying $Cx_i = y_i$, $Cy_i = C^2x_i = x_i$ and $CT = CTC^2 = T^*C$ for all $i \in I$ and $T \in \mathcal{M}$.

(ii) \implies (iii). Let $V_0 : \ker(V)^\perp \rightarrow \text{ran}(V)$ be the invertible conjugate-linear isometry given by $V_0h = Vh$. Define the conjugate-linear map $V^\# : H \rightarrow H$ by $V^\#h = V_0^{-1}h$ if $h \in \text{ran}(V)$ and $V^\#h = 0$ if $h \in \ker(V)^\perp$. Then, $V^\#V$ is the orthogonal projection onto $\ker(V)^\perp$. Moreover, using the polarization identity, it follows that $\langle Vh, k \rangle = \langle V^\#k, h \rangle$ for all $h \in \ker(V)^\perp$ and $k \in \text{ran}(V)$. Thus,

$$(2.9) \quad \langle Vh, k \rangle = \langle V^\#k, h \rangle \quad \text{for all } h, k \in H.$$

Now, let $P \in \mathcal{M}$ be an orthogonal projection. Using the above relation, for all $i, j \in I$, we obtain

$$(2.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle Py_j, y_i \rangle &= \langle PVx_j, Vx_i \rangle = \langle VPx_j, Vx_i \rangle = \langle V^\#Vx_i, Px_j \rangle \\ &= \langle x_i, Px_j \rangle = \langle Px_i, x_j \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

and similarly, we have

$$(2.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle Px_j, y_i \rangle &= \langle PVy_j, Vx_i \rangle = \langle VPy_j, Vx_i \rangle = \langle V^\#Vx_i, Py_j \rangle \\ &= \langle x_i, Py_j \rangle = \langle Px_i, y_j \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

(iii) \implies (ii). According to [11, p. 52, Lemma II.2.8], there exists a self-adjoint operator $A \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ such that $\mathcal{M} = W^*(A)$. It suffices to show that there exists a conjugation C on H such that $CAC = A$ and $Cx_i = y_i$ for every $i \in I$. In fact, any polynomial in A is C -symmetric; moreover, since the class of C -symmetric operators is closed in the weak operator topology, every operator in $W^*(A)$, and thus in \mathcal{M} , is C -symmetric.

Let $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ be a Borel subset. Then, by [9, p. 287, Lemma 8.7], the orthogonal projection $E_A(\Delta)$ belongs to \mathcal{M} . Therefore, by hypothesis, for all $i, j \in I$, we have $\langle E_A(\Delta)x_i, x_j \rangle = \langle E_A(\Delta)y_j, y_i \rangle$ and $\langle E_A(\Delta)x_i, y_j \rangle = \langle E_A(\Delta)x_j, y_i \rangle$.

For convenience, put $Z = \{x_i, y_i\}_{i \in I}$, $H_0 = L_{A,Z}$ and $H_1 = L_{A,Z}^\perp$. Then, H_0 and H_1 are reducing subspaces of A and $Z \subset H_0$. According to Theorem 2.11, there exists a conjugation C_0 on H_0 such that $C_0 A|_{H_0} C_0 = A_0$ and $C_0 x_i = y_i$ for every $i \in I$. Since $A|_{H_1}$ is normal, there exists a conjugation C_1 on H_1 such that $C_1 A|_{H_1} C_1 = A|_{H_1}$. Clearly, $C = C_0 \oplus C_1$ is a conjugation on H ; additionally, $CAC = A$ and $Cx_i = C_0 x_i = y_i$ for every $i \in I$. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.3. The implication (i) \implies (ii) is obvious, and the implication (ii) \implies (iii) follows a similar argument as (i) \implies (ii) in Theorem 2.1.

To show that (iii) \implies (iv), first note that by Lemma 2.12, for all Borel subsets $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ and $k \in K$, we have $VE_{N_k}(\Delta) = E_{N_k}(\Delta)V$. Hence, for any finite subset $K_0 \subseteq K$ and Borel subsets $\{\Delta_k\}_{k \in K_0}$ of \mathbb{C} , we have $V\left(\prod_{k \in K_0} E_{N_k}(\Delta_k)\right) = \left(\prod_{k \in K_0} E_{N_k}(\Delta_k)\right)V$. Put $P = \prod_{k \in K_0} E_{N_k}(\Delta_k)$; the remainder of the proof follows similarly to (2.10) and (2.11).

(iv) \implies (i). For convenience, put $\mathcal{M} = W^*(N_k : k \in K)$. By the Fuglede Theorem, we have $N_k N_l^* = N_l^* N_k$ for any $k, l \in K$. Therefore, it is not hard to see that \mathcal{M} is an abelian von Neumann algebra. Hence, by Theorem 2.1, we need to show that for all orthogonal projections $P \in \mathcal{M}$ and $i, j \in I$,

$$(2.12) \quad \langle Px_i, x_j \rangle = \langle Py_j, y_i \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \langle Px_i, y_j \rangle = \langle Px_j, y_i \rangle.$$

First, we show that $\mathcal{M} = \text{cl} - \text{WOT} \mathcal{M}_0$; i.e., the closure in the weak operator topology of

$$\mathcal{M}_0 = \text{span} \left\{ \prod_{k \in K_0} E_{N_k}(\Delta_k) : K_0 \subseteq K \text{ is finite and } \Delta_k \text{ is a Borel subset of } \mathbb{C} \right\}.$$

By [9, p. 287, Lemma 8.7], any spectral projection $E_{N_k}(\Delta) = \chi_\Delta(N_k) \in W^*(N_k) \subseteq \mathcal{M}$. Hence, $\mathcal{M}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{M}$, and consequently $\text{cl} - \text{WOT} \mathcal{M}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{M}$. Let us show the other containment. According to spectral theory, for every $k \in K$, we have

$$N_k \in \bigvee \{E_{N_k}(\Delta) : \Delta \text{ is a Borel subset of } \mathbb{C}\}.$$

This implies that $N_k \in \text{cl} - \text{WOT} \mathcal{M}_0$ for every $k \in K$. It is easy to see that $\text{cl} - \text{WOT} \mathcal{M}_0$ is a self-adjoint subalgebra of $\mathcal{B}(H)$ that contains the identity. Moreover, since, by the Fuglede Theorem, the spectral measures $\{E_{N_k}\}_{k \in K}$ mutually commute and $E_{N_k}(\Delta)E_{N_k}(D) = E_{N_k}(\Delta \cap D)$ for any Borel subsets Δ and D of \mathbb{C} , one can easily show that \mathcal{M}_0 , and thus $\text{cl} - \text{WOT} \mathcal{M}_0$, is also multiplicative. Hence, $\text{cl} - \text{WOT} \mathcal{M}_0$ is a von Neumann algebra containing $\{N_k\}_{k \in K}$. Therefore, by definition of \mathcal{M} , we must have $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \text{cl} - \text{WOT} \mathcal{M}_0$.

Now, by hypothesis, any $T \in \mathcal{M}_0$ satisfies the equalities (2.12). Then, by taking limits, in the weak operator topology, of operators in \mathcal{M}_0 , we obtain that (2.12) is true for every $T \in \mathcal{M}$; in particular, for orthogonal projections in \mathcal{M} . \square

Proof of Theorem 2.5. The implication (ii) \implies (iii) is obvious.

The implication (iv) \implies (i) follows from Theorem 2.3 (iv) \implies (i). In fact, for any finite subset $K_0 \subseteq K$ and Borel subsets $\{\Delta_k\}_{k \in K_0}$ of \mathbb{C} , the orthogonal projections $\{E_{N_k}(\Delta_k)\}_{k \in K_0}$ are mutually commuting. Thus, their product P is also an orthogonal projection; which gives

$$\langle Px, x \rangle = \langle P^2x, x \rangle = \langle Px, Px \rangle = \|Px\|^2 = \|Py\|^2 = \langle Py, y \rangle.$$

(iii) \implies (iv). Let $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ be a Borel subset and $K_0 \subseteq K$ a finite set. Then, $V\left(\prod_{k \in K_0} E_{N_k}(\Delta)\right) = \left(\prod_{k \in K_0} E_{N_k}(\Delta)\right)V$. Noting that V^*V is the orthogonal projection onto $\ker(V)^\perp$ and letting $P = \prod_{k \in K_0} E_{N_k}(\Delta)$, we get

$$\|Py\|^2 = \langle Py, y \rangle = \langle PVx, Vx \rangle = \langle Px, V^*Vx \rangle = \langle Px, x \rangle = \|Px\|^2.$$

(i) \implies (v). Clearly, $\|x\| = \|Cx\| = \|y\|$. It is easy to check that $C(x \otimes y)C = (Cx) \otimes (Cy)$; hence, for any $k \in K$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, we have

$$C(N_k + \lambda x \otimes y)C = CN_kC + \bar{\lambda}y \otimes x = N_k^* + \bar{\lambda}(x \otimes y)^* = (N_k + \lambda x \otimes y)^*;$$

that is, $N_k + \lambda x \otimes y$ is C -symmetric.

(v) \implies (ii). Since the class of C -symmetric operators forms a subspace of $\mathcal{B}(H)$, we obtain, for every $k \in K$, $CN_kC = N_k^*$ and $C(x \otimes y)C = (x \otimes y)^* = y \otimes x$. Given that x and y have the same norm, the latter equality implies the existence of a unimodular $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $Cx = \alpha y$.

Applying Theorem 2.3 (iv) \implies (ii) to $\{x_i\}_i = \{y_i\}_i = \{x\}$, we obtain a conjugation J on H such that $JN_kJ = N_k^*$ for every $k \in K$ and $Jx = x$. Put $U = \bar{\alpha}CJ$; then, since C and J are both surjective isometries and α is unimodular, the linear operator $U : H \rightarrow H$ must be unitary. Moreover, we have

$$UN_k = \bar{\alpha}CJN_k = \bar{\alpha}CN_k^*J = \bar{\alpha}N_kCJ = N_kU$$

and $Ux = \bar{\alpha}CJx = \bar{\alpha}Cx = \bar{\alpha}\alpha y = y$. This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

3. INTERPOLATION THEOREMS FOR CONJUGATIONS : C -SKEW SYMMETRIC VERSIONS

A conjugate-linear operator V on H is said to be *anti-unitary* if it is a surjective isometry. Clearly, every conjugation on H is anti-unitary.

For two operators A and B on Hilbert spaces, we denote $A \cong B$ if there exists an isometric isomorphism U between the underlying Hilbert spaces such that $UAU^{-1} = B$; or equivalently, $UA = BU$. It is worth mentioning that both complex symmetry and skew symmetry are preserved under the equivalence relation \cong .

For $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, \infty\}$, where $\infty = \aleph_0$, $H^{(k)}$ denotes the direct sum of H with itself k times. If $T \in \mathcal{B}(H)$, then $T^{(k)} \in \mathcal{B}(H^{(k)})$ is the direct sum of T with itself k times.

3.1. Main results.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $N \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ be normal, and let $Z = X \cup Y$ where $X = \{x_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $Y = \{y_i\}_{i \in I}$ are orthogonal sets of non-zero vectors in H . Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *There exists a conjugation C on H such that $CNC = -N^*$ and $Cx_i = y_i$ for every $i \in I$.*
- (ii) *There exists an anti-unitary operator V on H such that $VNV^{-1} = -N^*$, $Vx_i = y_i$ and $Vy_i = x_i$ for every $i \in I$.*
- (iii) *$N|_{L_{N,Z}^\perp}$ is skew-symmetric and, for all Borel subsets $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ and $i, j \in I$, we have*

$$\langle E_N(\Delta)x_i, x_j \rangle = \langle E_N(-\Delta)y_j, y_i \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \langle E_N(\Delta)x_i, y_j \rangle = \langle E_N(-\Delta)x_j, y_i \rangle.$$

Before stating the second main result of this section, we recall some facts about normal operators on separable complex Hilbert spaces. Given a finite measure with compact support μ on \mathbb{C} , denote by M_μ the operator defined on $L^2(\mu)$ by $[M_\mu f](z) = zf(z)$ for all $f \in L^2(\mu)$. According to spectral multiplicity theory (see, for instance, [9, p. 298, Theorem 10.16]), each normal operator N acting on H is unitarily equivalent to

$$(3.1) \quad M_{\mu_\infty}^{(\infty)} \oplus \bigoplus_{1 \leq i < \infty} M_{\mu_i}^{(i)}$$

where μ_i , $1 \leq i \leq \infty$ (some of which may be zero), are mutually singular finite measures on Borel subsets of \mathbb{C} , each with compact support. Moreover, the previous decomposition is unique in the sense that if M is another normal operator with corresponding measures ν_i , $1 \leq i \leq \infty$, then $N \cong M$ if and only if, for every $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \infty\}$,

$$(3.2) \quad \mu_i(\Delta) = 0 \iff \nu_i(\Delta) = 0 \quad \text{for every Borel subset } \Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}.$$

In [18, Theorem 1.11], Li and Zhu proved that N is skew-symmetric if and only if the sequence $\{\mu_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq \infty}$ can be chosen so that, for every $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \infty\}$,

$$(3.3) \quad \mu_i(\Delta) = \mu_i(-\Delta) \quad \text{for every Borel subset } \Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}.$$

Given a normal operator $N \in \mathcal{B}(H)$, we write $m(N) < \infty$ if the measure μ_∞ in (3.1) is zero; in other words, $M_{\mu_\infty}^{(\infty)}$ can be omitted from the decomposition (3.1). This definition makes sense due to the uniqueness property described in (3.2).

Theorem 3.2. *Let $N \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ be a skew-symmetric normal operator, and let Z be the set in Theorem 3.1 such that $m(N_{Z|\ker(N_Z)^\perp}) < \infty$. Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *There exists a conjugation C on H such that $CNC = -N^*$ and $Cx_i = y_i$ for every $i \in I$.*
(ii) *For every Borel subset $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ and all $i, j \in I$, we have*

$$\langle E_N(\Delta)x_i, x_j \rangle = \langle E_N(-\Delta)y_j, y_i \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \langle E_N(\Delta)x_i, y_j \rangle = \langle E_N(-\Delta)x_j, y_i \rangle.$$

In particular, if I is finite, then $m(N_{Z|\ker(N_Z)^\perp}) < \infty$ and the previous statements are equivalent.

The reader can see from Theorem 3.1 that the implication (i) \implies (ii), in the previous theorem, is true without the assumption that $m(N_{Z|\ker(N_Z)^\perp}) < \infty$. However, the following example shows that this condition is not superfluous for the implication (ii) \implies (i).

Example 3.3. Suppose that $H = K_1 \oplus K_2$, where K_1 and K_2 are infinite-dimensional separable complex Hilbert spaces, and let $\{e_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ and $\{f_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ be orthonormal bases of K_1 and K_2 , respectively. For each $i \geq 1$, put $x_i = e_i \oplus 0$ and $y_i = 0 \oplus f_{i+1}$. Let N be the normal operator on H given by $N = I_{K_1} \oplus -I_{K_2}$. Clearly, $N \cong -N$; hence, by Lemma 3.5, N is skew-symmetric.

For convenience, put $H_1 = \vee\{x_i : i \geq 1\}$, $H_2 = \vee\{y_i : i \geq 1\}$ and $H_3 = \vee\{f_1\}$. Then, $H = H_1 \oplus H_2 \oplus H_3$ and $L_{N,Z} = H_1 \oplus H_2$. Furthermore,

$$N_{Z|\ker(N_Z)^\perp} = N_Z = \begin{bmatrix} I_{H_1} & 0 \\ 0 & -I_{H_2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{matrix} H_1 \\ H_2 \end{matrix} \cong M_{\delta_1}^{(\infty)} \oplus M_{\delta_{-1}}^{(\infty)} \cong (M_{\delta_1} \oplus M_{\delta_{-1}})^{(\infty)} \cong M_\mu^{(\infty)}$$

where $\mu = \delta_1 + \delta_{-1}$ and δ_a denotes the Dirac measure, at $a \in \mathbb{C}$, on Borel subsets of \mathbb{C} . Thus, $m(N_{Z|\ker(N_Z)^\perp}) \not< \infty$.

Let us check that N satisfies the conditions in Theorem 3.2 (ii). One can easily see that, for every Borel subset $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$, the spectral projections $E_N(\Delta)$ and $E_N(-\Delta)$ fall into one of the following possibilities:

- (a) $E_N(\Delta) = E_N(-\Delta) = 0$;
- (b) $E_N(\Delta) = E_N(-\Delta) = I_H$;
- (c) $E_N(\Delta) = I_{K_1} \oplus 0$ and $E_N(-\Delta) = 0 \oplus I_{K_2}$;
- (d) $E_N(\Delta) = 0 \oplus I_{K_2}$ and $E_N(-\Delta) = I_{K_1} \oplus 0$.

In all cases, we have

$$\langle E_N(\Delta)x_i, x_j \rangle = \langle E_N(-\Delta)y_j, y_i \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \langle E_N(\Delta)x_i, y_j \rangle = \langle E_N(-\Delta)x_j, y_i \rangle.$$

Now, let us show that there exists no conjugation C on H satisfying the first assertion of Theorem 3.2. Suppose for contradiction that such a conjugation exists. Then,

$$CH_1 = C \vee \{x_i : i \geq 1\} = \vee \{Cx_i : i \geq 1\} = \vee \{y_i : i \geq 1\} = H_2,$$

and since $C^{-1} = C$, we also have $CH_2 = H_1$. As C is a surjective isometry, it follows that $CH_3 = C(H_1 + H_2)^\perp = (H_1 + H_2)^\perp = H_3$. Therefore, C takes the form

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & * & 0 \\ * & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & C_3 \end{bmatrix} \begin{matrix} H_1 \\ H_2 \\ H_3 \end{matrix}$$

where C_3 is a conjugation on H_3 . Finally, since H_3 reduces N and $CNC = -N^*$, we obtain $-I_{H_3} = C_3(-I_{H_3})C_3 = C_3N|_{H_3}C_3 = -N^*|_{H_3} = I_{H_3}$; a contradiction.

When $X = \{x\}$, $Y = \{y\}$, and $\{x, y\}$ are linearly independent, we can add the following equivalent perturbation-type statement to Theorem 3.1.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $N \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ be normal, and let $\{x, y\}$ be linearly independent vectors in H . The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *There exists a conjugation C on H satisfying $CNC = -N^*$ and $Cx = y$.*
- (ii) *There exists a conjugation C on H such that $N + \lambda(x \otimes x - y \otimes y)$ is C -skew symmetric for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$.*

The proof of the previous theorem does not require preliminary results and can be presented here.

Proof of Theorem 3.4. (i) \implies (ii). Let C be a conjugation satisfying (i). Then, for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} C(N + \lambda(x \otimes x - y \otimes y))C &= CNC + \bar{\lambda}((Cx) \otimes (Cx) - (Cy) \otimes (Cy)) \\ &= -N^* + \bar{\lambda}(y \otimes y - x \otimes x) \\ &= -(N + \lambda(x \otimes x - y \otimes y))^*. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) \implies (i). For convenience, put $T = x \otimes x - y \otimes y$. By the fact that the class of C -skew symmetric operators is a subspace of $\mathcal{B}(H)$, we clearly have $CNC = -N^*$ and $CTC = -T^* = -T$. Noting that T is skew-symmetric, it must have a skew-symmetric matrix with respect to some orthonormal basis. In particular, since T is a rank-two operator, its trace is well-defined and should be zero. Combining this with the fact that T is self-adjoint, it follows that there exists orthonormal vectors $e_1, e_2 \in H$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\text{ran}(T) = \ker(T - \alpha I) \oplus \ker(T + \alpha I),$$

$$\ker(T - \alpha I) = \vee\{e_1\} \quad \text{and} \quad \ker(T + \alpha I) = \vee\{e_2\}.$$

As $CTC = -T$, we get $C(T + \alpha I)C = -(T - \alpha I)$; hence

$$(3.4) \quad C(\vee\{e_1\}) = C\ker(T - \alpha I) = \ker(T + \alpha I) = \vee\{e_2\}.$$

Note that x and y have the same norm. In fact, $\langle x, x \rangle - \langle y, y \rangle$ is the trace of T . Hence, using [30, Theorem 2.1], we obtain a conjugation J on H satisfying $Jx = y$; one can check that $JTJ = -T$. The argument in (3.4) shows that $J(\vee\{e_1\}) = \vee\{e_2\}$. Then, since C and J are isometries, there exist unimodular scalars $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$ such

that $Ce_1 = ae_2$ and $Je_1 = be_2$. Furthermore, since $C^2 = J^2 = I$, we get $Ce_2 = ae_1$ and $Je_2 = be_1$. Noting that C and J are both conjugate-linear, we get $Ch = \overline{ab}Jh$ for every $h \in \vee\{e_1, e_2\}$. In particular, since $x \in \text{ran}(T) = \vee\{e_1, e_2\}$, we obtain $Cx = \overline{ab}Jx = \overline{ab}y$. Put $\widetilde{C} = \overline{ab}C$; one can easily check that \widetilde{C} is a conjugation that satisfies $\widetilde{C}N\widetilde{C} = -N^*$ and $\widetilde{C}x = y$. This ends the proof of the theorem. \square

The remainder of this section is devoted to proving Theorems 3.1 and 3.2.

3.2. Proof of Theorem 3.1 and 3.2. First, we begin with the following characterization of skew-symmetric normal operators.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $N \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ be a normal operator. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *There exists a unitary operator U on H such that $UNU^* = -N$.*
- (ii) *There exists a conjugation C on H such that $CNC = -N^*$.*
- (iii) *There exists an anti-unitary operator V on H such that $VNV^{-1} = -N^*$.*

Proof. The implication (ii) \implies (iii) is obvious.

(iii) \implies (i). Let V be an anti-unitary operator on H such that $VNV^{-1} = -N^*$. By normality of N , there exists a conjugation J on H that satisfies $JNJ = N^*$. Hence, we have $VNV^{-1} = -JNJ$, and so, since $J^2 = I$, we get

$$(JV)N(V^{-1}J) = -J^2NJ^2 = -N.$$

Put $U = JV$; then $U \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ is unitary and $U^* = U^{-1} = (JV)^{-1} = V^{-1}J^{-1} = V^{-1}J$. Therefore, $UNU^* = -N$.

(i) \implies (ii). Let $U \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ be a unitary operator satisfying $UN = -NU$. Fix a Borel subset $\Delta_0 \subset \mathbb{C}$ such that $\mathbb{C} \setminus \Delta_0 = -\Delta_0 \cup \{0\}$. By Lemma 2.12, we have $UE_N(\Delta_0) = E_N(-\Delta_0)U$ and $UE_N(-\Delta_0) = E_N(\Delta_0)U$. Consequently,

$$U\text{ran}(E_N(\Delta_0)) = \text{ran}(E_N(-\Delta_0)) \quad \text{and} \quad U\text{ran}(E_N(-\Delta_0)) = \text{ran}(E_N(\Delta_0)).$$

Given that $\mathbb{C} = \Delta_0 \cup (-\Delta) \cup \{0\}$ is a partition, it follows from the above equalities that U has the form

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & * & 0 \\ W & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & * \end{bmatrix} \begin{array}{l} \text{ran}(E_N(\Delta_0)) \\ \text{ran}(E_N(-\Delta_0)) \\ \text{ran}(E_N(\{0\})) \end{array}$$

Where W is an isometric isomorphism between Hilbert spaces. Noting that N can also be written as

$$N = \begin{bmatrix} N_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & N_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{array}{l} \text{ran}(E_N(\Delta_0)) \\ \text{ran}(E_N(-\Delta_0)) \\ \text{ran}(E_N(\{0\})) \end{array},$$

and since $UN = -NU$, simple matrix calculations show that $WN_1 = -N_2W$. This implies that $N_1 \cong -N_2$, and hence $N_{|\ker(N)^\perp} = N_1 \oplus N_2 \cong N_1 \oplus -N_1$. Therefore, N is skew symmetric by [18, Theorem 1.10]. \square

Note that every bounded linear T acting on a Hilbert space can be written as $T = N \oplus A$ where N is normal and A is an operator that has no reducing subspace for which the restriction of A is normal (of course, either N or A could be absent). In fact, N is the restriction of T to the reducing subspace

$$(3.5) \quad H_{\text{nor}} = \bigcap_{1 \leq n, m < \infty} \ker(T^{*n}T^m - T^mT^{*n}).$$

The operator N is called the *normal part* of T , while A is called the *abnormal part* of T . In this case, we denote $T_{\text{nor}} = N$ and $T_{\text{abnor}} = A$.

Using (3.5), one can easily see that if M is a normal operator, then

$$(3.6) \quad (M \oplus T)_{\text{nor}} = M \oplus T_{\text{nor}} \quad \text{and} \quad (M \oplus T)_{\text{abnor}} = T_{\text{abnor}}.$$

The following lemma is an immediate consequence of [29, Proposition 3.10] and (3.6).

Lemma 3.6. *Let $M \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ be normal and $T \in \mathcal{B}(K)$ such that $M \oplus T$ is skew-symmetric. Then, $M \oplus T_{\text{nor}}$ and T_{abnor} are skew-symmetric.*

Lemma 3.7. *Let $N \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ be a skew-symmetric normal operator and $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ a Borel subset such $\Delta = -\Delta$. Then, the restriction of N to the reducing subspace $\text{ran}(E_N(\Delta))$ is skew-symmetric.*

Proof. Let C be a conjugation on H such that $CNC = -N^*$. By Lemma 2.12, we have $CE_N(\Delta) = E_N(-\Delta)C = E_N(\Delta)C$; hence, $C\text{ran}(E_N(\Delta)) = \text{ran}(E_N(\Delta))$. Let C_0 and N_0 denote the restrictions of C and N to $\text{ran}(E_N(\Delta))$, respectively. Then, C_0 is a conjugation on $E_N(\Delta)$. Moreover, it follows immediately from the equality $CNC = -N^*$ that $C_0N_0C_0 = -N_0^*$. \square

In [17, Lemma 3.2] and [2, Corollary 3.4], the authors proved that if N is normal, then a direct sum $N \oplus T$ is complex symmetric (resp. conjugate-normal) if and only if T is complex-symmetric (resp. conjugate-normal). However, this property does not hold for skew-symmetry even if N is skew-symmetric. The next result provides a complete description of normal operators N that satisfy this property.

Theorem 3.8. *Let $N \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ be normal. The followings statements are equivalents:*

(i) *For every separable complex Hilbert space K and every $T \in \mathcal{B}(K)$,*

$$N \oplus T \text{ is skew-symmetric} \iff T \text{ is skew-symmetric.}$$

(ii) *N is skew-symmetric and $m(N|_{\ker(N)^\perp}) < \infty$.*

Proof. (i) \implies (ii). Suppose statement (i) holds. Taking $T = 0$, the zero operator on any Hilbert space K , we obtain that $N \oplus 0$ is skew-symmetric. By [18, Lemma 2.1], it follows that $N|_{(\ker N)^\perp}$ is skew-symmetric. Therefore, $N = N|_{(\ker N)^\perp} \oplus 0$ is skew-symmetric.

For convenience, put $N_1 = N|_{\ker(N)^\perp}$, and let $N_1 \cong M_{\mu_\infty}^{(\infty)} \oplus \bigoplus_{1 \leq i < \infty} M_{\mu_i}^{(i)}$ be the canonical decomposition in (3.1) of N_1 .

We need to show that $\mu_\infty = 0$. Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that $\mu_\infty \neq 0$. Hence, M_{μ_∞} is not absent and is not zero due to the injectivity of N_1 . Since $\sigma(M_{\mu_\infty}) \neq \{0\}$, using the spectral theorem, we can write $M_{\mu_\infty} = M \oplus L$, where L is a normal operator with $\sigma(L) \neq -\sigma(L)$; in particular, $L \neq -L$ and thus not skew-symmetric by Lemma 3.5.

Let us verify that $N \oplus L$ is skew symmetric. We have

$$\begin{aligned} N_1 \oplus L &\cong M_{\mu_\infty}^{(\infty)} \oplus \bigoplus_{1 \leq i < \infty} M_{\mu_i}^{(i)} \oplus L \cong (M \oplus L)^{(\infty)} \oplus L \oplus \bigoplus_{1 \leq i < \infty} M_{\mu_i}^{(i)} \\ &\cong M^{(\infty)} \oplus L^{(\infty)} \oplus L \oplus \bigoplus_{1 \leq i < \infty} M_{\mu_i}^{(i)} \\ &\cong M^{(\infty)} \oplus L^{(\infty)} \oplus \bigoplus_{1 \leq i < \infty} M_{\mu_i}^{(i)} \\ &\cong N_1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $N \oplus L \cong N$; in particular, $N \oplus L$ is skew-symmetric; a contradiction. Therefore, $m(N_1) < \infty$.

(ii) \implies (i). Since N is skew-symmetric, the reverse implication in (i) is always true. Fix a bounded linear operator T , assume that $N \oplus T$ is skew-symmetric, and let us show that T is skew-symmetric.

In view of Lemma 3.6 and [18, Lemma 2.1], we can assume without loss of generality that T is normal and $N = N|_{\ker(N)^\perp}$. Moreover, by (3.1) and (3.3), we may directly assume that

$$N = \bigoplus_{1 \leq i < \infty} M_{\mu_i}^{(i)} \quad \text{and} \quad H = \bigoplus_{1 \leq i < \infty} L^2(\mu_i)^{(i)}$$

where the μ_i 's are mutually singular and satisfy $\mu_i(\Delta) = \mu_i(-\Delta)$ for every Borel subset $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$. Since the measures μ_i 's are mutually singular and satisfy (3.3), it is elementary to see that there exist mutually disjoint Borel subsets $\{\Delta_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^+}$ of \mathbb{C} such that for all $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ with $i \neq j$,

$$(3.7) \quad \Delta_i = -\Delta_i, \quad \mu_i(\Delta) = \mu_i(\Delta \cap \Delta_i), \quad \mu_i(\Delta_j) = 0 \quad \text{for every Borel } \Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}.$$

Let $\Delta_0 = \mathbb{C} \setminus \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^+} \Delta_i$; clearly, $\Delta_0 = -\Delta_0$. For convenience, put $N_i = M_{\mu_i}^{(i)}$, $H_i = L^2(\mu_i)^{(i)}$ for $i \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, and let $T = T_0 \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^+} T_i$ be the decomposition of T with respect to the orthogonal decomposition $K = \text{ran}(E_T(\Delta_0)) \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^+} \text{ran}(E_T(\Delta_i))$. For $0 \leq i < \infty$, put $K_i = \text{ran}(E_T(\Delta_i))$.

Since by (3.7), $\mu_i(\Delta_0) = \mu_i(\Delta_j) = 0$ all $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ with $i \neq j$, it follows that $E_{N_i}(\Delta_0) = E_{N_i}(\Delta_j) = 0$. Therefore,

$$\text{ran}(E_{N \oplus T}(\Delta_0)) = K_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{ran}(E_{N \oplus T}(\Delta_i)) = H_i \oplus K_i \quad \text{for every } i \in \mathbb{Z}^+.$$

It follows that

$$(N \oplus T)|_{\text{ran}(E_{N \oplus T}(\Delta_0))} = T_0 \quad \text{and} \quad (N \oplus T)|_{\text{ran}(E_{N \oplus T}(\Delta_i))} = N_i \oplus T_i \quad \text{for every } i \in \mathbb{Z}^+.$$

Consequently, by Lemma 3.7, T_0 and $N_i \oplus T_i$, for $i \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, are skew-symmetric operators. In particular, by Lemma 3.5, we have

$$(3.8) \quad N_i \oplus T_i \cong -N_i \oplus -T_i \quad \text{for every } i \in \mathbb{Z}^+.$$

Fix $i \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, and let us prove that T_i is skew-symmetric. Given $\mu_i(\Delta) = \mu_i(-\Delta)$ for every Borel subset $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$, [18, Theorem 1.11] implies that N_i is skew-symmetric; hence, $N_i \cong -N_i$ by Lemma 3.5. Combining this with (3.8), we obtain $N_i \oplus T_i \cong N_i \oplus -T_i$. Since M_{μ_i} is a star-cyclic normal operator ([9, p. 269, Theorem 3.4]), applying [9, p. 295, Proposition 10.6] i times to M_{μ_i} , we conclude that $T_i \cong -T_i$, and so T_i is skew-symmetric by Lemma 3.5.

Thus, $T = T_0 \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^+} T_i$ is skew-symmetric as a direct sum of skew-symmetric operators. \square

Lemma 3.9. *Let $N \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ be normal, and suppose that there exist reducing subspaces $\{H_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq r}$, $r < \infty$, of N such that $H = \vee(\sum_{i=1}^r H_i)$ and $N|_{H_i}$ is star-cyclic for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$. Then, for every reducing subspace L of N , we have $m(N|_L) < \infty$.*

Proof. First, let us show that N is a finite direct sum of star-cyclic normal operators. We will proceed by induction on r . The result is clear when $r = 1$. Assume the lemma holds for some integer $r \geq 1$. Let H_1, H_2, \dots, H_{r+1} be $r + 1$ reducing subspaces of N such that $H = \vee(\sum_{i=1}^{r+1} H_i)$ and $N|_{H_i}$ is star cyclic for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, r+1\}$. Let $K = \vee(\sum_{i=1}^r H_i)$ and $P \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ be the orthogonal projection onto K . Then, K reduces N ; moreover, by the induction hypothesis, $N|_K$ is a finite direct sum of star-cyclic operators.

By star-cyclicity of $N|_{H_{r+1}}$, there exists $h \in H$ such that $H_{r+1} = L_{N,h}$. To complete the proof, it is clear that it suffices to show that $H = K \oplus L_{N,(I-P)h}$. Note that K and $L_{N,(I-P)h}$ are orthogonal. In fact, since K reduces N , its orthogonal projection P , and hence $(I - P)$, commutes with N and N^* . Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} L_{N,(I-P)h} &= \bigvee \{p(N, N^*)(I - P)h : p \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]\} \\ &= (I - P) \bigvee \{p(N, N^*)h : p \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]\} \subseteq K^\perp. \end{aligned}$$

It remains to prove that $H = K + L_{N,(I-P)h}$; we need only to show that $H_{r+1} \subseteq K + L_{N,(I-P)h}$. For $p \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$, we have $p(N, N^*)h = p(N, N^*)Ph + p(N, N^*)(I - P)h$. Since $Ph \in K$ and K reduces $p(N, N^*)$, we have $p(N, N^*)Ph \in K$. Hence, $p(N, N^*)h \in K + L_{N,(I-P)h}$, and thus $H_{r+1} \subseteq K + L_{N,(I-P)h}$.

Now, let L be a reducing subspace of N and assume, for contradiction, that $m(N|_L) \not< \infty$. According to (3.1), $N|_L$ has a reducing subspace for which its restriction is unitarily equivalent to $M_\mu^{(\infty)}$ for some finite non-zero compactly

supported measure μ on \mathbb{C} . Thus, we can write $N \cong N_0 \oplus M_\mu^{(\infty)}$ for some normal operator N_0 . This implies

$$N \oplus M_\mu^{(2)} \cong N_0 \oplus M_\mu^{(\infty)} \oplus M_\mu^{(2)} \cong N_0 \oplus M_\mu^{(\infty)} \oplus M_\mu \cong N \oplus M_\mu.$$

Since N is a direct sum of n star-cyclic normal operators M_1, M_2, \dots, M_n with $n < \infty$, applying [9, p. 295, Proposition 10.6] to each M_i , we conclude $M_\mu \cong M_\mu^{(2)}$; which contradicts (3.2). \square

We are now ready to prove Theorems 3.1 and 3.2.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. The implication (i) \implies (ii) is clear.

(ii) \implies (iii). First, let us show that $N|_{L_{N,Z}^\perp}$ is skew-symmetric. By the argument in (2.7), there exists a conjugation J on H so that $(JV)N = -N(JV)$ and $JN^*J = N$. By the Fuglede-Putnam Theorem, it follows that $(JV)N^* = -N^*(JV)$; hence, $VN^* = J^2VN^* = -JN^*JV = -NV$. Consequently, for any polynomial $p \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$, one can easily see that $Vp(N, N^*) = p(-N, -N^*)^*V$. Therefore, for every $i \in I$,

$$Vp(N, N^*)x_i = p(-N, -N^*)^*Vx_i = p(-N, -N^*)^*y_i$$

and

$$Vp(N, N^*)y_i = p(-N, -N^*)^*Vy_i = p(-N, -N^*)^*x_i.$$

This implies that if $L_0 = \text{span}\{p(N, N^*)x_i + q(N, N^*)y_i : p, q \in \mathbb{C}[x, y], i \in I\}$, then $VL_0 = L_0$. Taking the closure of L_0 in H , we obtain $VL_{N,Z} = L_{N,Z}$; moreover, since V is anti-unitary, we get $VL_{N,Z}^\perp = L_{N,Z}^\perp$.

Let V_1 and N_1 denote the restrictions of V and N to $L_{N,Z}^\perp$, respectively. Then, V_1 is anti-unitary on $L_{N,Z}^\perp$ and the relation $VN = -N^*V$ implies $V_1N_1 = -N_1^*V_1$. Consequently, N_1 is skew-symmetric by Lemma 3.5.

Now, by Lemma 2.12, for every Borel subset $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$, we have $VE_N(-\Delta) = E_N(\Delta)V$. Hence, using (2.9), for all $i, j \in I$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle E_N(\Delta)x_i, y_j \rangle &= \langle E_N(\Delta)Vy_i, Vx_j \rangle = \langle VE_N(-\Delta)y_i, Vx_j \rangle \\ &= \langle V^{-1}Vx_j, E_N(-\Delta)y_i \rangle = \langle E_N(-\Delta)x_j, y_i \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

and similarly, $\langle E_N(\Delta)x_i, x_j \rangle = \langle E_N(-\Delta)y_j, y_i \rangle$.

(iii) \implies (i). Let $M = -N$. For every Borel subset $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ and for all $i, j \in I$,

$$\langle E_N(\Delta)x_i, y_j \rangle = \langle E_N(-\Delta)x_j, y_i \rangle = \langle E_{-N}(\Delta)x_j, y_i \rangle = \langle E_M(\Delta)x_j, y_i \rangle,$$

and similarly, $\langle E_N(\Delta)x_i, x_j \rangle = \langle E_M(\Delta)y_j, y_i \rangle$. For convenience, put $H_0 = L_{N,Z}$, $H_1 = H_0^\perp$, $N_0 = N|_{H_0}$ and $N_1 = N|_{H_1}$. By Theorem 2.11, there exists a conjugation C_0 on H_0 such that $C_0N_0C_0 = -N_0^*$ and $C_0x_i = y_i$ for every $i \in I$. Since N_1 is skew-symmetric, there exists a conjugation C_1 on H_1 such that $C_1N_1C_1 = -N_1^*$, and thus the conjugation $C = C_0 \oplus C_1$ satisfies all required properties. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.2. The implication (i) \implies (ii) follows directly from Theorem 3.1.

(ii) \implies (i). Let N_0 and N_1 be the normal operators in the proof of Theorem 3.2. In the light of the same theorem, we only need to show that N_1 is skew-symmetric. This follows immediately from Theorem 3.8 and the facts that $m(N_{0|\ker(N_0)^\perp}) < \infty$ and $N = N_0 \oplus N_1$ is skew-symmetric.

Let us now prove the second part of the theorem. Assume that I is finite. Since

$$H_0 = \bigvee \left(\sum_{i \in I} L_{N, \{x_i\}} + L_{N, \{y_i\}} \right) = \bigvee \left(\sum_{i \in I} L_{N_0, \{x_i\}} + L_{N_0, \{y_i\}} \right)$$

and the restrictions of N_0 to $L_{N_0, \{x_i\}}$ and $L_{N_0, \{y_i\}}$ are star-cyclic, Lemma 3.9 implies that $m(N_{0|\ker(N_0)^\perp}) < \infty$. This concludes the proof. \square

4. APPLICATIONS TO SOME EQUATIONS IN $L^\infty(\mu)$

Throughout this section, let μ denote a finite measure on Borel subsets of \mathbb{C} with compact support, and let n be a positive integer. All functions are considered defined on \mathbb{C} . For a given function f , the notation \widetilde{f} stands for the function defined by $\widetilde{f}(z) = \overline{f(-z)}$ for $z \in \mathbb{C}$.

Let $[\phi_{i,j}]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ be a matrix of functions in $L^\infty(\mu)$. We denote $[\phi_{i,j}]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \in \mathcal{U}(\mu, n)$ if the matrix $[\phi_{i,j}(z)]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ is unitary for μ -almost every $z \in \mathbb{C}$.

Borel measurability has been widely considered in the context of linear algebra. In [3], Azoff showed that several standard operations in linear algebra can be performed in a measurable manner. For instance, he proved that if $z \mapsto A(z)$ is a matrix-valued Borel function on \mathbb{C} (i.e., its entries are Borel measurable), then there exists a Borel function $z \mapsto V(z)$ on \mathbb{C} such that, for every $z \in \mathbb{C}$, $V(z)$ is an invertible matrix and $V(z)^{-1}A(z)V(z)$ is the Jordan canonical form of $A(z)$. These results have since been extensively utilized in various domains of mathematics.

In this section, we shall apply the main results of this paper to explore additional problems of Borel measurability in linear algebra. Let $\{f_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ and $\{g_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ be functions in $L^2(\mu)$ so that $\sum_{k=1}^n |f_k|^2 = \sum_{k=1}^n |g_k|^2$ μ -almost everywhere (μ -a.e.). It is clear that we can find a matrix-valued function $z \mapsto [\phi_{i,j}(z)]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ on \mathbb{C} so that, for μ -almost every $z \in \mathbb{C}$, the matrix $[\phi_{i,j}(z)]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ is unitary and

$$[\phi_{i,j}(z)]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \begin{bmatrix} f_1(z) \\ f_2(z) \\ \cdots \\ f_n(z) \end{bmatrix}^{\text{tr}} = \begin{bmatrix} g_1(z) \\ g_2(z) \\ \cdots \\ g_n(z) \end{bmatrix}^{\text{tr}}.$$

However, it is not clear whether the functions ϕ_{ij} can be chosen to be Borel measurable. The next theorem provides a positive answer.

Theorem 4.1. Let $\{f_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ and $\{g_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ be two subsets of functions in $L^2(\mu)$. Then, the following equation

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{cases} \sum_{k=1}^n \phi_{1,k} f_k = g_1 \\ \sum_{k=1}^n \phi_{2,k} f_k = g_2 \\ \vdots \\ \sum_{k=1}^n \phi_{n,k} f_k = g_n \end{cases} \quad \mu\text{-a.e.}$$

has a solution $[\phi_{i,j}]_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \in \mathcal{U}(\mu, n)$ if and only if $\sum_{k=1}^n |f_k|^2 = \sum_{k=1}^n |g_k|^2$ μ -a.e.

For a function $\phi \in L^\infty(\mu)$, M_ϕ denotes the multiplication operator by ϕ on $L^2(\mu)$; that is, $[M_\phi f](z) = \phi(z)f(z)$ for every $f \in L^2(\mu)$.

Lemma 4.2. Let $U \in \mathcal{B}(L^2(\mu)^{(n)})$. Then, U is unitary and commutes with $M_\mu^{(n)}$ if and only if $U = [M_{\phi_{i,j}}]_{1 \leq i,j \leq n}$ for some $[\phi_{i,j}]_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \in \mathcal{U}(\mu, n)$.

Proof. Suppose $U = [M_{\phi_{i,j}}]_{1 \leq i,j \leq n}$ for some $[\phi_{i,j}]_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \in L^\infty(\mu)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} UU^* &= \left[\sum_{k=1}^n M_{\phi_{i,k}} M_{\phi_{j,k}}^* \right]_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} = \left[\sum_{k=1}^n M_{\phi_{i,k}} \overline{M_{\phi_{j,k}}} \right]_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \\ &= \left[\sum_{k=1}^n M_{\phi_{i,k} \overline{\phi_{j,k}}} \right]_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} = \left[M_{\sum_{k=1}^n \phi_{i,k} \overline{\phi_{j,k}}} \right]_{1 \leq i,j \leq n}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $U^*U = \left[M_{\sum_{k=1}^n \overline{\phi_{k,i}} \phi_{k,j}} \right]_{1 \leq i,j \leq n}$. Hence, the operator U is unitary if and only if, for all $1 \leq i, j \leq n$,

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \phi_{i,k} \overline{\phi_{j,k}} = \delta_{ij} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{k=1}^n \overline{\phi_{k,i}} \phi_{k,j} = \delta_{ij} \quad \mu\text{-a.e.}$$

where δ_{ij} denotes the Kronecker delta. That is, $[\phi_{i,j}]_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \in \mathcal{U}(\mu, n)$. The desired equivalence follows now directly from [9, p. 276, Proposition 6.1 (b)] and [9, p. 279, Corollary 6.9]. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.1. In the light of the previous lemma, the equation (4.1) has a solution in $\mathcal{U}(\mu, n)$ if and only if there exists a unitary operator U commuting with $M_\mu^{(n)}$ such that $UF = G$, where

$$F = [f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n]^{\text{tr}} \quad \text{and} \quad G = [g_1, g_2, \dots, g_n]^{\text{tr}}.$$

By Theorem 2.5, this is true if and only if $\|E_{M_\mu^{(n)}}(\Delta)F\|_{L^2(\mu)^{(n)}} = \|E_{M_\mu^{(n)}}(\Delta)G\|_{L^2(\mu)^{(n)}}$ for every Borel subset $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$. Note that

$$E_{M_\mu^{(n)}}(\Delta) = \bigoplus_{k=1}^n E_{M_\mu}(\Delta) = \bigoplus_{k=1}^n M_{\chi_\Delta}$$

(see, for instance, [10, p. 49, Proposition 10.4 (a)]). Consequently, (4.1) has a solution in $\mathcal{U}(\mu, n)$ if and only if, for every Borel subset $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int \sum_{k=1}^n |f_k|^2 \chi_\Delta \, d\mu &= \sum_{k=1}^n \int |f_k|^2 \chi_\Delta \, d\mu = \sum_{k=1}^n \|E_{M_\mu}(\Delta)f_k\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 = \|E_{M_\mu^{(n)}}(\Delta)F\|_{L^2(\mu)^{(n)}}^2 \\ &= \|E_{M_\mu^{(n)}}(\Delta)G\|_{L^2(\mu)^{(n)}}^2 = \int \sum_{k=1}^n |g_k|^2 \chi_\Delta \, d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

That is, $\sum_{k=1}^n |f_k|^2 = \sum_{k=1}^n |g_k|^2$ μ -a.e. \square

We denote $[\phi_{i,j}]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \in \mathcal{SU}(\mu, n)$ if $[\phi_{i,j}]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \in \mathcal{U}(\mu, n)$ and the functions $\phi_{i,j}$ satisfy the ‘‘symmetry’’ condition:

$$[\phi_{i,j}(z)]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} = ([\phi_{i,j}(-z)]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n})^{\text{tr}} \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-almost every } z \in \mathbb{C}.$$

As we will see later, this is equivalent to saying that $[M_{\phi_{i,j}}]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ is a unitary $(\mathcal{PT})^{(n)}$ -symmetric operator, where \mathcal{PT} is the composition of the parity and time-reversal operators defined on $L^2(\mu)$, provided that \mathcal{P} is well-defined.

Note that \mathcal{P} is well-defined if the measure μ is *symmetric*; i.e., $\mu(\Delta) = \mu(-\Delta)$ for every Borel subset $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$. Hence, the following theorem actually shows when a vector $F = [f_1, \dots, f_n]^{\text{tr}} \in L^2(\mu)^{(n)}$ is carried to a vector $G = [g_1, \dots, g_n]^{\text{tr}} \in L^2(\mu)^{(n)}$ by a $(\mathcal{PT})^{(n)}$ -symmetric unitary operator of the form $U = [M_{\phi_{i,j}}]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$.

Theorem 4.3. *Assume that μ is symmetric, and let $\{f_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ and $\{g_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ be two subsets of functions in $L^2(\mu)$. Then, the equation (4.1) has a solution $[\phi_{i,j}]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \in \mathcal{SU}(\mu, n)$ if and only if*

$$\sum_{k=1}^n |f_k(z)|^2 = \sum_{k=1}^n |g_k(z)|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{k=1}^n f_k(z)g_k(-z) = \sum_{k=1}^n f_k(-z)g_k(z)$$

for μ -almost every $z \in \mathbb{C}$.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $U \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ be a unitary operator and J a conjugation on H . Then, $U = JC$ for some conjugation C on H if and only if $JUJ = U^*$.*

Proof. In the light of the facts that $J^2 = I$ and $\langle JUh, JUk \rangle = \langle Uk, Uh \rangle = \langle k, h \rangle$ for all $h, k \in H$, it is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} U = JC \text{ for some conjugation } C \text{ on } H &\iff JU \text{ is a conjugation on } H \\ &\iff (JU) = (JU)^{-1} = U^* J^{-1} \\ &\iff JUJ = U^*. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 4.3. For convenience, put $J = \mathcal{PT}$; that is, $[Jf](z) = \overline{f(-z)}$ for every $f \in L^2(\mu)$. Note that J is a conjugation on $L^2(\mu)$. In fact, J is a well-defined conjugate-linear map with $J^2 = I_{L^2(\mu)}$. Additionally, since μ is symmetric, we have

$$\langle Jf, Jg \rangle_{L^2(\mu)} = \int \overline{f(-z)}g(-z) d\mu = \int \overline{f(z)}g(z) d\mu = \langle g, f \rangle_{L^2(\mu)}$$

for all $f, g \in L^2(\mu)$.

Also, for every $\phi \in L^\infty(\mu)$, we have

$$JM_\phi Jf(z) = JM_\phi \overline{f(-z)} = J\phi(z)\overline{f(-z)} = \overline{\phi(-z)}f(z)$$

for every $f \in L^2(\mu)$. Hence,

$$(4.2) \quad JM_\phi J = M_{\overline{\phi}}.$$

In particular, $J^{(n)}M_\mu^{(n)}J^{(n)} = -M_\mu^{(n)*}$, and $M_\mu^{(n)}$ is skew-symmetric since $J^{(n)}$ is a conjugation on $L^2(\mu)^{(n)}$.

Claim: An operator $U \in \mathcal{B}(L^2(\mu)^{(n)})$ is unitary, commutes with $M_\mu^{(n)}$ and satisfies $J^{(n)}UJ^{(n)} = U^*$ if and only if there exists $[\phi_{i,j}]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \in \mathcal{SU}(\mu, n)$ such that $U = [M_{\phi_{i,j}}]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$. By Lemma 4.2, it suffices to show that if $U = [M_{\phi_{i,j}}]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$, then

$$J^{(n)}UJ^{(n)} = U^* \iff \phi_{i,j}(z) = \phi_{j,i}(-z) \text{ } \mu\text{-a.e. for all } 1 \leq i, j \leq n.$$

In fact, simple matrix calculations show that

$$\begin{aligned} J^{(n)}UJ^{(n)} = U^* &\iff [JM_{\phi_{i,j}}J]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} = [M_{\phi_{i,j}}^*]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \\ &\iff [JM_{\phi_{i,j}}J]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} = [M_{\overline{\phi_{j,i}}}]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \\ &\iff M_{\overline{\phi_{i,j}}} = M_{\overline{\phi_{j,i}}} \text{ for all } 1 \leq i, j \leq n \text{ (by (4.2))} \\ &\iff \phi_{i,j}(z) = \phi_{j,i}(-z) \text{ } \mu\text{-a.e. for all } 1 \leq i, j \leq n. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim.

Now, one can see that the equation (4.1) has a solution in $\mathcal{SU}(\mu, n)$ if and only if, there exists a unitary operator U on $L^2(\mu)^{(n)}$ commuting with $M_\mu^{(n)}$ such

that $J^{(n)}UJ^{(n)} = U^*$ and

$$U[f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n]^{\text{tr}} = [g_1, g_2, \dots, g_n]^{\text{tr}}.$$

By Lemma 4.4, this true if and only if there exists a conjugation C on $L^2(\mu)^{(n)}$ such that $J^{(n)}C$ commutes with $M_\mu^{(n)}$ and

$$(4.3) \quad J^{(n)}C[f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n]^{\text{tr}} = [g_1, g_2, \dots, g_n]^{\text{tr}}.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} J^{(n)}CM_\mu^{(n)} = M_\mu^{(n)}J^{(n)}C &\iff CM_\mu^{(n)}C = J^{(n)}M_\mu^{(n)}J^{(n)} \\ &\iff CM_\mu^{(n)}C = -M_\mu^{(n)*} \text{ (by (4.2)).} \end{aligned}$$

Hence, taking into account (4.3), the equation (4.1) has a solution in $\mathcal{SU}(\mu, n)$ if and only if there exists a conjugation C on $L^2(\mu)^{(n)}$ such that $CM_\mu^{(n)}C = -M_\mu^{(n)*}$ and

$$C[f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n]^{\text{tr}} = J^{(n)}[g_1, g_2, \dots, g_n]^{\text{tr}} = [\tilde{g}_1, \tilde{g}_2, \dots, \tilde{g}_n]^{\text{tr}}.$$

For convenience, put $F = [f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n]^{\text{tr}}$ and $\tilde{G} = [\tilde{g}_1, \tilde{g}_2, \dots, \tilde{g}_n]^{\text{tr}}$. Then, by Theorem 3.2, the equation (4.1) has a solution in $\mathcal{SU}(\mu, n)$ if and only if

$$\left\langle E_{M_\mu^{(n)}}(\Delta)F, \tilde{G} \right\rangle_{L^2(\mu)^{(n)}} = \left\langle E_{M_\mu^{(n)}}(-\Delta)F, \tilde{G} \right\rangle_{L^2(\mu)^{(n)}}$$

and

$$\left\langle E_{M_\mu^{(n)}}(\Delta)F, F \right\rangle_{L^2(\mu)^{(n)}} = \left\langle E_{M_\mu^{(n)}}(-\Delta)\tilde{G}, \tilde{G} \right\rangle_{L^2(\mu)^{(n)}}$$

for every Borel subset $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$. That is,

$$\left\langle \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n M_{\chi_\Delta} \right) F, \tilde{G} \right\rangle_{L^2(\mu)^{(n)}} = \left\langle \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n M_{\chi_{-\Delta}} \right) F, \tilde{G} \right\rangle_{L^2(\mu)^{(n)}}$$

and

$$\left\langle \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n M_{\chi_\Delta} \right) F, F \right\rangle_{L^2(\mu)^{(n)}} = \left\langle \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n M_{\chi_{-\Delta}} \right) \tilde{G}, \tilde{G} \right\rangle_{L^2(\mu)^{(n)}}$$

for every Borel subset $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$; which means that

$$\int \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(z)g_i(-z)\chi_\Delta \, d\mu = \int \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(z)g_i(-z)\chi_{-\Delta} \, d\mu$$

and

$$\int \sum_{i=1}^n |f_i(z)|^2 \chi_\Delta \, d\mu = \int \sum_{i=1}^n |g_i(-z)|^2 \chi_{-\Delta} \, d\mu$$

for every Borel subset $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$. Therefore, by symmetry of μ , for every Borel subset $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$,

$$\int \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(z)g_i(-z)\chi_{\Delta} \, d\mu = \int \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(-z)g_i(z)\chi_{\Delta} \, d\mu$$

and

$$\int \sum_{i=1}^n |f_i(z)|^2 \chi_{\Delta} \, d\mu = \int \sum_{i=1}^n |g_i(z)|^2 \chi_{\Delta} \, d\mu;$$

which lead to the desired conditions. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Z. AMARA AND M. OUDGHIRI, *Finite rank perturbations of complex symmetric operators*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **495** (2021), no. 1, 124720.
- [2] Z. AMARA AND M. OUDGHIRI, *C-normality of rank-one perturbations of normal operators*, Linear Multilinear Algebra **71** (2023), no. 15, 2426–2440.
- [3] E. A. AZOFF, *Borel measurability in linear algebra*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **42** (1974), 346–350.
- [4] C. M. BENDER, *Making sense of non-Hermitian Hamiltonians*, Rep. Prog. Phys. **70** (2007), no. 6, 947–1018.
- [5] C. M. BENDER AND S. BOETTCHER, *Real spectra in non-Hermitian Hamiltonians having \mathcal{PT} symmetry*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80** (1998), no. 24, 5243–5246.
- [6] M. C. CÂMARA, K. KLIŚ-GARLICKA, B. ŁANUCHA AND M. PTAK, *Conjugations in L^2 and their invariants*, Anal. Math. Phys. **10** (2020), no. 2, 22.
- [7] M. C. CÂMARA, K. KLIŚ-GARLICKA, B. ŁANUCHA AND M. PTAK, *Conjugations in $L^2(\mathcal{H})$* , Integral Equations Operator Theory **92** (2020), no. 6, 48.
- [8] W. CAO AND L. HU, *Projective interpolation of polynomial vectors and improved key recovery attack on SFLASH*, Des. Codes Cryptogr. **73** (2014), no. 3, 719–730.
- [9] J. B. CONWAY, *A Course in Functional Analysis*, Second edition, Grad. Texts Math. **96**, Springer-Verlag, New York (1990).
- [10] J. B. CONWAY, *A Course in Operator Theory*, Grad. Stud. Math. **21**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI (2000).
- [11] K. R. DAVIDSON, *C^* -algebras by example*, Fields Inst. Monogr. **6**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI (1996).
- [12] P. DYMEK, A. PLANETA AND M. PTAK, *Conjugations preserving Toeplitz kernels*, Integral Equations Operator Theory **94** (2022), no. 4, 39.
- [13] P. DYMEK, A. PLANETA AND M. PTAK, *Conjugations on L^2 space on the real line*, Results Math. **79** (2024), no. 1, 39.
- [14] S. R. GARCIA AND M. PUTINAR, *Complex symmetric operators and applications*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **358** (2006), no. 3, 1285–1315.
- [15] S. R. GARCIA AND M. PUTINAR, *Complex symmetric operators and applications II*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **359** (2007), no. 8, 3913–3931.
- [16] S. R. GARCIA, E. PRODAN AND M. PUTINAR, *Mathematical and physical aspects of complex symmetric operators*, J. Phys. A **47** (2014), no. 35, 353001.
- [17] K. GUO, Y. JI AND S. ZHU, *A C^* -algebra approach to complex symmetric operators*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **367** (2015), no. 10, 6903–6942.
- [18] C. G. LI AND S. ZHU, *Skew symmetric normal operators*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **141** (2013), no. 8, 2755–2762.

- [19] T. LUI, L. SHI, C. WANG AND S. ZHU, *An interpolation problem for conjugations*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **500** (2021), no. 1, 125118.
- [20] T. LIU, X. XIE AND S. ZHU, *An interpolation problem for conjugations II*, Mediterr. J. Math. **19** (2022), no. 4, 153.
- [21] J. MASHREGHI, M. PTAK AND W. T. ROSS, *Conjugations of unitary operators, I*, Anal. Math. Phys. **14** (2024), no. 3, 62.
- [22] J. MASHREGHI, M. PTAK AND W. T. ROSS, *Conjugations of unitary operators, II*, Anal. Math. Phys. **14** (2024), no. 3, 56.
- [23] C. MEHL, *Condensed forms for skew-Hamiltonian/Hamiltonian pencils*, SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl. **21** (1999), no. 2, 454–476.
- [24] F. PIÑERO AND P. SINGH, *The weight spectrum of certain affine Grassmann codes*, Des. Codes Cryptogr. **87** (2019), no. 4, 817–830.
- [25] E. PRODAN, S. R. GARCIA AND M. PUTINAR, *Norm estimates of complex symmetric operators applied to quantum systems*, J. Phys. A **39** (2006), no. 2, 389–400.
- [26] H. RADJAVI AND P. ROSENTHAL, *Invariant subspaces*, Ergeb. Math. Grenzgeb., Band 77[Results in Mathematics and Related Areas] (1973).
- [27] C. WANG, X. XIE, S. YAN AND S. ZHU, *An interpolation problem for conjugations III*, Banach J. Math. Anal. **16** (2022), no. 4, 61.
- [28] C. WANG, J. ZHAO AND S. ZHU, *Remarks on the structure of C-normal operators*, Linear Multilinear Algebra **70** (2022), no 9, 1682–1696.
- [29] S. ZHU, *Approximate unitary equivalence to skew symmetric operators*, Complex Anal. Oper. Theory **8** (2014)0, no. 7, 1565–1580.
- [30] S. ZHU AND C. G. LI, *Complex symmetry of a dense class of operators*, Integral Equations Operator Theory **73** (2012), no. 2, 255–272.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, LABO LIABM, FACULTY OF SCIENCES, MOHAMMED FIRST UNIVERSITY, 60000 OUJDA, MOROCCO

Email address: z.amara@ump.ac.ma