Cavallaro, Jeffery Math 231b Homework #6

#### 4.12.20

Let  $(\vec{e_n})$  be a complete orthonormal sequence in a Hilbert space H. Show that a bounded operator A on H is unitary if and only if  $(A\vec{e_n})$  is a complete orthonormal sequence in H.

 $\implies$  Assume A is unitary.

Since  $A \in \mathcal{B}(H)$  it is also the case that  $A^* \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ .

*A* is isometric and thus preserves the norm and inner product.

$$\begin{split} &\langle \vec{e_i}, \vec{e_j} \rangle = \langle A\vec{e_i}, A\vec{e_j} \rangle \\ &\text{But } \vec{e_i} \perp \vec{e_j} \text{ and so } \langle \vec{e_i}, \vec{e_j} \rangle = \langle A\vec{e_i}, A\vec{e_j} \rangle = 0 \\ &\therefore A\vec{e_i} \perp A\vec{e_j} \end{split}$$

Also  $||A\vec{x}|| = ||\vec{x}|| = 1$ .

Therefore  $(A\vec{e}_n)$  is an orthonormal sequence.

Now, assume  $\vec{y} \in H$ .

Since A is onto,  $\exists \vec{x} \in H$  such that  $\vec{y} = A\vec{x}$ .

Since  $(\vec{e}_n)$  is complete orthonormal and since A is linear and isometric:

$$\vec{y} = A\vec{x} = A\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \langle \vec{x}, \vec{e}_k \rangle \vec{e}_k = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \langle A\vec{x}, A\vec{e}_k \rangle A\vec{e}_k$$

Therefore  $(A\vec{e}_n)$  is complete.

 $\iff$  Assume  $(A\vec{e_n})$  is a complete orthonormal sequence.

Assume  $\vec{x} \in H$ .

$$\vec{x} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \langle \vec{x}, A\vec{e_k} \rangle A\vec{e_k} = A \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \langle A^* \vec{x}, \vec{e_k} \rangle \vec{e_k}$$

But  $(\vec{e}_n)$  is complete orthonormal, and so:

 $\vec{x} = AA^*\vec{x}$  for all  $\vec{x} \in H$  and thus  $AA^* = I$ 

Now, note that:

$$A^*A\vec{x} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \langle A^*A\vec{x}, \vec{e_k} \rangle \vec{e_k} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \langle A\vec{x}, A\vec{e_k} \rangle \vec{e_k}$$

Let  $\vec{x} = \vec{e}_j$ :

$$A^* A \vec{e_j} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \langle A \vec{e_j}, A \vec{e_k} \rangle \vec{e_k} = ||A \vec{e_j}||^2 \vec{e_j} = 1 \cdot \vec{e_j} = \vec{e_j}$$

Thus  $(A^*A\vec{e}_n)$  is also a complete orthonormal sequence.

Assume  $\vec{x} \in H$ :

$$\vec{x} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \langle \vec{x}, A^* A \vec{e}_k \rangle A^* A \vec{e}_k = A^* \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \langle A \vec{x}, A \vec{e}_k \rangle A \vec{e}_k = A^* A \vec{x}$$

And so  $\vec{x} = A^*A\vec{x}$  for all  $\vec{x} \in H$  and thus  $A^*A = I$ 

Therefore  $AA^* = A^*A = I$  and thus A is unitary.

# 4.12.23

Let A be a bounded operator on a Hilbert space. Define the exponential operator:

$$e^A = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{A^n}{n!}$$

where  $A^0 = I$ .

Show that  $e^A$  is a well-defined operator.

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left\| \frac{A^n}{n!} \right\| = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\|A^n\|}{n!} \le \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\|A\|^n}{n!}$$

which converges to  $e^{\|A\|}$  for all  $\|A\| \in \mathbb{R}$ .

So  $e^{A}$  converges absolutely. But H is complete, so  $e^{A}$  converges.

Therefore  $e^A$  is well-defined.

Prove the following:

(a) 
$$(e^A)^n = e^{nA}$$

Proof by induction on n:

Base case: n = 1

Trivial.

Assume  $(e^A)^n = e^{nA}$ 

Consider  $(e^A)^{n+1}$ .

$$(e^{A})^{n+1} = \left[\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{A^{k}}{k!}\right]^{n+1} = \left[\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{A^{k}}{k!}\right]^{n} \left[\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{A^{k}}{k!}\right] = (e^{A})^{n} e^{A} = e^{nA} e^{A}$$

Note that nA and A commute, so applying part (d):

$$(e^A)^{n+1} = e^{nA}e^A = e^{nA+A} = e^{(n+1)A}$$

(b) 
$$e^0 = I$$

$$e^{A} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{A^{n}}{n!} = \frac{A^{0}}{0!} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{A^{n}}{n!} = I + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{A^{n}}{n!}$$

Now let A=0:

$$e^{0} = I + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{0^{n}}{n!} = I + 0 = I$$

(c)  $e^A$  is invertible (even if A is not) and its inverse is  $e^{-A}$ .

Note that A and -A commute, so applying part (d):

$$e^{A}e^{-A} = e^{A-A} = e^{0} = I$$
  
 $e^{-A}e^{A} = e^{-A+A} = e^{0} = I$ 

Therefore  $e^A$  is invertible with inverse  $e^{-A}$ .

(d)  $e^A e^B = e^{A+B}$  for any commuting operators A and B.

$$e^{A+B} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(A+B)^n}{n!}$$

$$= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} A^k B^{n-k}$$

$$= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{k=0}^{n} \frac{n!}{k!(n-k)!} A^k B^{n-k}$$

$$= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{n} \frac{A^k}{k!} \frac{B^{n-k}}{(n-k)!}$$

$$= \left[\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{A^k}{k!}\right] \left[\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{B^k}{k!}\right]$$

$$= e^A e^B$$

(by the Cauchy product of two infinite, absolutely converging series).

(e) If A is self-adjoint then  $e^{iA}$  is unitary.

Assume A is self-adjoint.

$$A = A^*$$

$$(e^{iA})^* = \left[\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(iA)^n}{n!}\right]^*$$

$$= \lim_{N \to \infty} \left[\sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{(iA)^n}{n!}\right]^*$$

$$= \lim_{N \to \infty} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{[(iA)^n]^*}{n!}$$

$$= \lim_{N \to \infty} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{[(iA)^*]^n}{n!}$$

$$= \lim_{N \to \infty} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{[-iA^*]^n}{n!}$$

$$= \lim_{N \to \infty} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{[-iA]^n}{n!}$$

$$= e^{-iA}$$

Therefore, by part (c),  $e^{iA}$  is unitary.

## 4.12.28

If  $T^*T = I$ , is it true that  $TT^* = I$ ?

No. Let  $H=\ell^2$  and let T be the right-shift operator:

$$T(z_1, z_2, z_3, \ldots) = (0, z_1, z_2, z_3, \ldots)$$

Claim:  $\forall z \in \ell^2, Tz \in \ell^2$ 

Assume  $z \in \ell^2$ .

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |(Tz)_n|^2 = 0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |z_n|^2 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |z_n|^2 < \infty$$

Claim: T is linear.

Assume  $x,y\in\ell^2$  and  $\alpha,\beta\in\mathbb{C}.$ 

$$T(\alpha x + \beta y) = T(\alpha x_1 + \beta y_1, \alpha x_2 + \beta y_2, \alpha x_3 + \beta y_3, \dots)$$
  
=  $(0, \alpha x_1 + \beta y_1, \alpha x_2 + \beta y_2, \alpha x_3 + \beta y_3, \dots)$   
=  $\alpha(0, x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots) + \beta(0, y_1, y_2, y_3, \dots)$   
=  $\alpha Tx + \beta Ty$ 

Claim: T is bounded.

$$||Tz||^2 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |(Tz)_n|^2 = 0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |z_n|^2 = ||z||^2$$

Therefore  $||T|| \le 1$  and thus T is bounded.

$$T \in \mathcal{B}(\ell^2)$$

Now, assume  $T^*T = I$ .

Thus,  $T^*$  is a left-inverse of T and must therefore be the left-shift operator:

$$T^*(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4 \ldots) = (z_2, z_3, z_4, \ldots)$$

And so:

$$T^*T(z_1, z_2, z_3, \ldots) = T^*(0, z_1, z_2, z_3, \ldots) = (z_1, z_2, z_3, \ldots)$$

However:

$$TT^*(z_1, z_2, z_3, \ldots) = T(z_2, z_3, \ldots) = (0, z_2, z_3, \ldots) \neq (z_1, z_2, z_3, \ldots)$$

And therefore  $TT^* \neq I$ .

### 4.12.31

If A and B are positive operators and A + B = 0, show that A = B = 0.

Assume A and B are positive operators and A + B = 0.

$$\langle (A+B)\vec{x}, \vec{x} \rangle = \langle A\vec{x} + B\vec{x}, \vec{x} \rangle = \langle A\vec{x}, \vec{x} \rangle + \langle B\vec{x}, \vec{x} \rangle = 0$$

But A and B are positive, so  $\langle A\vec{x}, \vec{x} \rangle \geq 0$  and  $\langle B\vec{x}, \vec{x} \rangle \geq 0$ .

And so  $\langle A\vec{x}, \vec{x} \rangle = \langle B\vec{x}, \vec{x} \rangle = 0$ , for all  $\vec{x}$ .

$$A = B = 0$$

## 4.12.54

Give an example of a self-adjoint operator that has no eigenvalues.

Let  $H=L^2[a,b]$  and let  $f_0\in H$  be a real-valued, continuous, non-constant (and hence non-zero), and bounded function. For example:  $f_0(x)=2+\sin x$ .

Define  $Tf = f_0 f$ .

Claim: T is linear.

$$T(\alpha f + \beta g) = f_0(\alpha f + \beta g) = \alpha f_0 f + \beta f_0 g = \alpha T f + \beta T g$$

Claim: T is bounded.

$$||Tf|| = ||f_0f|| \le ||f_0|| \, ||f||$$

Therefore  $\|T\| \leq \|f_0\|$  and thus T is bounded.

$$\therefore T \in \mathcal{B}(H)$$

Claim: T is self-adjoint.

$$\langle Tf, g \rangle = \int_{a}^{b} ((Tf)(x)) \overline{g(x)} dx$$

$$= \int_{a}^{b} (f_{0}f)(x) \overline{g(x)} dx$$

$$= \int_{a}^{b} f_{0}(x) f(x) \overline{g(x)} dx$$

$$= \int_{a}^{b} f(x) \overline{f_{0}(x)} g(x) dx$$

$$= \int_{a}^{b} f(x) \overline{(Tg)(x)} dx$$

$$= \langle f, Tg \rangle$$

Claim: T has no eigenvalues.

If it did, then  $(Tf)(x)=(f_0f)x=f_0(x)f(x)=\lambda f(x)$  for all  $x\in [a,b]$ . But this is only true for  $f(x)\equiv 0$ .

Therefore T has no eigenvalues.