

Section 23: The Deficiency of A

We have examined the paradigm whereby A can be written as

$$(23.1) \quad A(x) = \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \lambda_p \langle x, \phi_p \rangle \theta_p$$

in case $\{\lambda_p\} \rightarrow 0$ or in case $\{\lambda_p\} \rightarrow \infty$. We now examine the special case that $\{\frac{1}{\lambda_p}\}$ is bounded.

Remark: It goes without saying that we are supposing that no λ_p is zero. It may be that $\{\phi_p\}$ is not a maximal orthonormal family. Then A could be extended to all of E by making the value zero at the extension of the ϕ_p 's to a maximal orthonormal family. In that case, we can characterize the null space of this extension of A:

$$N(A) = \{ x: \langle x, \phi_p \rangle = 0 \text{ if } \lambda_p \neq 0 \}.$$

Theorem. Suppose that A can be written in the paradigm of (23.1) and that $R(A)$ represents the range of A. Then, these are equivalent:

(1) $\{\frac{1}{\lambda_p}\}$ is a bounded sequence,

(2) $R(A) = \{y: y = \sum_{\lambda_p \neq 0} \langle y, \theta_p \rangle \phi_p\}$.

(3) $R(A) = \text{perp}(N(A^*))$, where $\text{perp}(N(A^*))$ is the collection of vectors perpendicular to the nullspace of A^* .

(4) $R(A)$ is closed.

Suggestions for a proof.

1 \Rightarrow 2. Suppose (1). Let

$$S = \{ y: y = \sum_{\lambda_p \neq 0} \langle y, \theta_p \rangle \phi_p \}.$$

It is clear that the range of A is contained in S. To see that the range of A is S, suppose y is in S. Let

$$x = \sum_{\lambda_p \neq 0} \frac{1}{\lambda_p} \langle y, \theta_p \rangle \phi_p.$$

Because of (1), x is in E. Also, $Ax = y$.

2 \Rightarrow 3. Recall that

$$A^*(z) = \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \lambda_p^* \langle z, \theta_p \rangle \phi_p.$$

Also, as in the Remark above

$$(23.2) \quad N(A^*) = \{z: \langle z, \theta_p \rangle = 0 \text{ if } \lambda_p \neq 0\}.$$

And,

$$\text{perp}(N(A^*)) = \{w: \langle w, \theta_p \rangle = 0 \text{ if } \lambda_p = 0\}.$$

First we show that $\text{perp}(N(A^*))$ is contained in $R(A)$. Suppose that w is in $\text{perp}(N(A^*))$. Then

$$w = \sum_p \langle w, \theta_p \rangle \theta_p = \sum_{\lambda_p \neq 0} \langle w, \theta_p \rangle \theta_p.$$

To see that this w is in $R(A)$, we need to produce x so that $A(x) = w$. As above, choose $x =$

$$x = \sum_{\lambda_p \neq 0} \frac{1}{\lambda_p} \langle w, \theta_p \rangle \phi_p.$$

As before $Ax = w$. Thus, $\text{perp}(N(A^*))$ is contained in $R(A)$.

Finally, we show that $R(A)$ is contained in $\text{perp}(N(A^*))$. Suppose that y is in $R(A)$ and z is in $N(A^*)$. Then y is a combination of the θ_p 's

$$\langle y, z \rangle = \langle \sum_{\lambda_p \neq 0} \langle y, \theta_p \rangle \theta_p, z \rangle = \sum_{\lambda_p \neq 0} \langle y, \theta_p \rangle \langle \theta_p, z \rangle = 0 \text{ by equation (23.2).}$$

Thus, y is in $\text{perp}(N(A^*))$, completing the outline for $2 \Rightarrow 3$.

(3) = (4) This follows because $\text{perp}(N(A^*))$ is closed.

(4) \Rightarrow (1) Suppose that $\{1/\lambda_p\}$ is unbounded. Then

$$A^{(-1)} = \sum_p \frac{1}{\lambda_p} \langle z, \theta_p \rangle \phi_p$$

is an unbounded operator. Consequently, $A^{(-1)}$ cannot have domain all of E . Thus, there is z in E so that z is not in the domain of $A^{(-1)}$ or, what is the same, z is not in the $R(A)$. Let y_n be defined as follows:

$$y_n = \sum_{p=1}^n \frac{1}{\lambda_p} \langle z, \theta_p \rangle \phi_p.$$

Then, $A(y_n)$ is in the range of A and is seen to be

$$A(y_n) = \sum_{p=1}^n \langle z, \theta_p \rangle \theta_p.$$

Consequently, $A(y_n)$ is a sequence in $R(A)$ that has limit z which is not in $R(A)$. Thus, $R(A)$ is not closed. This is a contradiction.

This finishes an outline for a proof of the Theorem.

Definition. There are two numbers associated with A :

$$\eta(A) = \text{the dimension of the kernel of } A.$$

and

$$\delta(A) = \text{the dimension of the kernel of } A^*.$$

We call the number $\delta(A)$ the *deficiency of A*. In a sense, this number measures how much the range of A is deficient in filling E .

Examples:

1. If A is given by the simple paradigm,

$$A(x) = \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \lambda_p \langle x, \phi_p \rangle \phi_p,$$

then $\eta(A)$ is the number of λ_p 's such that $\lambda_p = 0$, and $\delta(A) = \eta(A)$.

2. If A is the right shift operator

$$A(x) = \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \lambda_p \langle x, \phi_p \rangle \phi_{p+1},$$

so that

$$A^*(x) = \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \lambda_p^* \langle x, \phi_{p+1} \rangle \phi_p,$$

then $\eta(A) = 0$ and $\delta(A) = 1$.

3. We compute $\eta(A)$ and $\delta(A)$ for

$$\mathbf{K}[f](x) = \int_0^1 \cos(\pi(x-y)) f(y) dy.$$

First, imagine \mathbf{K} in the simple paradigm noting that the range of \mathbf{K} is two dimensional and

$$\mathbf{K}[\cos(\pi y)](x) = \frac{\cos(\pi x)}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{K}[\sin(\pi y)](x) = \frac{\sin(\pi x)}{2}.$$

Hence, $\eta(A)$ in $L^2[0, 1]$ is ∞ . Also, $\delta(A) = \infty$, since $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{K}^*$.

4. We compute $\eta(\mathbf{K})$ for

$$\mathbf{K}[f](x) = x \int_0^x f(y) dy - \int_0^x y f(y) dy = \int_0^x (x - y) f(y) dy$$

Suppose f is in the kernel of \mathbf{K} . Then $\mathbf{K}[f](x) = 0$. Taking the derivative with respect to x , we see that

$$0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \mathbf{K}[f](x) = \int_0^x f(y) dy,$$

and

$$0 = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \mathbf{K}[f](x) = f(x).$$

Thus, f is zero and the null space of A must be zero. Hence $\eta(A) = 0$.