



Comment on” Frames of Subspaces”

H. R. Rahimi ^{a*}, H. Yousefi Nejad ^b

(a) *Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran*

(b) *Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, North Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran*

Received 25 September 2009; revised 4 February 2010; accepted 18 February 2010.

Abstract

In this paper we give a counter example for one of the lemmas of the paper” Frame of subspace in Wavelets, frames and operator theory” by P.G. Casazza and G. Kutyniok .

Keywords : Hilbert space; Fusion Frame; Orthogonal Projection; Orthonormal basis.

1 Introduction

Frames were first introduced by Duffin and Schaeffer[4] in the context of nonharmonic Fourier series, and today frames play important roles in many applications in mathematics, science, and engineering, including time-frequency analysis [5], internet coding [6], speech and music processing[11], communication [9], multiple antenna coding [8], medicine [10], quantum computing [7], and many other areas.

For the discussion of the following section, we state here some definitions, notations and known results. For convenience of readers, we suggest that one refer to [1, 2, 3] for details.

Let H be a separable Hilbert space and let I be a countable (or finite) index set. If W is a closed subspace of H , we denote the orthogonal projection of H onto W by π_W .

A sequence $F = \{f_i\}_{i \in I}$ in H is a frame for H if there exist constants $0 < A \leq B < \infty$ such that $A\|f\|^2 \leq \sum_{i \in I} |\langle f, f_i \rangle|^2 \leq B \|f\|^2$ for all $f \in H$. The numbers A, B are called lower and upper frame bounds, respectively. The family F is called a tight frame if $A = B$, it is a Parseval frame if $A = B = 1$, it is a x-uniform frame if $\|f_i\| = \|f_j\| = x$ for all $i, j \in I$ and an exact frame if it ceases to be a frame when any one of its elements is removed. If the right-handed of mentioned inequality holds, then we say that F is a Bessel sequence and call B the Bessel bound. The operator $S_F : H \rightarrow H$ is called frame

*Corresponding author. Email address:h_rahimi2004@yahoo.com

operator and defined by $S_F(f) = \sum_{i \in I} \langle f, f_i \rangle f_i$ which leads us to reconstruction formula $f = \sum_{i \in I} \langle f, f_i \rangle S_F^{-1} f_i = \sum_{i \in I} \langle f, S_F^{-1} f_i \rangle f_i$ for all $f \in H$ and also we have $AId \leq S_F \leq BId$ for frame operator.

Let $\{W_i\}$ be a family of closed subspaces of H and let $\{v_i\}$ be a family of weights, i.e. $v_i > 0$ for all $i \in I$. Then $W = \{(W_i, v_i)\}_{i \in I}$ is a fusion frame for H if there exist constants $0 < C \leq D < \infty$ such that $C \|f\|^2 \leq \sum_{i \in I} v_i^2 \|\pi_{W_i}(f)\|^2 \leq D \|f\|^2$ for all $f \in H$. The numbers C, D are called lower and upper fusion frames bounds, respectively. The family W is called a tight fusion frame if $C = D$, it is a Parseval fusion frame if $C = D = 1$, it is a v -uniform fusion frame if $v_i = v_j = v$ for all $i, j \in I$ and an orthonormal fusion basis for H if $H = \oplus_{i \in I} W_i$. If the right-handed of mentioned inequality holds, then we say that W is a fusion Bessel sequence and call B the fusion Bessel bound. The operator $S_F : H \rightarrow H$ defined by $S_F(f) = \sum_{i \in I} \langle f, f_i \rangle f_i$ is called the fusion frame operator which leads us to reconstruction formula $f = \sum_{i \in I} v_i^2 S_W^{-1} \pi_{W_i}(f) = \sum_{i \in I} v_i^2 \pi_{W_i} S_W^{-1}(f)$ for all $f \in H$. Also we have $CId \leq S_W \leq DId$ for frame operator.

2 Main Results

In the following Lemma [1] Casazza and Kutyniok have proved if $W = \{(W_i, v_i)\}_{i \in I}$ is a fusion frame for H , then the intersection of a closed subspace V of H with the family of subspaces $\{W_i\}_{i \in I}$ of H which have the same weights, i.e. $W_v = \{(W_i \cap V, v_i)\}_{i \in I}$, is a fusion frame.

Lemma 2.1. *Let V be a subspace of H and $W = \{W_i, v_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a fusion frame for H with bounds C, D then $W_V = \{(W_i \cap V, v_i)\}_{i \in I}$ is a fusion frame for V with bounds C, D*

Remark 2.1. *The authors have used the following equation in proof of the above Lemma*

$$\sum_{i \in I} v_i^2 \|\pi_{W_i}(f)\|^2 = \sum_{i \in I} v_i^2 \|\pi_{W_i \cap V}(f)\|^2 \quad (\text{for all } f \in H) \tag{2.1}$$

But this equation is not correct in general. Actually, the right-hand side of Eq. (2.1) could be equal to zero. In fact, if $W_i \cap V = \{o\}, (\forall i \in I)$ then $\pi_{W_i \cap V}(f) = 0$ for all $f \in H$. Therefore $\sum_{i \in I} v_i^2 \|\pi_{W_i}(f)\|^2 = \sum_{i \in I} v_i^2 \|\pi_{W_i \cap V}(f)\|^2 = 0$. Thus $C \|f\|^2 \leq 0$ which is in contradiction with $0 < C \leq D < \infty$

Now, we state a counter example as follow.

Example 2.1. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \geq 2$, set $N = \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$. Then $E = \{e_i\}_{i \in N}$ is a canonical orthonormal basis for $l^2(N)$, where $e_j = \{\delta_{ij}\}_{i \in N}, (\forall j \in N)$. Let $W_1 = \overline{\text{span}}\{e_1 + e_2\}$ and for every $i \in N, i \neq 1, W_i = \overline{\text{span}}\{e_i\}$. Then $\{W_i\}_{i \in N}$ is a family of subspaces of $l^2(N)$. Put $V = \overline{\text{span}}\{e_1\}$, we show that there exists a family of weights $\{v_i\}_{i \in I}$ such that $W = \{(W_i, v_i)\}_{i \in I}$.*

Let $\{f_i\}_{i \in I}$ be an orthonormal basis for a subspace W of H then

$$\pi_W f = \sum_{i \in I} \langle \pi_W f, f_i \rangle f_i = \sum_{i \in I} \langle f, \pi_W f_i \rangle f_i = \sum_{i \in I} \langle f, f_i \rangle f_i \quad (\forall f \in H)$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{W_1} f &= \langle f, \frac{e_1 + e_2}{\sqrt{2}} \rangle \frac{e_1 + e_2}{\sqrt{2}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \langle f, e_1 + e_2 \rangle (e_1 + e_2) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \langle f, e_1 \rangle e_1 + \frac{1}{2} \langle f, e_1 \rangle e_2 + \frac{1}{2} \langle f, e_2 \rangle e_1 + \frac{1}{2} \langle f, e_2 \rangle e_2 \end{aligned}$$

we note $\pi_{W_i} f = \langle f, e_i \rangle e_i, (\forall i \in N, i \neq 1, \forall f \in H)$, so $\|\pi_{W_i} f\|^2 = |\langle f, e_i \rangle|^2$. On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned} \|\pi_W f\|^2 &= \langle \frac{1}{2} \langle f, e_1 \rangle e_1 + \frac{1}{2} \langle f, e_1 \rangle e_2 + \frac{1}{2} \langle f, e_2 \rangle e_1 + \frac{1}{2} \langle f, e_2 \rangle e_2, \\ &\quad \frac{1}{2} \langle f, e_1 \rangle e_1 + \frac{1}{2} \langle f, e_1 \rangle e_2 + \frac{1}{2} \langle f, e_2 \rangle e_1 + \frac{1}{2} \langle f, e_2 \rangle e_2 \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2} |\langle f, e_1 \rangle|^2 + \frac{1}{2} |\langle f, e_2 \rangle|^2 + |\langle f, e_1 \rangle| |\langle f, e_2 \rangle| \end{aligned}$$

let $v_1 = \sqrt{2}, v_i = 1$ where, $i \neq 1, i \in N$ we show that $W = \{(W_i, v_i)\}_{i \in I}$ is a fusion frame of subspaces for $l^2(N)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n v_i^2 \|\pi_{W_i}(f)\|^2 &= 2[\frac{1}{2} |\langle f, e_1 \rangle|^2 + \frac{1}{2} |\langle f, e_2 \rangle|^2 + |\langle f, e_1 \rangle| |\langle f, e_2 \rangle|] + \sum_{i=2}^n |\langle f, e_i \rangle|^2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n |\langle f, e_i \rangle|^2 + |\langle f, e_2 \rangle|^2 + 2|\langle f, e_1 \rangle| |\langle f, e_2 \rangle| \\ &= \|f\|^2 + |\langle f, e_2 \rangle|^2 + 2|\langle f, e_1 \rangle| |\langle f, e_2 \rangle| \end{aligned}$$

If $|\langle f, e_1 \rangle| \geq |\langle f, e_2 \rangle|$, then

$$2|\langle f, e_2 \rangle|^2 \leq 2|\langle f, e_1 \rangle| |\langle f, e_2 \rangle| \leq 2|\langle f, e_1 \rangle|^2$$

Thus

$$\|f\|^2 \leq \|f\|^2 + 3|\langle f, e_2 \rangle|^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^n v_i^2 \|\pi_{W_i}(f)\|^2 \leq \|f\|^2 + |\langle f, e_2 \rangle|^2 + 2|\langle f, e_1 \rangle|^2 \leq 3 \|f\|^2$$

If $|\langle f, e_1 \rangle| < |\langle f, e_2 \rangle|$, then

$$2|\langle f, e_1 \rangle|^2 < 2|\langle f, e_1 \rangle| |\langle f, e_2 \rangle| < 2|\langle f, e_2 \rangle|^2$$

so

$$\|f\|^2 \leq \|f\|^2 + |\langle f, e_2 \rangle|^2 + |\langle f, e_1 \rangle|^2 < \sum_{i=1}^n v_i^2 \|\pi_{W_i}(f)\|^2 < \|f\|^2 + 3|\langle f, e_2 \rangle|^2 \leq 4 \|f\|^2$$

Then $W = \{W_i, v_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a fusion frame for $l^2(N)$ with bounds $C = 1$ and $D = 4$. On the other hand, $W_i \cap V = \{0\}$. Thus $W_V = \{(W_i \cap V, v_i)\}_{i \in I}$ could not be fusion frames for $l^2(N)$.

Acknowledgement. We would like to thank the referee for his careful reading of the manuscript and giving useful comments.

References

- [1] P. G. Casazza and G. Kutyniok, Frames of Subspaces, in "Wavelets, frames and operator theory" (college park, MD, 2003), Contemp. Math. 345, Amer. Mathe. Soc. Providence, RI, (2004) 87-113.
- [2] P. G. Casazza, The art of frame theory, Taiwanese J. Math. 4 (2000) 129-201.
- [3] O. Christensen, An introduction to frames and Riesz bases, Appl. Numer. Harmon. Anal. Birkhuler, Boston, 2003.
- [4] R. J. Duffin and A. C. Schaeffer, A class of nonharmonic Fourier series, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 72 (1952) 341-366.

- [5] K. Grochenig, Foundations of time-frequency analysis, Birkhauser, Boston, 2001.
- [6] V. K. Goyal, J. Kovacevic, and J. A. Kelner, Quantized frame expansions with erasures, *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.* 10 (2001) 203-233.
- [7] A. Klappenecker and M. Rotteler, Mutually unbiased bases, spherical designs, and frames, *Wavelets XI* (San Diego, CA, 2005), *Proc. SPIE* 5914, M. Papadakis et al., eds., SPIE, Bellingham, WA (2005), pp. 196-208.
- [8] A. Shokrollahi, B. Hassibi, B. M. Hochwald, and W. Sweldens, Representation theory for high-rate multiple-antenna code design, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* 47 (2001) 2335-2367.
- [9] T. Strohmer and R. W. Heath, Jr., Grassmannian frames with applications to coding and communication, *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.* 14 (2003) 257-275.
- [10] M. Unser, A. Aldroubi, and A. Laine, eds., Special Issue on Wavelets in Medical Imaging, *IEEE Trans. Medical Imaging*, 22 (2003).
- [11] P. J. Wolfe, S. J. Godsill, and W.-J. Ng, Bayesian variable selection and regularization for time-frequency surface estimation, *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.* 66 (2004) 575-589.